THE JOURNAL OF SYMBOLIC LOGIC
Volume 83, Number 4, December 2018

BROUWER'S FAN THEOREM AND CONVEXITY

JOSEF BERGER AND GREGOR SVINDLAND

Abstract. In the framework of Bishop's constructive mathematics we introduce co-convexity as a property of subsets B of $\{0,1\}^*$, the set of finite binary sequences, and prove that co-convex bars are uniform. Moreover, we establish a canonical correspondence between detachable subsets B of $\{0,1\}^*$ and uniformly continuous functions f defined on the unit interval such that B is a bar if and only if the corresponding function f is positive-valued, B is a uniform bar if and only if f has positive infimum, and B is co-convex if and only if f satisfies a weak convexity condition.

§**1. Introduction.** In their seminal article [7], Julian and Richman established the following correspondence between detachable subsets B of $\{0,1\}^*$ and uniformly continuous functions on the unit interval.

PROPOSITION 1.1. *For every detachable subset B of $\{0,1\}^*$ there exists a uniformly continuous function $f : [0,1] \to [0,\infty[$ such that*

(i) *B is a bar $\Leftrightarrow$ f is positive-valued,*
(ii) *B is a uniform bar $\Leftrightarrow$, f has positive infimum.*

Conversely, for every uniformly continuous function $f : [0,1] \to [0,\infty[$ there exists a detachable subset B of $\{0,1\}^*$ such that (i) and (ii) hold.

Consequently, Brouwer's fan theorem for detachable bars, D-FAN, is equivalent to the statement that every uniformly continuous, positive-valued function on $[0,1]$ has positive infimum. On the other hand, in [3, Theorem 1] we have shown that if the function is convex, the fan theorem is no longer required.

THEOREM 1.2. *Suppose that $f : [0,1] \to]0,\infty[$ is uniformly continuous and convex. Then f has positive infimum.*

Therefore, the question arises whether there is a constructively valid 'convex' version of the fan theorem. To this end, we define 'co-convexity' as a property of subsets B of $\{0,1\}^*$ and show in Theorem 2.1 that there indeed is such a result. Moreover, in Theorem 3.4, we include the following correspondence

(iii) B is co-convex $\Leftrightarrow$ f is weakly convex

into the list of Proposition 1.1, where weak convexity of functions generalises convexity. The way we achieve our aim shows some similarities with the proofs presented in [2] and [7], but in the crucial parts we need to proceed differently in order to include

Received March 18, 2017.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03F60, 26E40, 52A41.
Key words and phrases. constructive mathematics, fan theorem, convex functions.

0022-4812/18/8304-0003
DOI:10.1017/jsl.2018.49

(iii), in particular when deriving the function f with properties (i)–(iii) for some given detachable set B.

The framework of our presentation is Bishop's constructive mathematics [4–6]. This includes the use of choice axioms which are compatible with intuitionistic logic like the axiom of *countable choice*:

Let A be a set and let S be a subset of $\mathbb{N} \times A$. If for each n there exists a in A such that $(n, a) \in S$, then there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \to A$ such that $(n, f(n)) \in S$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

§2. A constructive fan theorem.

We write $\{0,1\}^*$ for the set of all finite binary sequences u, v, w. Let $\varnothing$ be the empty sequence and let $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be the set of all infinite binary sequences α, β, γ. For every u let $|u|$ be the *length* of u, that is $|\varnothing| = 0$ and for $u = (u_0, \ldots, u_{n-1})$ we have $|u| = n$. For $v = (v_0, \ldots, v_{m-1})$, the *concatenation* $u * v$ of u and v is defined by

$$u * v = (u_0, \ldots, u_{n-1}, v_0, \ldots, v_{m-1}).$$

The *restriction* $\overline{\alpha}n$ of α to n bits is given by

$$\overline{\alpha}n = (\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}).$$

Thus $|\overline{\alpha}n| = n$ and $\overline{\alpha}0 = \varnothing$. For u with $n \leq |u|$, the *restriction* $\overline{u}n$ is defined analogously. A subset B of $\{0,1\}^*$ is *closed under extension* if $u * v \in B$ for all $u \in B$ and for all v. A sequence α *hits* B if there exists n such that $\overline{\alpha}n \in B$. B is a *bar* if every α hits B. B is a *uniform bar* if there exists N such that for every α there exists $n \leq N$ such that $\overline{\alpha}n \in B$. Often one requires B to be *detachable*, that is for every u the statement $u \in B$ is decidable. Now we are ready to introduce Brouwer's *fan theorem for detachable bars*.

D-FAN : Every detachable bar is a uniform bar.

