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\textbf{A B S T R A C T}

We investigate when does the Repovš-Semenov splitting problem for selections have an affirmative solution for continuous set-valued mappings in finite-dimensional Banach spaces. We prove that this happens when images of set-valued mappings or even their graphs are \(P\)-sets (in the sense of Balashov) or strictly convex sets. We also consider an example which shows that there is no affirmative solution of this problem even in the simplest case in \(\mathbb{R}^3\). We also obtain affirmative solution of the approximate splitting problem for Lipschitz continuous selections in the Hilbert space.

\(© 2009\) Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

\textbf{1. Introduction}

The splitting problem for selections was recently stated in [10]. Let \(F_i : X \to 2^{\mathbb{Y}_i}, i = 1, 2\), be any (lower semi) continuous mappings with closed convex images and let \(L : \mathbb{Y}_1 \oplus \mathbb{Y}_2 \to \mathbb{Y}\) be any linear surjection. The splitting problem is the problem of representation of any continuous selection \(f(x) \in L(F_1(x), F_2(x))\) in the form \(f(x) = L(f_1(x), f_2(x))\), where \(f_i(x) \in F_i(x)\) are some continuous selections, \(i = 1, 2\).

This problem is related to some classical problems of set-valued analysis. First, it is a special case of the selection problem which is sufficiently common for various applications [11]. In particular it is quite close to the celebrated problem of parametrization of set-valued mappings [2,6,8].

Second, every affirmative solution of this problem is in fact, an answer to the following question: When does the operation of intersection of two (continuous) set-valued mappings yield a continuous (or lower semicontinuous) set-valued mapping with respect to the Hausdorff metric? This question is also quite common for certain branches of set-valued and nonsmooth analysis.

It is well known that the intersection of two continuous set-valued mappings is not necessarily continuous [2]. We shall first consider the extreme example which demonstrates the last assertion.
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Consider Question 4.6 from [10]: Do there exist for every closed convex sets $A$, $B$ and $C = A + B$, continuous functions $a : C \to A$ and $b : C \to B$ with the property that $a(c) + b(c) = c$, for all $c \in C$? In a space of dimension $\geq 3$ the answer is negative.

**Example 1.1.** Consider the following sets in the 3-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^3$ (where $\text{co}(X)$ denotes the convex hull of $X$):

$$D_0 = \{(\cos t, \sin t, 0) \mid t \in [0, \pi]\}, \quad A_0 = \text{co}(D_0 \cup \{(1, 0, 1)\} \cup \{(-1, 0, 1)\}).$$

$$D_1 = \{(\cos t, \sin t, 1) \mid t \in [-\pi, 0]\}, \quad A_1 = \text{co}(D_1 \cup \{(1, 0, 0)\} \cup \{(-1, 0, 0)\}).$$

and $A = A_0 \cup A_1$. It is easy to see that $A$ is a convex compact set. We also define the set $B = \text{co}((0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1))$ and the set $C = A + B$.

Let $\Gamma = \{(\cos t, \sin t, 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} t) \mid t \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]\}, \Gamma \subset \partial C$. Let

$$\Gamma_1 = \left\{ \left(\cos t, \sin t, 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} t \right) \mid t \in (0, \pi/2) \right\},$$

$$\Gamma_2 = \left\{ \left(\cos t, \sin t, 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} t \right) \mid t \in [-\pi/2, 0) \right\}$$

and $c_0 = (1, 0, 1)$.

Suppose that $c \in \Gamma_1$. In this case there exists only one pair of points $a(c) \in A$ and $b(c) \in B$ with the property $a(c) + b(c) = c$. Indeed, if $t_c \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ satisfies $c = (\cos t_c, \sin t_c, 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} t_c)$ then $a(c) = (\cos t_c, \sin t_c, 0)$, $b(c) = (0, 0, 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} t_c)$. The point $a(c)$ is unique because it is an exposed point of the set $A$ for the vector $p_c = (\cos t_c, \sin t_c, 0)$. Clearly, the point $b(c)$ is also unique. So we have

$$\lim_{c \to c_0, c \in \Gamma_1} a(c) = (1, 0, 0). \quad (1.1)$$

In the case when $c \in \Gamma_2$, similar considerations show that there exists only one pair of points $a(c) = (\cos t_c, \sin t_c, 1) \in A$ and $b(c) = (0, 0, -\frac{2}{\pi} t_c) \in B$ with $a(c) + b(c) = c$ and such that

$$\lim_{c \to c_0, c \in \Gamma_2} a(c) = (1, 0, 1). \quad (1.2)$$

Formulae (1.1) and (1.2) show that $a(c)$ is not continuous at the point $c = c_0$.

Simultaneously, we want to emphasize that the set-valued mappings

$$C \ni c \mapsto (c - B) \cap A \quad (1.3)$$

and

$$C \ni c \mapsto (A, B) \cap L^{-1}(c) \quad (1.4)$$

do not allow any continuous (on $c \in C$) selections. Here $L^{-1}(c) = \{(y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \mid y_1 + y_2 = c\}$.

Indeed, otherwise in the case (1.3) we could choose this selection as $a(c) \in (c - B) \cap A \subset A$ and set $b(c) = c - a(c) \in B$. In the case (1.4) we could choose $(a(c), b(c)) \in (A, B) \cap L^{-1}(c)$. In both cases we would have $a(c) + b(c) = c$, for all $c \in C$. This would contradict the fact that function $a(c)$, as it follows by Example 1.1, is not continuous at the point $c = c_0 = (1, 0, 1)$.

We shall further obtain an affirmative solution of the splitting problem for selections for some special cases in finite-dimensional Banach spaces. It suffices to solve this problem in Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ (with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$) because all norms in any finite-dimensional Banach space are equivalent.

Our general idea is to prove continuity of the intersection $(F_1(x), F_2(x)) \cap L^{-1}(f(x))$. This is the key idea. When this is done we can choose some continuous selection (e.g. the Steiner point) of the map $x \mapsto (F_1(x), F_2(x)) \cap L^{-1}(f(x))$ and solve the problem.

Unfortunately, this map is not continuous even in the simplest cases (as we can see from Example 1.1). So we need to invoke some special geometrical properties of maps $F_i$ or surjection $L$.

