

THE ORLICZ INEQUALITY FOR MULTILINEAR FORMS

DANIEL NÚÑEZ-ALARCÓN, DANIEL PELLEGRINO, AND DIANA SERRANO-RODRÍGUEZ

ABSTRACT. The Orlicz (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -mixed inequality states that

$$\left(\sum_{j_1=1}^n \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^n |A(e_{j_1}, e_{j_2})| \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{2} \|A\|$$

for all bilinear forms $A : \mathbb{K}^n \times \mathbb{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ and all positive integers n , where \mathbb{K}^n denotes \mathbb{R}^n or \mathbb{C}^n endowed with the supremum norm. In this paper we extend this inequality to multilinear forms, with \mathbb{K}^n endowed with ℓ_p norms for all $p \in [1, \infty]$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The origins of the theory of summability of multilinear forms and absolutely summing multilinear operators are probably associated to Orlicz (ℓ_2, ℓ_1) -mixed inequality published in the 1930's (see [8, page 24]). It states that

$$\left(\sum_{j_1=1}^n \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^n |A(e_{j_1}, e_{j_2})| \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{2} \|A\|$$

for all bilinear forms $A : \mathbb{K}^n \times \mathbb{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, and all positive integers n . Here and henceforth $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{K}^n is endowed with the supremum norm. We also represent by e_k the canonical vectors in a sequence space and

$$\|A\| := \sup \{ |A(x, y)| : \|x\| \leq 1 \text{ and } \|y\| \leq 1 \}.$$

An equivalent formulation is the following:

$$(1) \quad \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} |A(e_{j_1}, e_{j_2})| \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{2} \|A\|$$

for all continuous bilinear forms $A : c_0 \times c_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. The exponents in (1) are optimal in the sense that, fixing the exponent 1, the exponent 2 cannot be replaced by smaller exponents (nor the exponent 1 can be replaced by smaller exponents) keeping the constant independent of n . The Orlicz inequality is closely related to Littlewood's (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) -mixed inequality (see [8, page 23]), which asserts that

$$\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} |A(e_{j_1}, e_{j_2})|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{2} \|A\|$$

for all continuous bilinear forms $A : c_0 \times c_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. Again, the exponents are optimal in the same sense above described. Combining these two inequalities, and using the Hölder inequality for mixed sums we recover Littlewood's $4/3$ inequality:

$$\left(\sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^{\infty} |A(e_{j_1}, e_{j_2})|^{\frac{4}{3}} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \leq \sqrt{2} \|A\|$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47A63; 47A07 .

Key words and phrases. Multilinear forms; sequence spaces.

D. Pellegrino is supported by CNPq Grant 307327/2017-5 and Grant 2019/0014 Paraíba State Research Foundation (FAPESQ) .

for all continuous bilinear forms $A : c_0 \times c_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. For recent results on absolutely summing linear and multilinear operators we refer the interested reader to [6, 11, 17] and the references therein.

The exponent $4/3$ from the previous inequality cannot be replaced by smaller exponents keeping the constant independent of n . The constant $\sqrt{2}$ is optimal (in all the three inequalities) when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, but the optimal constants when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ are unknown.

In 1934 Hardy and Littlewood [10] (see also [13]) pushed the subject further, extending the above results to bilinear forms defined on ℓ_p spaces (when $p = \infty$ we consider c_0 instead of ℓ_∞). The investigation of extensions of the Hardy–Littlewood inequalities to multilinear forms were initiated by Praciano-Pereira [16] in 1981 and intensively investigated since then (see, for instance, [1, 2, 5, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15]), but there are still several open problems regarding the optimal exponents and optimal constants involved.

