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0. Introduction

The following 'convexification' of the notion of precompactness plays a central role in p-adic Functional Analysis. Let $K$ be a nonarchimedean nontrivially valued field, and $E$ a locally $K$-convex space. An absolutely convex subset $A$ of $E$ is called compactoid if for every (absolutely convex) neighbourhood $U$ of $0$ in $E$, there exists a finite subset $S = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ of $E$ such that $A \subseteq \text{co}(S) + U$. Here $\text{co}(S)$ denotes the absolute convex hull of $S$. Equivalently, we can say: for every absolutely convex neighbourhood $U$ of $0$, $\pi_U(A)$ is contained in a finitely generated $R$-module; here $R$ is the unit ball in $K$, and $\pi_U$ is the canonical map $E \to E/U$ in the category of $R$-modules. A natural question to ask is the following: can we choose $S$ to be subset of $A$? Or, equivalently, is $\pi_U(A)$ finitely generated as an $R$-module? The answer is affirmative if the valuation of $K$ is discrete, because $R$ is a noetherian ring in that case. If the valuation is dense, then we have an easy counterexample: take $A = \{\lambda \in K : |\lambda| < 1\}$.

It is shown in [3] that, for $E$ a Banach space, one may choose $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ in $\lambda A$, where $\lambda \in K$, $|\lambda| > 1$. For locally convex $E$ it is shown in [1] that it is possible to choose $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ in the $K$-vector space generated by $A$, and in [2], [4] that $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ may be chosen in $\lambda A$. Yet, all these proofs are somewhat involved. In this note, both authors present a straightforward and elementary proof. We considered it worth while to publish our two proofs, since the statement is quite fundamental.
1. Proof by the Second Author

1.1. Lemma. Let $A$, $B$ be absolutely convex subsets of a $K$-vector space $E$. Suppose $A \subseteq B + \text{co}(x)$ for some $x \in E$. Let $\lambda \in K$, $0 < |\lambda| < 1$ if the valuation of $K$ is dense, $\lambda = 1$ otherwise. Then there exists an $a \in A$ such that $\lambda A \subseteq B + \text{co}(a)$.

Proof. The set $C \subseteq K$ defined by $C = \{ \mu \in K : |\mu| < 1, \mu x \in A + B \}$ is absolutely convex. It is not hard to see that there exists $a \in C$ for which $\lambda A \subseteq \text{co}(a)$. Indeed, if $z \in A$ then $z = b + dx$ for some $b \in B$, $d \in C$ so we have $\lambda z = \lambda b + \lambda dx \in B + \text{co}(\lambda x) \subseteq B + \text{co}(a + B) \subseteq B + \text{co}(a)$. □

1.2. Lemma. Let $E$, $A$, $B$, $\lambda$ be as above. Suppose $A \subseteq B + \text{co}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ for some $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in E$. Then there exist $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A$ such that $\lambda A \subseteq B + \text{co}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$.

Proof. Choose $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in K$, $0 < |\lambda_i| < 1$ and $|\prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i| > |\lambda|$ if the valuation of $K$ is dense, $\lambda_i = 1$ for each $i$ otherwise. By applying Lemma 1.1 with $\lambda_i$ in place of $\lambda$ and $B + \text{co}(x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ in place of $B$ we find an $a_i \in A$ such that $\lambda_i A \subseteq B + \text{co}(a_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$. A second application of Lemma 1.1 with $\lambda_1 A$, $\lambda_2$, $B + \text{co}(a_1, x_3, \ldots, x_n)$ in place of $A$, $\lambda$, $B$ respectively yields an $a_2 \in \lambda_1 A \subseteq A$ for which $\lambda_1 \lambda_2 A \subseteq B + \text{co}(a_1, a_2, x_3, \ldots, x_n)$. Inductively we arrive at points $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A$ such that $\lambda A \subseteq \lambda_1 \ldots \lambda_n A \subseteq B + \text{co}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$. □