The main results of Section 2 are Theorem 2.4 with Corollary 2.5, Theorems 2.6 and 2.10. The key geometric objects used in Section 2 are P-sets (see Definition 2.1) and strictly convex sets.

In Section 3 we shall consider situation when in infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces $X$, $Y_1$, $Y_2$ there exist for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and any Lipschitz continuous selection $f(x) \in L(F_1(x), F_2(x))$, Lipschitz continuous selections $f_i(x) \in F_i(x) + B^\varepsilon_i(0)$, $i = 1, 2$, with the property $f(x) = L(f_1(x), f_2(x))$, for all $x$. Here, $B^\varepsilon_i(0) = \{y \in Y_i \mid \|y\| \leq \varepsilon\}$. The main results of Section 3 are Theorems 3.1 and 3.7.
We need to give some definitions for further explanation. We shall say that the subspace $L \subset L_1 \oplus L_2$ is not parallel to the subspaces $L_1$ and $L_2$ if for any pair of distinct points $w_1, w_2 \in L$, the projections of $w_1$ and $w_2$ onto $L_1$ (resp. $L_2$) parallel to $L_2$ (resp. $L_1$) yield different points.

Let $h$ be the Hausdorff distance. For any bounded subsets $A, B$ of a Banach space $X$ we have

$$h(A, B) = \inf \{ h > 0 \mid A \subset B + B^*_h(0), \ B \subset A + B^*_h(0) \}.$$ 

For any subsets $A, B$ of a linear space $X$ the operation

$$A \triangle B = \{ x \in X \mid x + B \subset A \} = \bigcap_{b \in B} (A - b)$$

is called the geometric difference (or the Minkowski–Pontryagin difference) of sets $A$ and $B$. A direct consequence of the definition of geometric difference is that $(A \triangle B) + B \subset A$.

The Chebyshev center $c(A)$ of a convex closed bounded subset $A$ of a Hilbert space $X$ is the point

$$c(A) = \arg \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{a \in A} \| x - a \|.$$ 

Chebyshev center always exists and it is unique.

Let $X, Y$ be any Banach spaces. We say that a continuous linear surjection $L : X \to Y$ has the Lip-property if the set-valued mapping $L^{-1}(y) = \{ x \in X \mid Lx = y \}$ has a Lipschitz (at $y$) selection $l(y) \in L^{-1}(y)$.

For example, if $Y_1 = Y_2 = Y$ and $L : Y_1 \oplus Y_2 \to Y$, $L(y_1, y_2) = y_1 + y_2$, then $l(y) = (\frac{1}{2}y, \frac{1}{2}y)$.

2. $P$-sets and the splitting problem for selections

We shall obtain an affirmative solution in certain cases when the images of the set-valued mapping are $P$-sets [3]. Let $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be an arbitrary unit vector and $L(q) = \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle z, q \rangle = 0 \}$, $l(q) = \{ q \lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \}$. The space $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the orthogonal sum of sets $L(q)$ and $l(q)$: $\mathbb{R}^n = L(q) \oplus l(q)$. Any point $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be expressed in the form $z = x + \mu q$, where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in l(q)$, or $z = (x, \mu)$. Let $P_q : \mathbb{R}^n \to L(q)$ be the operator of orthogonal projection: for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $P_q z = x$, where $z = (x, \mu)$.

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be any convex compact set. Let us define the function $f_{A,q} : P_q A \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f_{A,q}(x) = \min \{ \mu \mid (x, \mu) \in A \}, \text{ for all } x \in P_q A.$$

(2.5)

**Definition 2.1.** (See [3].) A convex compact subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a $P$-set, if for any unit vector $q$, the function $f_{A,q}$ (2.5) is continuous on the set $P_q A$.

**Proposition 2.2.** (See [3,9]) Any convex compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$ is a $P$-set. In $\mathbb{R}^n$ any convex polyhedron is a $P$-set, any strictly convex compact subset is a $P$-set, and any finite Minkowski sum of $P$-sets is a $P$-set. If $L : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is a linear operator and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a $P$-set then $LA \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is also a $P$-set. Moreover, the map $L : A \to LA$ is open in induced topologies.

We emphasize that a $P$-set is not necessarily a polyhedron or strictly convex.

**Example 2.3.** The cylinder $\{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq 1, \ 0 \leq x_3 \leq 1\}$ is a $P$-set as the Minkowski sum of two $P$-sets

$$\{(x_1, x_2, 0) \mid x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq 1\} + \{(0, 0, x_3) \mid 0 \leq x_3 \leq 1\}.$$

On the other hand, the subset $A_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$A_0 = \text{co}(\{(x_1 - 1)^2 + x_2^2 = 1, \ x_3 = 1\} \cup \{(0, 0, 0)\}),$$

is not a $P$-set.

Indeed, for $q = (0, 0, 1)$ it is easy to see that $f_{A_0,q}$ is not upper semicontinuous at the point $(0, 0) \in P_q A_0$. Note that the sum $A_0 + A_1$ (where $A_1$ is an arbitrary convex compact set) is not a $P$-set [3].

It was proved in [3] that if the subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is convex and compact then the function $f_{A,q}$ (2.5) is lower semicontinuous on $P_q A$. This is quite obvious. Therefore the question about continuity of the function $f_{A,q}$ is the question about its upper semicontinuity.

The domain of the set-valued mapping $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to 2^\mathbb{R}^m$ is the set $\text{dom} F = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid F(x) \neq \emptyset \}$.

**Theorem 2.4.** Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be any convex compact subset and $L \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ any subspace. Suppose that one of the following properties is satisfied:
Remark. It is easy to see that \( \text{dom } F = A + \mathcal{L} \).

Then the set-valued mapping \( F(z) = (z + \mathcal{L}) \cap A \) is continuous in the Hausdorff metric.

Proof. (1) Part (1) is a well-known fact, but we prove it for completeness. Let \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an arbitrary convex compact subset and \( \dim \mathcal{L} = n - 1 \). Consider \( F(z) = (z + \mathcal{L}) \cap A \), for all \( z \in \text{dom } F \). Using the closed graph theorem for set-valued mappings [1, Theorem 8.3.1] we conclude that map \( F \) is upper semicontinuous at any point \( z_0 \in \text{dom } F \).

