## **On Lower Semicontinuity and Metric Upper Semicontinuity of Nemytskii Set-Valued Operators**

**S. Rolewicz and Song Wen** 

Abstract. Sufficient conditions of lower semicontinuity and metric upper semicontinuity of Nemytskii set-valued operators  $N_F$  generated by a set-valued function  $F: \Omega \times X \to 2^Y$ , where X and Y are Orlicz-Musielak F-spaces are presented.

*Keywords: Nemytski set-valued operators, lower semicontinuity, metric upper semicontinuity, superposition measurable set-valued operators* 

AMS subject classification: 47H04, 28C20, 54C60

In years 1933 - 1934 V. Nemytskii (see [10] and [11]) considered the operator  $F$ :  $L^2[a, b] \to L^2[a, b]$  defined by  $y(\cdot) = N_F(x(\cdot))$ , where  $y(t) = F(t, x(t))$ . From that time the operator *NF* was generalized in several way and there is a lot of papers devoted to such subjects. Operators of this type are now called *Nemyiski operators.* 

In last years new important applications of Nemytskii set-valued operators in the theory of differential and integral inclusions appear (see [1 - 4]). For these applications lower semicontinuity and metric upper semicontinuity of Nemytskii set-valued operators are important.

In [1] Appell, Ngyen and Zabrejko give sufficient conditions of lower semicontinuity of Nemytski set-valued operators acting in so-called *ideal spaces.* We shall not give the definition here. We want only to mention that ideal spaces are some spaces of functions defined on a measure space  $\Omega$  admitting values in finite-dimensional spaces and it can be shown that each Orlicz space admitting values in a finite-dimensional space is an ideal space.

Thus the natural problem arose to give sufficient conditions of lower semicontinuity and metric upper semicontinuity of Nemytskii set-valued operators for spaces consisting of functions admitting values in infinite dimensional spaces.

In this paper sufficient conditions of lower semicontinuity and metric upper semicontinuity of Nemytskii set-valued operators acting in Orlicz-Musielak F-spaces are

ISSN 0232-2064 / \$ 2.50 ® Heldermann Verlag Berlin

S. Rolewicz: Polish Acad. Sci., Inst. Math., ul. Sniadeckich 8, skr. poszt. 137, P - 00-950 Warszawa. The paper is partially supported by the Polish Committee for Scientific Research under Grant No. 2 2009 9102.

Song Wen: Harbin Normal University, Department of Mathematics, Harbin, China

given.

Let X be a separable *F-space (i.e.* a complete linear metric space; basic properties can be found in [12]) with an F-norm  $\|\cdot\|_X$  and  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$  a measure space with complete and  $\sigma$ -finite measue  $\mu$ . A function  $x = x(t)$  mapping  $\Omega$  into X is called *measurable* if for every open set  $Q \subset X$  the inverse image  $x^{-1}(Q) = \{t \in \Omega : x(t) \in Q\}$  is measurable, i.e. if  $x^{-1}(Q) \in \Sigma$ . The set of all measurable functions defined on  $\Omega$  with values in X we shall denote by  $S(\Omega, X)$ .

A closed-valued set-valued function  $F = F(t)$  mapping  $\Omega$  into subsets of X is called *measurable* if for every open set  $Q \subset X$  the inverse image  $F^{-1}(Q) = \{t \in \Omega :$  $F(t) \cap Q \neq \emptyset$  is measurable, i.e. if  $F^{-1}(Q) \in \Sigma$ . By a *measurable selection* of the set-valued function F we mean a (single-valued) function  $x_F$  such that  $x_F(t) \in F(t)$  for all  $t \in \Omega$ .

Let  $F = F(t, x)$  be a closed-valued set-valued function mapping  $\Omega \times X$  into subsets of an F-space Y, i.e. into  $2^Y$ . We say that F is *sup-measurable* if for any measurable function  $x(\cdot): \Omega \to X$  the set-valued function  $s \to F(s, x(s)) : \Omega \to 2^Y$  is measurable.

Given a sup-measurable closed-valued set-valued function  $F: \Omega \times X \to 2^Y$ . This set-valued function induces a set-valued operator  $N_F$ :  $S(\Omega, X) \to S(\Omega, Y)$  defined by  $y(\cdot) = N_F(x(\cdot))$ , where  $y(t) = F(t, x(t))$ . The set-valued operator  $N_F$  is called *superposition operator* (or *Nemyiski operator)* generated by the set-valued function *F.*  et-valued function mapping  $\Omega \times X$  into subsets<br>hat *F* is *sup-measurable* if for any measurable<br>nction  $s \rightarrow F(s, x(s)) : \Omega \rightarrow 2^Y$  is measurable.<br>End set-valued function  $F : \Omega \times X \rightarrow 2^Y$ . This<br>i operator  $N_F : S(\Omega, X) \rightarrow S(\Omega, Y)$  def

Let  $N = N(t, u)$  be a real-valued measurable function defined on  $\Omega \times R$  such that for every  $t \in \Omega$  the function  $N(t, \cdot)$  is increasing and moreover  $N(t, 0) = 0$  for all  $t \in \Omega$ . Then we can define on  $S(\Omega, X)$  a *metrizing modular* 

$$
\rho_{N,\mu}(x(\cdot)) = \int_{\Omega} N(t, \|x(t)\|_{X}) d\mu \tag{1}
$$

(see, e.c., Nakano ([7],  $[8: p. 153]$  and  $[9: p. 204]$ ), Musielak  $[5: p. 1]$  and Rolewicz [12: p. 6]). The set of those measurable functions  $x(\cdot) \in S(\Omega, X)$  that there is a positive *k* such that  $\rho_{N,\mu}(kx(\cdot)) < \infty$  we shall denote by  $N(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;X))$ . Recall that a *metrizing modular* on a linear space X is a function  $\rho : X \to [0, \infty]$  having the following properties:

(md1)  $\rho(x)=0$  if and only if  $x=0$ 

 $(\text{md2})$   $\rho(ax) = \rho(x)$  provided  $|a| = 1$ 

(md3)  $\rho(ax + by) \leq \rho(x) + \rho(y)$  provided  $a, b > 0$  and  $a + b = 1$ 

(md4)  $\rho(a_n x) \to 0$  provided  $a_n \to 0$  and  $\rho(x) < +\infty$ 

(md5)  $\rho(ax_n) \rightarrow provided \rho(x_n) \rightarrow 0.$ 

We shall denote by  $(X, \rho)$  a linear space with a modular  $\rho$  and we shall call it *modular* space. Let  $(X, \rho)$  be a modular space with metrizing modular  $\rho$ . It is known that  $\rho$ induces in the space X an F-norm  $\|\cdot\|_X$  by  $b = 1$ <br>and we shalar  $\rho$ . It

$$
\|x\|_X = \inf \left\{ \varepsilon > 0 \; \middle| \; \rho\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) < \varepsilon \right\}.
$$
 (2)

The norm  $\|\cdot\|_X$  is equivalent to the moduler  $\rho$  in the sense that, for any sequence  ${x_n}$ ,  $||x_n||_X \to 0$  if and only if  $\rho(x_n) \to 0$  (see Musielak and Orlicz [6] and Musielak [5: p. 2]; see also Rolewicz [12: p. 8]). Observe that if the functions  $x_n(\cdot) \in$ *x x* of Set-Valued Operators 741<br> *x* the sense that, for any sequence<br>
elak and Orlicz [6] and Musielak<br> *x*  $_n(\cdot) \in$ <br> *x*  $_n(\cdot)$ <br> *(3)*<br> *A* set-valued operator  $\Gamma = \Gamma(x)$ 

$$
N(L(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu; X)) \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}) \text{ have disjoint supports, then}
$$
\n
$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \rho_{N, \mu}(x_n(\cdot)) = \rho_{N, \mu} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n(\cdot) \right).
$$
\n(3)

Let  $(X, \rho_X)$  and  $(Y, \rho_Y)$  be two modular spaces. A set-valued operator  $\Gamma = \Gamma(x)$ mapping  $(X, \rho_X)$  into subsets of  $(Y, \rho_Y)$  will be called *lower semicontinuous at a point*  $(x_0, y_0) \in X \times Y$  if it is lower semicontinuous at this point in the metric induced by the Fnorms introduced above. In other words  $\Gamma$  is lower semicontinuous at  $(x_0, y_0)$  if for every  $r > 0$  there is a number  $q_{(x_0,y_0)}(r) > 0$  with the following property: for every  $x \in X$  such that  $\rho_{N,\mu}(x_0(\cdot)-x(\cdot)) < q_{(x_0,y_0)}(r)$  there is an  $y \in \Gamma(x)$  such that  $\rho_{M,\mu}(y_0(\cdot)-y(\cdot)) < r$ . This is equivalent with the property that  $\rho_{N,\mu}(x_0(\cdot) - x(\cdot)) < q_{(x_0,y_0)}(r)$  implies (c)) =  $\rho_{N,\mu}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}x_n(\cdot)\right)$ . (3)<br>
(c)) =  $\rho_{N,\mu}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}x_n(\cdot)\right)$ . (3)<br>
modular spaces. A set-valued operator  $\Gamma = \Gamma(x)$ <br>
py ) will be called *lower semicontinuous at a point*<br>
inuous at this point in the met

$$
\Gamma(x) \cap Q \neq \emptyset \tag{4}
$$

where  $Q = \{ y : \rho_{M,\mu}(y_0(\cdot) - y(\cdot)) < r \}.$ 

A set-valued operator  $\Gamma$  mapping  $(X, \rho_X)$  into subsets of  $(Y, \rho_Y)$  will be called *lower semicontinuous at a point*  $x_0 \in X$  if it is lower semicontinuous at all the points  $(x_0, y_0)$   $(y_0 \in \Gamma(x_0)).$ 

Now we shall introduce a notion of global lower semicontinuity at  $x_0$ , which is nothing else than an uniformization of lower semicontinuity on  $\Gamma(x_0)$ . More precisely, we say that a set-valued mapping  $\Gamma$  is globally lower semicontinuous at the point  $x_0$ , if for every  $r > 0$  there is a  $q_{x_0}(r) > 0$  with the following property: for every  $y_0 \in \Gamma(x_0)$ and for every  $x \in X$  such that  $\rho_{N,\mu}(x_0(\cdot)-x(\cdot)) < q_{x_0}(r)$  there is an  $y \in \Gamma(x)$  such that  $\rho_{M,\mu}(y_0 - y) < r$ . This is equivalent with the property that  $\rho_{N,\mu}(x_0(\cdot) - x(\cdot)) < q_{x_0}(r)$ implies  $\langle r \rangle$ .<br>
pping  $(X, \rho_X)$  into subsets of  $(Y, \rho_Y)$  will be called<br>  $\rho_0 \in X$  if it is lower semicontinuous at all the points<br>
tion of global lower semicontinuity at  $x_0$ , which is<br>
on of lower semicontinuity on  $\Gamma(x_0)$ .

$$
\Gamma(x_0) \subset B(\Gamma(x), r) \tag{5}
$$

where

$$
B(A,s)=\left\{y(\cdot):\inf_{y_1(\cdot)\in A}\rho_{M,\mu}(y_1(\cdot)-y(\cdot))
$$

The essential difference between lower semicontinuity and global lower semicontinuity is that in the first case  $q_{(x_0,y_0)} > 0$  depends on  $x_0$  and  $y_0 \in \Gamma(x_0)$ , while in the second case it depends on  $x_0$  only.