In Bishop's constructive mathematics, D-FAN is neither provable nor falsifiable, see [5, Section 3 of Chapter 5]. Define

$$u < v \;:\Leftrightarrow\; |u| = |v| \wedge \exists k < |u| \, (\overline{u}k = \overline{v}k \wedge u_k = 0 \wedge v_k = 1)$$

and

$$u \leq v \;:\Leftrightarrow\; u = v \vee u < v.$$

Note that $u < v$ means that u and v are on the same level and u is to the left of v. A subset B of $\{0,1\}^*$ is *co-convex* if for every α which hits B there exists n such that either

$$\{v \mid v \leq \overline{\alpha}n\} \subseteq B \quad \text{or} \quad \{v \mid \overline{\alpha}n \leq v\} \subseteq B.$$

Note that, for detachable B, co-convexity follows from the convexity of the complement of B, where $C \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is *convex* if for all u, v, w we have

$$u \leq v \leq w \wedge u, w \in C \Rightarrow v \in C.$$

Define the *upper closure* B' of B by

$$B' = \{u \mid \exists k \leq |u| \, (\overline{u}k \in B)\}.$$

Note that B is a (uniform) bar if and only if B' is a (uniform) bar. Moreover, if B is detachable then B' is also detachable. Therefore, we may assume that bars are closed under extension.

THEOREM 2.1. *Every co-convex bar is a uniform bar.*

PROOF. Fix a co-convex bar B. Since the upper closure of B is also co-convex, we can assume that B is closed under extension. Define

$$C = \{u \mid \exists n \,\forall w \in \{0,1\}^n \,(u * w \in B)\}.$$

Note that C consists of the set of nodes beyond which B is uniform. Note that $B \subseteq C$ and that C is closed under extension as well. Moreover, B is a uniform bar if and only if there exists n such that $\{0,1\}^n \subseteq C$.

First, we show that

$$\forall u \,\exists i \in \{0,1\}\,(u * i \in C). \tag{1}$$

Fix u. For

$$\beta = u * 1 * 0 * 0 * 0 * \cdots$$

there exist an l such that either

$$\left\{v \mid v \leq \overline{\beta}l\right\} \subseteq B$$

or

$$\left\{v \mid \overline{\beta}l \leq v\right\} \subseteq B.$$

Since B is closed under extension, we can assume that $l > |u|+1$. Let $m = l - |u| - 1$. If $\left\{v \mid v \leq \overline{\beta}l\right\} \subseteq B$, we can conclude that

$$u * 0 * w \in B$$

for every w of length m, which implies that $u * 0 \in C$. If $\left\{v \mid \overline{\beta}l \leq v\right\} \subseteq B$, we obtain

$$u * 1 * w \in B$$

for every w of length m, which implies that $u * 1 \in C$. This concludes the proof of (1).

By countable choice, there exists a function $F : \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}$ such that

$$\forall u \;\left(u * F(u) \in C\right).$$

Define α by

$$\alpha_n = 1 - F(\overline{\alpha}n).$$

Next, we show by induction on n that

$$\forall n \,\forall u \in \{0,1\}^n \,(u \neq \overline{\alpha}n \Rightarrow u \in C). \tag{2}$$

If $n = 0$, the statement clearly holds, since in this case the statement $u \neq \overline{\alpha}n$ is false. Now fix some n such that (2) holds. Moreover, fix $w \in \{0,1\}^{n+1}$ such that $w \neq \overline{\alpha}(n+1)$.

CASE 1. $\overline{w}n \neq \overline{\alpha}n$. Then $\overline{w}n \in C$ and therefore $w \in C$.

CASE 2. $w = \overline{\alpha}n * (1 - \alpha_n) = \overline{\alpha}n * F(\overline{\alpha}n)$. This implies $w \in C$. So we have established (2).

There exists n such that $\overline{\alpha}n \in B$. Applying (2) to this n, we can conclude that every u of length n is an element of C, thus B is a uniform bar. ⊣

REMARK 2.2.

(a) Note that we do not need to require that the co-convex bar B in Theorem 2.1 be detachable.
(b) If B is detachable, the function F in the proof Theorem 2.1 can be defined directly—without using countable choice—by $F(u) = 0$ if

$$\exists m \left(\forall w \in \{0,1\}^m (u * 0 * w \in B) \wedge \exists w \in \{0,1\}^m (u * 1 * w \notin B)\right),$$

and $F(u) = 1$, otherwise.

§3. A correspondence between subsets of $\{0,1\}^*$ and functions on $[0,1]$. We recall a few basic notions of constructive analysis. Fix an inhabited subset S of $\mathbb{R}$. A real number x is a *lower bound* of S if

$$\forall s \in S\, (x \leq s)$$

and the *infimum* of S if it is a lower bound of S and

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0\, \exists s \in S\, (s < x + \varepsilon).$$

In this case we write $x = \inf S$. We cannot assume that every inhabited set with a lower bound has an infimum. However, under some additional conditions, this is the case. See [6, Corollary 2.1.19] for a proof of the following criterion.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let S be an inhabited set of real numbers which has a lower bound. Assume further that for all $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $p < q$ either p is a lower bound of S or else there exists $s \in S$ with $s < q$. Then S has an infimum.*

For $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, a function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is *weakly increasing* if

$$\forall s, t \in X \left(s < t \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(s) \leq f(t)\right),$$

strictly increasing if

$$\forall s, t \in X \left(s < t \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(s) < f(t)\right),$$

and *monotone* if either f or $-f$ is weakly increasing.

