

PERFORMANCE OF THE THRESHOLDING GREEDY ALGORITHM WITH LARGER GREEDY SUMS

HÙNG VIỆT CHU

ABSTRACT. The goal of this note is to study the performance of the Thresholding Greedy Algorithm (TGA) when we increase the size of greedy sums by a constant factor $\lambda \geq 1$. We introduce the so-called $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ bases. While the case $\lambda = 1$ gives strong partially greedy bases, we show that, for each $\lambda > 1$, there exists a (Schauder) basis that is $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ but is not strong partially greedy. Furthermore, we investigate and give examples when a basis is

- (1) not 1-(almost) greedy but the TGA still gives the smallest error from an m -term approximation if we allow greedy sums to be of size $\lceil \lambda m \rceil$, and
 - (2) not 1-strong partially greedy but $1-(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ for some $\lambda > 1$.
- Finally, we prove various equivalences for different greedy-type bases.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	5
3. Characterization of $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ bases	8
4. Characterizations of strong partially greedy bases	13
5. Characterizations of $(\lambda, \text{almost greedy})$ bases	14
6. Characterizations of $(\lambda, \text{reverse partially greedy})$ bases	17
7. Future research	18
8. Appendix	18
References	20

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Setup and terminology. Let $(\mathbb{X}, \|\cdot\|)$ be an infinite-dimensional Banach space over $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} with dual $(\mathbb{X}^*, \|\cdot\|_*)$. Let $\mathcal{B} = (e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a countable collection of vectors in \mathbb{X} such that

- (1) There exists a unique collection of biorthogonal functionals $(e_n^*)_{n=1}^\infty$ satisfying $e_i^*(e_j) = \delta_{i,j}$.
- (2) $0 < \inf_n \{\|e_n\|, \|e_n^*\|\} \leq \sup_n \{\|e_n\|, \|e_n^*\|\} < \infty$.
- (3) $\mathbb{X} = \overline{\text{span}\{e_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}}$.
- (4) $\mathbb{X}^* = \overline{\text{span}\{e_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N}\}}^{w^*}$.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 41A65; 46B15.

Key words and phrases. Greedy, almost greedy, partially greedy, reverse partially greedy bases, characterizations.

The author is thankful to Timur Oikhberg for helpful feedback on earlier drafts of this paper.

Then \mathcal{B} is called a *semi-normalized Markushevich basis* (or M-basis or basis, for short). With respect to an M-basis \mathcal{B} , every $x \in \mathbb{X}$ is uniquely associated with the formal sum $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e_n^*(x)e_n$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_n^*(x) = 0$. We set $\text{supp}(x) := \{n : e_n^*(x) \neq 0\}$, $\mathbb{X}_c = \{x \in \mathbb{X} : |\text{supp}(x)| < \infty\}$, and $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For each finite set $A \subset \mathbb{N}$, we let $P_A(x) = \sum_{n \in A} e_n^*(x)e_n$ and $P_{A^c}(x) = x - P_A(x)$.

We wish to approximate each vector $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with a finite linear combination from the M-basis \mathcal{B} . A natural algorithm is the Thresholding Greedy Algorithm (TGA), which we now describe. Consider $x \sim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e_n^*(x)e_n$. A finite set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{N}$ is called a *greedy set* of x if $\min_{n \in \Lambda} |e_n^*(x)| \geq \max_{n \notin \Lambda} |e_n^*(x)|$. For $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let

$$\mathcal{G}(x, m) := \{\Lambda \subset \mathbb{N} : \Lambda \text{ is a greedy set of } x \text{ and } |\Lambda| = m\}.$$

A *greedy operator* of order m , denoted by G_m , satisfies the following: for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$,

$$G_m(x) := \sum_{n \in \Lambda_x} e_n^*(x)e_n, \text{ for some } \Lambda_x \in \mathcal{G}(x, m).$$

We capture the error term from the greedy algorithm by

$$\gamma_m(x) := \sup \{\|x - P_{\Lambda}(x)\| : \Lambda \in \mathcal{G}(x, m)\},$$

and measure the efficiency of the TGA by comparing $\gamma_m(x)$ to the smallest possible error of an arbitrary m -term approximation

$$\sigma_m(x) := \inf \left\{ \left\| x - \sum_{n \in A} a_n e_n \right\| : A \subset \mathbb{N}, |A| \leq m, (a_n) \subset \mathbb{K} \right\}.$$

We also compare $\gamma_m(x)$ to the smallest projection error

$$\tilde{\sigma}_m(x) := \inf \{\|x - P_A(x)\| : A \subset \mathbb{N}, |A| = m\}.$$

More restrictively, we compare $\gamma_m(x)$ to the smallest partial sum error

$$\hat{\sigma}_m(x) := \inf \{\|x - S_n(x)\| : 0 \leq n \leq m\},$$

where $S_n(x) := \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^*(x)e_i$.

From now, we let $\lambda \in [1, \infty)$ and

$$1_A := \sum_{n \in A} e_n \text{ and } 1_{\varepsilon A} := \sum_{n \in A} \varepsilon_n e_n,$$

where $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{K}$ with $|\varepsilon_n| = 1$. For $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $\|x\|_{\infty} := \max_n |e_n^*(x)|$, and we write $A \sqcup B \sqcup x$ to indicate that A , B , and $\text{supp}(x)$ are pairwise disjoint. Given two sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$, we write $A < B$ if $\max A < \min B$.

Definition 1.1. An M-basis \mathcal{B} is said to be

- (1) *unconditional* if there exists $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq C\|x\|, \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall A \subset \mathbb{N}.$$

In this case, we say that \mathcal{B} is C -suppression unconditional. The least such C is denoted by \mathbf{K}_s .

(2) *quasi-greedy*¹ if there exists $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\gamma_m(x) \leq C\|x\|, \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (1.1)$$

In this case, we say that \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy or particularly, C -suppression quasi-greedy. The least such C is denoted by C_ℓ .

(3) *greedy* if there exists $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\gamma_m(x) \leq C\sigma_m(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (1.2)$$

In this case, we say that \mathcal{B} is C -greedy. The least such C is denoted by C_g .

(4) *almost greedy* if there exists $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\gamma_m(x) \leq C\tilde{\sigma}_m(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (1.3)$$

We then say that \mathcal{B} is C -almost greedy. The least such C is denoted by C_a .

(5) *strong partially greedy* if there exists $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\gamma_m(x) \leq C\hat{\sigma}_m(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (1.4)$$

We then say that \mathcal{B} is C -strong partially greedy. The least such C is denoted by C_p . The word "strong" in "strong partially greedy" is to indicate the difference from the definition of partially greedy bases given in [10]. See also [6, Remark 3.5].

(6) *C -democratic* if

$$\|1_A\| \leq C\|1_B\|, \quad (1.5)$$

for all finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|A| = |B|$. The smallest C verifying (1.5) is denoted by C_d .

1.2. Larger greedy sums and $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ bases. Dilworth, Kalton, Kutzarova, and Temlyakov [10] introduced the following condition: for some $C \geq 1$,

$$\gamma_{\lceil \lambda m \rceil}(x) \leq C\sigma_m(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (1.6)$$

and showed that (1.6) is equivalent to (1.3) (with a possibly different constant C .) In other words, enlarging greedy sums by a factor $\lambda > 1$ in (1.2) brings us to a strictly larger class of bases (namely, almost greedy bases) than the realm of greedy bases. In the same spirit, we consider the following conditions and investigate whether we have a nontrivial extension of known greedy-type bases.

$$\text{There exists } C \geq 1 \text{ such that } \gamma_{\lceil \lambda m \rceil}(x) \leq C\tilde{\sigma}_m(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (1.7)$$

$$\text{There exists } C \geq 1 \text{ such that } \gamma_{\lceil \lambda m \rceil}(x) \leq C\hat{\sigma}_m(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (1.8)$$

Definition 1.2. An M-basis \mathcal{B} is said to be C - $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ if \mathcal{B} satisfies (1.8). The least constant C is denoted by $C_{\lambda,p}$.

One main goal of this note is to characterize $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ bases and prove that (1.8) is strictly weaker than (1.4) when $\lambda > 1$. To do this, we need the notion of (λ, PSLC) , where PSLC stands for "partially symmetric for largest coefficients."

¹Wojtaszczyk [14] claimed that $\sup_m \|G_m\| < \infty$ is equivalent to the convergence of greedy algorithms $(G_m(x))_{m=1}^\infty$ to x for each $x \in \mathbb{X}$. Such an equivalence holds if and only if our M-basis is strong (see [3, Remark 6.2].)