Changing the role of x and  $x_0$  in formula (5) we obtain a notion of metric upper semicontinuity. We say that the set-valued mapping  $\Gamma$  is metric upper semicontinuous *(Hausdorff upper semicontinuous)* at a point  $x_0$  if for every  $r > 0$  there is a  $q_{x_0}(r) > 0$ such that  $\rho_{N,\mu}(x_0(\cdot) - x(\cdot)) < q_{x_0}(r)$  implies F(x)  $\left\{\n\begin{aligned}\n\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} &= \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x \partial x} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial$ 

$$
\Gamma(x) \subset B(\Gamma(x_0), r). \tag{6}
$$

**The both** notions are not equivalent. Indeed, it is easy to give an example of a set-valued mapping  $\Gamma$  which is globally lower semicontinuous at a point  $x_0$ , but which is not metric upper semicontinuous at this point. Conversely, an example of a set-valued mapping  $\Gamma$  which is metric upper semicontinuous at a point  $x_0$  but which is not globally lower semicontinuous at this point can be easily given too.

In the sequel we shall add some assumptions about the functions  $N(t, u)$  and  $M(t, u)$ . Namely, we assume that the function  $N = N(t, u)$  satisfies the following condition

(A) For every  $\epsilon > 0$  there are numbers  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$  such that for every measurable set  $E \subset \Omega$  with  $\mu(E) > \delta$  we have  $\int_E N(t,\varepsilon) dt \geq \alpha$ .

Observe that in Orlicz spaces, i.e. in the case when  $N(t, u) = N_0(u)$  depends only on *u*, the condition (A) is satisfied. Further, we assume that the function  $M(t, u)$  satisfies the following condition

 $f(\Delta_2)$  There are a constant  $k\geq 1$  and a non-negative function  $\delta$  such that  $\int_E M(t,\delta(t))\,d\mu$  $< +\infty$  and for almost all *t*, if  $u \geq \delta(t)$ , then  $M(t, 2u) \leq k M(t, u)$ .

The condition  $(\Delta_2)$  plays an essential role in the theory of Orlicz-Musielak spaces. Observe that if the function  $M(t, u)$  satisfies condition  $(\Delta_2)$ , then from the fact that  $\rho_{M,\mu}(x) < +\infty$  and  $\rho_{M,\mu}(y) < +\infty$  it follows that  $\rho_{M,\mu}(ax + by) < +\infty$  for all real a and *b*. We conclude that  $M(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;Y))$  is the set of those measurable functions  $y(\cdot)$ with values in the space X, that  $\rho_{M,\mu}(y) < +\infty$  (see [5: p. 52] and [6]).

**Theorem 1.** Let X, Y be two separable  $F_5$ spaces,  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$  a measure space with *complete non-atomic and*  $\sigma$ *-finite measure*  $\mu$ *, and*  $N_F$  *a Nemytskii set-valued operator mapping of a modular space*  $(N(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;X)),\rho_{N,\mu})$  into subsets of a modular space  $(M(L(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu; Y)), \rho_{M,\mu})$  induced by a sup-measurable set-valued function  $F(t, u): \Omega \times$  $X \rightarrow 2^Y$ . Suppose that

- (i) the function  $N = N(t, u)$  satisfies condition (A)
- (ii) the function  $M = M(t, u)$  satisfies condition  $(\Delta_2)$ .

If the function  $= F(t, u)$  is globally lower semicontinuous with respect to u for almost all  $t \in \Omega$ , then the operator  $N_F$  is globally lower semicontinuous.

**Proof.** Suppose that the operator *NF is* not globally lower semicontinuous. This implies that there are a number  $r > 0$  and sequences  $\{x_n(\cdot)\}, \{y_n(\cdot)\}$  with  $y_n(\cdot) \in$  $N_F(x_0(\cdot))$  such that that the operator  $N_F$  is not globally lower set <br> *i* a number  $r > 0$  and sequences  $\{x_n(\cdot)\}, \{p_{N,\mu}(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)) \to 0$ <br>  $\inf_{z(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))} \rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot) - y_n(\cdot)) > r \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$ that the operator  $N_F$  is not globally lower semicontinuous. Thi<br> *re* a number  $r > 0$  and sequences  $\{x_n(\cdot)\}, \{y_n(\cdot)\}$  with  $y_n(\cdot)$ <br>  $y_{N,\mu}(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)) \to 0$ <br>
inf<br>  $y(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))} \rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot) - y_n(\cdot)) > r$  ( $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ).<br>
and

$$
\rho_{N,\mu}(x_n(\cdot)-x_0(\cdot))\to 0
$$
  
inf  

$$
x(\cdot)\in N_F(x_n(\cdot))\rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot)-y_n(\cdot))>r \quad (n\in\mathbb{N}).
$$

By [2: Theorem 8.24 and Corollary 8.23], for arbitrary  $\eta > 0$  there is a sequence  $\{z_n(\cdot)\}$ of measurable selections  $z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))$  such that, for almost all  $t \in \Omega$ ,

$$
||y_n(t) - z_n(t)||_Y < (1 + \eta) d_Y(y_n(t), F(t, x_n(t)))
$$
\n(7)

where  $d_Y(y, A) = \inf_{z \in A} ||z - y||_Y$  denotes the distance of a point y to a set *A* in the norm  $\|\cdot\|_Y$ . We denote  $u_n(t) = \|y_n(t) - z_n(t)\|_Y$ . Since  $z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))$ , then

On Lower Semicontinuity of Set-Valued Operators  
\n
$$
(y, A) = \inf_{z \in A} ||z - y||_Y
$$
 denotes the distance of a point y to a set A in the  
\n $||y$ . We denote  $u_n(t) = ||y_n(t) - z_n(t)||_Y$ . Since  $z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))$ , then  
\n
$$
\int M(t, u_n(t)) d\mu \ge \inf_{z(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))} \rho_{M, \mu}(z(\cdot) - y_n(\cdot)) > r \qquad (n \in \mathbb{N}).
$$
 (8)<sub>1</sub>

The convergence  $\rho_{N,\mu}(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)) \rightarrow 0$  implies that the sequence  $\{x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)\}$ contains a subsequence  ${x_{n_k}(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)}$  such that