A subset S of a metric space (X, d) is *totally bounded* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $s_1, \ldots, s_n \in S$ such that

$$\forall s \in S\, \exists i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \left(d(s, s_i) < \varepsilon\right)$$

and *compact* if it is totally bounded and *complete* (i.e., every Cauchy sequence in S has a limit in S). Proofs of the following basic statements can be found in [6, Section 2.2].

LEMMA 3.2. (i) *If S is totally bounded, then for all $x \in X$ the distance*

$$d(x, S) = \inf \{d(x, s) \mid s \in S\}$$

exists and the function $x \mapsto d(x, S)$ is uniformly continuous.
(ii) *Uniformly continuous images of totally bounded sets are totally bounded.*
(iii) *If S is totally bounded and $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly continuous, then*

$$\inf f = \inf \{f(s) \mid s \in S\}$$

exists.

We want to include convexity in the list of Proposition 1.1. To this end, we introduce a suitable convexity condition for functions. Let S be a subset of $\mathbb{R}$. A function $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$ is *weakly convex* if for all $t \in S$ with $f(t) > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that either

$$\forall s \in S \left(s \leq t \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(s) \geq \varepsilon\right)$$

or

$$\forall s \in S \left(t \leq s \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(s) \geq \varepsilon\right).$$

We want to relate this condition to the usual notions of convexity for functions. Recall that a function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is *convex* if we have

$$f(\lambda s + (1-\lambda)t) \leq \lambda f(s) + (1-\lambda) f(t)$$

and *quasiconvex* if we have

$$f(\lambda s + (1-\lambda)t) \leq \max\left(f(s), f(t)\right)$$

for all $s, t \in [0,1]$ and all $\lambda \in [0,1]$. Note that convexity implies quasiconvexity.

LEMMA 3.3. *Fix a function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$.*

(a) *If f is weakly convex, then the set $\{t \mid f(t) \leq 0\}$ is convex. With classical logic, the reverse implication holds as well, if f is continuous. This illustrates that weak convexity is indeed a convexity property.*
(b) *Monotone functions are weakly convex.*

Now assume that f is uniformly continuous.

(c) *If f is quasiconvex, then it is weakly convex.*
(d) *Let D be a dense subset of $[0,1]$. Then f is weakly convex if and only its restriction to D is weakly convex.*

PROOF. We only show (c). Fix $t \in [0,1]$ and suppose that $f(t) > 0$. By part (iii) of Lemma 3.2, the real numbers

$$\iota = \inf \{f(s) \mid s \in [0,t]\}$$

and

$$\eta = \inf \{f(s) \mid s \in [t,1]\}$$

exist. We either have $0 < \iota$ or $\iota < f(t)$. If $0 < \iota$, we are done. So assume that $\iota < f(t)$. We either have $0 < \eta$ or $\eta < f(t)$. Again, in the first case, we are done. The second case can be ruled out in view of $\iota < f(t)$ and the quasiconvexity of f. ⊣

Now we can state the main theorem.

THEOREM 3.4. *For every detachable subset B of $\{0,1\}^*$ which is closed under extension there exists a uniformly continuous function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that*

(a) *B is a bar $\Leftrightarrow$ f is positive-valued,*
(b) *B is a uniform bar $\Leftrightarrow$ $\inf f > 0$,*
(c) *B is co-convex $\Leftrightarrow$ f is weakly convex.*

Conversely, for every uniformly continuous function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ there exists a detachable subset B of $\{0,1\}^*$ which is closed under extension such that (a), (b), and (c) hold.

We split the proof of Theorem 3.4 into two parts.

PART I: CONSTRUCTION OF A FUNCTION f FOR GIVEN B.

Fix a detachable subset B of $\{0,1\}^*$ which is closed under extension. We can assume that $\varnothing \notin B$. (Otherwise, let f be the constant function $t \mapsto 1$.) First, we define a function $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ which satisfies the properties (1) and (2) of Theorem 3.4. Then, we introduce a refined version f of g which satisfies all properties of Theorem 3.4. Define metrics

$$d_1(s,t) = |s-t|, \quad d_2((x_1,x_2),(y_1,y_2)) = |x_1-y_1| + |x_2-y_2|$$

on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R}^2$, respectively. The mapping

$$(\alpha,\beta) \mapsto \inf\left\{2^{-k} \mid \overline{\alpha}k = \overline{\beta}k\right\}$$

is a compact metric on $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. See [5, Section 1 of Chapter 5] for an introduction to basic properties of this metric space. Let $\kappa : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to [0,1]$ be the standard embedding of Cantor space into the reals as the Cantor set. Then

$$\kappa(\alpha) = 2 \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k \cdot 3^{-(k+1)},$$

so κ is uniformly continuous. The next lemma immediately follows from the definition of κ.