Definition 1.3. An M -basis is C - (λ, PSLC) if

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq C \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|,$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$, for all finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $(\lambda-1) \max A + |A| \leq |B|$ and $A < \text{supp}(x) \sqcup B$, and for all signs $(\varepsilon), (\delta)$. The least constant C is denoted by $C_{\lambda, pl}$.

Theorem 1.4. For $\lambda \geq 1$, a basis \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ if and only if it is quasi-greedy and (λ, PSLC) .

Theorem 1.5. Let $\lambda > 1$. The following hold.

- (1) If \mathcal{B} is strong partially greedy, then \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$.
- (2) There exists a Schauder basis \mathcal{B} that is $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ but is not strong partially greedy.

1.3. Characterizations of greedy-type bases. For later reference, we give a quick overview of existing results that characterize different greedy-type bases. The following is a classical result that characterizes greedy bases.

Theorem 1.6 (Konyagin and Temlyakov [13]). *The following hold.*

- (1) If \mathcal{B} is C_g -greedy, then \mathcal{B} is C_g -suppression unconditional and C_g -democratic.
- (2) Conversely, if \mathcal{B} is K_s -suppression unconditional and C_d -democratic, then \mathcal{B} is $(K_s + K_s^3 C_d)$ -greedy.

According to Theorem 1.6, while an 1-greedy basis is 1-suppression unconditional and 1-democratic, the converse may not hold; that is, an 1-suppression unconditional and 1-democratic basis may not be 1-greedy. For example, [9, Theorem E] gives an 1-unconditional (and thus, 1-suppression unconditional), 1-democratic basis which has $C_g = 2$. Hence, to characterize 1-greedy bases, Albiac and Wojtaszczyk [2] introduced the so-called Property (A).

Definition 1.7. An M -basis \mathcal{B} is said to have Property (A) if

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| = \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|, \tag{1.9}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$, for all finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|A| = |B|$ and $A \sqcup B \sqcup x$, and for all signs $(\varepsilon), (\delta)$.

Theorem 1.8 (Albiac and Wojtaszczyk [2]). *An M -basis \mathcal{B} is 1-greedy if and only if \mathcal{B} is 1-suppression unconditional and has Property (A).*

In [8], Dilworth, Kutzarova, Odell, Schlumprecht, and Zsák generalized Theorem 1.8 as follows

Definition 1.9. An M -basis \mathcal{B} is said to have C -property (A) if

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq C \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|,$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$, for all finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|A| = |B|$ and $A \sqcup B \sqcup x$, and for all signs $(\varepsilon), (\delta)$. The least constant C is denoted by C_b .

Theorem 1.10. [8, Theorem 2] *Let \mathcal{B} be an M -basis in a Banach space \mathbb{X} .*

- (1) If \mathcal{B} is C_g -greedy, then it is C_g -suppression unconditional and satisfies C_g -Property (A).

- (2) *Conversely, if \mathcal{B} is \mathbf{K}_s -suppression unconditional and satisfies C_b -Property (A), then it is $\mathbf{K}_s C_b$ -greedy.*

Later, Albiac and Ansorena [1] characterized 1-almost greedy bases.

Theorem 1.11. [1, Theorem 2.3] *A basis in a Banach space is 1-almost greedy if and only if it has Property (A).*

Theorem 1.12. [1, Theorem 3.3] *The following hold.*

- (1) *If \mathcal{B} is C_a -almost greedy, then it is C_a -suppression quasi-greedy and satisfies C_a -Property (A).*
- (2) *Conversely, if \mathcal{B} is C_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy and satisfies C_b -Property (A), then it is $C_\ell C_b$ -almost greedy.*

From now on, without specifying the constant C , we say that a basis has Property (A) to mean that it has C -Property (A) for some $C \geq 1$. We use 1-Property (A) to refer to Property (A) in Definition 1.7.

Recently, Berasategui, Berná, and Lassalle [5] characterized 1-strong partially greedy bases by introducing the so-called partial symmetry for largest coefficients (PSLC).

Definition 1.13. An M-basis is said to be C -partially symmetric for largest coefficients (PSLC) if

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq C\|x + 1_{\delta B}\|,$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$, for all finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|A| \leq |B|$ and $A < \text{supp}(x) \sqcup B$, and for all signs $(\varepsilon), (\delta)$. The least constant C is denoted by C_{pl} .

Theorem 1.14. [5, Theorem 1.15] *An M-basis \mathcal{B} is 1-strong partially greedy if and only if \mathcal{B} is 1-partially symmetric for largest coefficients.*

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we present several useful results that will be used in due course.

2.1. Properties of unconditionality, quasi-greediness, and democracy.

Proposition 2.1. *Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{B} = (e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be an unconditional basis with suppression-unconditional constant \mathbf{K}_s . For any scalars $a_1, \dots, a_N, b_1, \dots, b_N$ so that either $0 \leq a_n \leq b_n$ or $b_n \leq a_n \leq 0$ for all $1 \leq n \leq N$, we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N a_n e_n \right\| \leq \mathbf{K}_s \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N b_n e_n \right\|.$$

Proof. See [2, Proposition 2.1]. □

We shall need the uniform boundedness of the truncation operator. For each $\alpha > 0$, we define the truncation function T_α as follows: for $b \in \mathbb{K}$,

$$T_\alpha(b) = \begin{cases} \text{sgn}(b)\alpha, & \text{if } |b| > \alpha, \\ b, & \text{if } |b| \leq \alpha. \end{cases}$$

We define the truncation operator $T_\alpha : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ as

$$T_\alpha(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} T_\alpha(e_n^*(x))e_n = \alpha 1_{\varepsilon_{\Gamma_\alpha}(x)} + P_{\Gamma_\alpha^c}(x),$$

where $\Gamma_\alpha(x) = \{n : |e_n^*(x)| > \alpha\}$ and $\varepsilon_n = \text{sgn}(e_n^*(x))$ for all $n \in \Gamma_\alpha(x)$. The operator T_α is well-defined as $|\Gamma_\alpha(x)| < \infty$ for all $\alpha > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

Theorem 2.2. [4, Lemma 2.5] *Let \mathcal{B} be \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy. Then for any $\alpha > 0$, $\|T_\alpha\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell$.*

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\lambda \geq 1$, $C \geq 1$, and \mathcal{B} be an M -basis that satisfies*

$$\gamma_{\lceil \lambda m \rceil}(x) \leq C\|x\|, \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Then \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\Lambda \in \mathcal{G}(x, p)$. Choose $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\lceil \lambda m \rceil \leq p < \lceil \lambda(m+1) \rceil$. It follows that $p - \lceil \lambda m \rceil \leq \lambda$. Let $B \subset \Lambda$ such that $B \in \mathcal{G}(x, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$. We have

$$\|P_\Lambda(x)\| \leq \|P_B(x)\| + \|P_{\Lambda \setminus B}(x)\| \leq C\|x\| + \|P_{\Lambda \setminus B}\|\|x\|,$$

where

$$\|P_{\Lambda \setminus B}\| \leq \sum_{n \in \Lambda \setminus B} \|e_n^*\|_* \leq |\Lambda \setminus B| \sup_n \|e_n^*\|_* \leq \lambda \sup_n \|e_n^*\|_*.$$

We have shown that

$$\|P_\Lambda(x)\| \leq (C + \lambda \sup_n \|e_n^*\|_*)\|x\|.$$

Hence, \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy. \square

We now extend the definition of democracy and show that the extension is equivalent to democracy when \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy.

Definition 2.4. An M -basis is C - $(\lambda, \text{democratic})$ if

$$\|1_A\| \leq C\|1_B\|, \tag{2.1}$$

for all finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\lambda|A| \leq |B|$. The smallest C verifying (2.1) is denoted by $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,d}$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let \mathcal{B} be a quasi-greedy M -basis. Pick $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [1, \infty)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. Then \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda_1, \text{democratic})$ if and only if \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda_2, \text{democratic})$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that for all $\lambda \geq 1$, being $(\lambda, \text{democratic})$ is equivalent to being democratic. Fix $\lambda \geq 1$.

