COMPLEX INTERPOLATION OF FAMILIES OF ORLICZ SEQUENCE SPACES

WILLIAN HANS GOES CORRÊA

Abstract. We show that under general conditions complex interpolation of a family of Orlicz sequence spaces gives rise to an Orlicz sequence space, and compute the centralizer induced by the differential process, generalizing results for complex interpolation of couples. We apply these results to present a concrete example of interpolation family of three spaces inducing a centralizer on ℓ₂ that cannot be obtained from complex interpolation of couples.

1. Introduction

This work started as a study on twisted Hilbert spaces. A (separable) twisted Hilbert space X is a Banach space which contains an isomorphic copy Y of ℓ₂ such that X/Y is itself isomorphic to ℓ₂.

Complex interpolation is the main source of examples of nontrivial twisted Hilbert spaces. If we have a compatible couple (X₀, X₁) then we may use the complex method of interpolation to obtain the interpolation spaces X₀θ, 0 < θ < 1. It is known that another space is generated in the process, the so called derived space dX₀θ, which appears in a short exact sequence

\[ 0 \longrightarrow X_0 \longrightarrow dX_0 \longrightarrow X_0 \longrightarrow 0 \]

So if X₀ = ℓ₂ then dX₀ is a twisted Hilbert space. The most famous case is when we start with the couple (l∞, ℓ₁) and take θ = 1/2, obtaining ℓ₂ as interpolation space and the Kalton-Peck space Z₂ as derived space.

The space dX₀ is determined by a usually nonlinear function Ω₀ : X₀ → X₀ + X₁ called the derivation map, introduced in [13]. In the case where X₀ and X₁ are Köthe function spaces, Ω₀ is called a centralizer.

The complex method of interpolation may be generalized to interpolate families of Banach spaces [2, 9], and the derivation process may be studied in this case too [13, 9, 3, 1].

This paper originated from the following question: is there a twisted Hilbert space which comes induced by complex interpolation of three Banach spaces, but not as induced from two? It happens that the existence of such objects was is a simple consequence of results of Kalton. However, following the reasoning of Kalton’s proof to arrive to a concrete example of interpolation family doing that seems infeasible.

Considering natural families does not seem to work too. For example, if we take a family \{ℓₚ(w)\}_{w ∈ T} under very general conditions we have that the interpolation
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space at \( z \in \mathbb{D} \) is an \( \ell_p \) space, and the derived space is either isomorphic to \( \ell_p \) or to the Kalton-Peck space \( Z_p \).

Actually and more generally families constructed using a complex interpolation scale \( \{ X_\theta \}_{0 \leq \theta \leq 1} \) will not generate new interpolation and derived spaces with respect to interpolation of couples:

**Theorem 1.1.** [1, Theorem 3.20] Let \( \alpha : \mathbb{T} \to [0,1] \) be an integrable function and \((X_0, X_1)\) be a compatible couple of Banach spaces. Consider the interpolation family \( \{ Y_w \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) where \( Y_w = X_{\alpha(w)} \) for \( w \in \mathbb{T} \). Denote still by \( \alpha \) a harmonic extension of \( \alpha \) to \( \mathbb{D} \). If \( \sup_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \alpha(w) \) and \( \inf_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \alpha(w) \) are attained then for every \( z \in \mathbb{D} \) we have \( Y_{\{z\}} = Y_{[z]} = X_{\alpha(z)} \). Furthermore, if \( \Omega_\theta \) is the derivation corresponding to the couple \((X_0, X_1)\) at \( \theta \), then the derivation corresponding to the family \( \{ Y_w \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) at \( z \in \mathbb{D} \) is

\[
\Phi_z = f'(z) \Omega_{\alpha(z)}
\]

where \( f \) is an analytic function with \( \text{Re}(f) = \alpha \).

In the search of a concrete example of twisted Hilbert space coming from interpolation of three, but not of two Banach spaces, we started studying complex interpolation of families of Orlicz spaces.

One of the main results of this paper may be summarized as

**Theorems 3.7 and 3.8.** Under technical conditions complex interpolation of a family \( \{ \ell_{\phi_w} \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) of Orlicz spaces gives at \( z = re^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{D} \) the space \( \ell_{\phi_z} \), where \( \phi_z \) is defined as an extension of the inverse of

\[
t \mapsto \exp \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} P(r, \theta - t) \log \phi^{-1}_{\phi_z}(t) \, dt \right)
\]

on a neighborhood of 0 and \( P \) is the Poisson kernel.

Of course, this generalizes the classical results regarding complex interpolation of couples of Orlicz spaces [5], stating that \( (\ell_{\phi_0}, \ell_{\phi_1})_\theta = \ell_{\phi} \), with

\[
\phi^{-1} = (\phi^{-1}_0)^{1-\theta}(\phi^{-1}_1)^{\theta}
\]

See [4] for a generalization of this result for Orlicz spaces with respect to a vector measure.

We should note that while generalizing the results on complex interpolation for families of \( \ell_p \) spaces is somewhat simple, doing the same for families of Orlicz space led us to introduce admissible families of Orlicz functions. We hope our results may find applications in other contexts.

We also determine the derivation the interpolation process generates and use it to arrive at our desired example. We present our results in the context of Kalton’s interpolation method for Köthe function spaces. For a comparison of this method with the methods from [2, 6], see [1].

This result suggests the following discussion on stability of complex interpolation and derivation, on which we do not strive to be precise to avoid technicalities. Consider the following families of Banach spaces:

\[
l = \{ \ell_p \text{ spaces} \}
\]
\[
\mathcal{L} = \{ L_p \text{ spaces} \}
\]
\[
\mathcal{K} = \{ \text{Köthe spaces} \}
\]
\[
\mathcal{O} = \{ \text{Orlicz spaces} \}
\]
These families are stable both under complex interpolation of couples and of families, in the sense that if \( \mathcal{A} \) is one of these families then complex interpolation of spaces of \( \mathcal{A} \) gives a space in \( \mathcal{A} \).

Since \( l \) and \( L \) each form an interpolation scale, by reiteration when we interpolate a family of elements of them we do not obtain new centralizers with respect to interpolation of couples (except for the trivial centralizer, see Theorem 1.1). This is not the case for \( K \) and \( O \).

This suggests the terminology that the families \( l \) and \( L \) are stable at the second level, while \( K \) and \( O \) are stable at the first level, but not at the second.

Problem 1.2. Study the stability of other families of Banach spaces.

Of course, Theorem 1.1 tells us that for a couple \((X_0, X_1)\) the family \( \{X_\theta : 0 \leq \theta \leq 1\} \) is stable at the second level.

The organization of the paper is the following: in Section 2 we give the background on complex interpolation for families of Köthe function spaces and how it induces a special case of derivation called centralizer. In Section 3 we specialize, showing that in reasonable cases complex interpolation of a family of Orlicz spaces gives again an Orlicz space. Section 4 presents a criterion to decide when a centralizer comes from complex interpolation of a couple. We also discuss how Kalton’s results imply the existence of centralizers that do not come from couples, and in Section 5 we present the concrete example. Section 6 presents some final remarks.

2. Complex interpolation and derivations

We will use Kalton’s complex method of interpolation for families of Köthe function spaces \([9]\), and will only consider function spaces on \( \mathbb{N} \) with the counting measure, which we denote by \( \mu \).

Let \( \ell_0 \) be the space of all complex sequences indexed by \( \mathbb{N} \) with the topology of convergence in measure with respect to finite sets.

A Köthe function space \( X \) on \( \mathbb{N} \) is a linear subspace of \( \ell_0 \) with a norm \( \| \cdot \|_X \) which makes it into a complete Banach space such that (for \( x \in \ell_0 \setminus X \) we make the convention that \( \| x \|_X = \infty \)):

1. \( B_X \) is closed in \( \ell_0 \), where \( B_X \) is the closed unit ball of \( X \);
2. For every \( x, y \in \ell_0 \), if \( y \in X \) and \( |x| \leq |y| \) then \( x \in X \) and \( \|x\|_X \leq \|y\|_X \);
3. There are \( h, k \in \ell_0 \) strictly positive such that for every \( x \in \ell_0 \) we have \( \|xh\|_1 \leq \|x\|_X \leq \|xk\|_\infty \).

Let us consider the unit circle \( \mathbb{T} \) together with normalized Haar measure \( \lambda \).

Definition 2.1 (Strongly admissible family). A strongly admissible family is a family \( \mathcal{H} = \{X_w\}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) of Köthe function spaces on \( \mathbb{N} \) such that

1. The map \((w, x) \mapsto \|x\|_w \) from \( \mathbb{T} \times \ell_0 \) into \([0, \infty] \) is Borel;
2. There are \( h, k \in \ell_0 \) strictly positive such that for every \( x \in \ell_0 \) and a.e. \( w \in \mathbb{T} \) we have \( \|xh\|_1 \leq \|x\|_w \leq \|xk\|_\infty \);
3. There is a linear subspace \( V \) of \( \ell_0 \) of countable dimension such that \( V \cap B_{X_w} \) is \( \ell_0 \)-dense in \( B_{X_w} \) for a.e. \( w \in \mathbb{T} \).