On Lower Semicontinuity of Set-Valued Operators 743  
\n
$$
\in A \parallel z - y \parallel_{Y} \text{ denotes the distance of a point } y \text{ to a set } A \text{ in the}
$$
\ne  $u_{n}(t) = ||y_{n}(t) - z_{n}(t)||_{Y}$ . Since  $z_{n}(\cdot) \in N_{F}(x_{n}(\cdot)),$  then  
\n
$$
|d\mu \geq \inf_{z(\cdot) \in N_{F}(x_{n}(\cdot))} \rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot) - y_{n}(\cdot)) > r \qquad (n \in \mathbb{N}).
$$
\n(8)<sub>1</sub>  
\n
$$
(x_{n}(\cdot) - x_{0}(\cdot)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ implies that the sequence } \{x_{n}(\cdot) - x_{0}(\cdot)\} \{x_{n_{k}}(\cdot) - x_{0}(\cdot)\} \text{ such that}
$$
\n
$$
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} N(t, ||x_{n_{k}}(t) - x_{0}(t)||_{X}) d\mu < +\infty. \qquad (9)_{1}
$$
\n\nuence  $\{x_{n}(\cdot) - x_{0}(\cdot)\}$  by the subsequence  $\{x_{n_{k}}(\cdot) - x_{0}(\cdot)\}$  we can  
\ngenerating that  
\n
$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} N(t, ||x_{n}(t) - x_{0}(t)||_{X}) d\mu < +\infty. \qquad (10)_{1}
$$

Thus replacing the sequence  $\{x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)\}$  by the subsequence  $\{x_{n_k}(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)\}$  we can assume without loss of generality that

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} N(t, \|x_n(t) - x_0(t)\|_X) d\mu < +\infty. \tag{10}_1
$$

Now we have the following two possibilities: either (1)  $\mu(\Omega)$  is finite or (2)  $\mu(\Omega)$  is infinite.

Case (1):  $\mu(\Omega)$  is finite. We shall construct by induction a sequence of positive numbers  $\{\varepsilon_k\}$ , a sequence of measurable sets  $\{\Omega_k\}$   $(\Omega_k \subset \Omega)$  and a subsequence  $\{x_{n_k}$  $x_0$  such that the following conditions are satisfied:

(a)  $\varepsilon_{k+1} < \frac{\varepsilon_k}{2}$ 

(b) 
$$
\mu(\Omega_k) \leq \varepsilon_k
$$

(c) 
$$
\int_{\Omega_k} M(t, u_{n_k}(t)) d\mu > \frac{2}{3}r
$$

(d)  $\int_D M(t, u_{n_k}(t)) d\mu < \frac{1}{3}r$  for any set  $D \subset \Omega_k$  such that  $\mu(D) \leq 2\varepsilon_{k+1}$ .

We put  $\varepsilon_1 = \mu(\Omega), x_{n_1} - x_0 = x_1 - x_0$  and  $\Omega_1 = \Omega$ . Suppose that  $\varepsilon_k, x_{n_k} - x_0$ and  $\Omega_k$  have been constructed. Since  $N_F$  is a Nemytskii set-valued operator mapping of the modular space  $(N(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;X)),\rho_{N,\mu})$  into subsets of the modular space  $(M(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;Y)),\rho_{M,\mu}),$  by property  $(\Delta_2),$ 

$$
\int\limits_{\Omega_k} M(t,u_{n_k}(t))\,d\mu<+\infty.
$$

Thus the function  $M(t, u_{n_k}(t))$  is absolutely continuous. Hence it is easy to find  $\varepsilon_{k+1}$ satisfying conditions (a) and (d). Since the function  $N = N(t, u)$  satisfies condition (A) and  $\rho(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)) \to 0$ , the functions  $x_n$  tend to  $x_0$  in measure. Replacing eventually the sequence  $\{x_{n_k} - x_0\}$  by its subsequence, we can assume without loss of generality that  $x_{n_k}(t)$  tends to  $x_0(t)$  almost everywhere. By the global lower semicontinuity of  $F(t,x)$ , we obtain that  $d_Y(y_n(t),F(t,x_n(t)))$  tends to 0 almost everywhere.

Since  $\mu(\Omega) < +\infty$ , for the sequence  $\{z_n(\cdot)\}\$  of measurable selections chosen at the beginning of this proof such that (7)<sub>1</sub> holds, there are an index  $n_{k+1}$  and a set  $E_{k+1} \subset \Omega$ such that, for  $t \in E_{k+1}$ , *Marian*  $\{z_n(\cdot)\}\$  of measurable selections chosen at the  $(7)_1$  holds, there are an index  $n_{k+1}$  and a set  $E_{k+1} \subset \Omega$ <br>  $M(t, u_{n_k}(t)) < \frac{r}{3\mu(\Omega)}$  (11)<br>  $\mu(\Omega \setminus E_{k+1}) < \varepsilon_{k+1}.$  (12) *z*(*z*<sub>n</sub>(*c*) of measurable selections chosen at the  $T$ )<sub>1</sub> holds, there are an index  $n_{k+1}$  and a set  $E_{k+1} \subset S$ <br>  $f(t, u_{n_k}(t)) < \frac{r}{3\mu(\Omega)}$  (11)<br>  $f(t) = \frac{F}{3\mu(\Omega)}$  (12)<br>  $f(t) = \frac{F}{2\mu(\Omega)}$  (12)<br>  $f(t) = \frac{F}{2\mu(\Omega)}$  (12

$$
M(t, u_{n_k}(t)) < \frac{r}{3\mu(\Omega)}\tag{11}_1
$$

and

$$
\mu(\Omega \setminus E_{k+1}) < \varepsilon_{k+1}.\tag{12}_1
$$

Let  $\Omega_{k+1} = \Omega \setminus E_{k+1}$ . Observe that (12)<sub>1</sub> implies condition (b). By (8)<sub>1</sub> and (11)<sub>1</sub>, we obtain