- $(\lambda, \text{democratic}) \Rightarrow \text{democratic}$: Assume that \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,d}$ - $(\lambda, \text{democratic})$. Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $m := |A| = |B|$. We consider two cases:
 - (1) If $m \geq 2\lambda$, we partition A into $v := \lceil 2\lambda \rceil$ subsets, called A_1, \dots, A_v such that the size of each A_n is

$$|A_n| \leq m/(2\lambda) + 1 \leq m/\lambda = |B|/\lambda.$$

By $(\lambda, \text{democratic})$, we obtain

$$\|1_A\| \leq \sum_{n=1}^v \|1_{A_n}\| \leq v\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,d}\|1_B\| = \lceil 2\lambda \rceil \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,d}\|1_B\|.$$

(2) If $m < 2\lambda$, we pick $j \in B$ and have

$$\|1_A\| < 2\lambda \sup_n \|e_n\| \text{ and } 1 = |e_j^*(1_B)| \leq \sup_n \|e_n^*\|_* \|1_B\|.$$

Therefore,

$$\|1_A\| < 2\lambda \sup_n \|e_n\| \sup_m \|e_m^*\|_* \|1_B\|.$$

Hence, \mathcal{B} is democratic.

- democratic \Rightarrow $(\lambda, \text{democratic})$: Let \mathcal{B} be \mathbf{C}_d -democratic and \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy. Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $m := |A|$ and $|B| \geq \lambda m$. Let $D \subset B$ with $|D| = |A| = m$. We have

$$\|1_A\| \leq \mathbf{C}_d \|1_D\| \leq \mathbf{C}_d \mathbf{C}_\ell \|1_B\|,$$

for $B \setminus D$ is a greedy set of B .

□

2.2. Property (λ, \mathbf{A}) , (λ, PSLC) , and equivalent formulations.

Definition 2.6. An M -basis \mathcal{B} is said to have C -Property (λ, \mathbf{A}) if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq C \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|, \quad (2.2)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$, for all finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\lambda|A| \leq |B|$ and $A \sqcup B \sqcup x$, and for all signs $(\varepsilon), (\delta)$. The least constant C verifying (2.2) is denoted by $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda, ib}$.

Remark 2.7. By norm convexity, we have 1-Property (\mathbf{A}) is equivalent to 1-Property $(1, \mathbf{A})$. Indeed, let us prove that 1-Property (\mathbf{A}) implies 1-Property $(1, \mathbf{A})$. Pick $x \in \mathbb{X}_c$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$ and finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|A| < |B|$ and $A \sqcup B \sqcup x$. Pick signs $(\varepsilon), (\delta)$. Assuming 1-Property (\mathbf{A}) , we want to show that $\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|$. Choose $D \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $D > A \cup B \cup \text{supp}(x)$ and $|D| = |B| - |A|$. By norm convexity,

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \sup_{(\theta)} \|x + 1_{\varepsilon A} + 1_{\theta D}\| \leq \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|,$$

where the second inequality is due to 1-Property (\mathbf{A}) .

Let $\Omega_{\lambda, ib} \in [1, \infty)$ be the smallest number (if such a number exists) such that

$$\|x\| \leq \Omega_{\lambda, ib} \|x - P_A(x) + 1_{\varepsilon B}\| \quad (2.3)$$

holds for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$, all signs (ε) , and all finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\lambda|A| \leq |B|$ and $(A \cup \text{supp}(x)) \cap B = \emptyset$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let \mathcal{B} be an M -basis. The following hold.*

- (1) *If \mathcal{B} satisfies (2.3), then \mathcal{B} has $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda, ib}$ -Property (λ, \mathbf{A}) with $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda, ib} \leq \Omega_{\lambda, ib}$.*
- (2) *Conversely, if \mathcal{B} has $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda, ib}$ -Property (λ, \mathbf{A}) , then \mathcal{B} satisfies (2.3) with $\Omega_{\lambda, ib} \leq \mathbf{C}_{\lambda, ib}$.*

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{B} satisfies (2.3). Choose $x, A, B, (\varepsilon), (\delta)$ as in Definition 2.6. Let $y = x + 1_{\varepsilon A}$. We have

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| = \|y\| \stackrel{(2.3)}{\leq} \Omega_{\lambda, ib} \|y - P_A(y) + 1_{\delta B}\| = \Omega_{\lambda, ib} \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|.$$

Conversely, suppose that \mathcal{B} has $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib}$ -Property (λ, A) . Choose $x, A, B, (\varepsilon)$ as in (2.3). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\| &= \left\| x - P_A(x) + \sum_{n \in A} e_n^*(x) e_n \right\| \leq \sup_{(\delta)} \|x - P_A(x) + 1_{\delta A}\| \\ &\leq \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib} \|x - P_A(x) + 1_{\varepsilon B}\|. \end{aligned}$$

This completes our proof. \square

Let $\Psi_{\lambda,pl} \in [1, \infty)$ be the smallest number (if such a number exists) such that

$$\|x\| \leq \Psi_{\lambda,pl} \|x - P_A(x) + 1_{\varepsilon B}\| \quad (2.4)$$

holds for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with $\|x\|_{\infty} \leq 1$, all signs (ε) , and all finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $(\lambda - 1) \max A + |A| \leq |B|$ and $A < \text{supp}(x - P_A(x)) \sqcup B$.

Lemma 2.9. *Let \mathcal{B} be an M -basis. The following hold.*

- (1) *If \mathcal{B} satisfies (2.4), then \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,pl}(\lambda, \text{PSLC})$ with $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,pl} \leq \Psi_{\lambda,pl}$.*
- (2) *Conversely, if \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,pl}(\lambda, \text{PSLC})$, then \mathcal{B} satisfies (2.4) with $\Psi_{\lambda,pl} \leq \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,pl}$.*

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{B} satisfies (2.4). Choose $x, A, B, (\varepsilon), (\delta)$ as in Definition 1.3. Let $y = x + 1_{\varepsilon A}$. We have

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| = \|y\| \stackrel{(2.4)}{\leq} \Psi_{\lambda,pl} \|y - P_A(y) + 1_{\delta B}\| = \Psi_{\lambda,pl} \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|.$$

Conversely, suppose that \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,pl}(\lambda, \text{PSLC})$. Choose $x, A, B, (\varepsilon)$ as in (2.4). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\| &= \left\| x - P_A(x) + \sum_{n \in A} e_n^*(x) e_n \right\| \leq \sup_{(\delta)} \|x - P_A(x) + 1_{\delta A}\| \\ &\leq \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,pl} \|x - P_A(x) + 1_{\varepsilon B}\|. \end{aligned}$$

This completes our proof. \square

3. CHARACTERIZATION OF $(\lambda, \text{PARTIALLY GREEDY})$ BASES

3.1. Characterization of $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$. The goal of this subsection is to prove Theorem 1.4. First, we need the next useful theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let \mathcal{B} be a \mathbf{C}_{ℓ} -suppression quasi-greedy M -basis. The following hold.*

- (1) *If \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{1,p}(1, \text{partially greedy})$, then \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{1,p}(1, \text{PSLC})$.*
- (2) *If \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,p}(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$, then \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\ell} \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,p}(\lambda, \text{PSLC})$.*
- (3) *If \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,pl}(\lambda, \text{PSLC})$, then \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\ell} \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,pl}(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$.*

Proof. Item (1) follows from [6, Theorem 4.2].