LEMMA 3.5. *For all α, β and n, we have*

- $\overline{\alpha}n = \overline{\beta}n \;\Rightarrow\; |\kappa(\alpha) - \kappa(\beta)| \leq 3^{-n}$
- $\overline{\alpha}n = \overline{\beta}n \wedge \alpha_n < \beta_n \;\Rightarrow\; \kappa(\alpha) + 3^{-(n+1)} \leq \kappa(\beta)$
- $\overline{\alpha}n \neq \overline{\beta}n \;\Rightarrow\; |\kappa(\alpha) - \kappa(\beta)| \geq 3^{-n}$
- $\overline{\alpha}n < \overline{\beta}n \;\Rightarrow\; \kappa(\alpha) < \kappa(\beta)$.

Now define

$$\eta_B : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to [0,1], \; \alpha \mapsto \inf\left\{3^{-k} \mid \overline{\alpha}k \notin B\right\}.$$

LEMMA 3.6. *The function η_B is well-defined—the infimum in the definition of η_B always exists—and uniformly continuous. If $\eta_B(\alpha) > 0$, there exists k such that*

(1) $\overline{\alpha}k \notin B$
(2) $\overline{\alpha}(k+1) \in B$
(3) $\eta_B(\alpha) = 3^{-k}$.

Moreover,

$$\overline{\alpha}n \in B \;\Leftrightarrow\; \eta_B(\alpha) \geq 3^{-n+1} \;\Leftrightarrow\; \eta_B(\alpha) > 3^{-n}$$

for all α and n.

We consider the following, more abstract version of Lemma 3.6.

LEMMA 3.7. *For every weakly increasing function $h : \mathbb{N} \to \{0,1\}$ with $h(0) = 0$ the set*

$$S = \left\{3^{-k} \mid h(k) = 0\right\}$$

has an infimum. If $\inf S > 0$, *there exists k such that*

(1) $h(k) = 0$
(2) $h(k+1) = 1$
(3) $\inf S = 3^{-k}$.

Moreover,

$$h(n) = 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \inf S \geq 3^{-n+1} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \inf S > 3^{-n}$$

for all n.

Proof. Note that $1 \in S$ and that 0 is a lower bound of S. Fix $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $p < q$. If $p \leq 0$, p is a lower bound of S. Now assume that $0 < p$. Then there exists k with $3^{-k} < p$. If $h(k) = 0$, there exist $s \in S$ (choose $s = 3^{-k}$) with $s < q$. If $h(k) = 1$, we can compute the minimum s_0 of S. If $p < s_0$, p is a lower bound of S; if $s_0 < q$, there exists $s \in S$ (choose $s = s_0$) with $s < q$.

If $\inf S > 0$, there exists l such that $3^{-l} < \inf S$. Therefore, $h(l) = 1$. Let k be the largest number such that $h(k) = 0$.

Assume that $h(n) = 1$. Let l be the largest natural number with $h(l) = 0$. Then $l \leq n - 1$ and thus $\inf S = 3^{-l} \geq 3^{-n+1}$.

Assume that $\inf S > 3^{-n}$. Then there exists k with (1), (2), and (3). We obtain $k < n$ and therefore $h(n) = 1$. ⊣

Set

$$C = \left\{ \kappa(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \right\}$$

and

$$K = \left\{ (\kappa(\alpha), \eta_B(\alpha)) \mid \alpha \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.8. *The sets C and K are compact.*

Proof. Both sets are uniformly continuous images of the compact set $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and therefore totally bounded. Suppose that $\kappa(\alpha^n)$ converges to t and $\eta_B(\alpha^n)$ converges to s. By Lemma 3.5, the sequence (α^n) is Cauchy, therefore it converges to a limit α. Then $\kappa(\alpha^n)$ converges to $\kappa(\alpha)$ and $\eta_B(\alpha^n)$ converges to $\eta_B(\alpha)$. Therefore $t = \kappa(\alpha)$ and $s = \eta_B(\alpha)$. Thus we have shown that both C and K are complete. ⊣

In the following, we will use Bishop's lemma, see [4, Chapter 4, Lemma 3.8].