For the sake of simplicity, we shall use the same notation from [1]:

$$X_p := \begin{cases} \ell_p, & \text{if } p \in [1, \infty) \\ c_0, & \text{if } p = \infty \end{cases}$$

and, when $q = \infty$, the sum $\left(\sum_j \|x_j\|^q\right)^{1/q}$ shall represent the supremum of $\|x_j\|$. We also assume that $1/0 = \infty$ and $1/\infty = 0$ and denote the conjugate index of s by s^* , i.e., $1/s + 1/s^* = 1$. One of the main goals of this line of research is to find the optimal values of the exponents s_1, \dots, s_m and of the constants $C_{s_1, \dots, s_m}^{(\mathbb{K}) p_1, \dots, p_m}$ satisfying

$$\left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \dots \left(\sum_{j_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} |A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})|^{s_m} \right)^{\frac{s_{m-1}}{s_m-1}} \right)^{\frac{s_{m-2}}{s_{m-1}-1}} \dots \right)^{\frac{1}{s_1}} \leq C_{s_1, \dots, s_m}^{(\mathbb{K}) p_1, \dots, p_m} \|A\|$$

for all continuous m -linear forms $A : X_{p_1} \times \dots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. The answer is known in several cases (see [1, 5, 18] and the references therein), but a complete solution is still unknown. In this note we shall be interested in investigating the optimal exponents s_1, \dots, s_m . It is simple to prove that the optimal exponent s_m associated to the sum $\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty}$ is p_m^* . Our main result provides the optimal exponents s_1, \dots, s_{m-1} in the case that $s_m = p_m^*$.

From now on, let $r \geq 2$, and let $s_1, \dots, s_m \in [1, \infty]$. Let us define δ^{s_k, \dots, s_m} and $\lambda_r^{s_k, \dots, s_m}$ by

$$\delta^{s_k, \dots, s_m} := \frac{1}{\max \left\{ 1 - \left(\frac{1}{s_k} + \dots + \frac{1}{s_m} \right), 0 \right\}},$$

and

$$\lambda_r^{s_k, \dots, s_m} := \frac{1}{\max \left\{ \frac{1}{r} - \left(\frac{1}{s_k} + \dots + \frac{1}{s_m} \right), 0 \right\}},$$

for all positive integers m and $k = 1, \dots, m$. Note that when $1/s_k + \dots + 1/s_m \geq 1$ we have

$$\delta^{s_k, \dots, s_m} = \infty$$

and, also, when $1/s_k + \dots + 1/s_m \geq \frac{1}{r}$ we have

$$\lambda_r^{s_k, \dots, s_m} = \infty.$$

Our main result is, in some sense, a generalization of the Orlicz inequality. In fact, if we consider the very particular case $(m, p_1, p_2) = (2, \infty, \infty)$ and σ as the identity map in its statement, we recover the Orlicz inequality:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $m \geq 2$ be an integer and $\sigma : \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m\}$ be a bijection. If*

$$\begin{aligned} (q_1, \dots, q_{m-1}) &\in (0, \infty]^{m-1}, \\ (p_1, \dots, p_m) &\in [1, \infty]^m, \end{aligned}$$

the following assertions are equivalent:

(1) There is a constant $C_{p_1, \dots, p_m} \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{j_{\sigma(1)}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_{\sigma(2)}=1}^{\infty} \cdots \left(\sum_{j_{\sigma(m)}=1}^{\infty} |A(e_{j_{\sigma(1)}}, \dots, e_{j_{\sigma(m)}})|^{p_{\sigma(m)}^*} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{p_{\sigma(m)}^*}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m} \|A\|$$

for all continuous m -linear forms $A : X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$.

(2) The exponents q_1, \dots, q_{m-1} satisfy

$$q_1 \geq \delta^{p_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, p_{\sigma(m-1)}, \mu}, q_2 \geq \delta^{p_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, p_{\sigma(m-1)}, \mu}, \dots, q_{m-1} \geq \delta^{p_{\sigma(m-1)}, \mu},$$

where $\mu = \min\{p_{\sigma(m)}, 2\}$.