(2) Let $x, A, B, (\varepsilon), (\delta)$ be chosen as in Definition 1.3. Let $m := \max A$ and $D = \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus A$. It follows that

$$|B \cup D| = |B| + |D| \geq (\lambda - 1)m + |A| + (m - |A|) = \lambda m.$$

Choose $\Lambda \subset B \cup D$ with $|\Lambda| = \lceil \lambda m \rceil$. Set

$$y := 1_D + 1_{\varepsilon A} + x + 1_{\delta B}.$$

Then $\Lambda \in \mathcal{G}(y, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|1_{\varepsilon A} + x\| &= \|y - P_{B \cup D}(y)\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \|y - P_\Lambda(y)\| \\ &\leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda, p} \widehat{\sigma}_m(y) \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda, p} \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|. \end{aligned}$$

(3) Assume that \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda, pl}(\lambda, \text{PSLC})$. Let $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $A \in \mathcal{G}(x, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$. Fix $k \in [0, m]$. We need to show that

$$\|x - P_A(x)\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda, pl} \|x - S_k(x)\|.$$

Set $B = \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \setminus A$, $F = A \setminus \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, and $\alpha := \min_{n \in A} |e_n^*(x)|$. Clearly, $\|x - P_A(x)\|_\infty \leq \alpha$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |B| + (\lambda - 1) \max B &\leq k - |\{1, 2, \dots, k\} \cap A| + (\lambda - 1)k \\ &\leq \lambda m - |\{1, 2, \dots, k\} \cap A| \\ &\leq |A| - |\{1, 2, \dots, k\} \cap A| = |F|. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$B < \text{supp}(x - P_A(x) - P_B(x)) \sqcup F.$$

By Lemma 2.9 and Theorem 2.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - P_A(x)\| &\leq \mathbf{C}_{\lambda, pl} \left\| x - P_A(x) - P_B(x) + \alpha \sum_{n \in F} \text{sgn}(e_n^*(x)) e_n \right\| \\ &= \mathbf{C}_{\lambda, pl} \|T_\alpha(x - P_A(x) - P_B(x) + P_F(x))\| \\ &\leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda, pl} \|x - S_k(x)\|, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Fix $\lambda \geq 1$. Assume that \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$. Then there exists $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\gamma_{\lceil \lambda m \rceil}(x) \leq C \widehat{\sigma}_m(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Hence,

$$\gamma_{\lceil \lambda m \rceil}(x) \leq C \|x\|, \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

By Lemma 2.3, \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy. We now use Theorem 3.1 to conclude that \mathcal{B} is (λ, PSLC) .

Now assume that \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and (λ, PSLC) . Again by Theorem 3.1, \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$. \square

3.2. For $\lambda > 1$, $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ is strictly weaker than strong partially greedy. Before proving Theorem 1.5, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *If \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy, then (λ, PSLC) is equivalent to the condition: there exists $C \geq 1$ such that*

$$\|1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq C \|1_{\delta B}\|, \tag{3.1}$$

for all sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $A < B$, $|A| + (\lambda - 1) \max A \leq |B|$ and signs $(\varepsilon), (\delta)$.

Proof. By setting $x = 0$ in Definition 1.3, we see that (λ, PSLC) implies (3.1). Assume that \mathcal{B} satisfies (3.1) with constant C and is \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy. Let $x, A, B, (\varepsilon), (\delta)$ be chosen as in Definition 1.3. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| &\leq \|x\| + \|1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \|x + 1_{\delta B}\| + C \|1_{\delta B}\| \\ &\leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \|x + 1_{\delta B}\| + C(1 + \mathbf{C}_\ell) \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is due to the triangle inequality, while the second and third inequalities is due to the fact that B is a greedy set of $x + 1_{\delta B}$ and due to (3.1). Hence,

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq (\mathbf{C}_\ell + C + C\mathbf{C}_\ell) \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|.$$

This completes our proof. \square

We also need the notion of conservative bases.

Definition 3.3. A basis \mathcal{B} is C - $(\lambda, \text{conservative})$ if for all sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\lambda|A| \leq |B|$ and $A < B$, we have

$$\|1_A\| \leq C \|1_B\|.$$

The least constant C is denoted by $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda, c}$. When \mathcal{B} is $(1, \text{conservative})$, we say that it is conservative and set $\mathbf{C}_c := \mathbf{C}_{1, c}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Choose $\lambda > 1$.

(1) Assume that \mathcal{B} is strong partially greedy; that is, there exists $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\gamma_m(x) \leq C \widehat{\sigma}_m(x) \leq C \|x\|.$$

Hence, \mathcal{B} is C -suppression quasi-greedy. Therefore,

$$\gamma_{\lceil \lambda m \rceil}(x) \leq C \gamma_m(x) \leq C^2 \widehat{\sigma}_m(x).$$

We conclude that \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$.

(2) For each $\lambda > 1$, we now construct a Schauder basis \mathcal{B} that is $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ but is not strong partially greedy.

Step 1: Our construction is a modification of the Schreier space. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F \subset \mathbb{N} : \min F \geq |F|\}$ and $D = \{2^n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. Define weight sequences $\omega^F = (w^F(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ that depend on $F \subset \mathbb{N}$

$$w^F(n) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} & \text{if } F \subset D, \\ \frac{1}{n} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let \mathbb{X} be the completion of c_{00} with respect to the following norm: for $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$,

$$\|x\| = \sup \left\{ \sum_{n \in F} w_{\sigma(n)}^F |x_n| : F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \sigma : F \rightarrow [1, |F|] \text{ is a bijection} \right\}.$$

Clearly, the canonical basis \mathcal{B} is an 1-unconditional normalized Schauder basis of \mathbb{X} .

Step 2: We show that \mathcal{B} is not conservative. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Choose N sufficiently large such that $A := \{2^{N+1}, \dots, 2^{N+k}\} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $B := \{2^{N+k} + 1, \dots, 2^{N+k} + k\} \cap D = \emptyset$. Then $\|1_A\| \sim \sqrt{k}$ and $\|1_B\| \sim \ln k$. Hence, \mathcal{B} is not conservative.

Step 3: We prove that \mathcal{B} is (λ, PSLC) . By Lemma 3.2, it suffices to prove (3.1). Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $A < B$ and $|A| + (\lambda - 1) \max A \leq |B|$. We need to show that

$\|1_A\| \lesssim \|1_B\|$. Let $F \subset A$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}$. If $F \not\subset D$, then $\|1_F\| \leq \|1_B\|$. Assume that $F \subset D$. Write

$$F = \{2^{n_1}, 2^{n_2}, \dots, 2^{n_j}\}.$$

Then $\|1_F\| \sim \sqrt{j}$. Choose $B' \subset B$ such that $|B'| \sim |B|/2$ and $B' \in \mathcal{F}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|1_B\| &\geq \|1_{B'}\| \gtrsim \ln |B'| \gtrsim \ln |B| \geq \ln((\lambda - 1)2^{n_j}) = n_j \ln 2 + \ln(\lambda - 1) \\ &\geq j \ln 2 + \ln(\lambda - 1) \\ &\gtrsim \|1_F\| \ln 2 + \ln(\lambda - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Since F is arbitrary, we deduce that

$$\|1_B\| \gtrsim \|1_A\| \ln 2 + \ln(\lambda - 1). \quad (3.2)$$

Case 1: $\frac{1}{2}\|1_A\| + \ln(\lambda - 1) \geq 0$. Then (3.2) implies that

$$\|1_B\| \gtrsim (\ln 2 - 0.5)\|1_A\|.$$

Case 2: $\frac{1}{2}\|1_A\| + \ln(\lambda - 1) < 0$. Then $\|1_A\| < 2 \ln(\lambda - 1)^{-1}$. It follows that

$$2 \ln(\lambda - 1)^{-1} \|1_B\| > \|1_A\|.$$

Therefore, \mathcal{B} is (λ, PSLC) , as desired. Since \mathcal{B} is unconditional, we conclude that \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ by Theorem 1.4. However, \mathcal{B} is not strong partially greedy by Theorem [6, Theorem 4.2]. \square

3.3. 1 - $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ bases.

3.3.1. *Example.* We give an example showing that though a basis \mathcal{B} may not be 1-strong partially greedy, \mathcal{B} is 1 - $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ for some $\lambda > 1$. We consider a modification of the Schreier space as in [7, Proposition 6.10] with a renorming using bounded weights. Let \mathbb{S} be the completion of c_{00} under the following norm

$$\|(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)\|_{\mathbb{S}} = \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{n \in F} |x_n|,$$

where $\mathcal{F} = \{F \subset \mathbb{N} : \sqrt{\min F} \geq |F|\}$. Clearly, the canonical basis \mathcal{B} is an 1-unconditional and 1-conservative Schauder basis of \mathbb{S} . It is easy to check that \mathcal{B} is 1-PSLC; by Theorem 1.14, \mathcal{B} is 1-strong partially greedy.

We now renorm \mathbb{S} as follows: choose a fixed weight sequence $\omega = (w(n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

- $0 < w(n) \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w(n) = 1$ for all $n > N$,
- $(w(n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is not increasing.

Define

$$\|(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)\|_{\omega} := \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{n \in F} w(n) |x_n|.$$

Under $\|\cdot\|_{\omega}$, the basis \mathcal{B} is not 1-PSLC. Indeed, since $w(n)$ is not increasing, we can find $i < j$ and

$$\|e_i\|_{\omega} = w(i) > w(j) = \|e_j\|_{\omega}.$$

Hence \mathcal{B} is not 1-strong partially greedy. However, we can show that

$$\gamma_{(N+1)m}(x) \leq \hat{\sigma}_m(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{S}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

To see this, pick $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) \in \mathbb{S}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \leq m$, and $A \in \mathcal{G}(x, (N+1)m)$. We need to show that

$$\|x - P_A(x)\|_\omega \leq \|x - S_k(x)\|_\omega. \quad (3.3)$$

Let $B = \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \setminus A$, $F = A \setminus \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, and $t := \min_{n \in A} |e_n^*(x)|$.

