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: Nemytskii 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: $L^2[a,b] \rightarrow L^2[a,b]$ defined by $y(\cdot) = N_F(x(\cdot))$, where y(t) = F(t,x(t)). From that time the operator N_F was generalized in several way and there is a lot of papers devoted to such subjects. Operators of this type are now called *Nemytskii 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 Nemytskii 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 Ω 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

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 91 02.

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 (Ω, Σ, μ) a measure space with complete and σ -finite measure μ . A function x = x(t) mapping Ω 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 Ω with values in X we shall denote by $S(\Omega, X)$.

A closed-valued set-valued function F = F(t) mapping Ω 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 Nemytskii operator) generated by the set-valued function F.

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

$$\rho_{N,\mu}(x(\cdot)) = \int_{\Omega} N(t, \|x(t)\|_X) d\mu$$
(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

(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) $\rho(ax_n) \rightarrow \text{provided } \rho(x_n) \rightarrow 0.$

We shall denote by (X, ρ) a linear space with a modular ρ and we shall call it modular space. Let (X, ρ) be a modular space with metrizing modular ρ . It is known that ρ induces in the space X an F-norm $\|\cdot\|_X$ by

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

The norm $\|\cdot\|_X$ is equivalent to the moduler ρ 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 $x_n(\cdot) \in N(L(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu; X))$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ have disjoint supports, then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \rho_{N,\mu}(x_n(\cdot)) = \rho_{N,\mu}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n(\cdot)\right).$$
(3)

Let (X, ρ_X) and (Y, ρ_Y) be two modular spaces. A set-valued operator $\Gamma = \Gamma(x)$ mapping (X, ρ_X) into subsets of (Y, ρ_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 *F*norms introduced above. In other words Γ 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

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

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

A set-valued operator Γ mapping (X, ρ_X) into subsets of (Y, ρ_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 Γ 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

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

where

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

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 Γ 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

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

The both notions are not equivalent. Indeed, it is easy to give an example of a set-valued mapping Γ 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 Γ 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 ε > 0 there are numbers α > 0 and δ > 0 such that for every measurable set E ⊂ Ω with μ(E) > δ we have ∫_E N(t, ε) dt ≥ α.

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

(Δ_2) There are a constant $k \ge 1$ and a non-negative function δ such that $\int_E M(t, \delta(t)) d\mu < +\infty$ and for almost all t, if $u \ge \delta(t)$, then $M(t, 2u) \le k M(t, u)$.

The condition (Δ_2) plays an essential role in the theory of Orlicz-Musielak spaces. Observe that if the function M(t, u) satisfies condition (Δ_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-spaces, (Ω, Σ, μ) a measure space with complete non-atomic and σ -finite measure μ , 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 $F(t, u) : \Omega \times X \to 2^Y$. Suppose that

- (i) the function N = N(t, u) satisfies condition (A)
- (ii) the function M = M(t, u) satisfies condition (Δ_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 N_F 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

$$\begin{split} \rho_{N,\mu} \big(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot) \big) &\to 0\\ \inf_{z(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))} \rho_{M,\mu} \big(z(\cdot) - y_n(\cdot) \big) > r \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}). \end{split}$$

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 $t \in \Omega$,

$$\left\|y_n(t) - z_n(t)\right\|_{Y} < (1+\eta)d_Y(y_n(t), F(t, x_n(t)))$$
(7)₁

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

$$\int_{\Omega} M(t, u_n(t)) d\mu \geq \inf_{z(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))} \rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot) - y_n(\cdot)) > r \qquad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$
(8)₁

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

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} N(t, \|x_{n_k}(t) - x_0(t)\|_X) d\mu < +\infty.$$
(9)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

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} N(t, \|x_n(t) - x_0(t)\|_X) \, d\mu < +\infty.$$
 (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) $\varepsilon_{k+1} < \frac{\epsilon_k}{2}$

(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 Ω_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 (Δ_2) ,

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

Thus the function $M(t, u_{n_k}(t))$ is absolutely continuous. Hence it is easy to find ε_{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 $(7)_1$ holds, there are an index n_{k+1} and a set $E_{k+1} \subset \Omega$ such that, for $t \in E_{k+1}$,

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

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)₁ implies condition (b). By (8)₁ and (11)₁, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_{k+1}} M(t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)) \, d\mu = \int_{\Omega} M(t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)) \, d\mu - \int_{E_{k+1}} M(t, u_{n_{k+1}}(t)) \, d\mu > \frac{2}{3}r. \quad (13)_1$$