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Let $2 \leq q < \infty$ and $0 < s < \infty$. Recall that a Banach space X has cotype q if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that, no matter how we select finitely many vectors $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$,

$$(2) \quad \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|x_j\|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq C \left(\int_{[0,1]} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n r_j(t) x_j \right\|^2 dt \right)^{1/2},$$

where r_j denotes the j -th Rademacher function. The infimum of the cotypes of X is denoted by $\cot X$.

The following result was proved in [5]:

Theorem 2.1. (see [5]) Let $(q_1, \dots, q_m) \in (0, \infty)^m$, and Y be an infinite-dimensional Banach space with cotype $\cot Y$. If

$$(3) \quad \frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m} < \frac{1}{\cot Y},$$

then the following assertions are equivalent:

(a) There is a constant $C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \cdots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \|A\|$$

for all continuous m -linear operators $A : X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow Y$.

(b) The exponents q_1, \dots, q_m satisfy

$$q_1 \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_1, \dots, p_m}, q_2 \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_2, \dots, p_m}, \dots, q_{m-1} \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{m-1}, p_m}, q_m \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}.$$

We need the following extension of the previous theorem, relaxing the hypothesis (3). Besides, below we have $(q_1, \dots, q_m) \in (0, \infty]^m$ while in Theorem 2.1 we have $(q_1, \dots, q_m) \in (0, \infty)^m$.

Theorem 2.2. Let $(q_1, \dots, q_m) \in (0, \infty]^m$, $(p_1, \dots, p_m) \in [1, \infty]^m$ and Y be an infinite-dimensional Banach space with cotype $\cot Y$. The following assertions are equivalent:

(a) There is a constant $C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \geq 1$ such that

$$(4) \quad \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \cdots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \|A\|$$

for all continuous m -linear operators $A : X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow Y$.

(b) The exponents q_1, \dots, q_m satisfy

$$q_1 \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_1, \dots, p_m}, q_2 \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_2, \dots, p_m}, \dots, q_{m-1} \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{m-1}, p_m}, q_m \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}.$$

Proof. We begin by proving the direct implication. We just need to consider the case

$$(5) \quad \frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m} \geq \frac{1}{\cot Y},$$

since the other case is covered by Theorem 2.1. By the Maurey–Pisier factorization result (see [9, pages 286, 287]), the Banach space Y finitely factors the formal inclusion $\ell_{\cot Y} \hookrightarrow \ell_\infty$, i.e., there are universal constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that, for all n , there are vectors $z_1, \dots, z_n \in Y$ satisfying

$$(6) \quad C_1 \left\| (a_j)_{j=1}^n \right\|_\infty \leq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n a_j z_j \right\| \leq C_2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |a_j|^{\cot Y} \right)^{1/\cot Y},$$

for all sequences of scalars $(a_j)_{j=1}^n$. Consider the continuous m -linear operator $A_n: X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow Y$ given by

$$(7) \quad A_n(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)}) = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^{(1)} x_j^{(2)} \cdots x_j^{(m)} z_j.$$

By (6) and the Hölder inequality we have

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|A_n\| &= \sup_{\|x^{(1)}\|_{p_1} \leq 1, \dots, \|x^{(m)}\|_{p_m} \leq 1} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^{(1)} \cdots x_j^{(m)} z_j \right\| \\ &\leq \sup_{\|x^{(1)}\|_{p_1} \leq 1, \dots, \|x^{(m)}\|_{p_m} \leq 1} C_2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |x_j^{(1)} \cdots x_j^{(m)}|^{\cot Y} \right)^{1/\cot Y} \\ &\leq \sup_{\|x^{(1)}\|_{p_1} \leq 1, \dots, \|x^{(m)}\|_{p_m} \leq 1} C_2 \left(\prod_{k=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |x_j^{(k)}|^{p_k} \right)^{1/p_k} \right) \\ &= C_2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by (7), we have

$$\left(\sum_{j_1=1}^n \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^n \cdots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^n \|A_n(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|z_j\|^{q_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}}.$$