A family that satisfies only (1) and (2) is called admissible.

Definition 2.2. Let \( \mathcal{H} = \{X_w\}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) be an admissible family. The space \( \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H}) \) is the space of all functions (up to almost everywhere equivalence) \( \phi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \).
such that

\[ \| \phi \|_E = \text{ess sup} \| \phi(\cdot, w) \|_{X_w} < \infty \]

Let us denote the open unit disk by \( \mathbb{D} \), and let \( P(r, t) \) denote the Poisson kernel, that is,

\[ P(r, t) = \frac{1 - r^2}{1 - 2r \cos(t) + r^2} \]

**Definition 2.3.** Let \( \mathcal{H} = \{ X_w \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) be an admissible family. For \( z = re^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{D} \) the space \( X_z \) is the space of all \( x \in \ell_0 \) such that there is \( \phi \in \mathcal{E} \), \( \phi \geq 0 \) such that

\[ |x(n)| = \exp(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} P(r, \theta - t) \log \phi(n, e^{it}) dt) \]

The space \( X_z \) is normed by \( \| x \|_{X_z} = \inf \| \phi \|_E \), where the infimum is over all \( \phi \) satisfying (2.1).

**Observation 2.4.** Kalton’s original definition of \( X_z \) is through the quotient of a Banach space of analytic functions. The equivalence of his definition with the definition we gave is Theorem 3.3 of [9] in the case of strongly admissible families. However, the proof also works for admissible families. Strong admissibility is mainly related to duality.

The space \( X_z \) is a Köthe function space on \( \mathbb{N} \), and satisfies the interpolation property required of an interpolation space [9, Theorem 2.7]. Also, for every \( x \in X_z \) there is an optimal choice of \( \phi \) in the definition of \( \| x \|_{X_z} \) [9, Theorem 3.3].

Recall that for a Köthe function space \( X \) its Köthe dual \( X' \) is defined as the space of all \( y \in \ell_0 \) such that

\[ \| y \|_{X'} = \sup_{x \in B_X} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |y(n)x(n)| < \infty \]

Then \( X' \) is a subspace of the total dual \( X^* \).

We have the following duality result:

**Theorem 2.5.** [9, Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 4.8] Let \( \mathcal{H} = \{ X_w \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) be a strongly admissible family. Then the family \( \mathcal{H}' = \{ Y_w \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) where \( Y_w = X'_w \) is admissible and \( Y_z = X'_z \) isometrically.

For each \( z \in \mathbb{D} \) complex interpolation induces, besides the interpolation space \( X_z \), the so called derived space \( dX_z \) which appears in a short exact sequence

\[
0 \longrightarrow X_z \overset{i}{\longrightarrow} dX_z \overset{q}{\longrightarrow} X_z \longrightarrow 0
\]

The space \( dX_z \) may be defined through a nonlinear map called centralizer.

**Definition 2.6.** Let \( X \) be a Köthe function space. A centralizer on \( X \) is a map \( \Omega : X \to \ell_0 \) such that

1. \( \Omega \) is homogeneous;
2. There is a constant \( C > 0 \) such that for every \( x \in X \) and \( u \in \ell_\infty \) we have \( u\Omega(x) - \Omega(ux) \in X \) and

\[ \| u\Omega(x) - \Omega(ux) \|_X \leq C\| u \|_\infty \| x \|_X \]
Two centralizers $\Omega$ and $\Psi$ on $X$ are called *equivalent* if there is a linear map $L : X \to \ell_0$ such that $\Omega - \Psi - L : X \to X$ is bounded, in the sense that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\Omega(x) - \Psi(x) - L(x)\|_X \leq C\|x\|_X$$

for every $x \in X$. If we may take $L = 0$ then $\Omega$ and $\Psi$ are said *boundedly equivalent*, and we write $\Omega \sim \Psi$. If there is $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $\lambda \neq 0$ such that $\Omega$ is equivalent to $\lambda \Psi$ then $\Omega$ and $\Psi$ are said *projectively equivalent*. $\Omega$ is said to be *trivial* if it is equivalent to $0$.

The reasoning of [1, Theorem 3.8] shows that in the definition of equivalence we may take $L = f$ a multiplication map.

Given a centralizer $\Omega$ on $X$ we have the space $d_\Omega X = \{(w, x) \in \ell_0 \times X : w - \Omega(x) \in X\}$ with the quasi-norm

$$\|(w, x)\|_\Omega = \|w - \Omega(x)\|_X + \|x\|_X$$

The space $d_\Omega X$ appears in the short exact sequence

$$0 \to X \to i_{d_\Omega X} \to q_{d_\Omega X} \to X \to 0$$

where $i(x) = (x, 0)$ and $q(w, x) = x$. The centralizers $\Omega$ and $\Psi$ are equivalent if and only $d_\Omega X$ is equivalent to $d_\Psi X$, in the sense that we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & \to & X & \to & d_\Omega X & \to & X & \to & 0 \\
& & & \downarrow T & & & \downarrow T & & \\
0 & \to & X & \to & d_\Psi X & \to & X & \to & 0
\end{array}$$

where $T$ is an isomorphism. In turn, bounded equivalence is the same as $d_\Omega X = d_\Psi X$ with equivalence of norms, while projective equivalence is equivalent to the existence of a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & \to & X & \to & d_\Omega X & \to & X & \to & 0 \\
& & \downarrow \alpha Id_X & & \downarrow T & & \downarrow \beta Id_X & & \\
0 & \to & X & \to & d_\Psi X & \to & X & \to & 0
\end{array}$$

where $T$ is an isomorphism and $\alpha, \beta \neq 0$.

**Definition 2.7.** Let $\mathcal{H} = \{X_w\}_{w \in T}$ be an admissible family. Let $z \in D$, $C \geq 1$ and let $B_z : X_z \to \mathcal{E}$ be a homogeneous map such that $B_z(x)$ is $C$-optimal in the definition of $\|x\|_{X_z}$ for every $x \in X_z$. The centralizer $\Omega_z : X_z \to \ell_0$ is defined by

$$\Omega_z(x)(n) = \frac{x(n)}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{e^{it}}{(e^{it} - z)^2} \log B_z(x)(n, e^{it}) dt$$

The derived space $dX_z$ is simply the space $d_{\Omega_z} X_z$. In this case the quasi-norm on $dX_z$ is equivalent to a norm.

Different choices of $B_z$ will give different versions of $\Omega_z$ which are boundedly equivalent. To see that we use Kalton’s original description of $X_z$: consider the space $\mathcal{F}$ of functions $F : D \to \ell_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that the function $z \mapsto F(z)(n)$ is in the Smirnov class $N^+$ and

$$\|F\|_\mathcal{F} = \text{ess sup}_{w \in T} \|F(w)\|_{X_w} < \infty$$
where for \( w \in \mathbb{T} \) the function \( F(w) \) is the radial limit in the \( \ell_0 \) topology of \( F \), which exists almost everywhere. Then \( X_z = \{ F(z) : F \in \mathcal{F} \} \) with the corresponding quotient norm.

Given \( B_{z_0} \), let

\[
F_x(z)(n) = u(x, n) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{e^{it} + z}{e^{it} - z} \log B_{z_0}(x)(n, e^{it})dt\right)
\]

where \( u(x, n) \) of modulus 1 is chosen so that \( F_x(z_0)(n) = x(n) \). Then \( \Omega_{z_0} \) is the derivative on \( z_0 \) of \( F_x \).

If we have another choice of \( B_{z_0} \), say \( C_{z_0} \), and construct a corresponding function \( G_x \) and \( u' \) as before, then \( F_x(z_0) - G_x(z_0) = 0 \). Let \( \varphi : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{D} \) be a conformal map such that \( \varphi(z_0) = 0 \). Then one may check that \( \frac{F_x - G_x}{\varphi} \in \mathcal{F} \). So

\[
\|B_{z_0}(x) - C_{z_0}(x)\|_{X_{z_0}} = |\varphi'(z_0)|^{-1} \| \frac{F_x - G_x}{\varphi}(z_0) \|_{X_{z_0}} \\
\leq |\varphi'(z_0)|^{-1} \| \frac{F_x - G_x}{\varphi} \|_F \\
\leq K \| x \|_{X_{z_0}}
\]

**Definition 2.8.** A centralizer \( \Omega \) on a Köthe function space \( X \) is said real if \( \Omega(f) \) is a real function for every \( f \in X \) real.

Complex interpolation of couples always induces real centralizers. \cite{9} Theorem 7.6] says that every real centralizer on a superreflexive Köthe function space may be obtained from complex interpolation of couples, up to projective equivalence.

