

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

ON STARSHAPED SETS AND HELLY-TYPE THEOREMS

JOHN DAVID BAILDON AND RUTH SILVERMAN

ON STARSHAPED SETS AND HELLY-TYPE THEOREMS

JOHN D. BAILDON AND RUTH SILVERMAN

Suppose an ordered pair of sets (S, K) in a linear topological space is of Helly type $(n + 1, n)$, i.e., for every $n + 1$ distinct points in S there is a point in K which sees at least n of them via S . Then if S is closed, K compact, and $n \geq 3$, the nontrivial visibility sets in K are pairwise nonintersecting. Sufficient conditions are obtained for S to be starshaped.

Let S be a subset of a linear topological space L . For points x, y in S , we say x sees y via S if and only if the segment $[x, y]$ lies in S . Further, the set S is said to be *starshaped* if and only if there is some point p in S such that, for every x in S , p sees x via S .

If S and K are subsets of L , with every point x in S associated its *visibility set* $K(x)$, the set of all points of K which x sees via S .

We shall say (S, K) has *Helly-type* (s, r) , where r and s are positive integers, $r \leq s$, if for every s distinct points in S there is a point on K seeing at least r of them via S . Clearly, if (S, K) has Helly-type (s, r) , and $0 \leq i \leq r - 1$, then (S, K) has Helly-type $(s - i, r - i)$.

In this paper we obtain a solution to a problem posed by Valentine, concerning sets of Helly type which are unions of a finite number of starshaped sets [3, Prob. 6.7, p. 178], and also obtain some related results. Breen [1] has given conditions in the plane for a simply connected set to be a union of two starshaped sets. We replace simple connectedness by the following:

For S and K subsets of a linear topological space L , we shall say the ordered pair (S, K) has the *triangle property* if the interior of every triangle having an edge on K and the other edges in S is itself a subset of S .

If S is a closed subset of a linear topological space L , K is a compact convex subset of L of dimension k and (S, K) has the triangle property, then $K(x)$ is compact and convex for each $x \in S$. If (S, K) is of Helly type (r, r) , for $r \geq k + 1$, then by Helly's theorem $\bigcap \{K(x) : x \in S\} \neq \emptyset$, and S is starshaped. However, it is possible under certain conditions to weaken the hypothesis considerably, and yet reach the same conclusion.

A collection of sets \mathcal{K} is said to have "*piercing number*" j or a *j-partition* for a positive integer j , if \mathcal{K} can be represented as a union of j collections, each with a nonvoid intersection.

The classical result on j -partitions is a theorem by H. Hadwiger and H. DeBrunner [2], which for convenience we state here as Theorem 1.

THEOREM 1. *For integers r, s and n , let $J(s, r, n)$ denote the smallest integer (if one exists) for which a j -partition is admitted by each family \mathcal{K} of compact convex sets in R^n which has the (s, r) property, i.e., for every s members of \mathcal{K} , some r have a common point. Then $J(s, r, n) = s - r + 1$ whenever $r \leq s$ and $nr \geq (n - 1)s + (n + 1)$.*

REMARKS. When $j = 1$ and $r = n + 1$, Theorem 1 reduces to Helly's theorem.

If S is a closed subset of a linear topological space, K a compact convex subset of S of dimension n , such that (S, K) has the triangle property and is of Helly type (s, r) , then for every $x \in S$, $K(x)$ is compact and convex, and the collection $\{K(x) : x \in S\}$ has the (s, r) property.

Therefore, if $J(s, r, n) = j$, then the set S can be expressed as a union of j starshaped sets. However, for choices of s, r and n as small as $s = 4, r = 3, n = 2$, it is not known whether $J(4, 3, 2)$ exists.

If $n = 1$, then Theorem 1 implies that $J(s, r, 1) = s - r + 1$ if $r \geq 2$, so that $J(s, 2, 1) = s - 1$. Consequently S will be the union of $s - 1$ starshaped sets if (S, K) has Helly-type $(s, 2)$ and K is a compact line segment. Also, since $J(r + 1, r, 1) = 2$ for all $r \geq 2$, $J(3, 2, 1) = J(4, 3, 1) = 2$. Consequently if (S, K) has Helly-type $(3, 2)$ or $(4, 3)$, where K is a compact line segment, then S is the union of two starshaped sets. Breen [1] proved this result for Helly-type $(3, 2)$ without the assumption that $K(x) \neq \emptyset$ for all x in S . We improve the $(4, 3)$ case by showing S will be starshaped. In fact, in Theorem 4, we obtain the more general result that if (S, K) is of Helly type $(2k + 2, 2k + 1)$ in a linear topological space, and K is of dimension k , then with a single exception S is starshaped. This result improves the prediction, from $J(2k + 2, 2k + 1, k) = 2$, that S would be a union of two starshaped sets. In Theorems 2 and 3, for (S, K) of Helly type $(n + 1, n)$, without restrictions on dimension, sufficient conditions are obtained for the visibility sets to be pairwise nondisjoint (2), or for S to be starshaped (3).