Step 1: We prove the following claim

$$\|P_{(A \cup B)^c}(x) + t1_B\|_\omega \leq \|P_{(A \cup B)^c}(x) + t1_F\|_\omega. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. Letting $s := |\{1, 2, \dots, k\} \cap A|$, we have

$$|B| + N = k - s + N \leq (N+1)m - s = |A| - s = |F|. \quad (3.5)$$

Since $|\{n : w(n) < 1\}| \leq N$, (3.5) implies that $|\{n \in F : w(n) = 1\}| \geq |B|$. Let $D \in \mathcal{F}$ and choose $E \subset \{n \in F : w(n) = 1\}$ such that $|E| = |D \cap B|$. Write

$$\begin{aligned} y &:= P_{(A \cup B)^c}(x) + t1_B =: (y_1, y_2, \dots) \\ z &:= P_{(A \cup B)^c}(x) + t1_F =: (z_1, z_2, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $G := (D \cap (A \cup B)^c) \cup E \in \mathcal{F}$ because $|G| \leq |D|$ and $\min G \geq \min D$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \in D} w(n)|y_n| &= \sum_{n \in D \cap (A \cup B)^c} w(n)|x_n| + t \sum_{n \in D \cap B} w(n) \\ &\leq \sum_{n \in D \cap (A \cup B)^c} w(n)|x_n| + t \sum_{n \in E} 1 \\ &= \sum_{n \in G} w(n)|z_n| \leq \|z\|_\omega. \end{aligned}$$

Since $D \in \mathcal{F}$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $\|y\|_\omega \leq \|z\|_\omega$. \square

Step 2: We now use the claim to prove (3.3). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - P_A(x)\|_\omega &= \left\| x - P_A(x) - P_B(x) + \sum_{n \in B} e_n^*(x)e_n \right\|_\omega \\ &\leq \|P_{(A \cup B)^c}(x) + t1_B\|_\omega \\ &\leq \|P_{(A \cup B)^c}(x) + t1_F\|_\omega \\ &\leq \|P_{(A \cup B)^c}(x) + P_F(x)\|_\omega = \|x - S_k(x)\|_\omega, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

3.3.2. *When a basis is 1-(λ , partially greedy).*

Corollary 3.4 (A corollary of Theorem 3.1). *Let \mathcal{B} be an 1-suppression quasi-greedy M -basis. Then \mathcal{B} is 1-(λ , partially greedy) if and only if \mathcal{B} is 1-(λ , PSLC).*

Example 3.5. We consider the same example as in Subsection 3.3.1. The canonical basis \mathcal{B} is 1-suppression unconditional and thus, 1-suppression quasi-greedy. With the same notation used in Subsection 3.3.1, we now show that \mathcal{B} is 1-($N+1$, PSLC). Choose $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$, finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $N \max A + |A| \leq |B|$ and $A < \text{supp}(x) \sqcup B$, and signs $(\varepsilon), (\delta)$. We need to show

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\|_\omega \leq \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|_\omega. \quad (3.6)$$

Since $|B| \geq |A| + N \max A \geq |A| + N$, we know that $|\{n \in B : w(n) = 1\}| \geq |A|$. Using the exact argument as in the proof of (3.4) gives (3.6). By Corollary 3.4, \mathcal{B} is $1-(N+1)$, partially greedy).

4. CHARACTERIZATIONS OF STRONG PARTIALLY GREEDY BASES

Definition 4.1. An M-basis \mathcal{B} is said to have C -left Property (λ, A) if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq C\|x + 1_{\delta B}\|, \quad (4.1)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$, for all finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $A < B$, $\lambda|A| \leq |B|$ and $A \sqcup B \sqcup x$, and for all signs $(\varepsilon), (\delta)$. The least constant C verifying (4.1) is denoted by $C_{\lambda, lib}$.

We now extend the alternative definition of strong partially greedy bases due to Dilworth and Khurana [11]. For each $x \in \mathbb{X}$, a greedy ordering of x is an injective map $\rho_x : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{supp}(x) \subset \rho_x(\mathbb{N})$ and if $j < k$, then $|e_{\rho(j)}^*(x)| \geq |e_{\rho(k)}^*(x)|$. Clearly, ρ_x may not be unique. Let $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{X}} = (\rho_x)_{x \in \mathbb{X}}$ denote a collection of greedy orderings of \mathbb{X} . Given a greedy collection $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{X}}$, we define

$$\sigma_m^{\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{X}}, L}(x) := \inf \{ \|x - P_A(x)\| : |A| \leq m, \max A < \rho_x(1) \}.$$

Definition 4.2. An M-basis \mathcal{B} is said to be C - (λ, DK) partially greedy if \mathcal{B} satisfies

$$\left\| x - \sum_{n=1}^{\lceil \lambda m \rceil} e_{\rho_x(n)}^*(x) e_{\rho_x(n)} \right\| \leq C \sigma_m^{\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{X}}, L}(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0, \forall \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{X}} = (\rho_x)_{x \in \mathbb{X}}.$$

The least constant C is denoted by $C_{\lambda, dkp}$. Note that when $\lambda = 1$, we retrieve the definition of partially greedy bases given by Dilworth and Khurana [11].

Theorem 4.3. *Let \mathcal{B} be an M-basis. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) \mathcal{B} is strong partially greedy.
- (2) \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and conservative.
- (3) \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and PSLC.
- (4) \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and $(\lambda, \text{conservative})$ for all (some) $\lambda \geq 1$.
- (5) \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and has left Property (λ, A) for all (some) $\lambda \geq 1$,
- (6) \mathcal{B} is (λ, DK) partially greedy for all (some) $\lambda \geq 1$.

Lemma 4.4. *An M-basis \mathcal{B} is conservative if and only if \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{conservative})$ for all (some) $\lambda \geq 1$.*

The proof of Lemma 4.4 is similar to the proof of Lemma 2.5. However, in Lemma 4.4, we do not need the assumption that \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy. The reason lies in how conservative bases were first defined by Dilworth, Kalton, Kutzarova, and Temlyakov (see Definition 3.3), where the authors allowed the cardinality of the two sets A and B to be different. In contrast, when democracy was first defined by Konyagin and Temlyakov, the authors require the cardinality of the two sets to be the same. Of course, for quasi-greedy bases, whether $|A| \leq |B|$ or $|A| = |B|$ makes no difference.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. We prove the equivalences.

- (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (3): see [6, Theorem 4.2].
- (2) \Leftrightarrow (4): use Lemma 4.4.
- (5) \Rightarrow (2): fix $\lambda_0 \geq 1$. Observe that left Property (λ_0, A) implies $(\lambda_0, \text{conservative})$, which implies conservative.
- (1) \Rightarrow (5): By [12, Theorem 3.2], we know that a strong partially greedy basis is quasi-greedy and has left Property $(1, A)$ and thus, has left Property (λ, A) for all $\lambda \geq 1$.
- (2) \Rightarrow (6): Assume (2) with \mathcal{B} being \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy. Let $\lambda \geq 1$. By [11, Theorem 2.3], we know that \mathcal{B} is $(1, \text{DK partially greedy})$; that is, there exists $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\left\| x - \sum_{n=1}^m e_{\rho(n)}^*(x) e_{\rho(n)} \right\| \leq C \sigma_m^{\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}, L}(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0, \forall \mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X} = (\rho_x)_{x \in \mathbb{X}}.$$

For all $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X} = (\rho_x)_{x \in \mathbb{X}}$, we, therefore, have

$$\left\| x - \sum_{n=1}^{\lceil \lambda m \rceil} e_{\rho(n)}^*(x) e_{\rho(n)} \right\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \left\| x - \sum_{n=1}^m e_{\rho(n)}^*(x) e_{\rho(n)} \right\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell C \sigma_m^{\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}, L}(x).$$

Hence, \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{DK partially greedy})$.