Lemma 3.9. *Let A be a compact subset of a metric space X, and x a point of X. Then there exists a point a in A such that $d(x, a) > 0$ entails $d(x, A) > 0$.*

Define

$$g : [0, 1] \to [0, \infty[\,, \; t \mapsto d_2((t, 0), K).$$

Proposition 3.10. (1) *B is a bar $\Leftrightarrow$ g is positive-valued*
(2) *B is a uniform bar $\Leftrightarrow$ $\inf g > 0$.*

Proof. Assume that B is a bar. Fix $t \in [0, 1]$. In view of Bishop's lemma and the compactness of K, it is sufficient to show that

$$d_2((t, 0), (\kappa(\alpha), \eta_B(\alpha))) > 0$$

for each α. This follows from $\eta_B(\alpha) > 0$.

Now assume that g is positive-valued. Fix α. Since

$$d_2((\kappa(\alpha), 0), K) = g(\kappa(\alpha)) > 0,$$

we can conclude that

$$d_2((\kappa(\alpha), 0), (\kappa(\alpha), \eta_B(\alpha))) > 0.$$

Thus $\eta_B(\alpha)$ is positive which implies that α hits B.

The second equivalence follows from Lemma 3.6 and the fact that $\inf g = \inf \eta_B$. ⊣

Set

$$-C = \{t \in [0,1] \mid d_1(t, C) > 0\}$$

and introduce a new function f by

$$f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R},\ t \mapsto g(t) - d_1(t, C).$$

The next lemma lists up a few properties of f and g.

LEMMA 3.11. *For all α, n, and t we have*

- $g(\kappa(\alpha)) = f(\kappa(\alpha)) \leq \eta_B(\alpha)$
- $f(\kappa(\alpha)) > 3^{-n} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \overline{\alpha}n \in B$
- $\overline{\alpha}n \in B \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(\kappa(\alpha)) \geq 3^{-n}$
- $d_1(t, C) \leq g(t)$.

Next, we clarify how f behaves on $-C$.

LEMMA 3.12. *The set $-C$ is dense in* $[0,1]$. *For every $t \in -C$ there exist unique elements a, a' of C such that*

(a) $t \in]a, a'[\subseteq -C$.
(b) $d_1(t, C) = \min\left(d_1(t, a), d_1(t, a')\right)$.

Moreover, setting $\gamma = \kappa^{-1}(a)$ and $\gamma' = \kappa^{-1}(a')$, we obtain

(c) $\forall n \left(\overline{\gamma}n \in B \ \wedge\ \overline{\gamma'}n \in B \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(t) \geq 3^{-n}\right)$
(d) *if $d_1(t, a) < d_1(t, a')$, then*

$$\gamma \textit{ hits } B \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad f(t) > 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \inf\{f(s) \mid a \leq s \leq t\} > 0$$

(e) *if $d_1(t, a') < d_1(t, a)$, then*

$$\gamma' \textit{ hits } B \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad f(t) > 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \inf\{f(s) \mid t \leq s \leq a'\} > 0.$$

PROOF. Fix $t \in [0,1]$ and $\delta > 0$. If $d_1(t, C) > 0$, then $t \in -C$. Now assume that there exists α such that $d_1(t, \kappa(\alpha)) < \delta/2$. There exists u such that $d_1(\kappa(\alpha), t_u) < \delta/2$ where

$$t_u = \tfrac{1}{2} \cdot \kappa(u * 0 * 1 * 1 * 1 * \cdots) + \tfrac{1}{2} \cdot \kappa(u * 1 * 0 * 0 * 0 * \cdots).$$

Note that $t_u \in -C$ and that $d_1(t, t_u) < \delta$. So $-C$ is dense in $[0,1]$.

Fix $t \in -C$. Since for any α it is decidable whether $\kappa(\alpha) > t$ or $\kappa(\alpha) < t$, the sets $C_{<t} = \{s \in C \mid s < t\}$ and $C_{>t} = \{s \in C \mid s > t\}$ are compact. Let a be the maximum of $C_{<t}$ and let a' be the minimum of $C_{>t}$. Clearly, a and a' fulfil (a) and (b).

In order to show (c), assume that $\overline{\gamma}n \in B$ and $\overline{\gamma'}n \in B$. Fix α. We show that

$$d_2((t,0), (\kappa(\alpha), \eta_B(\alpha))) - d_1(t, C) \geq 3^{-n}. \tag{3}$$

First, assume that $\kappa(\alpha) < t$. Then we have

$$d_2((t,0), (\kappa(\alpha), \eta_B(\alpha))) - d_1(t, C) \geq \kappa(\gamma) - \kappa(\alpha) + \eta_B(\alpha).$$

If $\overline{\alpha}n = \overline{\gamma}n$, then $\overline{\alpha}n \in B$ and we can conclude that $\eta_B(\alpha) \geq 3^{-n+1}$, by Lemma 3.6. On the other hand, Lemma 3.5 implies that $\kappa(\gamma) - \kappa(\alpha) \leq 3^{-n}$. This proves (3). If $\overline{\alpha}n \neq \overline{\gamma}n$, then $\kappa(\gamma) - \kappa(\alpha) \geq 3^{-n}$, by Lemma 3.5. This also proves (3). The case $t < \kappa(\alpha)$ can be treated similarly.