This means that for any sequence \( \{z_k\} \subset \text{dom } F \), \( z_k \to z_0 \), and any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists a number \( k_\varepsilon \) such that for any \( k > k_\varepsilon \) the following holds:

\[
F(z_k) \subset F(z_0) + B_{\varepsilon}(0).
\]

Suppose that lower semicontinuity fails at some point \( z_0 \in \text{dom } F \). Then there exist a number \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) and a sequence \( \{z_k\} \subset \text{dom } F \) such that \( \lim z_k = z_0 \) and

\[
F(z_0) \not\subset F(z_k) + B_{\varepsilon_0}(0).
\]

This implies that \( z_k \notin z_0 + \mathcal{L} \), for all \( k \). From the condition (2.7) we conclude that for any \( k \), there exists a point \( w_k \in F(z_0) \) for which \( w_k \notin F(z_k) + B_{\varepsilon_0}(0) \).

We may assume that \( w_k \to w_0 \in F(z_0) \), due to the compactness of the set \( F(z_0) \) and since

\[
w_0 \notin F(z_k) + B_{\varepsilon_0/2}(0) \tag{2.8}
\]

Without loss of generality we may assume that \( z_1 \in A \). Otherwise, we can choose an arbitrary point \( \tilde{z}_1 \in F(z_1) \) instead of \( z_1 \). We can also suppose that \( \|z_1 - w_0\| > \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \), otherwise we could reduce \( \varepsilon_0 \).

Let \( \varphi \) be the angle between the segment \( [w_0, z_1] \) and the hyperplane \( \mathcal{L} \), \( \varphi \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \) (note that the segment \( [w_0, z_1] \) is not parallel to \( \mathcal{L} \)). Without loss of generality we may assume that the halfspace with the bound \( z_0 + \mathcal{L} \), which contains \( z_1 \), contains the entire sequence \( \{z_k\} \).

Let us choose a number \( k \) for which the distance from the point \( z_k \) to the hyperplane \( z_0 + \mathcal{L} \) is sufficiently small:

\[
\varrho(z_k, z_0 + \mathcal{L}) < \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \sin \varphi.
\]

Define the point \( w = w_0 + \frac{z_1 - w_0}{\|z_1 - w_0\|} \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \). We have

\[
\varrho(w, z_0 + \mathcal{L}) = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \sin \varphi > \varrho(z_k, z_0 + \mathcal{L}).
\]

We can now conclude that the points \( w_0 \) and \( w \) lie on the opposite sides of the hyperplane \( z_k + \mathcal{L} \). This follows from the last estimate, the inclusion \( w_0 \in z_0 + \mathcal{L} \) and the fact that the points \( z_k, z_1 \) (and consequently \( w \)) lie on the same side of the hyperplane \( z_0 + \mathcal{L} \). This means that the following holds:

\[
[w_0, w] \cap (z_k + \mathcal{L}) \neq \emptyset \tag{2.9}
\]

From the inclusions \( w_0 \in F(z_0) \), \( z_1 \in A \) we obtain that \( [w_0, w] \subset [w_0, z_1] \subset A \). We can conclude from this inclusion and the equality \( \|w_0 - w\| = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \) that \( [w_0, w] \subset A \cap B_{\varepsilon_0/2}(w_0) \). According to (2.9), we have

\[
A \cap B_{\varepsilon_0/2}(w_0) \cap (z_k + \mathcal{L}) \neq \emptyset,
\]

i.e. \( w_0 \in (A \cap (z_k + \mathcal{L})) + B_{\varepsilon_0/2}(0) \). This contradicts the existence of the inclusion (2.8).

The upper and lower semicontinuity imply continuity in the Hausdorff metric.

(2) Suppose now that \( \dim \mathcal{L} = m, 1 \leq m \leq n \), and that \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is a \( P \)-set. Upper semicontinuity can be proved in the same way as in (1) above.

Assuming to the contrary, as in (1), we conclude that there exist \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \), \( w_0 \in F(z_0) \) and a sequence \( \{z_k\} \subset \text{dom } F \), \( \lim z_k = z_0 \) such that

\[
w_0 \notin F(z_k) + B_{\varepsilon_0/2}(0).
\]

The map \( F \) is upper semicontinuous and not continuous. Hence

\[
F_0 = \lim_{k \to \infty} \sup_{\varepsilon > 0, \delta > 0} F(z_k) = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \bigcup_{\delta > 0} F(z_k) + B_{\delta}(0) \subset F(z_0).
\]
Let us fix any point \( w \in F_0. \) Obviously, \( w \neq w_0. \) Let \( q = \frac{w - w_0}{\|w - w_0\|}. \) Suppose that \( v_{k_n} \in F(z_{k_n}) \) is a sequence such that \( v_{k_n} \to w. \) We have \( F(z_{k_n}) = F(v_{k_n}), F(z_0) = F(w_0) = F(w). \)

Let \( w_0 = (x_0, \mu_0). \) Note that \( x_0 = P_q w. \) Let \( x_{k_n} = P_q v_{k_n}. \) For sufficiently large \( n \) (when \( \|w - v_{k_n}\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \)) we have \((v_{k_n} + I(q)) \cap B_{\varepsilon/4}(w_0) \neq \emptyset, \) \( I(q) = \{\lambda(w - w_0) | \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset \mathcal{L} \) and consequently, \( f_{A,q}(x_{k_n}) \geq \mu_0 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \) Together with \( f_{A,q}(x_0) \leq \mu_0, \) this contradicts the definition of a \( P \)-set.

The graph of a set-valued mapping \( F: \mathbb{R}^n \to 2^{\mathbb{R}^m} \) is the set graph \( F = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m | x \in \text{dom} F, y \in F(x)\}. \)

**Corollary 2.5.** Let \( F: \mathbb{R}^n \to 2^{\mathbb{R}^m} \) be any set-valued mapping with a convex closed graph.

1. If \( n = 1 \) and graph \( F \) is convex and compact then \( F \) is continuous.
2. If graph \( F \) is a \( P \)-set then \( F \) is continuous.