- (6) \Rightarrow (2): Assume that \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda, dkp}$ - $(\lambda, \text{DK partially greedy})$ for some $\lambda \geq 1$. Let $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $A \in \mathcal{G}(x, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$. Choose $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}$ such that for $\rho_x \in \mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}$, $A = \{\rho_x(1), \dots, \rho_x(\lceil \lambda m \rceil)\}$. Then

$$\|x - P_A(x)\| \leq \mathbf{C}_{\lambda, dkp} \sigma_m^{\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}, L}(x) \leq \mathbf{C}_{\lambda, dkp} \|x\|.$$

By Lemma 2.5, we know that \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy.

Next, we show that \mathcal{B} is conservative. Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\lambda|A| \leq |B|$ and $A < B$. Choose $E \subset B$ such that $|E| = \lceil \lambda m \rceil$, where $m := |A|$. Form $z := 1_A + 1_{B \setminus E} + 1_E$ and choose $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}$ such that for $\rho_z \in \mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}$, $E = \{\rho_z(1), \dots, \rho_z(\lceil \lambda m \rceil)\}$. By above, we can assume that \mathcal{B} is \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|1_A\| &= \|z - 1_{B \setminus E} - P_E(z)\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \|z - P_E(z)\| \\ &\leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda, dkp} \sigma_m^{\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}, L}(z) \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda, dkp} \|1_B\|, \end{aligned}$$

Hence, \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{conservative})$, which implies that \mathcal{B} is conservative according to Lemma 4.4. □

5. CHARACTERIZATIONS OF $(\lambda, (\text{ALMOST}) \text{GREEDY})$ BASES

Definition 5.1. An M-basis \mathcal{B} is said to be C - (λ, greedy) if \mathcal{B} satisfies (1.6). The least constant C is denoted by $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda, g}$.

Definition 5.2. An M-basis \mathcal{B} is said to be C - $(\lambda, \text{almost greedy})$ if \mathcal{B} satisfies (1.7). The least constant C is denoted by $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda, a}$.

5.1. Characterizations of $(\lambda, (\text{almost}) \text{ greedy})$.

Theorem 5.3. *Let \mathcal{B} be a \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy M -basis. The following hold.*

- (1) *If \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{1,a}$ - $(1, \text{ almost greedy})$, then \mathcal{B} has $\mathbf{C}_{1,a}$ -Property $(1, A)$.*
- (2) *If \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,a}$ - $(\lambda, \text{ almost greedy})$, then \mathcal{B} has $\mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,a}$ -Property (λ, A) .*
- (3) *If \mathcal{B} has $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib}$ -Property (λ, A) , then \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib}$ - $(\lambda, \text{ almost greedy})$.*

Proof of Theorem 5.3. Item (1) follows from Theorem 1.12.

(2) Assume that \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,a}$ - $(\lambda, \text{ almost greedy})$. Let $x, A, B, (\varepsilon), (\delta)$ be chosen as in Definition 2.6. Set $m = |A|$ and $y = x + 1_{\varepsilon A} + 1_{\delta B}$. Choose $\Lambda \subset B$ with $|\Lambda| = \lceil \lambda m \rceil$. Then $\Lambda \in \mathcal{G}(y, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$. We have

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| = \|y - P_B(y)\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \|y - P_\Lambda(y)\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,a} \tilde{\sigma}_m(y) \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,a} \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|.$$

Hence, \mathcal{B} has $\mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,a}$ -Property (λ, A) .

(3) Assume that \mathcal{B} has $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib}$ -Property (λ, A) . Let $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $A \in \mathcal{G}(x, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$, and $B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|B| = m$. Let $\alpha := \min_A |e_n^*(x)|$. Then $\|x - P_A(x)\|_\infty \leq \alpha$. By Lemma 2.8 and noticing that $\lambda |B \setminus A| \leq |A \setminus B|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - P_A(x)\| &\leq \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib} \left\| x - P_A(x) - P_{B \setminus A}(x) + \alpha \sum_{n \in A \setminus B} \operatorname{sgn}(e_n^*(x)) e_n \right\| \\ &= \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib} \left\| T_\alpha \left(P_{(A \cup B)^c}(x) + \sum_{n \in A \setminus B} e_n^*(x) e_n \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib} \left\| P_{(A \cup B)^c}(x) + \sum_{n \in A \setminus B} e_n^*(x) e_n \right\| \text{ by Theorem 2.2} \\ &= \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib} \|x - P_B(x)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the sup over all $A \in \mathcal{G}(x, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$ and the inf over all $B \subset \mathbb{N}$, we see that \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib}$ - $(\lambda, \text{ almost greedy})$. \square

We state the equivalences among (1.3), (1.6), and (1.7) when $\lambda > 1$. Though not being explicitly stated in the literature, the equivalence between (1.6) and (1.7) is expected as can be seen from the proof of [10, Theorem 3.3], which only employs the m -term projection error $\tilde{\sigma}_m(x)$ instead of the smallest m -term error $\sigma_m(x)$. For completeness, we still state equivalences of almost greedy in the next theorem with our introduction of Property (λ, A) . We move their proofs to the Appendix for interested readers.

Theorem 5.4. *Let \mathcal{B} be an M -basis. The following are equivalent*

- (1) *\mathcal{B} is almost greedy,*
- (2) *\mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and democratic,*
- (3) *\mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{ greedy})$ for all (some) $\lambda > 1$,*
- (4) *\mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and has Property (A) ,*
- (5) *\mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and is $(\lambda, \text{ democratic})$ for all (some) $\lambda \geq 1$,*
- (6) *\mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and has Property (λ, A) for all (some) $\lambda \geq 1$,*
- (7) *\mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{ almost greedy})$ for all (some) $\lambda \geq 1$.*

5.2. $\mathbf{1}$ - $(\lambda, (\text{almost}) \text{ greedy})$ bases.

5.2.1. *Example.* We give a renorming of ℓ_1 to show that though a basis may not be 1-greedy, we can still obtain the smallest error from an m -term approximation if we allow greedy sums to be of size greater than m by a constant factor. Let $\omega = (w(n))_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $0 < \inf_n w(n) < \sup_n w(n) < \infty$. We renorm ℓ_1 as follows: for $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) \in \ell_1$, let

$$\|x\| = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} w(n)|x_n|.$$

Let $\mathcal{B} = (e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be the canonical basis. Under $\|\cdot\|$, \mathcal{B} does not have 1-Property (A). Indeed, since $\inf_n w(n) < \sup_n w(n)$, we choose $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $w(i) < w(j)$. Then $\|e_i\| = w(i) < w(j) = \|e_j\|$. By Theorem 1.8, \mathcal{B} is not 1-greedy. However, if we set $\lambda = \frac{\sup_n w(n)}{\inf_n w(n)}$, then we can prove that \mathcal{B} satisfies

$$\gamma_{\lceil \lambda m \rceil}(x) \leq \sigma_m(x), \forall x \in \ell_1, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (5.1)$$

Indeed, pick $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) \in \ell_1$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $A \in \mathcal{G}(x, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$, and $B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|B| = m$. Also, pick $(b_n)_{n \in B} \subset \mathbb{K}$. Set $t := \min_{n \in A} |x_n|$. Since A is a greedy set and $|A| \geq \lambda|B|$ implies $|A \setminus B| \geq \lambda|B \setminus A|$, we have

$$\|P_{B \setminus A}(x)\| \leq t \sup_n w(n) |B \setminus A| \leq \frac{t}{\lambda} \sup_n w(n) |A \setminus B|. \quad (5.2)$$

Furthermore,

$$|A \setminus B| \leq \frac{1}{\inf_n w(n)} \sum_{n \in A \setminus B} w(n) \cdot 1 = \frac{1}{\inf_n w(n)} \|1_{A \setminus B}\|. \quad (5.3)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - P_A(x)\| &\stackrel{(5.2)}{\leq} \|x - P_A(x)\| - \|P_{B \setminus A}(x)\| + \frac{t}{\lambda} \sup_n w(n) |A \setminus B| \\ &\stackrel{(5.3)}{\leq} \|x - P_A(x)\| - \|P_{B \setminus A}(x)\| + \|t 1_{A \setminus B}\| \\ &= \|x - P_{A \cup B}(x) + t 1_{A \setminus B}\| \\ &\leq \left\| x - P_{A \cup B}(x) + P_{A \setminus B}(x) + \sum_{n \in B} (x_n - b_n) e_n \right\| \\ &= \left\| x - \sum_{n \in B} b_n e_n \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality is due to 1-suppression unconditionality of \mathcal{B} with respect to $\|\cdot\|$. Since A, B and $(b_n)_{n \in B}$ are arbitrarily chosen, we complete our proof of (5.1).