In order to show (d), set $\iota = d_1(t, a') - d_1(t, a)$ and suppose that $\overline{\gamma}n \in B$. Set $\varepsilon = \min(\iota, 3^{-n})$. Fix s with $a \leq s \leq t$. We show that $f(s) \geq \varepsilon$. Note that $d_1(s, C) = s - a$. Fix α. We show that

$$d_2((s,0),(\kappa(\alpha),\eta_B(\alpha))) - (s-a) \geq \varepsilon.$$

If $a' \leq \kappa(\alpha)$, we obtain

$$d_2((s,0),(\kappa(\alpha),\eta_B(\alpha))) - (s-a) \geq$$
$$\kappa(\alpha) - s - (s-a) \geq \iota \geq \varepsilon.$$

If $\kappa(\alpha) \leq a$, we obtain

$$d_2((s,0),(\kappa(\alpha),\eta_B(\alpha))) - (s-a) = s - \kappa(\alpha) + \eta_B(\alpha) - (s-a) =$$
$$\eta_B(\alpha) + a - \kappa(\alpha) \geq 3^{-n} \geq \varepsilon,$$

where $\eta_B(\alpha) + a - \kappa(\alpha) \geq 3^{-n}$ is derived by looking at the cases $\overline{\alpha}n = \overline{\gamma}n$ and $\overline{\alpha}n \neq \overline{\gamma}n$ separately.

Now assume that $f(t) > 0$. We show that γ hits B. If $f(t) > 0$, then $g(t) > t - a$. On the other hand, we have

$$g(t) \leq d_2((t,0),(a,\eta_B(\gamma))) = t - a + \eta_B(\gamma),$$

so $\eta_B(\gamma) > 0$. By Lemma 3.6, this implies that γ hits B.

The statement (e) is proved analogously to (d). ⊣

The next lemma is very easy to prove, we just formulate it to be able to refer to it.

Lemma 3.13. *For real numbers $x < y < z$ and $\delta > 0$ there exists a real number y' such that*

- $x < y' < z$
- $d_1(y, y') < \delta$
- $d_1(x, y') < d_1(y', z)$ *or* $d_1(x, y') > d_1(y', z)$.

For a function F defined on $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, set

$$F(u) = F(u * 0 * 0 * 0 * \cdots). \tag{4}$$

Now we can show that f has all the desired properties.

Proposition 3.14. (a) *B is a bar $\Leftrightarrow$ f is positive-valued*
(b) *B is a uniform bar* $\Leftrightarrow$ $\inf f > 0$
(c) *B is co-convex* $\Leftrightarrow$ *f is weakly convex.*

Proof. (a) "$\Rightarrow$". Suppose that B is a bar and fix t. By Proposition 3.10, we obtain $g(t) > 0$. If $d_1(t, C) < g(t)$, then $f(t) > 0$, by the definition of f. If $0 < d_1(t, C)$, we can apply Lemma 3.12 to conclude that $f(t) > 0$.

(a) "$\Leftarrow$". If f is positive-valued, then g is positive-valued as well and Proposition 3.10 implies that B is a bar.

(b) "$\Rightarrow$". If B is a uniform bar, Proposition 3.10 yields

$$\varepsilon := \inf g > 0.$$

Moreover, there exists n such that $\{0,1\}^n \subseteq B$. Fix $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|s - t| < \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad |f(s) - f(t)| < \varepsilon/2$$

for all s and t. Fix t. If $d_1(t, C) < \delta$, we can conclude that

$$f(t) \geq \varepsilon/2$$

by the choice of ε and δ. If $d_1(t, C) > 0$, Lemma 3.12 and $\{0,1\}^n \subseteq B$ imply that

$$f(t) \geq 3^{-n}.$$

So we have shown that $\inf f \geq \min(\varepsilon/2, 3^{-n})$.

(b) "$\Leftarrow$". If $\inf f > 0$, then $\inf g > 0$, and Proposition 3.10 implies that B is a uniform bar.

(c) "$\Rightarrow$". By part (d) of Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.12, it is sufficient to show that the restriction of f to $-C$ is weakly convex. Fix $t \in -C$ and assume that $f(t) > 0$. Choose a, a', γ and γ' according to Lemma 3.12. In view of Lemma 3.13 and the uniform continuity of f, we may assume without loss of generality that either

$$d_1(a, t) < d_1(t, a') \quad \text{or} \quad d_1(a, t) > d_1(t, a').$$

Consider the first case. The second case can be treated analogously. By Lemma 3.12, we obtain

$$\imath = \inf\{f(s) \mid a \leq s \leq t\} > 0.$$

In particular, $f(\kappa(\gamma)) > 0$, so γ hits B. There exists n such that either