**Proof.** Proof of Corollary 2.5 follows from Theorem 2.4 and the equality

\[
[x_0] \times F(x_0) = \text{graph } F \cap \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m | x = x_0\}. \]

Corollary 2.5 is false if graph \( F \) is not a \( P \)-set. Let \( q \) be the vector \((0, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^3. \) Let graph \( F = A_0, A_0 \) be as in Example 2.3, dom \( F = \{(x_1 - 1)^2 + x_2^2 \leq 1\} \) and \( F(x_1, x_2) = [\lambda | (x_1, x_2, \lambda) \in A_0]. \) Then the set-valued mapping \( F \) is not lower semicontinuous at the point \((0, 0). \)

The Steiner point of a convex compact subset \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is the point

\[
s(A) = \frac{1}{\mu_n B_1(0)} \int_{|p| = 1} s(p, A) p \, dp, \]

\( s(p, A) = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{A}} \langle p, \nu \rangle, \) where \( \mu_n \) is the Lebesgue measure in \( \mathbb{R}^n. \) For any convex compact subsets \( A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \) we have:

\[
\left\| s(A) - s(B) \right\| \leq L_n h(A, B), \quad L_n = \frac{2 \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + 1}{\sqrt{n} \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)},
\]

and \( s(A) \in A. \) The Lipschitz constant \( L_n \) above is the best possible [2.9].

**Theorem 2.6.** Let \( A, B \) be any closed convex subsets and let \( C = A + B. \) If \( C \) is a \( P \)-set then there exist continuous functions \( a : C \to A \) and \( b : C \to B \) with the property that \( a(c) + b(c) = c, \) for all \( c \in C. \)

**Proof.** Let \( L : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be a linear operator, \( L(x_1, x_2) = x_1 + x_2. \) Then \( L \) is a surjection. The set-valued mapping \( \mathbb{R}^n \ni c \to L^{-1}(c) = \{(x_1, x_2) | x_1 + x_2 = c\} \) is Lipschitz continuous in the Hausdorff metric [1, Corollary 3.3.6] and its values are parallel affine planes of the same dimension. The set \( C \) is a \( P \)-set and consequently, \( A \) and \( B \) are \( P \)-sets, too [3]. Using Corollary 2.5, we conclude that the set-valued mapping \( C \ni c \to (A, B) \cap L^{-1}(c) \) is continuous. Taking the Steiner point \( s(\cdot) \) of the latter set-valued mapping, we get the following:

\[
(a(c), b(c)) = s((A, B) \cap L^{-1}(c)). \]

**Theorem 2.7.** Consider any set-valued mappings \( F_1 : \mathbb{R}^n \to 2^{\mathbb{R}^m_1} \) and \( F_2 : \mathbb{R}^n \to 2^{\mathbb{R}^m_2}. \) Suppose that graph \( (F_1, F_2) \) is a \( P \)-set. Suppose that \( L : \mathbb{R}^{m_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_2} \to \mathbb{R}^k \) is a linear surjection. Then for any continuous selection \( f(x) \in L(F_1(x), F_2(x)), \) there exist continuous selections \( f_i(x) \in F_i(x), i = 1, 2, \) with \( f(x) = L(f_1(x), f_2(x)). \)

**Proof.** We can take

\[
(x, f_1(x), f_2(x)) = s((\text{graph } F_1, F_2) \cap (x, L^{-1}(f(x)))).
\]

The map \( x \to (x, L^{-1}(f(x))) \) is continuous, due to [1, Corollary 3.3.6] and the intersection is continuous by Corollary 2.5.

**Theorem 2.8.** Suppose that a compact subset \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is strictly convex and that \( B \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is an arbitrary convex closed subset. In this case there exist continuous functions \( a : C \to A \) and \( b : C \to B \) with the property that \( a(c) + b(c) = c, \) for all \( c \in C. \)

**Proof.** We shall consider \( H(c) = (c - A) \cap B, c \in C. \) Note that \( H(c) \neq \emptyset, \) for all \( c \in C. \) If \( ri H(c_0) \neq \emptyset, \) for some \( c_0 \in C, \) the condition of nonempty interior yields the continuity of \( H(c) \) at the point \( c = c_0 \) [2.9].

Note that \( ri H(c_0) \) is the relative interior of the set \( H(c_0), \) i.e. the interior of the set \( H(c_0) \) in the affine hull of the set \( B. \)
If \( \forall H(c_0) = \emptyset \) then \( H(c_0) \) is a single point, due to the strict convexity of \( A \). The intersection of \( c - A \) and \( B \) is upper semicontinuous, by the closed graph theorem [1, Theorem 3.1.8], i.e.

\[
H(c) \subset H(c_0) + B_{\varepsilon}(0), \quad \forall \varepsilon \in B(c_0) \cap C.
\]

But this implies

\[
H(c_0) \in H(c) + B_{\varepsilon}(0), \quad \forall \varepsilon \in B(c_0) \cap C.
\]

Both formulae yield the continuity (in the Hausdorff metric) at the point \( c = c_0 \). Thus \( H(c) \) is continuous at any point \( c \in C \) and \( b(c) = s(H(c)), \alpha(c) = c - b(c). \)

**Theorem 2.9.** Let \( X \) be any metric space. Consider any set-valued mappings \( F_1 : X \to 2^{\mathbb{R}^m} \) and \( F_2 : X \to 2^{\mathbb{R}^n} \) which are continuous in the Hausdorff metric. Suppose that \( F_1 \) has strictly convex compact images and that \( F_2 \) has closed convex images. Suppose also that \( f(x) \in F_1(x) + F_2(x) \) is a continuous selection. Then there exist continuous selections \( f_i(x) \in F_i(x) \) with \( f(x) = f_1(x) + f_2(x) \), for all \( x \in X \).

**Proof.** Proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.8. The set-valued mapping

\[
H(x) = (f(x) - F_1(x)) \cap F_2(x)
\]

is continuous and \( f_2(x) = s(H(x)), \quad f_1(x) = f(x) - f_2(x). \)

**Theorem 2.10.** Let \( X \) be any metric space. Let \( F_i : X \to 2^{\mathbb{R}^m}, i = 1, 2, \) be set-valued mappings with strictly convex compact or single-point images, which are continuous in the Hausdorff metric. Let \( L_i = \mathbb{R}^m, i = 1, 2, \) and let \( L : L_1 \oplus L_2 \to \mathbb{R}^k \) be a linear surjection such that \( L = \ker L \) is not parallel to \( L_i, i = 1, 2 \). Then for any continuous selection \( f(x) \in L(F_1(x), F_2(x)) \), there exist continuous selections \( f_i(x) \in F_i(x), i = 1, 2, \) such that \( f(x) = L(f_1(x), f_2(x)) \), for all \( x \in X \).