1.3. Theorem (Katsaras). Let $A$ be an absolutely convex compactoid in a locally convex space over $K$. Let $\lambda \in K$, $|\lambda| > 1$ if the valuation of $K$ is dense, $\lambda = 1$ otherwise. Then for each absolutely convex neighbourhood $U$ of $0$ in $E$ there exist $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \lambda A$ such that $A \subseteq U + \text{co}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. 
\textbf{Proof.} \(\lambda^{-1}U\) is a zero neighbourhood. By definition there exist \(y_1, \ldots, y_n\) \(\in E\) such that \(A \subseteq \lambda^{-1}U + \text{co}(y_1, \ldots, y_n)\). By Lemma 1.2 we can find \(a_1, \ldots, a_n\) \(\in A\) such that \(\lambda^{-1}A \subseteq \lambda^{-1}U + \text{co}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)\), i.e. \(A \subseteq U + \text{co}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\), where, for each \(i\), \(x_i = \lambda a_i \in \lambda A\). \(\square\)

2. \textbf{Proof by the First Author}

In the introduction, we have seen that Theorem 1.3 is trivial if the valuation of \(K\) is discrete; so let us assume from now on that \(|K|\) is dense.

2.1. \textbf{Lemma.} Let \(A\) be an \(R\)-submodule of a finitely generated free \(R\)-module, and let \(\lambda \in R\) be such that \(|\lambda| < 1\). Then we can find \(a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A\) such that \(\lambda A \subseteq Ra_1 + \ldots + Ra_n\).

\textbf{Proof.} \(A \subseteq R^n \subseteq K^n\). We furnish \(K^n\) with the usual supremum norm; it is well-known (cf. [3]) that every one dimensional subspace of \(K^n\) has an orthocomplement. Let us proceed using induction on \(n\). The case \(n = 1\) is trivial.

Let \(m = \sup\{\|x\| : x \in A\}\), and choose \(a_1 \in A\) such that \(\|a_1\| > \frac{1}{2}|\lambda'|m\), where \(\lambda' \in K\) is such that \(|\lambda'|^2 < |\lambda|\). Let \(Q : K^n + Ka_1\) be an orthoprojection, and take \(P = I - Q\). Then every \(x \in K^n\) may be written under the form \(x = \lambda(x)a_1 + Px\), where \(\|x\| = \max(|\lambda(x)||a_1|, \|Px\|)\). If \(x \in A\), then \(|\lambda(x)||a_1| < \|x\| < m < |\lambda'|^{-1}\|a_1\|\), so \(|\lambda(x)| < |\lambda'|^{-1}\).

Using the induction hypothesis, we find \(f_2, \ldots, f_n \in PA\) such that \(\lambda'PA \subseteq Rf_2 + \ldots + Rf_n\). Lift \(f_i\) to an element \(a_i \in A\). Then, for \(i > 2\), we have that \(a_i = f_i + \lambda a_i\), where \(|\lambda a_i| < |\lambda'|^{-1}\). We now have, for \(x \in A\):

\[x = Qx + Px = \lambda(x)a_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} u_i f_i = (\lambda(x) - \sum_{i=2}^{n} \lambda u_i) a_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} u_i a_i,\]

where \(|\lambda(x)|, |\lambda a_i|, |u_i| < |\lambda'|^{-1}\). This implies the result. \(\square\)

\textbf{Proof of Theorem 1.3.} Write \(\mu = \lambda^{-1}\), then \(|\mu| < 1\). \(U\) is an absolutely convex neighbourhood of 0, so \(\pi_\mu U(A)\) is a submodule of a finitely generated \(R\)-module \(N\). So we have an epimorphism \(\phi : R^n + N\).
R-modules. By Lemma 2.1, we may find $a_1, \ldots, a_n \subseteq \phi^{-1}(\mu \Gamma \Lambda (\Lambda))$ such that

$$\mu \phi^{-1}(\mu \Gamma \Lambda (\Lambda)) \subseteq R a_1 + \ldots + R a_n.$$ Choose $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ in $\Lambda$ such that $\mu \Gamma \Lambda (u_i) = \phi(a_i)$. Then $\mu \Gamma \Lambda (\Lambda) \subseteq R \phi(a_1) + \ldots + R \phi(a_n) = R \Gamma \Lambda (u_1) + \ldots + R \Gamma \Lambda (u_n)$, hence $\mu A \subseteq R u_1 + \ldots + R u_n + \mu U$, and, after multiplication by $\lambda$,

$$A \subseteq R \lambda u_1 + \ldots + R \lambda u_n + U,$$ and this proves the theorem. \(\square\)
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