By Theorem \cite{11} we have that in a very general scenario an interpolation family built using a compatible couple \( \{X_0, X_1\} \) will not give new derivations with respect to interpolation of couples, up to projective equivalence. Therefore, the interpolation family we find in this paper solves the following problem:

**Problem 2.9.** Find a concrete example of family of three Köthe function spaces such that the interpolation space at 0 is \( \ell_2 \) and the induced centralizer is not projectively equivalent to a real centralizer.

We will be interested in the following particular case of admissible families:

**Definition 2.10.** An admissible family \( \mathcal{H} = \{X_w\}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) is finite if there is a finite family \( \{A_j\} \) of disjoint measurable subsets of \( \mathbb{T} \) and a corresponding finite family \( \{X^j\} \) of Köthe function spaces such that \( X_w = X^j \) for every \( w \in A_j \). In this case, we will also write \( \mathcal{H} = \{X^j; A_j\} \).

We have the following characterization of the interpolation spaces \( X_z \) for finite families (part of the statement is implicit in the proof given in \cite{11}):

**Theorem 2.11.** \cite{11} Proposition 3.11] Let \( \mathcal{H} = \{X^j; A_j\}_{j=1}^n \) be a finite admissible family. Let \( \mu_z \) denote harmonic measure on \( \mathbb{T} \) with respect to \( z \in D \). Then \( X_z \) coincides with the space

\[
\Pi_{j=1}^n \left(X^j\right)^{\mu_z(A_j)} = \left\{ x \in \ell_0 : |x| \leq \prod_{j=1}^n |x_j|^{\mu_z(A_j)}, f_j \in X^j \right\}
\]
and \( \| \cdot \|_{X_z} \) satisfies
\[
\| x \|_{X_z} = \inf \{ \prod_{j=1}^{n} \| x_j \|_{X_j}^{\mu_z(A_j)} \}
\]
where the infimum is over all \( x_j \) as in (2.2). Furthermore, \( \Omega_z \) can be taken as
\[
\Omega_z(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \psi_j'(z) \log \frac{|x_j|}{\| x \|_{X_z}}
\]
where \( \psi_j \) is an analytic function on \( D \) such that \( \text{Re}(\psi_j) = \chi_{A_j} \) on \( T \) and \( x_j = x_j(x) \) are chosen homogeneously on \( x \) such that
\[
|x| = \prod_{j=1}^{n} |x_j|^{\mu_z(A_j)}
\]
and \( \prod_{j=1}^{n} \| x_j \|_{X_j}^{\mu_z(A_j)} \leq \lambda \| x \|_{X_z} \) for some \( \lambda \geq 1 \) independent of \( x \).

**Observation 2.12.** Notice that we may replace the inequality in (2.2) by an equality. Indeed, suppose we have a strict inequality. Then there is a non-negative function \( a \) on \( N \) such that
\[
|x| = a \prod_{j=1}^{n} |x_j|^{\mu_z(A_j)}
\]
Necessarily \( a \leq 1 \). We may now substitute \( x_1 \) by \( a \prod_{j=1}^{n} x_j \) in (2.2) and since
\[
\| a \prod_{j=1}^{n} x_j \|_{X_1} \leq \| x_1 \|_{X_1},
\]
we are done.

### 3. Complex interpolation of Orlicz spaces

Despite the fact that our example is obtained through interpolation of a finite family we feel that this is the place to discuss interpolation of families of Orlicz spaces, which we were not able to find in the literature. This study was motivated by a question by Michał Wojciechowski.

For the following facts about Orlicz functions and Orlicz spaces we refer to \([10] \) Chapter 4 and \([12] \).

Recall that \( \phi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty) \) is an Orlicz function if it convex, non-decreasing, \( \phi(0) = 0 \) and \( \lim_{t \to \infty} \phi(t) = \infty \). \( \phi \) is said non-degenerate if \( \phi(t) > 0 \) for \( t > 0 \), and satisfies the \( \Delta_2 \)-condition at \( 0 \) if \( \lim \sup_{t \to 0} \frac{\phi(2t)}{\phi(t)} < \infty \).

In general we will suppose that we are dealing with non-degenerate Orlicz functions, which will be clear whenever we use inverse functions.

Given an Orlicz function \( \phi \) we have the Orlicz space
\[
\ell_{\phi} = \{ x \in \mathbb{C}^N : \sum \phi \left( \frac{|x(n)|}{\rho} \right) < \infty \text{ for some } \rho > 0 \}
\]
endowed with the complete norm
\[
\| x \|_{\phi} = \inf \{ \rho > 0 : \sum \phi \left( \frac{|x(n)|}{\rho} \right) \leq 1 \}
\]
The \( \Delta_2 \)-condition at \( 0 \) is equivalent to the separability of \( \ell_{\phi} \).

Of course, the most famous examples of Orlicz spaces are the \( \ell_p \) spaces, which come from the functions \( t \mapsto t^p \).
A particular case is that of an $N$-function, which is a nondegenerate Orlicz function $\phi$ such that $\lim_{t \to 0} \frac{\phi(t)}{t} = 0$ and $\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\phi(t)}{t} = \infty$. For a nondegenerate Orlicz function $\phi$ which is not an $N$-function we have $\ell_\phi \simeq \ell_1$.

If $\phi$ is an $N$-function satisfying the $\Delta_2$-condition at 0 then there is an $N$-function $\phi^*$ such that $\ell_{\phi^*} \simeq \ell_{\phi}$, where the action of an element $x^* \in \ell_{\phi^*}$ on $x \in \ell_{\phi}$ is given by

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x^*(n)x(n)$$

In fact, (3.1)

$$\|x^*\|_{\ell_{\phi^*}} \leq \|x^*\|_{\ell_{\phi}} \leq 2\|x^*\|_{\ell_{\phi^*}}$$

$\phi^*$ is given by

$$\phi^*(y) = \sup\{xy - \phi(x) : 0 < x < \infty\}$$

If $X$ is order continuous then its Köthe dual agrees with its total dual [11, page 29]. Since a separable $\sigma$-complete Banach lattice $X$ is $\sigma$-order continuous, and this implies that $X$ is order continuous [11, page 7], we have that if $\phi$ satisfies the $\Delta_2$-condition at 0 then $\ell_{\phi} = \ell_{\phi}^\prime$.

If $\phi, \psi$ are Orlicz functions, then $\ell_{\phi} = \ell_{\psi}$ with equivalence of norms if and only if there are $t_0, k, K > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{K} \phi\left(\frac{t}{K}\right) \leq \psi(t) \leq K \phi(kt)$$

for every $t \in [0, t_0]$. If $\phi$ or $\psi$ satisfies the $\Delta_2$-condition at zero then we can take $k = 1$.

Let us show that Orlicz spaces fit nicely into the framework of the complex method we described in the previous section.

**Proposition 3.1.** An Orlicz space is a Köthe function space on $\mathbb{N}$.

**Proof.** Let $\phi$ be an Orlicz function. We start by showing that $B_{\ell_\phi}$ is closed in $\ell_\phi$. The argument is from [7, Theorem 6.19].

Let $(x^n) \subset B_{\ell_\phi}$ and suppose that $(x^n)$ converges to $x$ in $\ell_\phi$. We want to show that $x \in B_{\ell_\phi}$.

For every $\epsilon > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mu\{j : |x_n(j) - x(j)| \geq \epsilon, 1 \leq j \leq k\} = 0$$

This means that for $n$ big enough we have $|x_n(j) - x(j)| < \epsilon$, $1 \leq j \leq k$. This implies that for $n$ big enough

$$(1 - \epsilon) |x(j)| \leq |x_n(j)|$$

Indeed, if $x(j) = 0$ this is clear, otherwise it follows from

$$|x_n(j)| |x(j)|^{-1} - 1 < \epsilon$$

when $n$ is big.

So

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \phi((1 - \epsilon) |x(j)|) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} \phi(|x_n(j)|) \leq 1$$

for $n$ big enough. Since $k$ and $\epsilon$ are arbitrary we have that $x \in B_{\ell_\phi}$. Here we used the continuity of $\phi$. 
The fact that $\ell_{\phi}$ is an order ideal is clear. Let us show that there are $h, k \in \ell_0$ strictly positive such that for every $x \in \ell_0$ we have $\|xh\|_1 \leq \|x\|_X \leq \|xk\|_\infty$.

Take $y \in \ell'_0$, strictly positive of norm at most 1. This $y$ is our $h$.