**Proof.** By the closed graph theorem [1, Theorem 3.1.8] and [1, Corollary 3.3.6], the set-valued mapping

\[
H(x) = (F_1(x), F_2(x)) \cap L^{-1}(f(x))
\]

is upper semicontinuous, for all \( x \in X \).

Note that the mapping which associates to each convex compact subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) its nearest (with respect to zero) point, is a continuous selection of sets in the Euclidean space, in the Hausdorff metric [2,5] and hence

\[
L^{-1}(f(x)) = w(x) + L,
\]

where \( w(x) = (w_1(x), w_2(x)) \) is a continuous (at \( x \in X \)) projection of the zero onto \( L^{-1}(f(x)) \) in the Euclidean space \( L_1 \oplus L_2 \).

Thus we can write

\[
H(x) = w(x) + (F_1(x) - w_1(x), F_2(x) - w_2(x)) \cap L.
\]

Consequently, we can assume that \( w(x) = 0 \), \( H(x) = (F_1(x), F_2(x)) \cap L \neq \emptyset \) and prove the continuity of the last map. We shall assume that \( H(x_0) \) is not a single point, otherwise \( H \) would be continuous at the point \( x = x_0 \) for the same reason as in Theorem 2.8.

Let \( \exists \varepsilon_0 > 0 \), \( x_k \to x_0 \), such that \( w_0 \notin H(x_k) + B_{\varepsilon_0}(0), \forall k \).

Let \( w \in \lim \sup_{k \to -\infty} H(x_k) \subset H(x_0) \); \( w \neq w_0, w, w_0 \in L \). Let \( [u, v] \subset F_1(x_0) \cap L \) be a projection of the segment \([w, w_0]\) onto \( L_1 \) parallel to \( L_2 \) and \([v, v_0] \subset F_2(x_0) \cap L \), a projection of the segment \([w, w_0]\) onto \( L_2 \) parallel to \( L_1 \).

By hypothesis, we have \( u \neq u_0, v \neq v_0 \). Sets \( F_1(x_0), i = 1, 2, \) are strictly convex and \( \overline{\frac{x + x_0}{2}} \in \text{int} F_1(x_0), \overline{\frac{v + v_0}{2}} \in \text{int} F_2(x_0) \). Thus we can find \( \alpha > 0 \) such that:

\[
B^1_{\alpha} \left( \frac{u + u_0}{2} \right) \subset F_1(x_0), \quad B^2_{\alpha} \left( \frac{v + v_0}{2} \right) \subset F_2(x_0)
\]

and

\[
B_{\alpha} \left( \frac{w + w_0}{2} \right) \subset (F_1(x_0), F_2(x_0))
\]

In the last inclusion we considered the ball of norm \( \max \{\|u\|_{L_1}, \|v\|_{L_2}\} \), \( (u, v) \in L_1 \oplus L_2 \).
Without loss of generality we may assume that \( \|w - w_0\| > \varepsilon_0 \) (otherwise we reduce \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \)). Let \( t = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\|w - w_0\|} \in (0, 1) \). By a homothety with center \( w_0 \) and the coefficient \( t \) we get that for \( \tilde{w} = w_0 + \frac{t}{2}(w - w_0) \) the inclusion \( B_{t \delta}(\tilde{w}) \subset (F_1(x_0), F_2(x_0)) \) holds and \( \|\tilde{w} - w_0\| = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \).

By continuity of \( F_i, i = 1, 2 \), we get that there exists \( k_0 \) such that \( B_{\frac{1}{2}t \delta}(\tilde{w}) \subset (F_1(x_k), F_2(x_k)) \), for all \( k > k_0 \) and hence we have:

\[
\tilde{w} \in (F_1(x_k), F_2(x_k)) \cap L \cap B_{\varepsilon_0}(w_0), \quad \forall k > k_0,
\]

i.e. \( H(x_k) \cap B_{\varepsilon_0}(w_0) \neq \emptyset \) for all \( k > k_0 \). This contradicts (2.10).

So we have proved that \( H(x) \) is continuous in the Hausdorff metric, for all \( x \in X \). Taking the Steiner point of \( H(x) = (F_1(x), F_2(x)) \cap L^{-1}(f(x)) \) we obtain that \( (f_1(x), f_2(x)) = s(H(x)) \). □

**Corollary 2.11.** Let \( X \) be any metric space. Let \( F_i : X \to 2^{\mathbb{R}^m}, i = 1, 2 \), be \((\varepsilon - \delta)\)-lower semicontinuous set-valued mappings with strictly convex compact images. Let \( L_i = \mathbb{R}^m, i = 1, 2 \), and let \( L : L_1 \oplus L_2 \to \mathbb{R}^k \) be a linear surjection such that \( L = \text{ker} L \) is not parallel to \( L_i, i = 1, 2 \). Suppose that for any \( x \in X \) and any point \( f \in L(F_1(x), F_2(x)) \) there exists a pair of distinct points \( w_1, w_2 \in (F_1(x), F_2(x)) \) such that \( f = Lw_i, i = 1, 2 \). Then for any continuous selection \( f(x) \in L(F_1(x), F_2(x)) \) there exist continuous selections \( f_1(x) \in F_1(x), i = 1, 2 \), such that \( f(x) = L(f_1(x), f_2(x)) \), for all \( x \in X \).

**Proof.** We can repeat word-by-word the proof from Theorem 2.10 of the lower semicontinuity of \( H \) at any point \( x_0 \). The only difference is when we choose the point \( w \) as an arbitrary point of the set \( H(x_0) \setminus \{w_0\} \). Using the Michael selection theorem [7] we can choose a continuous selection \( (f_1(x), f_2(x)) \in H(x) \). □

Finally, we shall prove that the exact solution of the splitting problem for selections takes place on the dense subset of arguments of the \( G_\delta \)-type.

