

# Generalizations of L- and M-weakly compact operators

Safak Alpay<sup>1</sup>, Eduard Emelyanov<sup>2</sup>, Svetlana Gorokhova<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematics, Middle East Technical University, Turkey

<sup>2</sup> Sobolev Institute of Mathematics, Russia

<sup>3</sup> Uznyj matematicheskij institut VNC RAN, Russia

## Abstract

L- and M-weakly compact operators were introduced by Meyer-Nieberg in the beginning of seventies in attempts of a diversification of the concept of weakly compact operators via imposing Banach lattice structure on the range or on the domain of operators. We investigate regularity and algebraic properties of several generalizations of L- and M-weakly compact operators in a unified point of view with main focus on almost (order) L-, M-weakly compact operators introduced recently by Bouras, Lhaimer, and Moussa.

**Keywords:** Banach lattice, regularly  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator, domination property, limited set, LW-set.

**MSC2020:** 46A40, 46B42, 46B50, 47B65

## 1 Introduction and Preliminaries

L- and M-weakly compact operators were introduced half a century ago in order to diversify the concept of weakly compact operators by adding lattice structure on the range/domain of operators. Since then, these operators attract permanent attention and inspire further investigations.

**1.1** In the present paper: vector spaces are real; operators are linear; the letters  $X, Y, Z$  stand for Banach spaces,  $E, F, G$  for Banach lattices, and  $V, W$  for ordered vector spaces. An operator  $T : X \rightarrow Y$  (a subset  $A$  in  $X$ ) is said to be *bounded* if  $T$  is norm continuous (resp., if  $A$  is norm bounded). We denote by  $B_X$  the closed unit ball of  $X$ ; by  $L(X, Y)$  ( $K(X, Y)$ ,  $W(X, Y)$ ) the space of all bounded (compact, weakly compact) operators from  $X$  to  $Y$ ; by  $E_+$  the positive cone of  $E$ ; by  $\text{sol}(A)$  the solid hull of  $A \subseteq E$ ; and by  $E^{\text{o}} = \{x \in E : |x| \geq x_n \downarrow 0 \Rightarrow \|x_n\| \rightarrow 0\}$  the o-continuous part of  $E$ . An operator  $T : V \rightarrow W$  is called *regular* if  $T = T_1 - T_2$  for some positive operators  $T_1, T_2 : V \rightarrow W$ . We denote by:

$\mathcal{L}(V, W)$  the space of all linear operators from  $V$  to  $W$ ;

$\mathcal{L}_r(V, W)$  the space of all regular operators from  $V$  to  $W$ ;

$\mathcal{L}_{ob}(V, W)$  the space of all order bounded operators from  $V$  to  $W$ .

Clearly,  $\mathcal{L}_r(V, W) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{ob}(V, W)$ . The order dual  $E^\sim$  of  $E$  coincides with the norm dual  $E'$ . For any  $S \in \mathcal{L}_{ob}(E, F)$ , the adjoint  $S' : F' \rightarrow E'$  is order bounded and o-continuous (cf. [3, Thm.1.73]). Furthermore, let  $T \in \mathcal{L}_{ob}(E, F)$ , then  $T'' \in \mathcal{L}_{ob}(E'', F'')$ . Since  $F''$  is Dedekind complete,  $T'' \in \mathcal{L}_r(E'', F'') \subseteq L(E'', F'')$ . Thus  $T \in L(E, F)$ , and hence  $\mathcal{L}_{ob}(E, F) \subseteq L(E, F)$ . We shall also use

$$\|f\| = \sup\{|f(x)| : x \in B_X\} = \sup\{|y(f)| : y \in B_{X''}\} \quad (\forall f \in X') \quad (1)$$

and, as a consequence of (1),

$$(f_n) \text{ in } X' \text{ converges uniformly on } B_X \text{ iff it converges uniformly on } B_{X''} \quad (2)$$