We must first prove the following lemma.

LEMMA. *Let S and K be a closed and a compact subset, respectively, of a linear topological space L . If there exist x, w in S such that $K(x) \cap K(w) = \emptyset$ and $p \in K(x), q \in K(w)$, then there exist t_0, τ_0 in $(0, 1)$ such that if $|t| < t_0, |\tau| < \tau_0$, then $K(y(t)) \cap K(z(\tau)) = \emptyset$, where $y(t) = tp + (1 - t)x$, and $z(\tau) = \tau q + (1 - \tau)w$.*

Proof. We first observe that for every x in S , $K(x)$ is compact: recall $K(x) = \{p \in K \cap S \mid [p, x] \subset S\}$. Let p be a limit point of $K(x)$. Select a sequence $\{p_n\}$ such that $p_n \in K(x)$ for every n and $p_n \rightarrow p$. For each n , the line segment $[p_n, x]$ is contained in S . By closure of S , $[p, x] \subset S$ and by closure of K , $p \in K$. Therefore $p \in$

$K(x)$. So $K(x)$ is a closed subset of a compact set and consequently compact.

Since $K(w)$ and $K(x)$ are compact and disjoint, there are disjoint open neighborhoods U, U' in L , such that $K(x) \subset U$ and $K(w) \subset U'$.

We wish to prove the existence of $t_0 > 0$ such that $0 < t < t_0$ implies $K(y(t)) \subset U$. Since t_0 exists trivially if $K(x) = \{x\}$, we may assume $K(x) \neq \{x\}$.

Assume no such t_0 exists. Then we can find a sequence of real numbers $\{t_n\}$, $t_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and a corresponding sequence of points $\{\alpha_n\}$ in $K \sim U$, such that for every n , $\alpha_n \in K(y(t_n))$.

By compactness of $K \sim U$, there is a point $\alpha_0 \in K \sim U$ and a subsequence of $\{\alpha_n\}$, called for convenience $\{a_i\}$, such that $a_i \rightarrow \alpha_0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Now for each i , $a_i \in K(y(t_i))$, so the line segment from $y(t_i)$ to a_i is in S . By closure of S , the limiting line segment from x to α_0 is also in S . Therefore x sees α_0 , contradicting the hypothesis, since α_0 , not being in U , is clearly not in $K(x)$.

The same argument implies the existence of $\tau_0 > 0$ such that for $0 < \tau < \tau_0$, $K(z(\tau)) \subset U'$. We therefore conclude that for t, τ sufficiently small, $K(y(t)) \cap K(z(\tau)) = \emptyset$.

THEOREM 2. *Let S and K be, respectively, a closed and a compact subset of a linear topological space L , such that (S, K) is of Helly type $(n+1, n)$ for some $n \geq 3$. Let $\mathcal{K} = \{K(x) : x \in S, K(x) \not\subset \{x\}\}$. Then \mathcal{K} is pairwise nondisjoint.*

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{K} fails to be pairwise nondisjoint and let $K(x)$ and $K(w)$ be members of \mathcal{K} such that $K(x) \cap K(w) = \emptyset$. There exist neighborhoods U, U' such that $K(x) \subset U$, $K(w) \subset U'$, and $U \cap U' = \emptyset$. As in the proof of the lemma, select $p \in K(x)$, $p \neq x$, $q \in K(w)$, $q \neq w$, and then y on (x, p) , z on (w, q) such that $K(y) \subset U$, $K(z) \subset U'$. There is no point in K seeing three of the four points x, y, w, z . Expanding the set $\{x, y, w, z\}$ if necessary, we have a contradiction of the hypothesis of Helly type $(n+1, n)$ for all $n \geq 3$. Therefore \mathcal{K} is pairwise nondisjoint.

A special case of Theorem 2 is of sufficient interest to be stated separately.