Thus, by (6) we conclude that

$$\left(\sum_{j_1=1}^n \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^n \cdots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^n \|A_n(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \geq C_1 n^{\frac{1}{q_1}}.$$

Combining the previous inequality with (4) and (8) we conclude that

$$C_1 n^{1/q_1} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y C_2.$$

Thus, since n is arbitrary, we have

$$(9) \quad q_1 = \infty = \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_1, \dots, p_m}.$$

If

$$\frac{1}{p_i} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m} \geq \frac{1}{\cot Y}$$

for all i , the proof is immediate. Otherwise, let $i_0 \in \{2, 3, \dots, m\}$ be the smallest index such that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{p_{i_0}} + \dots + \frac{1}{p_m} < \frac{1}{\cot Y}, \\ \frac{1}{p_{i_0-1}} + \dots + \frac{1}{p_m} \geq \frac{1}{\cot Y}. \end{cases}$$

If $i_0 = 2$, note that by (9) we have

$$(10) \quad \sup_{j_1} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\dots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_m-1}{q_m}} \dots \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_2}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \|A\|$$

for all continuous m -linear operators $A : X_{p_1} \times \dots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow Y$. From (10) it is simple to show that

$$\left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \left(\dots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_2}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_m-1}{q_m}} \dots \right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_2}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \|A\|,$$

for all continuous $(m-1)$ -linear operators $A : X_{p_2} \times \dots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow Y$. Since

$$\frac{1}{p_2} + \dots + \frac{1}{p_m} < \frac{1}{\cot Y},$$

by Theorem 2.1 we conclude that

$$q_2 \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_2, \dots, p_m}, q_3 \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_3, \dots, p_m}, \dots, q_{m-1} \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{m-1}, p_m}, q_m \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}.$$

If $i_0 = 3$, we consider

$$A(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)}) = x_1^{(1)} \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^{(2)} \dots x_j^{(m)} z_j$$

and we can imitate the previous arguments to conclude that

$$q_2 = \infty = \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_2, \dots, p_m}.$$

and hence

$$(11) \quad \sup_{j_1, j_2} \left(\sum_{j_3=1}^{\infty} \left(\dots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_m-1}{q_m}} \dots \right)^{\frac{q_3}{q_4}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_3}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \|A\|,$$

for all continuous m -linear operators $A : X_{p_1} \times \dots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow Y$. Again, it is plain that

$$\left(\sum_{j_3=1}^{\infty} \left(\dots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_3}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_m-1}{q_m}} \dots \right)^{\frac{q_{i_0}+1}{q_{i_0}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_{i_0}}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \|A\|,$$

for all continuous $(m-2)$ -linear operators $A : X_{p_3} \times \dots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow Y$. Since

$$\frac{1}{p_3} + \dots + \frac{1}{p_m} < \frac{1}{\cot Y},$$

by Theorem 2.1 we have

$$q_3 \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_3, \dots, p_m}, q_4 \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_4, \dots, p_m}, \dots, q_{m-1} \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{m-1}, p_m}, q_m \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}.$$

We conclude the proof in a similar fashion for $i_0 = 4, \dots, m$.

Now we prove the reverse implication. The case

$$\frac{1}{p_1} + \dots + \frac{1}{p_m} < \frac{1}{\cot Y}$$

is encompassed by Theorem 2.1. So, we shall consider

$$\frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m} \geq \frac{1}{\cot Y}.$$

If

$$\frac{1}{p_i} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m} \geq \frac{1}{\cot Y}$$

for all i , the proof is immediate. Otherwise, let $i_0 \in \{2, \dots, m\}$ be the smallest index such that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{p_{i_0}} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m} < \frac{1}{\cot Y}, \\ \frac{1}{p_{i_0-1}} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m} \geq \frac{1}{\cot Y}. \end{cases}$$