**Theorem 2.12.** Let \( X \) be any metric space and \( Y, Y_i, i = 1, 2 \), any Banach spaces. Let \( F_i : X \to 2^{Y_i} \), \( i = 1, 2 \), be upper semicontinuous set-valued mappings with convex compact images and suppose that the set \( \text{cl}(F_1(x), F_2(x)) \) is compact. Let \( L : Y_1 \oplus Y_2 \to Y \) be any continuous linear surjection. Then for any continuous selection \( f(x) \in L(F_1(x), F_2(x)) \) there exist a dense \( G_\delta \)-set \( X_f \subset X \) and selections \( f_i(x) \in F_i(x), i = 1, 2 \), continuous on the set \( X_f \), such that \( f(x) = L(f_1(x), f_2(x)) \), for all \( x \in X_f \).

**Proof.** The intersection \( H(x) \) of the continuous mapping \( L^{-1}(f(x)) \) and the upper semicontinuous mapping \( (F_1(x), F_2(x)) \) with compact images is upper semicontinuous [2,9].

Moreover, the set graph \( H \) is closed. By [1, Theorem 3.110], \( H(x) \) is continuous on some dense \( G_\delta \)-set \( X_f \subset X \). Note that \( X_f \) is also a metric space. Applying the Michael selection theorem [7] to the set-valued mapping \( H : X_f \to 2^{Y_1 \oplus Y_2} \), we obtain continuous selections \( (f_1(x), f_2(x)) \in H(x) \), for all \( x \in X_f \). □

We conclude this section by some final remarks concerning \( P \)-sets.

**Lemma 2.13.** Let \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be any convex compact subsets and suppose that in terms of Definition 2.1, for any unit vector \( q \) the operator \( P_q : A \to P_q A \), in the induced topologies. Then \( A \) is a \( P \)-set.

**Proof.** Suppose that \( A \) is not a \( P \)-set. Then for some unit vector \( q \) there exists a sequence \( \{x_k\} \subset P_q A \) such that \( \lim x_k = x_0 \) and \( \lim f_{A,q}(x_k) = \mu_0 > f(x_0) \). Let \( z_0 = (x_0, f_{A,q}(x_0)), z_0 = (x_0, \mu_0), \ z = \frac{1}{2}(z_0 + z_0) = (x_0, \frac{1}{2}(\mu_0 + f_{A,q}(x_0))) \), and \( \varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} \|z_0 - z_0\| = \frac{1}{4}(\mu_0 - f_{A,q}(x_0)) \). Then \( x_k \notin P_q(B_{\varepsilon}(z) \cap A) \), for all \( k \). This contradicts the openness of \( P_q \). □

**Theorem 2.14.** Any convex compact subset \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is a \( P \)-set if and only if for any natural number \( m \) and any linear map \( L : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m \), the map \( L : A \to LA \) is open in the induced topology.

**Proof.** The openness \( L : A \to LA \) was proved in [3]. By Lemma 2.13, we get the converse statement, it suffices to take \( L = P_q \). □

**Corollary 2.15.** Let \( E \) be any Banach space, \( \dim E = n \), and \( E = L \oplus l \), \( \dim L = n - 1 \), \( \dim l = 1 \). A set \( A \subset E \) is a \( P \)-set if and only if the projection \( A \) onto \( L \), parallel to \( l \), is an open map and this property holds for any pairs of subspaces \( L, l \) with \( E = L \oplus l \), \( \dim E = n - 1 \), \( \dim l = 1 \).

**Proof.** Proof follows from Theorem 2.14 and the equivalence of the Euclidean and the given norm. □
3. Solution of the approximate splitting problem for Lipschitz selections in a Hilbert space

Let $X$, $Y$, $Y_i$, $i = 1, 2$, be infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. Define $B^Y_\varepsilon(x) = \{ y \in X \mid \|x - y\| \leq \varepsilon \}$. Let $L : Y_1 \oplus Y_2 \to Y$ be any continuous linear surjection. We shall consider the following problem: When can an arbitrary Lipschitz continuous (resp. uniformly continuous) set-valued mapping $f(x)$ be represented in the form $f(x) = L(f_1(x), f_2(x))$, where $f_i(x)$ are some Lipschitz selections, $i = 1, 2$.

Clearly, Example 1.1 shows that there is no affirmative solution of this problem in such a formulation.

We shall prove that there exists an approximate solution of the Lipschitz splitting problem, namely that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, any pair of uniformly continuous set-valued mappings $F_i$, $i = 1, 2$, with closed convex bounded images, and any Lipschitz selection $f(x) \in L(F_1(x), F_2(x))$, there exist Lipschitz selections $f_i(x) \in F_i(x) + B^Y_{\varepsilon}(0)$ such that $f(x) = L(f_1(x), f_2(x))$.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let $(X, \rho)$ be any metric space and $(Y, \| \cdot \|)$ any Banach space. Let $F_i : X \to 2^Y$, $i = 1, 2$, be any set-valued mappings with closed convex images. Let $\omega_i : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$, $i = 1, 2$, be the modulus of continuity for $F_i$, i.e. $\lim_{t \to 0} \omega_i(t) = 0$ and

$$\forall x_1, x_2 \in X : \quad h(F_1(x_1), F_2(x_2)) \leq \omega_i(\rho(x_1, x_2)),$$

Let $d(x) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq 2} \operatorname{diam} F_i(x) < +\infty$ for all $x \in X$. Suppose there exist a function $\gamma : X \to [0, +\infty)$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that:

$$\gamma(x) B^Y_1(0) \subset F_1(x) - F_2(x), \quad \forall x \in X,$$

$$d(x) \leq \alpha \gamma(x), \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Then the set-valued mapping $G(x) = F_1(x) \cap F_2(x)$ is uniformly continuous with the modulus $\omega(t) = \max(\omega_1(t), \omega_2(t)) + \alpha(\omega_1(t) + \omega_2(t))$.

**Proof.** We shall use ideas from Theorem 2.2.1 from [9]. Note that $G(x) \neq \emptyset$ follows by inclusion (3.11). Fix $t > 1$. Choose any pair of points $x_1, x_2 \in X$ and $y_1 \in G(x_1)$.