$$\{v \mid v \leq \overline{\gamma}n\} \subseteq B \tag{5}$$

or

$$\{v \mid \overline{\gamma}n \leq v\} \subseteq B. \tag{6}$$

Set $\varepsilon = \min(\imath, 3^{-n})$. In case (5), we show that

$$\forall s \in -C \left(s \leq t \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(s) \geq \varepsilon\right),$$

as follows. Assume that there exists $s \in -C$ with $s \leq t$ such that $f(s) < \varepsilon$. Then, by the definition of $\imath$, we obtain that $s < a$. Applying Lemma 3.12 again, we can choose α and α' such that

$$s \in \left]\kappa(\alpha), \kappa(\alpha')\right[\subseteq -C.$$

Then $\overline{\alpha}n \leq \overline{\alpha'}n \leq \overline{\gamma}n$. Thus both $\overline{\alpha}n$ and $\overline{\alpha'}n$ are in B. This implies $f(s) \geq 3^{-n}$, which is a contradiction. In case (6), a similar argument yields

$$\forall s \in -C \left(t \leq s \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(s) \geq \varepsilon\right).$$

(c) "$\Leftarrow$". Assume that f is weakly convex. Fix α and suppose that α hits B. Then Lemma 3.11 implies that $f(\kappa(\alpha)) > 0$. By the weak convexity of f, there exists $\imath > 0$ such that either

$$\forall s \left(s \leq \kappa(\alpha) \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(s) \geq \imath\right) \tag{7}$$

or else

$$\forall s \left(\kappa(\alpha) \leq s \;\; \Rightarrow \;\; f(s) \geq \iota\right). \tag{8}$$

Fix n large enough such that $\overline{\alpha}n \in B$ and $3^{-n} < \iota$. Assume that (7) holds. Fix v with $v \leq \overline{\alpha}n$. Then $\kappa(v) \leq \kappa(\alpha)$. If $v \notin B$, then, by Lemmas 3.6 and 3.11,

$$f(\kappa(v)) = g(\kappa(v)) \leq \eta_B(v) \leq 3^{-n}.$$

This contradiction shows that

$$\{v \mid v \leq \overline{\alpha}n\} \subseteq B.$$

Now, consider the case (8). Fix v with $\overline{\alpha}n < v$. Then $\kappa(\alpha) \leq \kappa(v)$. If $v \notin B$, then $f(\kappa(v)) \leq 3^{-n}$. This contradiction shows that

$$\{v \mid \overline{\alpha}n \leq v\} \subseteq B. \qquad \dashv$$

PART II: CONSTRUCTION OF A SET B FOR GIVEN f.
Set

$$\kappa' : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to [0,1],\ \alpha \mapsto \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k \cdot 2^{-(k+1)}.$$

One cannot prove that κ' is surjective, since this would imply LLPO. Note, however, that every rational $q \in [0,1]$ is in the range of κ'. Moreover, we make use of the following lemma, see [1, Lemma 1].

LEMMA 3.15. *Let S be a subset of $[0,1]$ such that*

$$\forall \alpha\, \exists \varepsilon > 0\, \forall t \in [0,1] \left(|t - \kappa'(\alpha)| < \varepsilon \Rightarrow t \in S\right).$$

Then $S = [0,1]$.

The next lemma is a typical application of Lemma 3.15.

LEMMA 3.16. *Fix a uniformly continuous function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ and define*

$$F : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R},\ \alpha \mapsto f(\kappa'(\alpha)).$$

Then

(1) *f is positive-valued $\Leftrightarrow$ F is positive-valued,*
(2) $\inf f > 0 \;\Leftrightarrow\; \inf F > 0$.

PROOF. In (1), the direction "$\Rightarrow$" is clear. For "$\Leftarrow$", apply Lemma 3.15 to the set

$$S = \{t \in [0,1] \mid f(t) > 0\}.$$

The equivalence (2) follows from the density of the image of κ' in $[0,1]$ and the uniform continuity of f. $\dashv$

In the following proposition, we use a similar construction as in [2].

PROPOSITION 3.17. *For every uniformly continuous function*

$$f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$$

there exists a detachable subset B of $\{0,1\}^*$ which is closed under extension such that

(a) *B is a bar* $\Leftrightarrow$ *f is positive-valued,*
(b) *B is a uniform bar* $\Leftrightarrow$ $\inf f > 0$,
(c) *B is co-convex* $\Leftrightarrow$ *f is weakly convex.*