Remark 5.5. With a similar construction as in Example 5.2.1, it is easy to show that for any two numbers λ_1, λ_2 with $1 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, there exists a basis that is 1 - $(\lambda_2, \text{greedy})$ but is not 1 - $(\lambda_1, \text{greedy})$.

The proof of the next theorem is similar to the proof of Theorem 5.3 and is moved to the Appendix.

Theorem 5.6. *Let \mathcal{B} be a \mathbf{K}_s -suppression unconditional M -basis. The following hold.*

- (1) If \mathcal{B} is $C_{1,g}$ -(1, greedy), then \mathcal{B} has $C_{1,g}$ -Property (1, A).
- (2) If \mathcal{B} is $C_{\lambda,g}$ -(λ , greedy), then \mathcal{B} has $K_s C_{\lambda,g}$ -Property (λ , A).
- (3) If \mathcal{B} has $C_{\lambda,ib}$ -Property (λ , A), then \mathcal{B} is $K_s C_{\lambda,ib}$ -(λ , greedy).

Corollary 5.7. *Let \mathcal{B} be an 1-suppression unconditional M-basis. Then \mathcal{B} is 1-(λ , greedy) if and only if it has 1-Property (λ , A).*

Example 5.8. We consider the renorming of ℓ_1 discussed in Subsection 5.2.1. Clearly, the canonical basis \mathcal{B} is 1-suppression unconditional with respect to the new norm $\|\cdot\|$. Let $\lambda = \frac{\sup_n w(n)}{\inf_n w(n)}$. We show that \mathcal{B} has 1-Property (λ , A). Choose $x, A, B, (\varepsilon), (\delta)$ as in Definition 2.6. We have

$$\|1_{\varepsilon A}\| = \sum_{n \in A} w(n) \leq |A| \sup_n w(n) \leq \frac{\sup_n w(n)}{\lambda} |B| = \inf_n w(n) |B| \leq \|1_{\delta B}\|.$$

Therefore,

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| = \|x\| + \|1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \|x\| + \|1_{\delta B}\| = \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|.$$

By Corollary 5.7, we know that \mathcal{B} is 1-(λ , greedy) (though it is not 1-greedy.)

Corollary 5.9 (Corollary of Theorem 5.3). *Let \mathcal{B} be an 1-suppression quasi-greedy M-basis. Then \mathcal{B} is 1-(λ , almost greedy) if and only if it has 1-Property (λ , A).*

When $\lambda = 1$, Corollary 5.7 and Theorem 1.6 give Theorem 1.8, while Corollary 5.9 and [1, Proposition 2.5] give Theorem 1.11. Let us illustrate this by proving Theorem 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Assume that \mathcal{B} is 1-greedy. By Theorem 1.6, \mathcal{B} is 1-suppression unconditional. We need to prove 1-Property (A). Setting $\lambda = 1$ in Corollary 5.7, we know that \mathcal{B} has 1-Property (1, A), which is equivalent to 1-Property (A).

Conversely, let \mathcal{B} be 1-suppression unconditional and have 1-Property (A), which is equivalent to 1-Property (1, A). By Corollary 5.7, we know that \mathcal{B} is 1-greedy. \square

6. CHARACTERIZATIONS OF (λ , REVERSE PARTIALLY GREEDY) BASES

Given a greedy collection $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{X}}$, we define

$$\sigma_m^{\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{X}}, R}(x) := \inf \{ \|x - P_A(x)\| : |A| \leq m, \min A > \rho_x(m) \}.$$

Definition 6.1. An M-basis \mathcal{B} is said to be C -(λ , reverse partially greedy) if \mathcal{B} satisfies

$$\left\| x - \sum_{n=1}^{\lceil \lambda m \rceil} e_{\rho_x(n)}^*(x) e_{\rho_x(n)} \right\| \leq C \sigma_m^{\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{X}}, R}(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0, \forall \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{X}} = (\rho_x)_{x \in \mathbb{X}}.$$

The least constant C is denoted by $C_{\lambda, rp}$. Note that when $\lambda = 1$, we retrieve the definition of reverse partially greedy bases given by Dilworth and Khurana [11].

Definition 6.2. A basis \mathcal{B} is C -(λ , reverse conservative) if for all sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\lambda|A| \leq |B|$ and $B < A$, we have

$$\|1_A\| \leq C \|1_B\|.$$

The least constant C is denoted by $C_{\lambda, rc}$. When \mathcal{B} is (1, reverse conservative), we say that it is reverse conservative and set $C_{rc} := C_{1, rc}$.

Definition 6.3. An M -basis \mathcal{B} is said to have C -right Property (λ, A) if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq C\|x + 1_{\delta B}\|, \quad (6.1)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with $\|x\|_{\infty} \leq 1$, for all finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $B < A$, $\lambda|A| \leq |B|$ and $A \sqcup B \sqcup x$, and for all signs $(\varepsilon), (\delta)$. The least constant C verifying (6.1) is denoted by $C_{\lambda, rib}$. When $\lambda = 1$, we say that \mathcal{B} has right Property (A) .

Theorem 6.4. *Let \mathcal{B} is an M -basis. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{B} is reverse partially greedy,
- (2) \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{reverse partially greedy})$ for all (some) $\lambda \geq 1$,
- (3) \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and is reverse conservative,
- (4) \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and has right Property (A) ,
- (5) \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and is $(\lambda, \text{reverse conservative})$ for all (some) $\lambda \geq 1$,
- (6) \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy and has right Property (λ, A) for all (some) $\lambda \geq 1$.

For proof of Theorem 6.4, see Subsection 8.3.

7. FUTURE RESEARCH

- (1) As we have seen, for $\lambda > 1$, $(\lambda, \text{partially greedy})$ is strictly weaker than strong partially greedy. In a similar manner, is there a notion of $(\lambda, \text{reverse partially greedy})$ that is strictly weaker than reverse partially greedy?
- (2) It is also interesting to investigate what happens when we enlarge greedy sums at a slower or faster rate. For example, we may replace λm by $m \ln m$ or m^2 .

8. APPENDIX

8.1. Proof of Theorem 5.4.

Corollary 8.1. *Let \mathcal{B} be a quasi-greedy M -basis. Pick $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [1, \infty)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. Then \mathcal{B} has Property (λ_1, A) if and only if \mathcal{B} has Property (λ_2, A) .*

Proof. We prove that for all $\lambda > 1$, \mathcal{B} has Property (λ, A) if and only if it has Property (A) . Fix $\lambda > 1$. Clearly, Property (A) implies Property (λ, A) . We prove the converse. Assume \mathcal{B} has Property (λ, A) , which implies $(\lambda, \text{democracy})$. By Lemma 2.5, \mathcal{B} is democratic. As \mathcal{B} is democratic and quasi-greedy, \mathcal{B} is almost greedy (by [10, Theorem 3.3]) and thus, satisfies Property (A) according to Theorem 1.12. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.4. We prove the equivalences.

- (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (3): use [10, Theorem 3.3].
- (1) \Leftrightarrow (4): use Theorem 1.12.
- (2) \Leftrightarrow (5): use Lemma 2.5.
- (4) \Leftrightarrow (6): use Corollary 8.1.
- (1) \Rightarrow (7): Fix $\lambda_0 \geq 1$. We want to show that there exists $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\gamma_{\lceil \lambda_0 m \rceil}(x) \leq C \tilde{\sigma}_m(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (8.1)$$

If $\lambda_0 = 1$, then (8.1) is exactly the definition of almost greedy bases and we are done. Suppose that $\lambda_0 > 1$. Since (1) \Leftrightarrow (3), we know that \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda_0, \text{greedy})$;

that is, there exists some $C' \geq 1$ such that

$$\gamma_{\lceil \lambda_0 m \rceil}(x) \leq C' \sigma_m(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (8.2)$$

As (8.2) implies (8.1) with $C = C'$, we are done.

- (7) \Rightarrow (4): Assume that \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda_0, \text{almost greedy})$ for some $\lambda_0 \geq 1$. Then there exists $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\gamma_{\lceil \lambda_0 m \rceil}(x) \leq C \tilde{\sigma}_m(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (8.3)$$

Since $\tilde{\sigma}_m(x) \leq \|x\|$, we obtain $\gamma_{\lceil \lambda_0 m \rceil}(x) \leq C\|x\|$, which implies that \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy by Lemma 2.3. By Theorem 5.3, \mathcal{B} has Property (λ_0, A) , which implies Property (A) according to Corollary 8.1. \square

8.2. Proof of Theorem 5.6.

Proof of Theorem 5.6. Item (1) follows from Theorem 1.10.

