

A NOTE ON THE BOHNENBLUST–HILLE INEQUALITY FOR MULTILINEAR FORMS

J. SANTOS AND T. VELANGA

ABSTRACT. The general versions of the Bohnenblust–Hille inequality for m -linear forms are valid for exponents $q_1, \dots, q_m \in [1, 2]$. In this paper we show that a slightly different characterization is valid for $q_1, \dots, q_m \in (0, \infty)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Bohnenblust–Hille inequality [3] asserts that for all positive integers $m \geq 1$ there is a constant $C = C(\mathbb{K}, m) \geq 1$ such that

$$(1) \quad \left(\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_m})|^{\frac{2m}{m+1}} \right)^{\frac{m+1}{2m}} \leq C \|T\|$$

for all continuous m -linear forms $T : c_0 \times \dots \times c_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, where \mathbb{K} denotes the fields of real or complex scalars. This result can be generalized in some different directions. A very interesting and far reaching generalization is the following (below, $e_j^{n_j}$ means (e_j, \dots, e_j) repeated n_j times):

Theorem 1.1 (Albuquerque, Araújo, Nuñez, Pellegrino and Rueda). ([1]) *Let $1 \leq k \leq m$ and $n_1, \dots, n_k \geq 1$ be positive integers such that $n_1 + \dots + n_k = m$, let $q_1, \dots, q_k \in [1, 2]$. The following assertions are equivalent :*

(I) *There is a constant $C_{k, q_1 \dots q_k}^{\mathbb{K}} \geq 1$ such that*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\dots \left(\sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1}^{n_1}, \dots, e_{i_k}^{n_k})|^{q_k} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-2}}{q_{k-1}}} \right)^{\dots} \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{k, q_1 \dots q_k}^{\mathbb{K}} \|T\|$$

for all continuous m -linear forms $T : c_0 \times \dots \times c_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$.

(II) $\frac{1}{q_1} + \dots + \frac{1}{q_k} \leq \frac{k+1}{2}$.

When $k = m$ we recover a characterization of Albuquerque et al. [2], and finally when $q_1 = \dots = q_m = \frac{2m}{m+1}$ we recover the Bohnenblust–Hille inequality.

Key words and phrases. Bohnenblust–Hille inequality.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 47A63; Secondary 47A07.

J. Santos was supported by CNPq, grant 303122/2015-3.

In this note we present an extension of the above theorem to $q_1, \dots, q_m \in (0, \infty)$. In particular, we remark that in general the condition $\frac{1}{q_1} + \dots + \frac{1}{q_k} \leq \frac{k+1}{2}$ is not enough to prove (I) for $q_1, \dots, q_m \in (0, \infty)$. For instance, if $m = k = 3$ and $(q_1, q_2, q_3) = (1, \frac{18}{10}, 3)$ we have $\frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} + \frac{1}{q_3} < \frac{3+1}{2}$ but, as we shall see, (I) is not true. We prove the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $1 \leq k \leq m$ and $n_1, \dots, n_k \geq 1$ be positive integers such that $n_1 + \dots + n_k = m$, let $q_1, \dots, q_k \in (0, \infty)$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) *There is a constant $C_{k, q_1 \dots q_k}^{\mathbb{K}} \geq 1$ such that*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\dots \left(\sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1}^{n_1}, \dots, e_{i_k}^{n_k})|^{q_k} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}} \right) \dots \right) \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{k, q_1 \dots q_k}^{\mathbb{K}} \|T\|$$

for all continuous m -linear forms $T : c_0 \times \dots \times c_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$.

(ii) $\sum_{j \in A} \frac{1}{q_j} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A)+1}{2}$ for all $A \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$.

2. THE PROOF

We begin by recalling the following theorem (in fact, as we mentioned before, this is precisely Theorem 1.1 with $k = m$):

Theorem 2.1 (Albuquerque, Bayart, Pellegrino and Seoane). *Let $m \geq 1$, let $q_1, \dots, q_m \in [1, 2]$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

(a) *There is a constant $C_{q_1 \dots q_m}^{\mathbb{K}} \geq 1$ such that*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\dots \left(\sum_{i_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_m})|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}} \right) \dots \right) \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{q_1 \dots q_m}^{\mathbb{K}} \|T\|$$

for all continuous m -linear forms $T : c_0 \times \dots \times c_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$.

(b) $\frac{1}{q_1} + \dots + \frac{1}{q_m} \leq \frac{m+1}{2}$.

Our first step is to extend the Theorem 2.1 as follows:

Theorem 2.2. *Let $m \geq 1$, let $q_1, \dots, q_m \in (0, \infty)$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

(A) *There is a constant $C_{q_1 \dots q_m}^{\mathbb{K}} \geq 1$ such that*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\dots \left(\sum_{i_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_m})|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}} \right) \dots \right) \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{q_1 \dots q_m}^{\mathbb{K}} \|T\|$$

for all continuous m -linear forms $T : c_0 \times \dots \times c_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$.

$$(B) \sum_{j \in A} \frac{1}{q_j} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A)+1}{2} \text{ for all } A \subset \{1, \dots, m\}.$$

To prove Theorem 2.2 we need to prove the following elementary lemma:

Lemma 2.3. *If $q_1, \dots, q_m \in (0, \infty)$ and*

$$(2) \quad \sum_{j \in A} \frac{1}{q_j} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A) + 1}{2}$$

for all $A \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$, then

$$\frac{1}{\min\{q_1, 2\}} + \dots + \frac{1}{\min\{q_m, 2\}} \leq \frac{m+1}{2}.$$

Proof. Given $q_1, \dots, q_m \in (0, \infty)$, consider $A_1 = \{j : q_j \leq 2\}$ and $A_2 = \{j : q_j > 2\}$. Then, by (2), we have

$$\frac{1}{\min\{q_1, 2\}} + \dots + \frac{1}{\min\{q_m, 2\}} = \sum_{j \in A_1} \frac{1}{q_j} + \sum_{j \in A_2} \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A_1) + 1}{2} + \frac{\text{card}(A_2)}{2} = \frac{m+1}{2}.$$

□

Now we can prove Theorem 2.2. Let us begin by proving that (A) implies (B). The proof of the case $A = \{1, \dots, k\}$ for $k < m$ illustrates the argument. Let

$$T_k : c_0 \times \dots \times c_0 \xrightarrow{k \text{ times}} \mathbb{K}$$

be the k -linear form given by the Kahane–Salem–Zygmund inequality (see [2, Lemma 6.1]). Then, define

$$T_m : c_0 \times \dots \times c_0 \xrightarrow{m \text{ times}} \mathbb{K}$$

by

$$T_m(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)}) = T_k(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(k)})x_1^{(k+1)} \dots x_1^{(m)}.$$

It is obvious that $\|T_m\| = \|T_k\|$ and by the Kahane–Salem–Zygmund inequality we have $\|T_k\| \leq Cn^{\frac{k+1}{2}}$ for some $C > 0$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} n^{\frac{1}{q_1} + \dots + \frac{1}{q_k}} &= \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\dots \left(\sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty} |T_k(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_k})|^{q_k} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-2}}{q_{k-1}}} \right)^{\dots} \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\dots \left(\sum_{i_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{\infty} |T_m(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_m})|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-2}}{q_{m-1}}} \right)^{\dots} \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \\ &\leq C_{q_1 \dots q_m}^{\mathbb{K}} \|T_m\| \\ &\leq C_{q_1 \dots q_m}^{\mathbb{K}} Cn^{\frac{k+1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

since n is arbitrary, we conclude that

$$\sum_{j \in A} \frac{1}{q_j} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A) + 1}{2}.$$

To prove that (B) implies (A), suppose that $\sum_{j \in A} \frac{1}{q_j} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A)+1}{2}$ for all $A \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$; from the lemma proved above we have

$$\frac{1}{\min\{q_1, 2\}} + \dots + \frac{1}{\min\{q_m, 2\}} \leq \frac{m+1}{2}.$$

Besides, by considering $A = \{k\}$ it is plain that $q_k \geq 1$. Hence $\min\{q_k, 2\} \in [1, 2]$ for all $k = 1, \dots, m$ and the proof of Theorem 2.2 is now a consequence of (b) \Rightarrow (a) and of the canonical inclusion between the norms of ℓ_p spaces.

Now we can prove Theorem 1.2. Let us begin by proving that (i) implies (ii). From the proof of the main result of [1] we know that since (i) holds for all continuous m -linear forms $T_m : c_0 \times \dots \times c_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, then

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\dots \left(\sum_{i_{k-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty} |T_k(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_k})|^{q_k} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-2}}{q_{k-1}}} \right)^{\dots} \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{k, q_1, \dots, q_k}^{\mathbb{K}} \|T_k\|$$

holds for all k -linear forms $T_k : c_0 \times \dots \times c_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. So, from Theorem 2.2 we conclude that

$$\sum_{j \in A} \frac{1}{q_j} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A) + 1}{2}$$

for all $A \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Now we prove that (ii) implies (i). If $\sum_{j \in A} \frac{1}{q_j} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A)+1}{2}$ for all $A \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$, from the lemma we have

$$\frac{1}{\min\{q_1, 2\}} + \dots + \frac{1}{\min\{q_k, 2\}} \leq \frac{k+1}{2}.$$

Since $\min\{q_j, 2\} \in [1, 2]$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$, the proof is now a consequence of (II) \Rightarrow (I) and of the canonical inclusion between the norms of ℓ_p spaces.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Albuquerque, G. Araújo, D. Nuñez-Alarcón, D. Pellegrino and P. Rueda, Bohnenblust-Hille and Hardy-Littlewood inequalities by blocks, arXiv:1409.6769 [math.FA].
- [2] N. Albuquerque, F. Bayart, D. Pellegrino and J. Seoane-Sepúlveda, Sharp generalizations of the Bohnenblust-Hille inequality, *J. Funct. Analysis*, **266** (2014), 3726–3740.
- [3] H.F. Bohnenblust and E. Hille, On the absolute convergence of Dirichlet series, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **32** (1931), 600–622.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DA PARAÍBA, 58.051-900 - JOÃO PESSOA, BRAZIL.

E-mail address: joedsonmat@gmail.com

IMECC, UNICAMP-UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE CAMPINAS, 13.083-859 - SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE RONDÔNIA, 76.801-059 - PORTO VELHO, BRAZIL.

E-mail address: thiagovelanga@gmail.com