Proof. Since the function

$$F : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R},\ \alpha \mapsto f(\kappa'(\alpha))$$

is uniformly continuous, there exists a strictly increasing function $M : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|F(\alpha) - F(\overline{\alpha}(M(n)))| < 2^{-n}$$

for all α and n, recalling the convention given in (4). Since M is strictly increasing, for every k the statement

$$\exists n \left(k = M(n)\right)$$

is decidable. Therefore, for every u we can choose $\lambda_u \in \{0,1\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_u = 0 \quad &\Rightarrow \quad \forall n \left(|u| \neq M(n)\right) \ \vee \ \exists n \left(|u| = M(n) \ \wedge \ F(u) < 2^{-n+2}\right), \\ \lambda_u = 1 \quad &\Rightarrow \quad \exists n \left(|u| = M(n) \ \wedge \ F(u) > 2^{-n+1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The set

$$B = \{u \in \{0,1\}^* \mid \exists l \leq |u| \, (\lambda_{\overline{u}l} = 1)\}$$

is detachable and closed under extension. Note that

$$F(\alpha) \geq 2^{-n+3} \ \Rightarrow \ \overline{\alpha}(M(n)) \in B \tag{9}$$

and

$$\overline{\alpha}(M(n)) \in B \ \Rightarrow \ F(\alpha) \geq 2^{-n} \tag{10}$$

for all α and n. In view of Lemma 3.16, (9) and (10) yield (a) and (b).

In order to show (c), assume that B be co-convex. Moreover, fix $t \in [0,1]$ and assume that $f(t) > 0$. By part (d) of Lemma 3.3, we may assume that t is a rational number, which implies that there exists α such that $\kappa'(\alpha) = t$. Now $F(\alpha) > 0$ implies that α hits B. Therefore, there exists n such that either

$$\{v \mid v \leq \overline{\alpha}n\} \subseteq B$$

or

$$\{v \mid \overline{\alpha}n \leq v\} \subseteq B.$$

In the first case, we show that

$$\inf \{f(s) \mid s \in [0,t]\} \geq \min\left(2^{-n}, F(\alpha)\right). \tag{11}$$

Assume that there exists $s \leq t$ such that $f(s) < 2^{-n}$ and $f(s) < F(\alpha)$. The latter implies that $s < t$. Choose a β with the property that $\kappa'(\beta)$ is close enough to s such that

$$\kappa'(\beta) < \kappa'(\alpha) \tag{12}$$

and

$$F(\beta) = f(\kappa'(\beta)) < 2^{-n}. \tag{13}$$

Now (10) and (13) imply that $\overline{\beta}n \notin B$. On the other hand, (12) implies that $\overline{\beta}n \leq \overline{\alpha}n$ and therefore $\overline{\beta}n \in B$. This is a contradiction, so we have shown (11).

In the case

$$\{v \mid \overline{\alpha}n \leq v\} \subseteq B$$

we can similarly show that

$$\inf \{f(s) \mid s \in [t, 1]\} \geq \min \left(2^{-n}, F(\alpha)\right).$$

Now assume that f is weakly convex. Fix an α which hits B. Then there exists n with $\overline{\alpha}(M(n)) \in B$ and (10) implies that $f(\kappa'(\alpha)) > 0$. We choose n large enough such that either

$$\inf \left\{f(t) \mid t \in \left[0, \kappa'(\alpha)\right]\right\} \geq 2^{-n+3}$$

or

$$\inf \left\{f(t) \mid t \in \left[\kappa'(\alpha), 1\right]\right\} \geq 2^{-n+3}.$$

By (9), we obtain

$$\{v \mid v \leq \overline{\alpha}(M(n))\} \subseteq B$$

in the first case and

$$\{v \mid \overline{\alpha}(M(n)) \leq v\} \subseteq B.$$

in the second. Therefore, B is co-convex. ⊣

Acknowledgments. We thank the Excellence Initiative of the LMU Munich, the Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, and the European Commission Research Executive Agency for supporting the research. Moreover, we thank the anonymous referee for valuable comments.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Berger and D. Bridges, *A fan-theoretic equivalent of the antithesis of Specker's theorem*. ***Mathematicae***, vol. 18 (2007), pp. 195–202.

[2] J. Berger and H. Ishihara, *Brouwer's fan theorem and unique existence in constructive analysis*. ***Mathematical Logic Quarterly***, vol. 51 (2005), pp. 360–364.

[3] J. Berger and G. Svindland, *Convexity and constructive infima*. ***Archive for Mathematical Logic***, vol. 55 (2016), pp. 873–881.

[4] E. Bishop and D. Bridges, ***Constructive Analysis***, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1985.

[5] D. Bridges and F. Richman, ***Varieties of Constructive Mathematics***, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes, vol. 97, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1987.

[6] D. Bridges and L. S. Vita, ***Techniques of Constructive Analysis***, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2006.

[7] W. Julian and F. Richman, *A uniformly continuous function on* [0, 1] *that is everywhere different from its infimum*. ***Pacific Journal of Mathematics***, vol. 111 (1984), pp. 333–340.

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT
LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN
THERESIENSTRASSE 39
80333 MÜNCHEN, GERMANY
E-mail: jberger@math.lmu.de
E-mail: svindla@math.lmu.de