under the identification of  $f \in X'$  with  $\hat{f} \in (X')''$ . By [4, Def.1.1]: a subset  $A \subseteq E$  is called *b-order bounded* whenever  $\hat{A}$  is order bounded in  $E''$ , where  $E \xrightarrow{\hat{}} E''$  is the natural embedding of  $E$  into  $E''$ . We call an operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  *b-order bounded*, if  $T(A)$  is order bounded in  $F$  for each b-order bounded  $A \subseteq E$ . An operator  $T : E \rightarrow Y$  is said to be *b-w-compact* (resp. *o-w-compact*) if  $T$  carries b-order bounded sets (resp. order interval) of  $E$  onto a relatively w-compact subset of  $Y$ . We denote by  $\text{b-W}(E, Y)$  (resp. by  $\text{o-W}(E, Y)$ ) the space of all b-w-compact weakly (resp. o-w-compact) operators from  $E$  to  $Y$ .

**1.2** The Meyer-Nieberg theorem (cf. [3, Thm.5.55]):

- (\*) *if every disjoint sequence in the solid hull of  $L \subseteq F$  is norm null, then  $\text{sol}(L)$  (and hence  $L$  itself) is relatively w-compact in  $F$*

produces the following proper subclass of relatively w-compact subsets.

**Definition 1.2.1.** ([33, Def.1.iii]) A bounded subset  $L$  of  $F$  is called an LW-set whenever every disjoint sequence in  $\text{sol}(L)$  is norm null.

For every LW-subset  $A$  of  $E$ , we have  $A \subseteq E^a$ . Indeed, otherwise there is  $a \in A$  with  $|a| \in E \setminus E^a$ , and then there exists a disjoint sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $[0, |a|] \subseteq \text{sol}(A)$  with  $\|x_n\| \not\rightarrow 0$ . We need the following characterization of LW-sets (see [34, Prop.3.6.2] and [14, Lm.2.4]):

**Assertion 1.2.2.** *For a nonempty bounded subset  $A$  of  $E$ , the following are equivalent.*

- (i)  *$A$  is an LW-set.*
- (ii) *For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $u_\varepsilon \in E_+^a$  such that  $A \subseteq [-u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon] + \varepsilon B_E$ .*
- (iii)  *$f_n(x_n) \rightarrow 0$  for every  $(x_n)$  in  $A$  and every disjoint bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $E'$ .*

In particular,

almost order bounded sets in  $E$  with o-continuous norm are LW-sets. (3)

It can be easily seen that  $B_E$  is w-compact yet not an LW-set in any infinite dimensional reflexive  $E$ .

**1.3** An LW-operator  $T : X \rightarrow F$  is defined [33, Def.1.iii] via the condition that  $T(B_X)$  is an LW-set. Then  $\text{LW}(X, F) \subseteq \text{W}(X, F)$ , and

$$T \in \text{LW}(X, F) \iff T \text{ takes bounded subsets onto LW-subsets.} \quad (4)$$

In view of (3), and of (8) below:

$$\text{if the norm in } F \text{ is o-continuous then } \text{K}(X, F) \subseteq \text{LW}(X, F). \quad (5)$$

The next important fact goes back to Meyer-Nieberg (see also [3, Thm.5.63] and [15, Prop.2.2] for the more general setting). It is the key tool to various generalizations of LW-operators.

**Assertion 1.3.1.** *Let  $A \subseteq F$  and  $B \subseteq F'$  be nonempty bounded sets. TFAE.*

- (i) *Each disjoint sequence in  $\text{sol}(A)$  is uniformly null on  $B$ .*
- (ii) *Each disjoint sequence in  $\text{sol}(B)$  is uniformly null on  $A$ .*

We include a proof of the following certainly well known fact.