$$
\mu(\Omega \setminus E_{k+1}) < \varepsilon_{k+1}.\tag{12}
$$
\n
$$
\mu(\Omega \setminus E_{k+1}) < \varepsilon_{k+1}.\tag{13}
$$
\n
$$
\int M(t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)) d\mu = \int M(t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)) d\mu - \int M(t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)) d\mu > \frac{2}{3}r.\tag{13}
$$
\n
$$
\mu(\bigcup_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \Omega_j) \leq \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \mu(\Omega_j) \leq \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_j < 2\varepsilon_{k+1}.\tag{13}
$$
\n
$$
\mu(\Omega \setminus \Omega) \leq \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \mu(\Omega_j) \leq \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_j < 2\varepsilon_{k+1}.\tag{14}
$$
\n
$$
\text{thus we have constructed a sequence of positive numbers } \{\varepsilon_k\}, \text{ a sequence of measurable}
$$
\n
$$
\text{ts } \{\Omega_k\}, \Omega_k \subset \Omega, \text{ and a subsequence } \{x_{n_k} = x_0\} \text{ such that conditions (a) - (d) hold.}
$$
\n
$$
\text{Now we shall continue the proof. Let}
$$
\n
$$
D_k = \Omega_k \setminus \bigcup_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \Omega_j \qquad (k \in \mathbb{N}).
$$
\n
$$
\text{effine functions } \psi, \psi_0, y_0, z \text{ in the following way:}
$$
\n
$$
\psi(s) = \begin{cases} x_{n_k}(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k \ (k \in \mathbb{N}) \\ 0 & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \\ 0 & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \end{cases}
$$

By properties  $(a)$  and  $(b)$ , we get

$$
\mu\bigg(\bigcup_{j=k+1}^{\infty}\Omega_j\bigg)\leq \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty}\mu(\Omega_j)\leq \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty}\varepsilon_j<2\varepsilon_{k+1}.
$$

Thus we have constructed a sequence of positive numbers  $\{\varepsilon_{\bm k}\},$  a sequence of measurable sets  $\{\Omega_k\}, \Omega_k \subset \Omega$ , and a subsequence  $\{x_{n_k} - x_0\}$  such that conditions (a)  $\cdot$  (d) hold.

Now we shall continue the proof. Let

a sequence of positive numbers 
$$
\{\varepsilon_k\}
$$
,  
subsequence  $\{x_{n_k} - x_0\}$  such that of  
the proof. Let  

$$
D_k = \Omega_k \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \Omega_j\right) \qquad (k \in \mathbb{N}).
$$

Define functions  $\psi$ ,  $\psi$ <sub>0</sub>,  $y$ <sub>0</sub>, *z* in the following way:

$$
\psi(s) = \begin{cases} x_{n_k}(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k \ (k \in \mathbb{N}) \\ 0 & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \end{cases} \tag{14}_1
$$

$$
i_{k+1} \qquad j=k+1 \qquad j=k+1
$$
\nd a sequence of positive numbers { $\varepsilon_k$ }, a sequence of measurable  
\na subsequence { $x_{n_k} - x_0$ } such that conditions (a) - (d) hold.  
\nuue the proof. Let  
\n
$$
D_k = \Omega_k \setminus \left( \bigcup_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \Omega_j \right) \qquad (k \in \mathbb{N}).
$$
\n
$$
v_0, z \text{ in the following way:}
$$
\n
$$
\psi(s) = \begin{cases} x_{n_k}(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k \ (k \in \mathbb{N}) \\ 0 & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \end{cases} \qquad (14)_1
$$
\n
$$
\psi_0(s) = \begin{cases} x_0(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k \ (k \in \mathbb{N}) \\ 0 & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \end{cases} \qquad (15)_1
$$
\n
$$
y_0(s) = \begin{cases} y_{n_k}(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k \ (k \in \mathbb{N}) \\ w(s) & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \end{cases} \qquad (16)_1
$$
\n
$$
z(s) = \begin{cases} z_{n_k}(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k \ (k \in \mathbb{N}) \\ v(s) & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \end{cases} \qquad (17)_1
$$
\n
$$
y_0 = \begin{cases} z_{n_k}(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k \ (k \in \mathbb{N}) \\ v(s) & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \end{cases} \qquad (17)_1
$$
\n
$$
y_0 = \begin{cases} z_{n_k}(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k \ (k \in \mathbb{N}) \\ v(s) & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \end{cases} \qquad (18)_1
$$
\n
$$
y_0 = \begin{cases} z_{n_k}(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k
$$

$$
y_0(s) = \begin{cases} y_{n_k}(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k \ (k \in I\!\!N) \\ w(s) & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \end{cases}
$$
 (16)<sub>1</sub>

$$
z(s) = \begin{cases} z_{n_k}(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k \ (k \in \mathbb{N}) \\ v(s) & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \end{cases} \tag{17}_1
$$

where  $w(\cdot)$  and  $v(\cdot)$  belong to  $N_F(0)$  (i.e. these are measurable selections of  $F(s,0)$ ). From conditions (c), (d) and inequalities  $(11)_1$ ,  $(13)_1$  it follows that

e 
$$
w(\cdot)
$$
 and  $v(\cdot)$  belong to  $N_F(0)$  (i.e. these are measurable selections of  $F(s,0)$ ).  
\nconditions (c), (d) and inequalities (11), (13), it follows that  
\n
$$
\int_{D_k} M(t, \|y_0(t) - z(t)\|) d\mu = \int_{D_k} M(t, u_{n_k}(t)) d\mu
$$
\n
$$
= \int_{\Omega_k} M(t, u_{n_k}(t)) d\mu - \int_{\Omega_k \setminus D_k} M(t, u_{n_k}(t)) d\mu \qquad (18),
$$
\n
$$
> \frac{1}{3}r.
$$

Observe that  $\psi_0 \in N(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;X))$  and, by (10)<sub>1</sub>, also  $\psi \in N(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;X))$ . It is easy to see that  $y_0(\cdot) \in N_F(\psi_0(\cdot))$  and  $z(\cdot) \in N_F(\psi(\cdot)).$ 

On the other hand,

that 
$$
\psi_0 \in N(L(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu; X))
$$
 and, by  $(10)_1$ , also  $\psi \in N(L(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu; X))$ . It is that  $y_0(\cdot) \in N_F(\psi_0(\cdot))$  and  $z(\cdot) \in N_F(\psi(\cdot))$ .