Such an $y$ exists because of the following: for an Orlicz function $\phi$ let $h_\phi$ be the closure of $\text{span}\{e_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\ell_\phi$. Even if $\phi$ is not an $\text{N}$-function it still makes sense to define $\phi^*$, which is an Orlicz function, and [12 Proposition 3.3.4] tells us that $\|\cdot\|_{\ell_\phi}$ is equivalent to the norm

$$\|x\| = \sup\left\{ \sum_{n=1}^\infty |x^*(n)x(n)| : \|x^*\|_{\ell_{\phi^*}} \leq 1 \right\}$$

So $h_\phi$ is a subspace of $\ell^\ast_{\phi^*}$, and actually of $\ell^\ast_{\phi^*}$. If $h_\phi$ only had sequences of finite support then it would have a countable Hamel basis, which cannot happen. So there is a vector of infinite support $y'$. If the complement of this support is finite, we can just fill these spaces and normalize. Otherwise, we take a bijection between the support of $y'$ and its complement, and using this bijection build a vector $y''$ such that the support of $y''$ is the complement of the support of $y'$. Now $y = \frac{y' + y''}{\|y' + y''\|}$.

For the last part, we follow the argument of [3]: take $k$ strictly positive such that $\sum \phi(k(n)^{-1}) \leq 1$. Then for $x \in \ell_0$ we have

$$\sum \phi\left(\frac{|x(n)|}{\|xk\|_\infty}\right) = \sum \phi\left(\frac{|x(n)| \cdot k(n)k(n)^{-1}}{\|xk\|_\infty}\right) \leq \sum \phi(k(n)^{-1}) \leq 1$$

and therefore $\|x\|_{\phi} \leq \|xk\|_\infty$.

\[\square\]

**Proposition 3.2.** Let $\{\phi_w\}_{w \in T}$ be a family of Orlicz functions such that

1. For every $t \in [0, \infty)$ the function $w \mapsto \phi_w(t)$ is Borel;
2. There are $h, k \in \ell_0$ strictly positive such that for every $x \in \ell_0$ and a.e. $w \in T$ we have $\|xh\|_1 \leq \|x\|_{\ell_w} \leq \|xk\|_\infty$.

Then $H = \{X_{\ell_w}\}_{w \in T}$ is an admissible family. Furthermore, if the functions $\phi_w$ satisfy the $\Delta_2$-condition at 0, then the family is strongly admissible.

**Proof.** We must show that the map $T : (w, x) \mapsto \|x\|_{\ell_w}$ is Borel.

Let $\psi_\lambda : T \times \ell_0 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be given by $\psi_\lambda(w, x) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \phi_w\left(\frac{|x(n)|}{\lambda}\right)$.

Let $a \in [0, \infty]$. We want to check that $T^{-1}[0, a)$ is a Borel set. Let $(\lambda_n)$ be an enumeration of $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, a)$. We have

$$(w, x) \in T^{-1}[0, a) \iff \inf\{\rho : \sum_{n=1}^\infty \phi_w\left(\frac{|x(n)|}{\rho}\right) \leq 1\} < a$$

$$\iff \exists k : \sum_{n=1}^\infty \phi_w\left(\frac{|x(n)|}{\lambda_k}\right) \leq 1$$

$$\iff (w, x) \in \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty \psi_{\lambda_k}^{-1}[0, 1]$$

so we just need to check that $\psi_{\lambda_k}^{-1}[0, 1]$ is a Borel set for every $k$. 

that we have the inequality $w$ be called strongly admissible.

A family $\{w, \phi, \psi\}$ of Orlicz functions will be called Borel.

So $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $x \mapsto \frac{|x(k)|}{\lambda}$ is continuous.

Let $\xi_{k,n} : [0, \infty] \to \ell_0$ be given by

$$\xi_{k,m}(w, x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \chi_{A_{k,n,m}}(x) \phi_w \left( \frac{n}{2m} \right)$$

The functions $(w, x) \mapsto \chi_{A_{k,n,m}}(x)$ and $(w, x) \mapsto \phi_w \left( \frac{|x(k)|}{\lambda} \right)$ are Borel, so that $\xi_{k,n}$ is Borel. But $\xi_{k,m}(w, x)$ converges in $m$ to $\phi_w \left( \frac{|x(k)|}{\lambda} \right)$, so that this function is Borel.

This implies that the function $\psi_{\lambda_k} : [0, \infty] \to \ell_0$ is Borel, and therefore so is $\psi_{\lambda_k}$, proving that $(w, x) \mapsto \|x\|_w$ is a Borel function.

For the last part, we may take $V = c_{00}$. Indeed, take $x \in B_{X_w}$. Then the $N$-truncations $x^N \in V \cap B_{X_w}$ and converge to $x$ in $\ell_0$, since $x \in c_{00}$.

**Proposition 3.3.** Condition (2) of Proposition 2.2 is equivalent to the existence of Orlicz functions $\phi, \psi$ such that for a. e. $w \in \mathbb{T}$ we have $\phi \leq \phi_w$ on a neighborhood of 0 and $\phi_w \leq \psi$ on a neighborhood of 0.

**Proof.** Suppose $\phi$ and $\psi$ are as in the enunciate. Then for a. e. $w \in \mathbb{T}$ we have continuous inclusions $\ell_0 \subseteq \ell_{\phi_w} \subseteq \ell_\phi$, with uniform bound on their norms.

Let $y \in \ell_{\phi_w}$ be strictly positive of norm at most 1. Then there is $a > 0$ such that $y \in \ell_{\phi_w}^a$ with norm at most $a$ for a. e. $w \in \mathbb{T}$. Take $\frac{a}{\phi}$ as $h$.

Now take $k$ strictly positive such that $\sum \psi(k(n)^{-1}) \leq 1$ with $k(n)$ big enough so that we have the inequality $\phi_w(k(n)^{-1}) \leq \psi(k(n)^{-1})$ for every $n$ and a. e. $w \in \mathbb{T}$.

Then for a. e. $w \in \mathbb{T}$ and every $x \in \ell_0$ we have

$$\sum \phi_w \left( \frac{|x(n)|}{\|xk\|_\infty} \right) \leq \sum \phi_w(k(n)^{-1}) \leq \sum \psi(k(n)^{-1}) \leq 1$$

For the converse, suppose we have (2). Taking $x = e_1$ we have for a. e. $w \in \mathbb{T}$

$$h(1) \leq \inf \{ \rho > 0 : \phi_w \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \leq 1 \} = \frac{1}{\phi_w(1)} \leq k(1)$$

So $k(1)^{-1} \leq \phi_w^{-1}(1) \leq h(1)^{-1}$.

Now we may take as $\phi$ a degenerate function which is 0 on $[0, h(1)^{-1}]$, and $\psi(t) = k(1)t$.

**Definition 3.4.** A family $\{\phi_w\}_{w \in \mathbb{T}}$ of Orlicz functions will be called admissible if

1. For every $t \in [0, \infty)$ the function $w \mapsto \phi_w(t)$ is Borel;
2. There is $t_0 > 0$ such that for every $t \in (0, t_0)$ the function $w \mapsto \log \phi_w^{-1}(t)$ is integrable;
3. There are $h, k \in \ell_0$ strictly positive such that for every $x \in \ell_0$ and a. e. $w \in \mathbb{T}$ we have $\|xh\|_1 \leq \|x\|_w \|sk\|_\infty$.

If, furthermore, the functions $\phi_w$ satisfy the $\Delta_2$-condition at 0, the family will be called strongly admissible.
Given an admissible family of Orlicz functions and \( z = re^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{D} \) we will denote
\[
I_z(\{\phi_w\})(t) = \exp \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} P(r, \theta - t) \log \phi_w^{-1}(t) dt \right)
\]

**Proposition 3.5.** Let \( \{\phi_w\}_{w \in \Xi} \) be an admissible family of Orlicz functions. Then for every \( z \in \mathbb{D} \) we have
1. \( I_z(\{\phi_w\})(0) = 0; \)
2. If \( t_0 \) is like in (2) of Definition 3.4, then \( I_z(\{\phi_w\}) \) is concave and strictly increasing on \([0, t)\) for some \( t < t_0 \).