We need to prove that there is a constant $C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \geq 1$, such that

$$\sup_{j_1, \dots, j_{i_0-1}} \left(\sum_{j_{i_0}=1}^{\infty} \left(\cdots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_{i_0}}{q_{i_0+1}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_{i_0}}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \|A\|$$

for

$$q_{i_0} \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{i_0}, \dots, p_m}, \dots, q_m \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}.$$

By Theorem 2.1, we know that for any fixed vectors $e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_{i_0-1}}$, there is a constant $C_{p_{i_0}, \dots, p_m}^Y \geq 1$, such that

$$\left(\sum_{j_{i_0}=1}^{\infty} \left(\cdots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}} \right)^{\frac{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{m-1}, p_m}}{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{i_0}, \dots, p_m}}{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{i_0+1}, \dots, p_m}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{i_0}, \dots, p_m}}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \|A\|$$

for all continuous m -linear operators $A: X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow Y$. Then,

$$\sup_{j_1, \dots, j_{i_0-1}} \left(\sum_{j_{i_0}=1}^{\infty} \left(\cdots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}} \right)^{\frac{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{m-1}, p_m}}{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{i_0}, \dots, p_m}}{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{i_0+1}, \dots, p_m}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{i_0}, \dots, p_m}}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m}^Y \|A\|$$

for all continuous m -linear operators $A: X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow Y$.

To conclude the proof we just need to remark that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{j_1, \dots, j_{i_0-1}} \left(\sum_{j_{i_0}=1}^{\infty} \left(\cdots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{q_m} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_{i_0}}{q_{i_0+1}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_{i_0}}} \\ & \leq \sup_{j_1, \dots, j_{i_0-1}} \left(\sum_{j_{i_0}=1}^{\infty} \left(\cdots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})\|^{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}} \right)^{\frac{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{m-1}, p_m}}{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{i_0}, \dots, p_m}}{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{i_0+1}, \dots, p_m}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{i_0}, \dots, p_m}}} \end{aligned}$$

provided

$$q_{i_0} \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_{i_0}, \dots, p_m}, \dots, q_m \geq \lambda_{\cot Y}^{p_m}.$$

□

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Throughout this proof the adjoint of a Banach space X will be denoted by X^* . To simplify the notation we will consider $\sigma(j) = j$ for all j ; the other cases are similar. Let $\mathcal{L}^m(X_{p_1}, \dots, X_{p_m}; Y)$ denote the space of all continuous m -linear operators from $X_{p_1} \times \dots \times X_{p_m}$ to Y . By the canonical isometric isomorphism

$$\Psi : \mathcal{L}^m(X_{p_1}, \dots, X_{p_m}; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^{m-1}(X_{p_1}, \dots, X_{p_{m-1}}; (X_{p_m})^*)$$

and duality in X_{p_m} , note that, if $R \in \mathcal{L}^m(X_{p_1}, \dots, X_{p_m}; \mathbb{K})$, we have

$$(12) \quad R(x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}, e_n) = \Psi(R)(x_1, \dots, x_{m-1})(e_n) = (\Psi(R)(x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}))_n.$$

We start off by proving (1) \Rightarrow (2). Let us suppose that there is a constant $C_{p_1, \dots, p_m} \geq 1$ such that

$$(13) \quad \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \dots \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})|^{p_m^*} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{p_m}} \dots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m} \|T\|$$

for all continuous m -linear forms $T : X_{p_1} \times \dots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$.

Consider a continuous $(m-1)$ -linear operator $A : X_{p_1} \times \dots \times X_{p_{m-1}} \rightarrow (X_{p_m})^*$. Then, using our hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (14) \quad & \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \dots \left(\sum_{j_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \|A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_{m-1}})\|_{(X_{p_m})^*}^{q_{m-1}} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-2}}{q_{m-1}}} \dots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \\ &= \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \dots \left(\sum_{j_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} |(A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_{m-1}}))_{j_m}|^{p_m^*} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{p_m}} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-2}}{q_{m-1}}} \dots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \\ &\stackrel{(12)}{=} \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \dots \left(\sum_{j_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} |\Psi^{-1}(A)(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})|^{p_m^*} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{p_m}} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-2}}{q_{m-1}}} \dots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \\ &\leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m} \|\Psi^{-1}(A)\| \\ &\leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_m} \|A\| \end{aligned}$$