\nother hand,

\n
$$
\int_{\Omega} M(t, \|y_0(t) - z(t)\|) d\mu \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{D_k} M(t, \|y_0(t) - z(t)\|) d\mu = +\infty
$$
\n(19)

which contradicts the fact that  $N_F$  is a set-valued operator mapping of the modular space  $(N(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;X)), \rho_{N,\mu})$  into subsets of the space  $(M(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;Y)), \rho_{M,\mu})$ . This finishes the proof of the case when  $\mu(\Omega)$  is finite.

**Case (2):**  $\mu(\Omega)$  is infinite. We will consider the following two subcases:

- (2a) There are a subset  $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$  with finite measure  $\mu(\Omega_0)$  and a number  $\beta \in (0, r)$ such that  $\int_{\Omega_n} M(t, u_n(t)) d\mu \geq \beta$   $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ .
- (2b) There are a subsequence  ${u_{n_k}(t)}$  and a sequence of measurable sets  ${D_k}$  such that
	- (e)  $\mu(D_k) < +\infty$  and  $D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$
	- *(f)*  $\int_{D_1} M(t, u_{n_k}(t)) d\mu \ge \frac{1}{2} r \ (k \in \mathbb{N}).$

In the subcase  $(2a)$  the consederation can be reduced to that of Case  $(1)$  with replacing *r* by  $\beta$ . In the subcase (2b) we define functions  $\psi$ ,  $\psi_0$ ,  $y$ ,  $z$  by formulae (14)<sub>1</sub> - (17)<sub>1</sub>. As in Case (1) we obtain that  $\psi, \psi_0 \in N(L(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu; X))$ , and that  $z(\cdot) \in N_F(\psi(\cdot))$  and simultaneously  $y_0(\cdot) \in N_F(\psi_0(\cdot))$ . On the other hand, by properties (e) and (f) we obtain that  $z(t) - y_0(t) \notin (M(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;Y)),\rho_{M,\mu})$ , which leads to a contradiction

**Theorem 2.** Let X, Y be two separable F-spaces,  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$  a measure space with *complete non-atomic and a-finite measue p, and N F a Nernytskiz' set-valued operator mapping of a modular space*  $(N(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;X)),\rho_{N,\mu})$  into subsets of a modular space  $(M(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;Y)),\rho_{M,\mu})$  induced by a sup-measurable set-valued function  $F = F(t,u)$ :  $\Omega \times X \rightarrow 2^Y$ . Suppose that

- (i) the function  $N = N(t, u)$  satisfies condition (A)
- (ii) the function  $M = M(t, u)$  satisfies condition  $(\Delta_2)$ .

If the function  $F = F(t, u)$  is lower semicontinuous with respect to u for almost all  $t \in \Omega$ , then the operator  $N_F$  is lower semicontinuous.

**Proof.** Suppose that the operator  $N_F$  is not lower semicontinuous at some point  $(x_0(\cdot), y_0(\cdot))$  with  $y_0(\cdot) \in N_F(x_0(\cdot))$ . This implies that there are a number  $r > 0$  and a sequence  $\{x_n(\cdot)\}\$  such that

se that the operator 
$$
N_F
$$
 is not lower semicontin  $y_0(\cdot) \in N_F(x_0(\cdot))$ . This implies that there are a n  
uch that  

$$
\rho_{N,\mu}(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)) \to 0
$$
  
in  $f$   

$$
x(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot)) \rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot) - y_0(\cdot)) > r \qquad (n \in \mathbb{N}).
$$

By [2: Theorem 8.24 and Corollary 8.23], for arbitrary  $\eta > 0$  there is a sequence  $\{z_n(\cdot)\}$ of measurable selections  $z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))$  such that, for almost all  $t \in \Omega$ , *of*  $\int f(x) \, dx \leq \int f(x) \, dx$ <br> *o(t)* -  $\int f(x) \, dx \leq \int f(x) \, dx$  for arbitrary  $\eta > 0$  there is a sequend<br>  $\int f(x) \, dx = \int f(x) \, dx$ <br>  $\int f(x) \, dx = \int f(x) \, dx$ <br> *o(t)* -  $\int f(x) \, dx$  is the distance of a point *y* to a set *A* in the no<br>  $\int$ 

$$
\|y_0(t)-z_n(t)\|_Y < (1+\eta)d_Y(y_0(t),F(t,x_n(t)))
$$
\n(7)<sub>2</sub>

of measurable selections  $z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))$  such that, for almost all  $t \in \Omega$ ,<br>  $||y_0(t) - z_n(t)||_Y < (1 + \eta)d_Y(y_0(t), F(t, x_n(t)))$  (<br>
where as before  $d_Y(y, A)$  denotes the distance of a point y to a set *A* in the norm  $||\cdot||$ <br>
We denote  $u$ *k'*  We denote  $u_n(t) = ||y_0(t) - z_n(t)||_Y$ . Since  $z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))$ , then

$$
\|y_0(t) - z_n(t)\|_Y < (1 + \eta)d_Y(y_0(t), F(t, x_n(t))) \tag{7}_2
$$
\nbefore  $d_Y(y, A)$  denotes the distance of a point y to a set A in the norm  $\| \cdot \|_Y$ .  
\nthe  $u_n(t) = \|y_0(t) - z_n(t)\|_Y$ . Since  $z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))$ , then\n
$$
\int_{\Omega} M(t, u_n(t)) d\mu \ge \inf_{z(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))} \rho_{M, \mu}(z(\cdot) - y_0(\cdot)) > r \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}). \tag{8}_2
$$