**Proof.** (1) Follows from \( \phi_w(0) = 0 \) for every \( w \in \mathbb{T} \).
2. Let \( t_0, t_1 \in [0, \infty) \) and \( \alpha \in [0, 1] \).
First, suppose that \( \mu \) is a probability measure on \( \mathbb{T} \) and let \( f, g : \mathbb{T} \to (0, \infty) \) be simple functions, let us write \( f(w) = \sum a_k \chi_{E_k} \) and \( g = \sum b_k \chi_{E_k} \). Then for \( \alpha \in [0, 1] \) we have
\[
\alpha \exp \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log f(w) dw \right) + (1 - \alpha) \exp \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log g(w) dw \right)
= \alpha \prod \phi_k^{-\mu(E_k)} + (1 - \alpha) \prod \phi_k^{-\mu(E_k)}
= \prod (\alpha a_k)^{-\mu(E_k)} + \prod ((1 - \alpha) b_k)^{-\mu(E_k)}
\leq \prod (\alpha a_k + (1 - \alpha) b_k)^{-\mu(E_k)}
= \exp \left( \log \prod (\alpha a_k + (1 - \alpha) b_k)^{-\mu(E_k)} \right)
= \exp \left( \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log [\alpha f(w) + (1 - \alpha) g(w)] dw \right)
\]

Now let \( f_n \) (respectively, \( g_n \)) be a monotone sequence of simple positive functions such that \( f_n(w) \to \phi_w^{-1}(t_0) \) (respectively, \( g_n(w) \to \phi_w^{-1}(t_1) \)) for a.e. \( w \in \mathbb{T} \). Then, since \( f_1 \) and \( g_1 \) are integrable, monotone convergence gives
\[
(I_z(\{\phi_w\})(\alpha t_0 + (1 - \alpha) t_1))
= \exp \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \log \phi_w^{-1}(\alpha t_0 + (1 - \alpha) t_1) P_z(w) dw \right)
\geq \exp \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \log (\alpha \phi_w^{-1}(t_0) + (1 - \alpha) \phi_w^{-1}(t_1)) P_z(w) dw \right)
= \lim_n \exp \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \log (\alpha f_n(w) + (1 - \alpha) g_n(w)) P_z(w) dw \right)
\geq \lim_n \alpha \exp \left( \int_{0}^{2\pi} \log f(w) P_z(w) dw \right) + (1 - \alpha) \exp \left( \int_{0}^{2\pi} \log g(w) P_z(w) dw \right)
= \alpha \exp \left( \int_{0}^{2\pi} \log \phi_w^{-1}(t_0) P_z(w) dw \right) + (1 - \alpha) \exp \left( \int_{0}^{2\pi} \log \phi_w^{-1}(t_1) P_z(w) dw \right)
= \alpha (I_z(\{\phi_w\})(t_0)) + (1 - \alpha)(I_z(\{\phi_w\})(t_1))
\]
Since \( I_z(\{\phi_w\}) \) is concave and nonnegative, the only way for (2) to not be satisfied is if there is \( 0 < t' < t_0 \) such that \( I_z(\{\phi_w\})(t) = 0 \) for \( 0 \leq t < t' \), which would imply that \( w \mapsto \log \phi_w^{-1}(t) \) is not integrable for \( 0 \leq t < t' \). \( \square \)
Definition 3.6. Let \( \{ \phi_w \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) be an admissible family of Orlicz functions. A real number \( t \) satisfying (2) of Proposition 3.5 will be called a witness of the family.

Fixed a witness \( t \) of \( \{ \phi_w \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) and \( z \in \mathbb{D} \), we denote by \( \phi_z \) an extension of \( (I_z(\{ \phi_w \}))_{(0,t)}^{-1} \) to an Orlicz function.

The paramount example of (strongly) admissible family of Orlicz functions is that of a finite family (satisfying the \( \Delta_2 \)-condition at 0).

Lemma 3.7. Let \( \{ \phi_w \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) be a strongly admissible family of \( N \)-functions. Then the family \( \{ \phi_w^s \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) is admissible.

Proof. By Theorem 2.35 and 3.1 we know that the family \( \{ \phi_w^s \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) is admissible, so that we have (3) of Definition 3.4.

Let \( \{ q_n \} \) be an enumeration of the nonnegative rationals, and for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( w \in \mathbb{T} \) and \( y > 0 \) let \( \psi_{y,n}(w) = q_n y - \phi_w(q_n) \). Then, by the continuity of \( \phi_w \),

\[
\phi_w^s(y) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \psi_{y,n}(w)
\]

so that the map \( w \mapsto \phi_w^s(y) \) is Borel for each \( y \geq 0 \), and we have (1) of Definition 3.4.

Finally, by \cite[Proposition 2.1.1(ii)]{12}, we have that for each \( w \in \mathbb{T} \) and \( t \geq 0 \)

\[
t < \phi_w^{-1}(t)(\phi_w^s)^{-1}(t) < 2t
\]

so that if \( t \) is a witness of \( \{ \phi_w \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) and \( 0 < t' < t \) we have

\[
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log(\phi_w^s)^{-1}(t')dw \geq 2\pi t' - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log(\phi_w^{-1}(t'))dw > -\infty
\]

and similarly the integral is not \( +\infty \), so that the family \( \{ \phi_w^s \} \) is admissible. \( \square \)

Theorem 3.8. Let \( \{ \phi_w \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) be a strongly admissible family of \( N \)-functions. Consider the family \( \mathcal{H} = \{ X_w \}_{w \in \mathbb{T}} \) such that \( X_w = \ell_{\phi_w} \). Then \( X_z = \ell_{\phi_z} \) with equivalence of norms.

Also, there is an \( a > 0 \) such that a choice of \( B_z \) is

\[
B_z(x)(n,w) = a\|x\|_{\ell_{\phi_z}} \phi_w^{-1}(\phi_z(\frac{|x(n)|}{a\|x\|_{\ell_{\phi_z}}}))
\]

for every \( x \in \ell_{\phi_z} \).

Proof. Fix a witness \( t \) for the family \( \{ \phi_w \} \). Since we are dealing with sequence spaces, we may find \( a < 1 \) so that if \( x \in \ell_{\phi_z} \) is such that \( \|x\|_{\ell_{\phi_z}} \leq a \) then \( \phi_z(\|x(n)\|) < t \) for every \( n \in \mathbb{N} \).

Indeed, take \( a \) such that \( \phi_z(a\phi_z^{-1}(1)) < t \). If \( \|x\|_{\ell_{\phi_z}} \leq a \) then \( \phi_z(\|x(n)\|/a) \leq 1 \) implies \( \phi_z(\|x(n)\|) \leq \phi_z(a\phi_z^{-1}(1)) < t \).

For such an \( x \) let \( \phi(n,w) = \phi_w^{-1}(\phi_z(\|x(n)\|)) \).

Then

\[
\exp\left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} P(r, \theta - t) \log \phi(n, e^{it})dt \right)
\]

\[
= \exp\left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} P(r, \theta - t) \log \phi_w^{-1}(\phi_z(\|x(n)\|))dt \right)
\]

\[
= I_z(\{ \phi_w \})(\phi_z(\|x(n)\|))
\]

\[
= |x(n)|
\]
And
\[ \| \phi \|_C = \text{ess sup} \| \phi_w^{-1}(\phi_z(|x(n)|)) \|_{\ell_{\phi_z}} \leq 1 \]
Indeed, since \( a < 1 \) we have for \( w \in T \)
\[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi_w(\phi_w^{-1}(\phi_z(|x(n)|))) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi_z(|x(n)|) \leq 1 \]
since \( \|x\|_{\ell_\varphi} \leq a < 1 \). So we obtain \( \|x\|_{X_z} \leq \frac{1}{a} \|x\|_{\ell_{\phi_z}} \), and the second part of the enunciate will follow from this calculation too.

Now let \( x \in X_z \) of norm 1. Consider the family \( H^* = \{Y_w\}_{w \in T} = \{\ell_{\psi_w}\}_{w \in T} \) is admissible, where \( \psi_w = \phi_w^* \).

By Lemma 3.7, the family \( \{\psi_w\} \) is admissible and by the previous calculation, \( \ell_{\psi_z} \subset Y_z \) with continuous inclusion.

The proof now follows [12, Lemma 6.3.3]. By [12, Proposition 2.1.1(ii)] we have
\[ t < \phi_z^{-1}(t)(\phi_z^*)^{-1}(t) < 2t \]
and
\[ t < \phi_w^{-1}(t)\psi_w^{-1}(t) < 2t \]
of every \( t > 0, w \in T \).

So if \( t' \) is a witness for both \( \{\phi_w\} \) and \( \{\psi_w\} \) we have for \( t < t' \) that
\[ (\phi_z^*)^{-1}(t) \leq \frac{2t}{\phi_z^{-1}(t)} \]
\[ = 2t \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} P(z, \theta - s) \log \phi_{\psi_z}^{-1}(t) ds \right) \]
\[ = 2 \exp \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} P(z, \theta - s) \log \phi_{\phi_z}^{-1}(t) ds \right) \]
\[ < 2 \exp \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} P(z, \theta - s) \log \psi_{\phi_z}^{-1}(t) ds \right) \]
\[ = 2\psi_z^{-1}(t) \]

If \( t_0 \) is such that \( \psi_z(t) < t' \) for \( t \in [0, t_0] \), replacing \( t \) by \( \psi_z(t) \) we obtain \( \psi_z(t) < \phi_z^{2}(2t) \) for every \( t \in [0, t_0] \).