**Lemma 1.3.2.** *Let  $L$  be a nonempty bounded subset of  $F'$ . TFAE.*

- i)  *$L$  is an LW-subset of  $F'$ .*
- ii) *Each disjoint bounded sequence in  $F$  is uniformly null on  $L$ .*
- iii) *Each disjoint bounded sequence in  $F''$  is uniformly null on  $L$ .*

*Proof.* Keeping in mind (2) and the fact that the unite balls in Banach lattices are solid, we apply Assertion 1.3.1 first to  $A = B_F$  and  $B = L$ , and then to  $A = L$  and  $B = B_{F''}$  in order to obtain that both ii) and iii) are equivalent to the condition that every disjoint sequence in  $\text{sol}(L)$  is norm null, which means that  $L$  is an LW-subset of  $F'$ .  $\square$

The next well known assertion is a direct consequence of Lemma 1.3.2.

**Assertion 1.3.3.** *Let  $T : X \rightarrow F'$  be a bounded operator. TFAE.*

- (i)  *$T \in \text{LW}(X, F')$ .*
- (ii)  *$(T'f_n)$  is norm null for every disjoint bounded sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $F$ .*
- (iii)  *$(T'f_n)$  is norm null for every disjoint bounded sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $F''$ .*

The condition (iii) had lead to the idea of the following definition.

**Definition 1.3.4.** [33, Def.1.iv)] A bounded operator  $S : E \rightarrow Y$  is called:  
an MW-operator, or  $S \in \text{MW}(E, Y)$ , if  $\|Sx_n\| \rightarrow 0$  for every disjoint bounded sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $E$ .

The following duality result [33, Satz.3] (cf. also [3, Them.5.64]) has justified the success of introducing of LW- and MW-operators.

**Assertion 1.3.5.** *The following holds.*

- (i)  *$X \xrightarrow{T} F$  is an LW-operator  $\iff F' \xrightarrow{T'} X'$  is an MW-operator.*
- (ii)  *$E \xrightarrow{S} Y$  is an MW-operator  $\iff Y' \xrightarrow{S'} E'$  is an LW-operator.*

**1.4** The scheme described in the previous subsection applied to  $A = T(C)$  with any w-compact subset  $C$  of  $X$  and to  $B = B_{F'}$  produces *almost* LW- and *almost* MW-operators [14], whereas the choice of  $A = T([-x, x])$  with arbitrary  $x \in E_+$  and  $B = B_{F'}$  produces *order* LW- and *order* MW-operators [28]. Taking in the scheme  $A = T(C)$  with any compact  $C \subseteq X$  and  $B = B_{F'}$  gives:

- Definition 1.4.1.** a) An operator  $T : X \rightarrow F$  is called a c-LW-operator if  $T$  maps compact subsets of  $X$  into LW-subsets of  $F$ .
- b) A bounded operator  $S : E \rightarrow Y$  is called a c-MW-operator if  $S' \in \text{c-MW}(Y', E')$ .

In view of Assertion 1.2.2, we may replace in Definition 1.4.1(a) compact subsets of  $X$  by singletons and get:

**Assertion 1.4.2.** *The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (i)  $T \in \text{c-LW}(X, F)$ .
- (ii)  $\{Tx\}$  is an LW-subset of  $F$  for each  $x \in X$ .
- (iii)  $T(X) \subseteq F^a$ .
- (iv)  $f_n(Tx) \rightarrow 0$  for each  $x \in X$  and for every disjoint bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $F'$ .
- (v)  $T'$  takes disjoint bounded sequences of  $F'$  onto  $w^*$ -null sequences of  $X'$ .

The next fact is a consequence of Lemma 1.3.2.

**Assertion 1.4.3.** *Let  $T : X \rightarrow F'$  be a bounded operator. TFAE.*

- (i)  $T \in \text{c-LW}(X, F')$ .
- (ii)  $(T'f_n)$  is  $w^*$ -null in  $X'$  for every disjoint bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $F$ .
- (iii)  $(T'f_n)$  is  $w^*$ -null in  $X'$  for every disjoint bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $F''$ .

The class of c-LW-operators is too large to be of any reasonable interest.

b-LW-operators were introduced in [27]. They correspond to taking the pair  $(A, B)$  in the scheme above:  $A = T(U)$ , with an arbitrary b-bounded  $U \subseteq E$ , and  $B = B_{F'}$ . In the present paper, we investigate this scheme for  $A = T(L)$ , with an arbitrary limited subset  $L$  of  $X$ , and  $B = B_{F'}$ .