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

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{j=k+1}^{\infty}\Omega_{j}\right) \leq \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty}\mu(\Omega_{j}) \leq \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty}\varepsilon_{j} < 2\varepsilon_{k+1}.$$

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

Now we shall continue the proof. Let

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

Define functions ψ, ψ_0, y_0, z in the following way:

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

$$\psi_0(s) = \begin{cases} x_0(s) & \text{if } s \in D_k \ (k \in \mathbb{N}) \\ 0 & \text{if } s \notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j \end{cases}$$
(15)₁

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

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

$$\int_{D_{k}} M(t, ||y_{0}(t) - z(t)||) d\mu = \int_{D_{k}} M(t, u_{n_{k}}(t)) d\mu$$
$$= \int_{\Omega_{k}} M(t, u_{n_{k}}(t)) d\mu - \int_{\Omega_{k} \setminus D_{k}} M(t, u_{n_{k}}(t)) d\mu \qquad (18)_{1}$$
$$> \frac{1}{3}r.$$

Observe 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 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,

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

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 $\int_{\Omega_0} M(t, u_n(t)) d\mu \geq \beta$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$.
- (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) $\int_{D_k} M(t, u_{n_k}(t)) d\mu \geq \frac{1}{2}r \ (k \in \mathbb{N}).$

In the subcase (2a) the consederation can be reduced to that of Case (1) with replacing r by β . In the subcase (2b) we define functions ψ, ψ_0, y, z by formulae $(14)_1 - (17)_1$. 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, (Ω, Σ, μ) a measure space with complete non-atomic and σ -finite measure μ , 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): $\Omega \times X \to 2^Y$. Suppose that

- (i) the function N = N(t, u) satisfies condition (A)
- (ii) the function M = M(t, u) satisfies condition (Δ_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

$$\begin{split} \rho_{N,\mu}\big(x_n(\cdot)-x_0(\cdot)\big) &\to 0\\ \inf_{z(\cdot)\in N_F(x_n(\cdot))}\rho_{M,\mu}\big(z(\cdot)-y_0(\cdot)\big) > r \qquad (n\in\mathbb{N}). \end{split}$$

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 $t \in \Omega$,

$$\left\| y_0(t) - z_n(t) \right\|_Y < (1+\eta) d_Y \left(y_0(t), F(t, x_n(t)) \right)$$
(7)₂

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 $u_n(t) = \|y_0(t) - z_n(t)\|_Y$. Since $z_n(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))$, then

$$\int_{\Omega} M(t, u_n(t)) d\mu \geq \inf_{z(\cdot) \in N_F(x_n(\cdot))} \rho_{M,\mu}(z(\cdot) - y_0(\cdot)) > r \qquad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$
(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

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

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 Γ 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.

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

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

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 \blacksquare

Theorem 3. Let X, Y be two separable F-spaces, (Ω, Σ, μ) a measure space with complete non-atomic and σ -finite measure μ , 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): $\Omega \times X \to 2^Y$. Suppose that

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

(ii) the function M = M(t, u) satisfies condition (Δ_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 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

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

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

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 $t \in \Omega$,

$$\left\|y_{n}(t)-z_{n}(t)\right\|_{Y} < (1+\eta)d_{Y}\left(y_{n}(t),F(t,x_{0}(t))\right)$$
(7)₃

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

$$\int_{\Omega} M(t, u_n(t)) d\mu \ge \inf_{z(\cdot) \in N_F(z_0(\cdot))} \rho_{M, \mu}(z(\cdot) - y_n(\cdot)) > r \qquad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$
(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

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

and

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

hold. In order to do this we replace the global lower semicontinuity of Γ by its metric upper semicontinuity. Since the function N = N(t, u) satisfies condition (A) and $\rho_{N,\mu}(x_n(\cdot) - x_0(\cdot)) \rightarrow 0$, 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.

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 \blacksquare

Theorem 3 generalizes Theorem 1 of [3], where it is proved for Banach spaces X, Yand for functions $N(t, u) = u^p, M(t, u) = u^q$ with $1 \le p \le q < +\infty$ 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

- 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. Frankowska: 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 Appl. 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. Sci. 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 équations integrales non-linéaires. Matem. Sbornik 41 (1934), 421 - 438.
- [12] Rolewicz, S.: Metric Linear Spaces. Dortrecht: D. Reidel 1985, and Warszawa: Polish Sci. Publ. 1985.

Received 22.02.1994