This means that there is a constant \( C \geq 1 \) such that \( \|\cdot\|_{\psi_z} \leq C \|\cdot\|_{\phi_z} \). So we find a constant \( C' \) such that if \( x \in X_z \)
\[ \sup_{y^* \in B_{\ell_{\phi_z}}} |y^*(x)| \leq C \sup_{y^* \in B_{\ell_{\psi_z}}} |y^*(x)| \]
\[ \leq C' \sup_{y^* \in B_{\ell_{\psi_z}}} |y^*(x)| \]
\[ \leq C' \|x\|_{X_z} \]

(The first inequality is (3.1))

Now [12, Proposition 3.3.4] tells us that we have a continuous inclusion \( X_z \subset \ell_{\phi_z} \).

In the proof of Theorem 3.8 we asked that the functions \( \phi_w \) be N-functions satisfying the \( \Delta_2 \)-condition at 0 so that we may use duality and the invertibility of
φ\textsuperscript{*}{\textsubscript{w}}. It is reasonable to suspect that we may sometimes circumvent these issues. The next theorem shows that this is the case when we are dealing with finite families. Its proof should be compared with that of [4, Lemma 4.1].

**Theorem 3.9.** Let \( \{ \phi_w \} \) be an admissible family of non-degenerate Orlicz functions which induces a finite family \( \mathcal{H} = \{ \ell_{\phi_j}; A_j \} \). Then for every \( z \in \mathbb{D} \) we have \( X_z = \ell_{\phi_z} \) with equivalence of norms, where

\[
\phi_z^{-1} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} (\phi_j^{-1})^{\mu(A_j)}
\]

Also, a choice of centralizer is

\[
\Omega_z(x) = x \prod_{j=1}^{n} \psi_j'(z) \log \phi_j^{-1}(\phi_z \left( \frac{|x(n)|}{\|x\|_{\ell_{\phi_z}}} \right))
\]

for \( x \in \ell_{\phi_z} \), where \( \psi_j \) is an analytic function on \( \mathbb{D} \) which real part agrees with \( \chi_{A_j} \) on \( T \).

**Proof.** We begin by noticing that the definition of \( \phi_z \) given above coincides with that of Definition 3.6 when the witness is +\( \infty \). If we mimic now the first part of the proof of Theorem 3.8 for \( a = 1 \) we obtain \( \ell_{\phi_z} \subset X_z \) and \( \| x \|_{X_z} \leq \| x \|_{\ell_{\phi_z}} \). The centralizer part is also similar to the one from the previous theorem.

For the other inclusion, let \( x \in X_z \) of norm 1. By Theorem 2.11, we may write

\[
|x| = \prod_{j=1}^{n} |x_j|^{\mu(A_j)}_{\ell_j(A_j)}
\]

with \( \| x_j \|_{\ell_j(A_j)} \in [1,2] \). Let \( h_j \in \ell_0 \) be given by \( h_j(n) = \phi_j \left( \frac{|x_j(n)|}{2} \right) \), and let \( h = \sum_{j=1}^{n} h_j \). Then we have

\[
\frac{|x|}{2} = \prod \left( \frac{|x_j|}{2} \right)^{\mu(A_j)}_{\ell_j(A_j)} = \prod \phi_j^{-1}(h_j)^{\mu(A_j)} \\
\leq \prod \phi_j^{-1}(h)^{\mu(A_j)} = \phi_z^{-1}(h)
\]

so that

\[
\sum_{n} \phi_z \left( \frac{|x(n)|}{2} \right) \leq \sum_{n} h(n) = \sum_{n,j} \phi_j \left( \frac{|x_j(n)|}{2} \right) \leq n + 1
\]

That is, \( x \in \ell_{\phi_z} \), and therefore we have an equality of sets \( X_z = \ell_{\phi_z} \). By the first part and the open mapping theorem, the two spaces are the same with equivalence of norms. \( \square \)

4. A PRELIMINARY RESULT

According to Kalton, if \( X \) is a Köthe function space and \( \Omega \) is a centralizer on \( X \), then there are real centralizers \( \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \) on \( X \) such that \( \Omega \sim \Omega_1 + i\Omega_2 \) [9, Lemma 7.1]. The following known result characterizes when a sum \( \Omega_1 + i\Omega_2 \) of real centralizers gives us a real centralizer.
Lemma 4.1. Let $\Omega$ be a centralizer on a Köthe function space $X$, and write $\Omega \sim \Omega_1 + i\Omega_2$, with $\Omega_1, \Omega_2$ real centralizers on $X$. Then $\Omega$ is projectively equivalent to a real centralizer on $X$ if and only if one of the following is true:

1. $\Omega_1$ is trivial;
2. $\Omega_2$ is equivalent to $\gamma \Omega_1$, for some $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Let $\Psi$ be a real centralizer on $X$, and suppose that $\Omega \sim (\alpha + i\beta)\Psi$, with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. That is, there are two real functions $f_1, f_2$ on $\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\Omega_1 + i\Omega_2 - (\alpha + i\beta)\Psi - f_1 - if_2$$

is bounded (and complex homogeneous). Notice that we are treating $f_i$ as a multiplication map.

This happens if and only if

$$\Omega_1 - \alpha \Psi - f_1 = B_1$$

and

$$\Omega_2 - \beta \Psi - f_2 = B_2$$

where $B_j$ is real homogeneous and bounded.

We have two cases now:

1. $\alpha = 0$
   In this case we have that $\Omega_1$ is trivial.
2. $\alpha \neq 0$
   In this case, we have $\psi = \frac{1}{\alpha}(\Omega_1 - f_1 - B_1)$, and substituting we get

$$\Omega_2 - \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \Omega_1 = B_2 + \frac{\beta}{\alpha}(f_1 + B_1)$$

that is, $\Omega_2 \sim \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \Omega_1$.

The converse is easy. $\square$

This, together with Kalton’s results, shows that there are centralizers which come from interpolation of three spaces, but not of two. Indeed, take two real centralizers $\Omega_1, \Omega_2$ on $\ell_2$ which are not projectively equivalent. Then by [9, Theorem 7.9] there is a family of three spaces which induces a centralizer projectively equivalent to $\Omega_1 + i\Omega_2$, and this centralizer cannot come from interpolation of two spaces. This was observed to us by Félix Cabello Sánchez.

In theory one could follow Kalton’s reasoning and obtain the interpolation family if the calculations were reasonable enough, but they are not promising.

5. The Example

Our example of family of three spaces inducing a centralizer that is not projectively equivalent to a real one is obtained through complex interpolation of a finite family of Orlicz spaces.

Recall that two Orlicz functions $\phi$ and $\psi$ satisfying the $\Delta_2$-condition are equivalent, written $\phi \sim \psi$, if there are $K > 0$, $t_0 > 0$ such that for every $0 \leq t \leq t_0$ we have

$$K^{-1} \leq \frac{\phi(t)}{\psi(t)} \leq K$$

and this happens if and only if $\ell_\phi = \ell_\psi$ with equivalence of norms.
Using inverse functions, we have that this is equivalent to
\[ \phi^{-1}(K^{-1}\psi(t))^2 \leq t \leq \phi^{-1}(K\psi(t)) \]
for every \(0 < t \leq t_0\).

We consider the arches \(A_0 = \{e^{it} : 0 \leq t < \frac{2\pi}{4}\}\), \(A_1 = \{e^{it} : \frac{2\pi}{4} \leq t < \frac{4\pi}{4}\}\) and \(A_2 = \{e^{it} : \frac{4\pi}{4} \leq t < 2\pi\}\).

To each arc \(A_j\) we will attach an Orlicz space \(\ell_{\phi^j}\) obtaining a strongly admissible family \(\mathcal{H} = \{X_w\}_{w \in \mathbb{T}}\) in such a way that \(X_0 = \ell^2\) with equivalence of norms. We will fix \(\phi^0(t) = t\).