We shall prove that there exists a point $y_2 \in G(x_2)$ with

$$\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq t \omega(\rho(x_1, x_2)).$$

Define $\omega = \omega(\rho(x_1, x_2))$, $\omega_i = \omega_i(\rho(x_1, x_2))$. By the uniform continuity of $F_i$ it follows that:

$$y_1 \in F_1(x_1) + t \omega_1 B^Y_1(0),$$

$$y_1 \in F_2(x_2) + t \omega_2 B^Y_1(0).$$

Set $d(x_2) = \operatorname{diam} F_1(x_2)$. By inclusion (3.14) it follows that there exists a point $y \in F_1(x_2)$ such that $\|y - y_1\| \leq t \omega_1$.

From this and by the inclusion (3.15) we conclude that

$$y \in F_2(x_2) + t(\omega_1 + \omega_2) B^Y_1(0).$$

Let

$$\theta = \frac{\gamma(x_2)}{\gamma(x_2) + t(\omega_1 + \omega_2)} \in [0, 1].$$

From the previous inclusion we get the inclusion

$$\theta y \in \theta F_2(x_2) + \theta t(\omega_1 + \omega_2) B^Y_1(0).$$

Keeping in mind that $\theta t(\omega_1 + \omega_2) = (1 - \theta) \gamma(x_2)$, we get

$$(1 - \theta) \gamma(x_2) B^Y_1(0) \subset (1 - \theta) F_1(x_2) - (1 - \theta) F_2(x_2),$$

and

$$\theta y \in \theta F_2(x_2) + (1 - \theta) F_2(x_2) - (1 - \theta) F_1(x_2) = F_2(x_2) - (1 - \theta) F_1(x_2).$$

Hence there exists a point $z \in F_1(x_2)$ with

$$\theta y + (1 - \theta) z \in F_2(x_2).$$

Let $y_2 = \theta y + (1 - \theta) z$. Then $y_2 \in F_1(x_2)$ since $y, z \in F_1(x_2)$. Thus $y_2 \in G(x_2)$. 

From the equality \( y_1 - y_2 = (y_1 - y) + (1 - \theta)(y - z) \) we conclude that:

\[
\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq \|y_1 - y\| + (1 - \theta)\|y - z\| \leq t\omega_1 + (1 - \theta)d(x_2).
\]

(3.16)

If \( \gamma(x_2) = 0 \) then \( d(x_2) = 0 \) and \( \|y_1 - y_2\| \leq t\omega_1 \).

If \( \gamma(x_2) > 0 \) then from the definition of \( \theta \) and from (3.12) we get

\[
(1 - \theta)d(x_2) \leq \frac{t(\omega_1 + \omega_2)}{\gamma(x_2)} + t\alpha\gamma(x_2) \leq t\alpha(\omega_1 + \omega_2).
\]

So by inequality (3.16),

\[
\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq t(\omega_1 + \alpha(\omega_1 + \omega_2)).
\]

By taking the limit \( t \to 1 + 0 \) we obtain

\[
h(G(x_1), G(x_2)) \leq (\omega_1 + \alpha(\omega_1 + \omega_2)).
\]

Finally, note that in the general case we must take \( \max\{\omega_1, \omega_2\} \) instead of \( \omega_1 \), because it may happen that \( d(x_2) = \text{diam} \ F_2(x_2) \). □

Propositions 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 are well known:

**Proposition 3.2.** (See [6, Lemma 5].) Let \( X \) be a Banach space and \( A_1, A_2 \subset X \) any convex closed bounded sets, \( d = \max\{\text{diam} \ A_1, \text{diam} \ A_2\} \). Let \( B^X_{\alpha}(x) \subset A_i, i = 1, 2 \). Then for any \( \beta \in (0, \alpha) \) the following holds:

\[
h(A_1 - B^X_{\beta}(0), A_2 - B^X_{\beta}(0)) \leq \frac{d}{\alpha - \beta}h(A_1, A_2).
\]

**Proposition 3.3.** (See [6, Lemma 4].) Let \( X \) be a Hilbert space and \( A_1, A_2 \subset X \) any convex closed bounded sets, \( A_i \subset B^X_{\gamma}(a_i), i = 1, 2 \). Then \( c(A_i) \in A_i, i = 1, 2 \), and

\[
\|c(A_1) - c(A_2)\| \leq 2\sqrt{\|\gamma\|h(A_1, A_2)} + h(A_1, A_2).
\]

The next proposition follows by the well-known Valentine extension theorem [14]:

**Proposition 3.4.** (See [6, Lemma 3].) Let \( X, Y \) be Hilbert spaces and \( X_1 \subset X \) any convex subset of \( X \). Let \( w : X_1 \to Y \) be a uniformly continuous function. Then for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists a Lipschitz continuous function \( v : X_1 \to Y \) with \( \|v(x) - w(x)\| < \varepsilon \), for all \( x \in X_1 \).

**Lemma 3.5.** Let \( X \) be a Hilbert space, \( Y \) a Banach space and \( L : X \to Y \) a continuous linear surjection. Then the operator \( L \) has the Lip-property.

**Proof.** Let \( \ker L = \mathcal{L} \) and \( \mathcal{L}^\perp \) be the orthogonal subspace of \( \mathcal{L} \). The set-valued mapping \( L^{-1}(y) \) is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the Hausdorff distance [1, Corollary 3.3.6]. Let \( R(y) = \inf_{x \in L^{-1}(y)} \|x\|, \) \( l(y) \in L^{-1}(y) : \|l(y)\| = R(y), \) and

\[
G(y) = B^X_{2R(y)}(0) \cap L^{-1}(y).
\]

It is well known ([9, Theorem 2.2.2], see also [2,4,8]), that \( G(y) \) is a Lipschitz set-valued mapping with respect to the Hausdorff distance. This also follows by Theorem 3.1.

Now consider \( H(y) = G(y) \cap \mathcal{L}^\perp \). The point \( l(y) \) is a metric projection of zero onto \( L^{-1}(y) \), hence \( l(y) \in G(y) \) and (because of \( l(y) \in \mathcal{L}^\perp \) \( l(y) \in H(y) \)). Moreover, from the fact that some shift of \( \mathcal{L} \) contains \( G(y) \), we can deduce that \( H(y) = \{l(y)\} \).