THEOREM 3. *Let S and K be a closed and a compact subset respectively, of a linear topological space L , such that (S, K) is of Helly type $(n+1, n)$ for some $n \geq 3$. Let us further assume that for some $x_0 \in S$, $K(x_0) = \{p\}$, $p \neq x_0$. Then either S is starshaped relative to p or S is the union of an isolated point and a set starshaped relative to p .*


Proof. Suppose y_1 and y_2 are points in $S \sim \{p\}$, such that $K(y_i) \subset \{y_i\}$, $i = 1, 2$. The set $\{x_0, y_1, y_2\}$, suitably expanded, lacks the

$(n + 1, n)$ property, since y_1 and y_2 do not see p , and x_0 sees neither y_1 nor y_2 . Therefore there is at most one point y in $S \sim \{p\}$ such that $K(y) \subset \{y\}$.

We then have, by Theorem 2, that at most one point in S does not see p . Furthermore, any such point must be isolated, by the closure of S .

REMARK. It is possible for a point x_0 to be the only point with singleton visibility set. Consider the following example: Let $S = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y \leq x^2, 0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq 1\}$, and $K = \{(1, y) \mid 0 \leq y \leq 1\}$. Let $x_0 = (0, 0)$. Then $K(x_0) = \{(1, 0)\}$. It is easily seen that (S, K) satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 3, and that $(0, 0)$ is the only point with the required property.

REMARK. Theorems 2 and 3 do not hold when (S, K) is of Helly type (3.2). An example is shown below.



REMARK. Theorems 2 and 3 trivially fail if the hypothesis lacks the condition that $K(x) \neq \emptyset$, for every $x \in S$.

REMARK. Let S and K be subsets of a linear topological space L , such that (S, K) is of Helly type (3, 2). If there exist points $x, z \in S$ such that $K(x) = \{a\}$, $K(z) = \{b, c\}$, a, b, c , distinct, then S is a union of three starshaped sets, since an arbitrary w in S sees at least one of $\{a, b, c\}$ via S . As we see by Breen's example [1], even with the restriction that S is a closed subset of the plane and K is a line segment we may need as many as three points to write S as a union of starshaped sets.

THEOREM 4. *Let S be a closed subset of a linear topological space L , and let K be a compact convex subset of S of finite dimension k . Suppose (S, K) has the triangle property and is of Helly type $(2k + 2, 2k + 1)$. Then S is the union of a starshaped set and at most one isolated point.*

Proof. Since the theorem is trivially true for $k = 0$, we assume $k > 0$. For arbitrary $x \in S$, $K(x)$ is compact, as was shown in the Lemma, and is also convex.

Suppose $K(x) \neq \emptyset$ for every $x \in S$. If, for arbitrary $\{x_i : x_i \in S, i = 1, 2, \dots, k + 1\}$, the set $\bigcap_{i=1}^{k+1} K(x_i) \neq \emptyset$, then Helly's theorem implies $\bigcap_{x \in S} K(x) \neq \emptyset$, so S is starshaped. Assume S is not starshaped. Then let j be a minimal integer such that $\bigcap_{i=1}^j K(x_i) = \emptyset$ for some collection

$\{x_i: x_i \in S, i = 1, 2, \dots, j\}$. Then $j \geq 2$ since $K(x) \neq \emptyset$ for all x , and $j \leq k + 1$ by assumption.

Consider $(S \sim \{x_1, \dots, x_j\}, K)$. This pair is of Helly type $(2k + 2 - j, 2k + 2 - j)$: for given an arbitrary collection of $2k + 2 - j$ points from $S \sim \{x_1, \dots, x_j\}$, augment the collection with $\{x_1, \dots, x_j\}$, making a total of $2k + 2$ points of S . By hypothesis at least $2k + 1$ of these points must see a point of K in common. One point from the $2k + 2$ points in S must fail to see the point in K , in fact, a point from the set $\{x_1, \dots, x_j\}$ since otherwise the assumption that $\bigcap_{i=1}^j K(x_i) = \emptyset$ would be violated. Therefore all of the $2k + 2 - j$ points from $S \sim \{x_1, \dots, x_j\}$ see the point in question.

Since $j \leq k + 1$, it follows that $2k + 2 - j \geq k + 1$, so the pair $(S \sim \{x_1, \dots, x_j\}, K)$ is of Helly type $(k + 1, k + 1)$ as well, and consequently, by Helly's theorem $S \sim \{x_1, \dots, x_j\}$ is starshaped. Then the closure of $S \sim \{x_1, \dots, x_j\}$ is also starshaped. Our assumption that S is not starshaped implies that there is an integer i , $1 \leq i \leq j$, such that x_i is not in the closure of $S \sim \{x_1, \dots, x_j\}$. Therefore x_i has a neighborhood containing no points of $S \sim \{x_1, \dots, x_j\}$, and sees no points of K via S , which contradicts that $K(x_i) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore S is starshaped.