**Proposition 5.1.** \(X_0 = \ell^2\) with equivalence of norms if and only if there is \(K > 0\) and \(t_0 > 0\) such that for every \(0 < t \leq t_0\) we have

\[ ((\phi^1)^{-1}(K^{-2}t^4))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^2)^{-1}(K^{-2}t^4))^\frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq ((\phi^3)^{-1}(t^4))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^4)^{-1}(t^4))^\frac{1}{2} \]

**Proof.** \(X_0 = \ell^2\) with equivalence of norms is equivalent to the existence of \(K > 0\) and \(t_0 > 0\) such that for every \(0 < t \leq t_0\)

\[ ((\phi^0)^{-1}(K^{-1}t^2))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^1)^{-1}(K^{-1}t^2))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^2)^{-1}(K^{-1}t^2))^\frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq ((\phi^3)^{-1}(Kt^2))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^4)^{-1}(Kt^2))^\frac{1}{2} \]

Since \(\phi^0(t) = t\), we have

\[ K^{-\frac{1}{2}}t^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^1)^{-1}(K^{-1}t^2))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^2)^{-1}(K^{-1}t^2))^\frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq K^\frac{1}{2}t^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^3)^{-1}(Kt^2))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^4)^{-1}(Kt^2))^\frac{1}{2} \]

that is

\[ ((\phi^1)^{-1}(K^{-1}t^2))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^2)^{-1}(K^{-1}t^2))^\frac{1}{2} \leq K^\frac{1}{2}t^\frac{1}{2} \leq ((\phi^3)^{-1}(Kt^2))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^4)^{-1}(Kt^2))^\frac{1}{2} \]

so

\[ ((\phi^1)^{-1}(K^{-1}t^2))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^2)^{-1}(K^{-1}t^2))^\frac{1}{2} \leq K^\frac{1}{2}t^\frac{1}{2} \leq ((\phi^3)^{-1}(Kt^2))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^4)^{-1}(Kt^2))^\frac{1}{2} \]

Taking \(u = K^\frac{1}{2}t^\frac{1}{2}\) we have

\[ ((\phi^1)^{-1}(K^{-2}u^4))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^2)^{-1}(K^{-2}u^4))^\frac{1}{2} \leq u \leq ((\phi^3)^{-1}(u^4))^\frac{1}{2}((\phi^4)^{-1}(u^4))^\frac{1}{2} \]

\[ \square \]

The following pair satisfies (5.1) (we define the functions on a neighborhood of \(0\)):

\[ t \mapsto 5^{-2}t^2|\log(t)|^4 \]
\[ t \mapsto 5^{-2}e^{-2+2\sqrt{T-s}}(2s + 2\sqrt{T-s} - 2)^2 \]
up to a multiplicative factor that we determine later.

The reader should rightly ask why we have chosen these functions, and how do we know they satisfy (5.1).

From the following calculations it will be clear that we need \(\phi^1\) to be of the form \(\phi^1(t) = t^2f(t)\), where \(\lim_{t \to 0} |f(t)| = \infty\).

Also, one way to obtain \(\phi^1\) and \(\phi^2\) is to start with a pair of Orlicz functions \(\psi^1, \psi^2\) such that \((\ell_{\psi^1}, \ell_{\psi^2})_{\frac{1}{2}} = \ell^2\) and then consider the 2-convexification of \(\ell_{\psi^1}\) and \(\ell_{\psi^2}\).
It is well-known that in many cases interpolation of a Banach space with its dual yields $\ell_2$. So we could take $\psi^2 = (\psi^1)^*$.

The functions $t \mapsto t^p |\log(t)|^\alpha$ are convex and increasing on a neighborhood of 0 for $\alpha > 0$ and $1 < p < \infty$, so they may be extended to Orlicz functions [10 Example 4.c.1]. Unfortunately, for $p = 1$ this is not case, since the function is not convex on a neighborhood of 0.

Nevertheless, let us ignore that and take $\psi^1(t) = t |\log(t)|^2$. From now on we will use the notation for the inverse of a function when the function is injective on a neighborhood of 0. Define $\psi^2 = (\psi^1)^*$ as if $\psi^1$ was an Orlicz function. So

$$\psi^2(s) = \max_{t \geq 0}(ts - \psi^1(t)) = \max_{t \geq 0}t(s - \log(t)^2)$$

Let $f_s(t) = t(s - \log(t)^2)$. Then $f'_s(t) = s - \log(t)^2 - 2 \log(t)$, which is 0 if and only if $t = e^{-1 + \sqrt{1-s}}$ for $0 \leq s < 1$. Then we have

$$\psi^2(s) = e^{-1 + \sqrt{1-s}}(s - (-1 + \sqrt{1-s})^2)$$

for $0 \leq s < 1$. One may check that this function is increasing on a neighborhood of 0.

By definition we have

$$ts \leq \psi^1(t) + \psi^2(s)$$

then

$$(\psi^1)^{-1}(t)(\psi^2)^{-1}(t) \leq 2t$$

Let $\xi^i = (\psi^i)^2$. Then $((\xi^i)^{-1}(t) = (\psi^i)^{-1}(t^\frac{1}{2})$. In particular

$$(\xi^1)^{-1}(t)(\xi^2)^{-1}(t) \leq 2t^\frac{1}{2}$$

so

$$(\xi^1)^{-1}(t^i)(\xi^2)^{-1}(t^i)^\frac{1}{2} \leq \sqrt{2}t^i$$

Write $t = \sqrt{\frac{u}{10}2}$ and we have

$$(\xi^1)^{-1}(\frac{u^4}{100})(\xi^2)^{-1}(\frac{u^4}{100})^\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{u}{\sqrt{5}}$$

For $t$ near 1 from below, we have that the function $f(t) = \psi^2(\psi^1(t)) - \psi^1(t)$ is negative. This implies, taking $\psi^1(t) = u$

$$\frac{u}{5} \leq (\psi^1)^{-1}(u)(\psi^2)^{-1}(u)$$

for $u$ small enough. In particular

$$\frac{u}{\sqrt{5}} \leq (\xi^1)^{-1}(u^4)^\frac{1}{2}(\xi^2)^{-1}(u^4)^\frac{1}{2}$$

So we have

$$(\xi^1)^{-1}(\frac{u^4}{100})^\frac{1}{2}(\xi^2)^{-1}(\frac{u^4}{100})^\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{u}{\sqrt{5}} \leq (\xi^1)^{-1}(u^4)^\frac{1}{2}(\xi^2)^{-1}(u^4)^\frac{1}{2}$$

If we now take $\phi^i = 5^{-2} \xi^i$ and write $\sqrt{\frac{u}{9}} = t$, then we have

$$(\phi^1)^{-1}(\frac{t^4}{100})^\frac{1}{2}(\phi^2)^{-1}(\frac{t^4}{100})^\frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq (\phi^1)^{-1}(t^4)^\frac{1}{2}(\phi^2)^{-1}(t^4)^\frac{1}{2}$$

We must now check that $\phi^1$ and $\phi^2$ are indeed Orlicz functions in a neighborhood of 0. This may be done deriving the functions twice. We leave the bothersome details to the reader. One may also check that both satisfy the $\Delta_2$ condition at 0.
Our interpolation family of three spaces induces a centralizer \( \Omega_0 \) on \( X_0 \). As we have seen, \( \Omega_0 \) may be written as \( \Omega_0 \sim \Omega_1 + i\Omega_2 \). Actually, Kalton shows in [9, Lemma 7.1] that we may choose

\[
\Omega_1(x) = Re(\Omega_0(Re(x))) + iRe(\Omega_0(Im(x)))
\]

and

\[
\Omega_2(x) = Im(\Omega_0(Re(x))) + iIm(\Omega_0(Im(x)))
\]

Let \( s_n \in \ell_2 \) be the unit vectors given by

\[
s_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} e_j
\]

By the proofs of Theorems 3.8 and 3.9, we may take \( B_0(s_n)(j, w) = \phi_w^{-1}(\phi_2(\frac{j}{\sqrt{n}})) \) for \( 1 \leq j \leq n \), and 0 otherwise.

Let \( r_n = 1/\sqrt{n} \).

Then, for \( 1 \leq j \leq n \),

\[
\Omega_0(s_n)(j) = \frac{s_n(j)}{n} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{1}{e^{it}} \log B_0(s_n)(j, e^{it}) dt
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{n}} \left( \sqrt{3} - 3i \right) \log(\phi^0)^{-1}(r_n) - 2\sqrt{3} \log(\phi^1)^{-1}(r_n)
\]

\[
+ \left( \sqrt{3} + 3i \right) \log(\phi^2)^{-1}(r_n)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{n}} \left( \sqrt{3} \log \left( \frac{(\phi^0)^{-1}(r_n)(\phi^2)^{-1}(r_n)}{(\phi^1)^{-1}(r_n)^2} \right) + 3i \log \left( \frac{(\phi^2)^{-1}(r_n)}{(\phi^0)^{-1}(r_n)} \right) \right)
\]

and 0 otherwise.

Let \( A_n = \log \left( \frac{(\phi^0)^{-1}(r_n)(\phi^2)^{-1}(r_n)}{(\phi^1)^{-1}(r_n)^2} \right) \) and \( B_n = \log \left( \frac{(\phi^2)^{-1}(r_n)}{(\phi^0)^{-1}(r_n)} \right) \). Then

\[
(5.3) \quad \Omega_1(s_n) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi} A_n s_n
\]

and

\[
(5.4) \quad \Omega_2(s_n) = \frac{3}{2\pi} B_n s_n
\]

Since \( X_0 = \ell_2 \) with equivalence of norms, there are \( k, K > 0 \) such that

\[
\frac{k}{n} \leq \phi_0(r_n) \leq \frac{K}{n}
\]

Lemma 5.2. With the previous definitions we have:

1. If \( \Omega_1 \) is trivial then there is \( C > 0 \) such that \( |A_n| \leq C \) for every \( n \).
2. If there is \( \gamma \) such that \( \Omega_2 \) is equivalent to \( \gamma \Omega_1 \) then there is \( C > 0 \) such that \( |\gamma A_n - B_n| \leq C \) for every \( n \).