Then we continue the proof step by step in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 1 replacing  $y_n(\cdot)$  by  $y_0(\cdot)$ . The only difference is to show the existence of a subsequence  ${u_{n_k}}$  such that the inequalities *t*)  $||_Y < (1 + \eta)d_Y(y_0(t), F(t, x_n(t)))$ <br>
as the distance of a point *y* to a set *l*<br> *M*(*Y*). Since  $z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))$ , then<br>  $\inf_{y \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))} \rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot) - y_0(\cdot)) > r$ <br>
p by step in the same way as in the<br>
p by step in the same way as  $\inf_{\mathcal{N}_F(x_n(\cdot))} \rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot) - y_0(\cdot)) > r \qquad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$ (8)<sub>2</sub><br>
y step in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 1<br>
difference is to show the existence of a subsequence<br>  $(t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)) < \frac{r}{3\mu(\Omega)}$  (11)<sub>2</sub><br>  $u(\Omega \setminus E_{k+1}) < \vare$ 

$$
M(t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)) < \frac{r}{3\mu(\Omega)}\tag{11}_2
$$

and

$$
\mu(\Omega \setminus E_{k+1}) < \varepsilon_{k+1} \tag{12}_2
$$

hold. In order to do this we replace the global lower semicontinuity of  $\Gamma$  by its lower semicontinuity. Since the function  $N = N(t, u)$  satisfies condition (A) and  $\rho_{N,\mu}(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)) \rightarrow 0$ , the sequence  $\{x_n(\cdot)\}\)$  tends to  $x_0(\cdot)$  in measure. Thus by the lower semicontinuity of  $F(t, x)$  with respect to x,  $d_Y(y_0, F(t, x_n(t)))$  tends to 0 in measure. wer semico<br> *u*) satisfie<br>
to  $x_0(\cdot)$  in<br>  $d_Y(y_0, F(t,$ <br>
: selections<br>  $k+1$ , the in (12)<br>
uity of  $\Gamma$  by it<br>
mdition (A) an<br>
easure. Thus b<br>
())) tends to 0 is<br>
()) there are a<br>
alities<br>
(11) replace the global lower semicontinuity of  $\Gamma$  by its<br>function  $N = N(t, u)$  satisfies condition (A) and<br>uence  $\{x_n(\cdot)\}$  tends to  $x_0(\cdot)$  in measure. Thus by<br>with respect to  $x$ ,  $d_Y(y_0, F(t, x_n(t)))$  tends to 0 in<br>quence of mea

Since  $\mu(\Omega) < +\infty$ , for the sequence of measurable selections  $\{z_n(\cdot)\}\$  there are an index  $n_{k+1}$  and a subset  $E_{k+1} \subset \Omega$  such that, for  $t \in E_{k+1}$ , the inequalities

$$
M(t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)) < \frac{r}{3\mu(\Omega)}\tag{11}_2
$$

 $\mathbf{and}$  .

$$
\mu(\Omega \setminus E_{k+1}) < \varepsilon_{k+1} \tag{12}_2
$$

hold. The remained part of the proof can be continued in the same way as presented in the proof of Theorem 1 **<sup>U</sup>**

**Theorem 3.** Let X, Y be two separable F-spaces,  $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$  a measure space with *complete non-atomic and*  $\sigma$ *-finite measue*  $\mu$ *, and*  $N_F$  *a Nemytskii set-valued operator mapping of a modular space*  $(N(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;X)),\rho_{N,\mu})$  into subsets of a modular space  $(M(L(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu;Y)), \rho_{M,\mu})$  induced by a sup-measurable set-valued function  $F = F(t,u)$ :  $\Omega \times X \rightarrow 2^Y$ . Suppose that  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

(i) the function 
$$
N = N(t, u)
$$
 satisfies condition (A)

(ii) the function  $M = M(t, u)$  satisfies condition  $(\Delta_2)$ .

If the function  $F = F(t, u)$  is metric upper semicontinuous with respect to u for almost all  $t \in \Omega$ , then the operator  $N_F$  is metric upper semicontinuous.

**Proof.** Suppose that the operator  $N_F$  is not metric upper semicontinuous. This lies that there are a number  $r > 0$  and sequences  $\{x_n(\cdot)\}$  and  $\{y_n(\cdot)\}$  with  $y_n(\cdot) \in$ <br> $x_n(\cdot)$  such that  $\rho_{N,\mu}(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)) \to 0$ <br>inf implies that there are a number  $r > 0$  and sequences  $\{x_n(\cdot)\}\$  and  $\{y_n(\cdot)\}\$  with  $y_n(\cdot) \in$  $N_F(x_n(\cdot))$  such that On Lower<br>operator  $N_F$ <br>er  $r > 0$  and<br> $(x - x_0(\cdot)) \rightarrow 0$ <br> $\rightarrow \rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot))$ *If* the operator  $N_F$  is not metric upper semicontinuous. This<br> *If*  $n, \mu(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)) \to 0$ <br>  $\inf_{\{y_n(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot))\}} \rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot) - y_n(\cdot)) > r$  ( $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ).<br>  $\{a_n\}$  and Corollary 8.23], for arbitrary  $\eta > 0$  there is a seque

$$
\rho_{N,\mu}(x_n(\cdot)-x_0(\cdot))\to 0
$$
  
 
$$
\inf_{z(\cdot)\in N_F(x_0(\cdot))}\rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot)-y_n(\cdot))>r \qquad (n\in\mathbb{N}).
$$