We prove (2). Assume that \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,g}(\lambda, \text{greedy})$. Let $x, A, B, (\varepsilon), (\delta)$ be chosen as in Definition 2.6. Set $m = |A|$ and $y = x + 1_{\varepsilon A} + 1_{\delta B}$. Choose $\Lambda \subset B$ with $|\Lambda| = \lceil \lambda m \rceil$. Then $\Lambda \in \mathcal{G}(y, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$. We have

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| = \|y - P_B(y)\| \leq \mathbf{K}_s \|y - P_\Lambda(y)\| \leq \mathbf{K}_s \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,g} \sigma_m(y) \leq \mathbf{K}_s \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,g} \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|.$$

Hence, \mathcal{B} has $\mathbf{K}_s \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,g}$ -Property (λ, A) .

We prove (3). Assume that \mathcal{B} has $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib}$ -Property (λ, A) . Let $x \in \mathbb{X}, m \in \mathbb{N}, A \in \mathcal{G}(x, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$, and $B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|B| = m$. Let $(b_n)_{n \in B} \subset \mathbb{K}$ and $\alpha := \min_A |e_n^*(x)|$. Then $\|x - P_A(x)\|_\infty \leq \alpha$. By Lemma 2.8 and noticing that $\lambda|B \setminus A| \leq |A \setminus B|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - P_A(x)\| &\leq \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib} \left\| x - P_A(x) - P_{B \setminus A}(x) + \alpha \sum_{n \in A \setminus B} \text{sgn}(e_n^*(x)) e_n \right\| \\ &= \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib} \left\| P_{(A \cup B)^c}(x) + \alpha \sum_{n \in A \setminus B} \text{sgn}(e_n^*(x)) e_n \right\| \\ &\leq \mathbf{K}_s \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib} \left\| P_{(A \cup B)^c}(x) + \sum_{n \in B} (e_n^*(x) - b_n) e_n + \sum_{n \in A \setminus B} e_n^*(x) e_n \right\| \\ &= \mathbf{K}_s \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib} \left\| x - \sum_{n \in B} b_n e_n \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the sup over all $A \in \mathcal{G}(x, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$ and the inf over all $B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|B| = m$ and over all $(b_n)_{n \in B} \subset \mathbb{K}$, we see that \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{K}_s \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,ib}(\lambda, \text{greedy})$. \square

8.3. Proof of Theorem 6.4. Using the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.5, we have

Lemma 8.2. *An M -basis \mathcal{B} is reverse conservative if and only if \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{reverse conservative})$ for all (some) $\lambda \geq 1$.*

Proof of Theorem 6.4. We prove the equivalences.

- (1) \Leftrightarrow (3) \Leftrightarrow (4): see [11, Theorem 2.7] and [12, Theorem 3.12].
- (3) \Leftrightarrow (5): use Lemma 8.2.
- (1) \Rightarrow (2): Assume that \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{1,rp}$ -reverse partially greedy. Fix $\lambda > 1$. We need to show that \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{reverse partially greedy})$. Since (1) \Leftrightarrow (3), we can assume that \mathcal{B} is \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy. Pick an arbitrary collection $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X} = (\rho_x)_{x \in \mathbb{X}}$. Let $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We have

$$\left\| x - \sum_{n=1}^{\lceil \lambda m \rceil} e_{\rho_x(n)}^*(x) e_{\rho_x(n)} \right\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \left\| x - \sum_{n=1}^m e_{\rho_x(n)}^*(x) e_{\rho_x(n)} \right\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{1,rp} \sigma_m^{\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}, R}(x).$$

Therefore, \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{reverse partially greedy})$.

- (2) \Rightarrow (3): Assume that \mathcal{B} is $\mathbf{C}_{\lambda,rp}$ - $(\lambda, \text{reverse partially greedy})$ for some $\lambda \geq 1$. Let $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $A \in \mathcal{G}(x, \lceil \lambda m \rceil)$. Choose $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}$ such that for $\rho_x \in \mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}$, $A = \{\rho_x(1), \dots, \rho_x(\lceil \lambda m \rceil)\}$. Then

$$\|x - P_A(x)\| \leq \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,rp} \sigma_m^{\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}, R}(x) \leq \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,rp} \|x\|.$$

By Lemma 2.5, we know that \mathcal{B} is quasi-greedy.

Next, we show that \mathcal{B} is reverse conservative. Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\lambda|A| \leq |B|$ and $B < A$. Choose $E \subset B$ such that $|E| = \lceil \lambda m \rceil$, where $m := |A|$. Form $z := 1_A + 1_B$ and choose $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}$ such that for $\rho_z \in \mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}$, $E = \{\rho_z(1), \dots, \rho_z(\lceil \lambda m \rceil)\}$. By above, we can assume that \mathcal{B} is \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|1_A\| &= \|z - 1_{B \setminus E} - P_E(z)\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \|z - P_E(z)\| \\ &\leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,rp} \sigma_m^{\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{X}, R}(z) \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell \mathbf{C}_{\lambda,rp} \|1_B\|, \end{aligned}$$

Hence, \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda, \text{reverse conservative})$, which implies that \mathcal{B} is reverse conservative according to Lemma 8.2.

- (4) \Rightarrow (6): the implication is immediate from the definition of right Property (λ, A) .
- (6) \Rightarrow (3): Since \mathcal{B} has right Property (λ_0, A) for some $\lambda_0 \geq 1$, \mathcal{B} is $(\lambda_0, \text{reverse conservative})$, which implies reverse conservative by Lemma 8.2.

□

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Albiac and J. L. Ansorena, Characterization of 1-almost greedy bases, *Rev. Mat. Complut.* **30** (2017), 13–24.
- [2] F. Albiac and P. Wojtaszczyk, Characterization of 1-greedy bases, *J. Approx. Theory* **138** (2006), 65–86.
- [3] P. M. Berná, Ó. Blasco, G. Garrigós, E. Hernández, and T. Oikhberg, Lebesgue inequalities for Chebyshev thresholding greedy algorithms, *Rev. Mat. Complut.* **33** (2020), 695–722.
- [4] P. M. Berná, O. Blasco, and G. Garrigós, Lebesgue inequalities for greedy algorithm in general bases, *Rev. Mat. Complut.* **30** (2017), 369–392.
- [5] M. Berasategui, P. M. Berná, and S. Lassalle, Strong partially greedy bases and Lebesgue-type inequalities, *Constr. Approx.* **54** (2021), 507–528.
- [6] P. M. Berná, A note on partially-greedy bases in quasi-Banach spaces, *Studia Math.* **259** (2021), 225–239.
- [7] P. M. Berná, S. J. Dilworth, D. Kutzarova, T. Oikhberg, and B. Wallis, The weighted property (A) and the greedy algorithm, *J. Approx. Theory* **248** (2019), 1–18.

- [8] S. J. Dilworth, D. Kutzarova, E. Odell, Th. Schlumprecht, and A. Zsák, Renorming spaces with greedy bases, *J. Approx. Theory* **188** (2014), 39–56.
- [9] S. J. Dilworth, E. Odell, Th. Schlumprecht, and A. Zsák, Renormings and symmetry properties of 1-greedy bases, *J. Approx. Theory* **163** (2011), 1049–1075.
- [10] S. J. Dilworth, N. J. Kalton, D. Kutzarova, and V. N. Temlyakov, The thresholding greedy algorithm, greedy bases, and duality, *Constr. Approx.* **19** (2003), 575–597.
- [11] S. J. Dilworth and D. Khurana, Characterizations of almost greedy and partially greedy bases, *Jaen J. Approx.* **11** (2019), 115–137.
- [12] D. Khurana, Weight-partially greedy bases and weight-property (A), *Ann. Funct. Anal.* **11** (2020), 101–117.
- [13] S. V. Konyagin and V. N. Temlyakov, A remark on greedy approximation in Banach spaces, *East J. Approx.* **5** (1999), 365–379.
- [14] P. Wojtaszczyk, Greedy algorithms for general biorthogonal systems. *J. Approx. Theory* **107** (2000), 293–314.

Email address: hungchu2@illinois.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, URBANA,
IL 61820, USA