Proof. (1) If \( \Omega_1 \) is trivial there is a sequence \( f \in \ell_0 \) such that \( \Omega_1 - f \) is bounded.

For a given Orlicz function space \( \ell_p \) we have that the norm of \( e_n \) is independent of \( n \). This implies that we may choose \( B_0 \) in such a way that \( \Omega_0(e_n) = ae_n \) for some \( a \in \mathbb{C} \) and every \( n \). Since \( \Omega_1 - f \) is bounded, this implies that \( f \in \ell_\infty \).

So, for every \( n \),

\[
||\Omega_0(s_n)||_2 \leq ||\Omega_0(s_n) - fs_n||_2 + ||fs_n||_2 \leq C||s_n||_2
\]

The result follows from [9].

(2) follows from a similar reasoning. \( \Box \)
Recall that on a neighborhood of 0
\[ \phi^1(t) = 5^{-2}t^2 |\log(t)|^4 \]
\[ \phi^2(t) = 5^{-2}e^{-2+2\sqrt{1-(2s+2\sqrt{1-s}-2)^2}} \]

In the following results we will use (5.2).

**Lemma 5.3.** The sequence \(|A_n|\) is not bounded.

**Proof.** We have
\[ A_n = \log \left( \frac{(\phi^0)^{-1}(r_n)(\phi^2)^{-1}(r_n)}{((\phi^1)^{-1}(r_n))^2} \right) \]
Let \( r_n = u_n^4 \), so that we have
\[ A_n \geq \log \left( \frac{u_n^4u_n^2}{((\phi^1)^{-1}(u_n^4))^3} \right) \]
The right side is bounded from above if and only if there is \( C > 0 \) such that
\[ \frac{u_n^6}{((\phi^1)^{-1}(u_n^4))^3} \leq e^C \]
for \( n \) big enough, that is
\[ \phi^1 \left( \frac{u_n^2}{e^C} \right) \leq u_n^4 \]
which cannot happen. \( \Box \)

**Lemma 5.4.** No matter \( \gamma \in \mathbb{R} \), \(|\gamma A_n - B_n|\) is not bounded.

**Proof.** We must consider a number of cases.

*Case 1: \( \gamma = 1 \)
We have
\[ A_n - B_n = \log \left( \frac{r_n^2}{((\phi^1)^{-1}(r_n))^2} \right) \]
If \(|A_n - B_n|\) is bounded there is \( C > 0 \) such that for \( n \) big enough
\[ \phi^1 \left( \frac{r_n}{C} \right) \leq r_n \]
For \( n \) big enough this is the same as
\[ 5^{-2}r_n \left| \log \frac{r_n}{C} \right|^4 \geq 1 \]
which cannot happen.

For cases 2 through 6 we will write \( r_n = u_n^4 \).

*Case 2: \( \gamma - 1 < 0 \) and \( 3\gamma - 1 > 0 \)
We have
\[ \gamma A_n - B_n \leq \log \left( \frac{u_n^{4(\gamma+1)}u_n^{2(\gamma-1)}}{((\phi^1)^{-1}(u_n^4))^{3\gamma-1}} \right) \]
Let us show that the sequence on the right has \(-\infty\) as limit. Were it bounded from below we should have for some \( C > 0 \)
\[ u_n^4 \leq \phi^1 \left( \frac{2(\gamma+1)}{u_n^{3\gamma-1}C} \right) \]
For \( n \) big enough this is
\[
\frac{u_n^4}{C^2} \leq 5^{\gamma} \frac{u_n^{3\gamma+1}}{C^{\gamma+1}} \log \frac{u_n^{3\gamma+1}}{C} \]
that is
\[
\frac{u_n^{3\gamma+1}}{C^{\gamma+1}} \leq 5^{-2} \frac{u_n^{2(3\gamma+1)}}{C^4} \]
for \( n \) big enough, which cannot happen.

**Case 3:** \( \gamma = \frac{4}{3} \)

We would have
\[
\gamma A_n - B_n \leq \log \left( u_n^{2(3\gamma+1)} \right) \]
Again, let us show that this is not bounded from below. If this was the case we should have
\[
e^C \leq u_n^4 \]
which cannot happen.

**Case 4:** \( 3\gamma - 1 < 0 \) and \( 3\gamma + 1 > 0 \)

We would have
\[
\gamma A_n - B_n \leq \log \left( \frac{u_n^{4(\gamma+1)} u_n^{2(\gamma-1)}}{(\phi_1^{-1}(u_n^3))^{3\gamma-1}} \right) \]
The right side is bounded from below if and only if there is \( C > 0 \) such that
\[
u_n^4 \geq \phi^3 \left( \frac{u_n^{2(3\gamma+1)}}{C} \right) \]
The right side goes to infinity, while the left one goes to zero.

**Case 5:** \( \gamma = -\frac{1}{3} \)

We have
\[
\gamma A_n - B_n \leq \log \left( \frac{u_n^{4(\gamma+1)} u_n^{2(\gamma-1)}}{(\phi_1^{-1}(u_n^3))^{3\gamma-1}} \right) \]
The right side is bounded from below if and only if, for some constant \( C \),
\[
u_n^4 \geq \phi^3 \left( \frac{1}{C} \right) \]
which cannot be true.

**Case 6:** \( \gamma < -\frac{1}{3} \)

We have
\[
\gamma A_n - B_n \leq \log \left( \frac{u_n^{4(\gamma+1)} u_n^{2(\gamma-1)}}{(\phi_1^{-1}(u_n^3))^{3\gamma-1}} \right) \]
The right side is bounded from below if and only if for some \( C > 0 \) we have
\[
u_n^4 \geq \phi^3 \left( \frac{u_n^{2(3\gamma+1)}}{C} \right) \]
For \( n \) big enough this is the same as
\[
\frac{u_n^{3\gamma+1}}{C^{\gamma+1}} \geq 5^{-2} \frac{1}{C^2} \log \frac{u_n^{2(3\gamma+1)}}{C^4} \]
The left side goes to 0, while the right one goes to infinity.

Case 7: $\gamma - 1 > 0$

Let $r_n = \frac{u_n^4}{100}$. Then

$$\gamma A_n - B_n \leq \log \left( \frac{u_n^{4(\gamma+1)} u_n^{2(\gamma-1)}}{100^{\gamma+1} (\log^{(\gamma+1)}(\frac{u_n^4}{100}))^{3(\gamma-1)}} \right)$$

The right side is bounded from below if and only if for some $C > 0$ we have

$$\frac{u_n^4}{100} \leq \frac{\phi_1 \left( \frac{u_n^{2(\gamma+1)}}{C} \right)}{(\log^{(\gamma+1)}(\frac{u_n^4}{100}))^{3(\gamma-1)}}$$

For $n$ big enough this is the same as

$$\frac{u_n^{4 - \frac{8}{\gamma+1}}}{100} \leq 5^{-2} \frac{1}{C^2} \left| \log \frac{u_n^{\gamma+1}}{C} \right|^{4}$$

which cannot happen for $n$ big enough.

From all this we get the desired result:

**Theorem 5.5.** Let $A_0 = \{e^{it} : 0 \leq t < \frac{2\pi}{3}\}$, $A_1 = \{e^{it} : \frac{2\pi}{3} \leq t < \frac{4\pi}{3}\}$ and $A_2 = \{e^{it} : \frac{4\pi}{3} \leq t < 2\pi\}$. Let $H = \{X_w\}_{w \in T}$, with $X_w = \ell_{\phi}$ for $w \in A_j$, where

$$\phi^0(t) = t$$

$$\phi^1(t) = 5^{-2}t^2 \|\log(t)\|^4$$

$$\phi^2(t) = 5^{-2}e^{-2+2\sqrt{1-t}}(2t+2\sqrt{1-t}-2)^2$$

(the definitions of $\phi^1$ and $\phi^2$ are on a neighborhood of 0). Then $H$ is a strongly admissible family, $X_0 = \ell_2$ with equivalence of norms, and $\Omega_0$ is not projectively equivalent to any centralizer obtained from complex interpolation of couples of K"othe spaces.

6. Final remarks

The most general form of equivalence for centralizers is the following:

**Definition 6.1.** Two centralizer $\Omega$ and $\Psi$ on $X$ are said isomorphically equivalent if there are automorphisms $R, S$ of $X$ such that $R\Omega$ is equivalent to $\Psi S$. This is the same as the existence of a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & d\Omega X & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow R & & \downarrow T & & \downarrow S & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & d\Psi X & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

where $T$ is an isomorphism.

The methods of this paper do not seem suited to the solution of the following problem:

**Problem 6.2.** Is every centralizer on $\ell_2$ isomorphically equivalent to a real centralizer?
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