By [2: Theorem 8.24 and Corollary 8.23], for arbitrary  $\eta > 0$  there is a sequence  $\{z_n(\cdot)\}$ of measurable selections  $z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_0(\cdot))$  such that, for almost all  $t \in \Omega$ ,

$$
\|y_n(t)-z_n(t)\|_Y < (1+\eta)d_Y(y_n(t),F(t,x_0(t)))
$$
\n(7)<sub>3</sub>

where as before  $d_Y(y, A)$  denotes the distance of a point y to a set A in the norm  $\|\cdot\|_Y$ . We denote  $u_n(t) = ||y_n(t) - z_n(t)||_Y$ . Since  $z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_0(\cdot))$ , then

$$
||y_n(t) - z_n(t)||_Y < (1 + \eta)d_Y(y_n(t), F(t, x_0(t)))
$$
\n
$$
\text{before } d_Y(y, A) \text{ denotes the distance of a point } y \text{ to a set } A \text{ in the norm } || \cdot ||_Y.
$$
\n
$$
\text{the } u_n(t) = ||y_n(t) - z_n(t)||_Y. \text{ Since } z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_0(\cdot)), \text{ then}
$$
\n
$$
\int\limits_{\Omega} M(t, u_n(t)) d\mu \ge \inf_{z(\cdot) \in N_F(x_0(\cdot))} \rho_{M, \mu}(z(\cdot) - y_n(\cdot)) > r \qquad (n \in \mathbb{N}). \tag{8}_3
$$

Then we continue the proof step by step in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 1. The only difference is to show the existence of a subsequence  $\{u_{n_k}\}\$  such that the inequalities that, for almost all<br>  $(y_n(t), F(t, x_0(t)))$ <br>  $\in N_F(x_0(\cdot)),$  then<br>  $(\cdot) - y_n(\cdot)) > r$ <br>
same way as in the f a subsequence<br>  $\frac{r}{3\mu(\Omega)}$ <br>  $(k+1)$  $\inf_{F(x_0(\cdot))} \rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot) - y_n(\cdot)) > r$   $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ . (8)<sub>3</sub><br>y step in the same way as in the proof of Theorem<br>the existence of a subsequence  $\{u_{n_k}\}$  such that the<br> $t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)$   $< \frac{r}{3\mu(\Omega)}$  (11)<sub>3</sub><br> $(\Omega \setminus E_{k+1}) < \varepsilon_{k+1}$ 

$$
M(t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)) < \frac{r}{3\mu(\Omega)}
$$
 (11)<sub>3</sub>

and

$$
\mu(\Omega \setminus E_{k+1}) < \varepsilon_{k+1} \tag{12}_3
$$

hold. In order to do this we replace the global lower semicontinuity of  $\Gamma$  by its metric upper semicontinuity. Since the function  $N = N(t, u)$  satisfies condition (A) and  $\rho_{N,\mu}(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)) \to 0$ , the sequence  $\{x_n(\cdot)\}$  tends to  $x_0(\cdot)$  in measure. Thus by the metric upper semicontinuity of  $F(t, x)$  with respect to x,  $d_Y(y_n, F(t, x_0(t)))$  tends to 0 in measure. *(t, x)* with respect to  $x$ ,  $d_Y(y_n, F(t, x_0(t)))$  tends to 0<br> *(t, x)* with respect to  $x$ ,  $d_Y(y_n, F(t, x_0(t)))$  tends to 0<br>
quence of measurable selections  $\{z_n(\cdot)\}$  there are an<br>  $\Omega$  such that, for  $t \in E_{k+1}$ , the inequalitie

Since  $\mu(\Omega) < +\infty$ , for the sequence of measurable selections  $\{z_n(\cdot)\}\$  there are an index  $n_{k+1}$  and a subset  $E_{k+1} \subset \Omega$  such that, for  $t \in E_{k+1}$ , the inequalities

$$
M(t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)) < \frac{r}{3\mu(\Omega)}\tag{11}_3
$$

and

$$
\mu(\Omega \setminus E_{k+1}) < \varepsilon_{k+1} \tag{12}_3
$$

hold. The remained part of the proof can be continued in the same way as presented in the proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 3 generalizes Theorem 1 of [3], where it is proved for Banach spaces X, *Y*  and for functions  $N(t, u) = u^p, M(t, u) = u^q$  with  $1 \leq p \leq q < +\infty$  under some estimation assumptions warranting that a Nemytskii operator  $N_F$  induced by a supmeasurable set-valued function  $F = F(t, u)$  maps the space  $L^p(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu; X)$  into the space  $L^q(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu; Y)$ .

## **References**

- [1] Appell, J., Nguyen, H. T. and P. P. Zabrejko: *Multivalued superposition operators in ideal spaces* of *vector functions.* Parts I and II. Indag. Math. (N. S.) 2 (1991), 385 - 395 and 397 - 409.
- [2] Aubin, J. P. and H. F'rankowska: *Set-Valued Analysis* (Systems and Control: Vol. 2). Boston et al: Birkbäuser Verlag 1990.
- [3] Cellina, A., Fryszkowska, A. and T. Rzezuchowski: Uppersemicontinuity of Nemytskij *operators.* Ann. Mat. Pura AppI. 160 (1991), 321 - 330.
- [4] Goncharow, V. V.: *On the existence of solutions of a class of differential inclusions on a compact set* (in Russian). Sib. Math. Zhur. 31(1990)5, 24 - 30.
- [5] Musielak, J.: *Orlicz Spaces and Modular Spaces.* Lect. Notes Math. 1034 (1983), 1 222.
- [6] Musielak, J. and W. Orlicz: *On modular spaces.* Stud. Math. 18 (1959), 49 65.
- [7] Nakano, H.: *Modulared linear spaces.* J. Fac. Sd. Univ. Tokyo (Section I) 6 (1950), 85 131.
- [8] Nakano, H.: *Modulared Semi-Ordered Linear Spaces.* Tokyo: Maruzen Co. 1950.
- *[9] Nakano, H.: Topology and Linear Topological Spaces.* Tokyo: Maruzen Co. 1951.
- [10] Niemytzki, V.: Sur les équations integrales non-linéaires. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 196 (1933),836 - 838.
- *[11] Niemytzkij, V.: Théorèmes d'existence et d'unicite des solutions de quelques equations integrales non-linéaires.* Matem. Sbornik 41(1934), 421 - 438.
- [12] Rolewicz, S.: *Metric Linear Spaces.* Dortrecht: D. Reidel 1985, and Warszawa: Polish Sci. PubI. 1985.

 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$ 

Received 22.02.1994