for all continuous $(m-1)$ -linear operators $A : X_{p_1} \times \dots \times X_{p_{m-1}} \rightarrow (X_{p_m})^*$. Since $(X_{p_m})^*$ has cotype $\max\{p_m^*, 2\}$, by Theorem 2.2, the exponents q_1, \dots, q_{m-1} in (2.2) satisfy

$$(15) \quad q_1 \geq \lambda_{\max\{p_m^*, 2\}}^{p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}}, q_2 \geq \lambda_{\max\{p_m^*, 2\}}^{p_2, \dots, p_{m-1}}, \dots, q_{m-1} \geq \lambda_{\max\{p_m^*, 2\}}^{p_{m-1}}.$$

Since

$$1 - \frac{1}{\max\{p_m^*, 2\}} = \frac{1}{\mu}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{\max\{p_m^*, 2\}}^{p_i, \dots, p_{m-1}} &= \frac{1}{\max\left\{\frac{1}{\max\{p_m^*, 2\}} - \left(\frac{1}{p_i} + \dots + \frac{1}{p_{m-1}}\right), 0\right\}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\max\left\{1 - \left(\frac{1}{p_i} + \dots + \frac{1}{p_{m-1}} + \frac{1}{\mu}\right), 0\right\}} \\ &= \delta^{p_i, \dots, p_{m-1}, \mu}\end{aligned}$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$. Then, (15) can be re-stated as

$$q_1 \geq \delta^{p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}, \mu}, q_2 \geq \delta^{p_2, \dots, p_{m-1}, \mu}, \dots, q_{m-1} \geq \delta^{p_{m-1}, \mu}$$

and the proof is done.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). If the exponents q_1, \dots, q_{m-1} satisfy

$$q_1 \geq \delta^{p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}, \mu}, q_2 \geq \delta^{p_2, \dots, p_{m-1}, \mu}, \dots, q_{m-1} \geq \delta^{p_{m-1}, \mu},$$

we have, again, that the exponents q_1, \dots, q_{m-1} satisfy

$$q_1 \geq \lambda_r^{p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}}, q_2 \geq \lambda_r^{p_2, \dots, p_{m-1}}, \dots, q_{m-1} \geq \lambda_r^{p_{m-1}},$$

with $r = \cot(X_{p_m})^*$. Thus, by Theorem 2.2, there is a constant $C_{p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}}^{(X_{p_m})^*} \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \dots \left(\sum_{j_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \|T(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_{m-1}})\|_{(X_{p_m})^*}^{q_{m-1}} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-2}}{q_{m-1}}} \dots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}}^{(X_{p_m})^*} \|T\|$$

for all continuous m -linear operators $T : X_{p_1} \times \dots \times X_{p_{m-1}} \rightarrow (X_{p_m})^*$.

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}& \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \dots \left(\sum_{j_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_m=1}^{\infty} |A(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_m})|_{p_m^*}^{p_m^*} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{p_m^*}} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-2}}{q_{m-1}}} \dots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \\ &= \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \dots \left(\sum_{j_{m-1}=1}^{\infty} \|\Psi(A)(e_{j_1}, \dots, e_{j_{m-1}})\|_{(X_{p_m})^*}^{q_{m-1}} \right)^{\frac{q_{m-2}}{q_{m-1}}} \dots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \\ &\leq C_{p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}}^{(X_{p_m})^*} \|\Psi(A)\| \\ &= C_{p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}}^{(X_{p_m})^*} \|A\|\end{aligned}$$

for all continuous m -linear forms $A : X_{p_1} \times \dots \times X_{p_m} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$.