From the properties

\[
B^X_{\sqrt{2R(y)}(0)} \subset G(y) \cap \mathcal{L}^\perp, \quad \text{diam} \ G(y) \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{3R(y)}
\]

and from Theorem 3.1 we now obtain that \( H(y) = \{l(y)\} \) is Lipschitz continuous in the Hausdorff distance, hence \( l(y) \) is a Lipschitz function. □

**Remark 3.6.** We gave a purely geometric proof of Lemma 3.5. Note that this lemma can also be proved with the help of the Implicit function theorem [12].
Theorem 3.7. Let $X, Y, Y_i, i = 1, 2$, be Hilbert spaces and $X_1 \subset X$ a convex subset of $X$. Let $L : Y_1 \oplus Y_2 \to Y$ be a continuous linear surjection. Let $F_i : X_1 \to 2^{Y_i}, i = 1, 2$, be uniformly continuous (with modulus $\omega_i$) set-valued mappings with convex closed bounded images and $d = \sup_{x \in X_1} \text{diam}(F_1(x), F_2(x)) < +\infty$. Suppose that for all $x \in X_1$ $f(x) \in L(F_1(x), F_2(x))$ is a Lipschitz selection. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist Lipschitz selections $f_i(x) \in F_i(x) + B_{\varepsilon}^{Y_i}(0)$ with $f(x) = L(f_1(x), f_2(x))$, for all $x \in X_1$.

**Proof.** Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $f(x) \in L(F_1(x), F_2(x))$ be a Lipschitz selection. The set-valued mapping $L^{-1}(f(x))$ is Lipschitz continuous in Hausdorff metric [1, Corollary 3.3.6]. Let $w(x) = l(f(x)) \in L^{-1}(f(x))$. The function $w(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous as a superposition of two Lipschitz functions: $l(y)$ (Lemma 3.5) and $f(x)$.

Hence $L^{-1}(f(x)) = w(x) + L. \quad \mathcal{L} = \ker L$. Consider

$$H(x) = \left( (F_1(x), F_2(x)) + B_{\varepsilon}^{Y_1 \oplus Y_2}(0) \right) \cap L^{-1}(f(x)) = w(x) + \left( (F_1(x), F_2(x)) - w(x) + B_{\varepsilon}^{Y_1 \oplus Y_2}(0) \right) \cap L.$$ 

Without loss of generality we may assume that $w(x) = 0$ and $H(x) = ((F_1(x), F_2(x)) + B_{\varepsilon}^{Y_1 \oplus Y_2}(0)) \cap L$. The mappings $x \mapsto (F_1(x), F_2(x)) + B_{\varepsilon}^{Y_1 \oplus Y_2}(0)$ and $x \mapsto \mathcal{L}$ are uniformly continuous ($x \in X_1$),

$$B_{\varepsilon}^{Y_1 \oplus Y_2}(0) \subset \left( (F_1(x), F_2(x)) + B_{\varepsilon}^{Y_1 \oplus Y_2}(0) \right) - \mathcal{L}$$

and

$$\text{diam}(F_1(x), F_2(x)) + B_{\varepsilon}^{Y_1 \oplus Y_2}(0) \leq d + 2e \leq \frac{d + 2e}{\varepsilon}.$$

Using Theorem 3.1 we obtain that $H(x), x \in X_1$, is a uniformly continuous set-valued mapping.

Consider $\mathcal{L}$ with the induced topology: the ball $B_{L}^c(w) \subset \mathcal{L} (w \in \mathcal{L})$ is $B_{L}^c(w) = B_{L/2}^{Y_1 \oplus Y_2}(w) \cap \mathcal{L}$. Obviously, $\mathcal{L}$ is a Hilbert space. The set-valued selection $H(x) \subset \mathcal{L}$ has a nonempty interior in $\mathcal{L}$, moreover $H(x) \cap B_{L/2}^{c}(0) \neq \emptyset$, for all $x \in X_1$.

Let $H_1(x) = H(x) \cap B_{L/2}^{c}(0)$. By Proposition 3.2 we have that $H_1(x)$ is a uniformly continuous set-valued mapping with convex closed images. By Proposition 3.3 we have that the Chebyshev center $c(H_1(x))$ of the set-valued mapping $H_1(x)$ is a uniformly continuous function and $c(H_1(x)) \in H_1(x)$.

By Proposition 3.4 there exists a Lipschitz continuous function $v(x) \in c(H_1(x)) + B_{L/2}^{c}(0)$, for all $x \in X_1$. Hence

$$v(x) \in c(H_1(x)) + B_{L/2}^{c}(0) \subset H_1(x) + B_{L/2}^{c}(0) \subset H(x).$$

We can now choose $(f_1(x), f_2(x)) = v(x)$. \hfill \square

**Remark 3.8.** In the finite-dimension case (when $\dim Y_i < \infty$, $i = 1, 2$) Lip-property of $L$ follows from results [4,8] (see also [2,6,9]). Let $R(y) = \inf \|l\| \in L^{-1}(y)$, for all $y \in Y$. The set-valued mapping

$$G(y) = B_{2R(y)}^{Y_1 \oplus Y_2}(0) \cap L^{-1}(y)$$

is Lipschitz continuous on $y$ (this also follows by Theorem 3.1). We can choose $l(y) = s(G(y))$, where $s(\cdot)$ is the Steiner point.

**Remark 3.9.** It is easy to see that the proof of Theorem 3.7 can be given in any uniformly convex Banach (not necessarily Hilbert) spaces $Y_1, Y_2$, where every uniformly continuous function can be approximated (with arbitrary precision) by a Lipschitz function, for any continuous linear surjection with Lip-property.

**Example 3.10.** An exact solution of the splitting problem does not exist for Lipschitz selections. Besides Example 1.1 we can demonstrate one more example. Tsar’kov proved [13] that there exists a Lipschitz (with respect to the Hausdorff distance) set-valued mapping $F : [0, 1] \to 2^Y$ (Y an infinite dimension Hilbert space) with convex closed bounded images, such that the mapping $F$ has no Lipschitz selection. Thus for $L : Y \oplus Y \to Y, L(y_1, y_2) = y_1 - y_2$, we have $f(x) = 0 = F(x) - F(x)$, but the Lipschitz function $f(x) = 0$ cannot be represented in the form $0 = f_1(x) - f_2(x)$, where $f_i(x) \in F(x)$ is a Lipschitz selection.
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