On the other hand, suppose for some $x_0 \in S$, $K(x_0) = \emptyset$. Then x_0 is the only point of S with empty visibility set, and $(S \sim \{x_0\}, K)$ is of Helly type $(2k + 1, 2k + 1)$. By Helly's theorem, the collection $\{K(y): y \in S \sim \{x_0\}\}$ has a nonvoid intersection, so $S \sim \{x_0\}$ is starshaped. S consists of the starshaped set $S \sim \{x_0\}$ and the point $\{x_0\}$. Closure of S implies that x_0 is isolated.

REFERENCES

1. M. Breen, *An Example Concerning Unions of Two Starshaped Sets in the Plane*, Israel J. of Math., **17** #4 (1974), 347-349.
2. H. Hadwiger and H. DeBrunner, *Über eine Variante zum Hellyschen Satz*, Arch. Math., **8** (1957), 309-313.
3. F. A. Valentine, *Convex Sets*, McGraw-Hill, New York (1964).

Received July 2, 1975 and in revised form October 9, 1975. Partial support for the second author was provided by Pennsylvania State University through Grant PDE-OCC-EDUC-PROG IV #3412.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, BETHLEHEM, PENNSYLVANIA

AND

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, WORTHINGTON SCRANTON CAMPUS

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 62, No. 1

January, 1976

| | |
|--|-----|
| Mieczyslaw Altman, <i>Contractor directions, directional contractors and directional contractions for solving equations</i> | 1 |
| Michael Peter Anderson, <i>Subgroups of finite index in profinite groups</i> | 19 |
| Zvi Arad, <i>Abelian and nilpotent subgroups of maximal order of groups of odd order</i> | 29 |
| John David Baidon and Ruth Silverman, <i>On starshaped sets and Helly-type theorems</i> | 37 |
| John W. Baker and R. C. Lacher, <i>Some mappings which do not admit an averaging operator</i> | 43 |
| Joseph Barback, <i>Composite numbers and prime regressive isols</i> | 49 |
| David M. Boyd, <i>Composition operators on $H^p(A)$</i> | 55 |
| Maurice Chacron, <i>Co-radical extension of PI rings</i> | 61 |
| Fred D. Crary, <i>Some new engulfing theorems</i> | 65 |
| Victor Dannon and Dany Leviatan, <i>A representation theorem for convolution transform with determining function in L^p</i> | 81 |
| Mahlon M. Day, <i>Lumpy subsets in left-amenable locally compact semigroups</i> | 87 |
| Michael A. Gauger, <i>Some remarks on the center of the universal enveloping algebra of a classical simple Lie algebra</i> | 93 |
| David K. Haley, <i>Equational compactness and compact topologies in rings satisfying A.C.C</i> | 99 |
| Raymond Heitmann, <i>Generating ideals in Prüfer domains</i> | 117 |
| Gerald Norman Hile, <i>Entire solutions of linear elliptic equations with Laplacian principal part</i> | 127 |
| Richard Oscar Hill, <i>Moore-Postnikov towers for fibrations in which $\pi_1(\text{fiber})$ is non-abelian</i> | 141 |
| John Rast Hubbard, <i>Approximation of compact homogeneous maps</i> | 149 |
| Russell L. Merris, <i>Relations among generalized matrix functions</i> | 153 |
| V. S. Ramamurthi and Edgar Andrews Rutter, <i>On cotorsion radicals</i> | 163 |
| Ralph Tyrrell Rockafellar and Roger Jean-Baptiste Robert Wets, <i>Stochastic convex programming: basic duality</i> | 173 |
| Alban J. Roques, <i>Local evolution systems in general Banach spaces</i> | 197 |
| I. Bert Russak, <i>An indirect sufficiency proof for problems with bounded state variables</i> | 219 |
| Richard Alexander Sanerib, Jr., <i>Ultrafilters and the basis property</i> | 255 |
| H. A. Seid, <i>The decomposition of multiplication operators on L_p-spaces</i> | 265 |
| Franklin D. Tall, <i>The density topology</i> | 275 |
| John Campbell Wells, <i>Invariant manifolds on non-linear operators</i> | 285 |
| James Chin-Sze Wong, <i>A characterization of topological left thick subsets in locally compact left amenable semigroups</i> | 295 |