Remark 3.1. The determination of the exact values of the constants involved in our main theorem is probably a difficult task, as it happens with the Hardy–Littlewood inequalities (see [3, 4] and the references therein). However when we are restricted to the bilinear case, with $p_1 = p_2 = \infty$ and σ as the identity map, it is not difficult to check that we recover the constant $\sqrt{2}$ from the Orlicz inequality.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Albuquerque, F. Bayart, D. Pellegrino, J. B. Seoane-Sepúlveda, Optimal Hardy-Littlewood type inequalities for polynomials and multilinear operators, *Israel J. Math.* **211** (2016), 197–220.
- [2] N. Albuquerque, L. Rezende, Anisotropic regularity principle in sequence spaces and applications. *Comm. Contemp. Math.* **20** (2018), no. 7, 1750087, 14pp.
- [3] G. Araújo, K. Câmara, Universal bounds for the Hardy-Littlewood inequalities on multilinear forms. *Results Math.* **73** (2018), no. 3, Paper No. 124, 10 pp.
- [4] G. Araújo, D. Pellegrino, D. Diniz P. da Silva e Silva, On the upper bounds for the constants of the Hardy-Littlewood inequality. *J. Funct. Anal.* **267** (2014), no. 6, 1878–1888.
- [5] R. Aron, D. Núñez-Alarcón, D. Pellegrino and D. M. Serrano-Rodríguez, Optimal exponents for Hardy-Littlewood inequalities for m -linear operators, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **531** (2017), 399–422.
- [6] F. Bayart, Multiple summing maps: coordinatewise summability, inclusion theorems and p -Sidon sets. *J. Funct. Anal.* **274** (2018), no. 4, 1129–1154.
- [7] O. Blasco, G. Botelho, D. Pellegrino, P. Rueda, Summability of multilinear mappings: Littlewood, Orlicz and beyond. *Monatsh. Math.* **163** (2011), no. 2, 131–147.
- [8] R. Blei, *Analysis in Integer and Fractional Dimensions*, Cambridge Studies in Advances Mathematics. **71** Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [9] J. Diestel, H. Jarchow, A. Tonge, *Absolutely summing operators*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [10] G. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, Bilinear forms bounded in space $[p, q]$, *Quart. J. Math.* **5** (1934), 241–254.
- [11] M. Mastyło, An operator ideal generated by Orlicz spaces. *Math. Ann.* **376** (2020), no. 3-4, 1675–1703.
- [12] M. Mastyło, P. Młeczko, Norm estimates for matrix operators between Banach spaces. *Linear Algebra Appl.* **438** (2013), no. 3, 986–1001.
- [13] B. Osikiewicz, A. Tonge, An interpolation approach to Hardy-Littlewood inequalities for norms of operators on sequence spaces, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **331** (2001), 1–9.
- [14] D. Paulino, Critical Hardy-Littlewood inequality for multilinear forms. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo, II. Ser* (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12215-019-00409-0>.
- [15] D. Pellegrino, J. Santos, D. M. Serrano-Rodríguez, E. V. Teixeira, Regularity Principle in Sequence Spaces and Applications. *Bull. Sci. Math.* **141** (2017), 802–837.
- [16] T. Praciano-Pereira, On bounded multilinear forms on a class of ℓ_p spaces. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **81** (1981), 561–568.
- [17] P. Rueda, E. A. Sánchez-Pérez, A. Tallab, Traced tensor norms and multiple summing multilinear operators. *Linear Multilinear Algebra* **65** (2017), no. 4, 768–786.
- [18] J. Santos, T. Velanga, On the Bohnenblust-Hille inequality for multilinear forms. *Results Math.* **72** (2017), no. 1-2, 239–244.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE COLOMBIA, 111321 - BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA
E-mail address: `dnuneza@unal.edu.co`

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DA PARAÍBA, 58.051-900 - JOÃO PESSOA, BRAZIL.
E-mail address: `daniel.pellegrino@academico.ufpb.br`

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE COLOMBIA, 111321 - BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA
E-mail address: `diserranor@unal.edu.co`