**1.5** The following technical notion was introduced in [23, Def.2].

**Definition 1.5.1.** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a set of operators (the set of  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators) from  $V$  to  $W$ . An operator  $T : V \rightarrow W$  is called a *regularly  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator* (shortly, an *r- $\mathcal{P}$ -operator*), if  $T$  is a difference of two positive  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators.

Given a set  $\mathcal{P}$  of operators from  $V$  to  $W$ . We denote by:

$\mathcal{P}(V, W)$  the set of all  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators from  $V$  to  $W$ ;

$\mathcal{P}_+(V, W)$  the set of all positive  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators from  $V$  to  $W$ ;

$\mathcal{P}_r(V, W)$  the set of all regular operators in  $\mathcal{P}(V, W)$ ;

r- $\mathcal{P}(V, W)$  the set of all r- $\mathcal{P}$ -operators in  $\mathcal{P}(V, W)$ .

$\mathcal{P}$ -operators are said to satisfy the *domination property* if it follows from  $0 \leq S \leq T \in \mathcal{P}$  that  $S$  is likewise a  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator. We say that an operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$  is  *$\mathcal{P}$ -dominated* if  $\pm T \leq U$  for some  $U \in \mathcal{P}$  (cf. [1, p.3022]).

**Proposition 1.5.2.** Let  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(V, W)$ ,  $\mathcal{P} \pm \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset$ , and  $T \in \mathcal{L}(V, W)$ .

- i)  $T$  is an r- $\mathcal{P}$ -operator iff  $T$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -dominated  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator.
- ii) Assume the modulus  $|T|$  of  $T$  exists in  $\mathcal{L}(V, W)$  and suppose that  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators satisfy the domination property. Then  $T$  is an r- $\mathcal{P}$ -operator iff  $|T|$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator.

*Proof.* i) Let  $T$  be an r- $\mathcal{P}$ -operator, say  $T = T_1 - T_2$  with two positive  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators  $T_1, T_2$ . It follows from  $\mathcal{P} \pm \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  that  $T$  and  $U = T_1 + T_2$  are both  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators. Since  $\pm T \leq U$  then  $T$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -dominated  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator.

Now, let  $T$  be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -dominated  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator. Take a  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator  $U$  such that  $\pm T \leq U$ . Since  $T = U - (U - T)$ , and both  $U$  and  $U - T$  are positive  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators,  $T$  is an r- $\mathcal{P}$ -operator.

ii) First assume  $|T|$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator. Since  $T = T_+ - T_-$ ,  $0 \leq T_{\pm} \leq |T|$ , and  $|T|$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator, the domination property implies that  $T_+$  and  $T_-$  are both positive  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators, and hence  $T = T_+ - T_-$  is an r- $\mathcal{P}$ -operator.

Now, assume  $T$  is an r- $\mathcal{P}$ -operator. Then there are two positive  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators  $T_1, T_2$  satisfying  $T = T_1 - T_2$ . Since  $0 \leq T_+ \leq T_1$  and  $0 \leq T_- \leq T_2$ , the domination property implies that  $T_+$  and  $T_-$  are both  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators. Hence  $|T| = T_+ + T_-$  is likewise a  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator.  $\square$

**Proposition 1.5.3.** Let  $F$  be Dedekind complete, and let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a subspace in  $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ , satisfying the domination property. Then r- $\mathcal{P}(E, F)$  is a Dedekind complete vector lattice.

*Proof.* First, we check that  $r\mathcal{P}(E, F)$  is a vector lattice. Since  $F$  is Dedekind complete then  $\mathcal{L}_r(E, F)$  is a vector lattice. By Proposition 1.5.2 ii), it follows  $T \in r\mathcal{P}(E, F) \implies |T| \in r\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ , and hence  $r\mathcal{P}(E, F)$  is a vector lattice.

In order to show that  $r\mathcal{P}(E, F)$  is Dedekind complete, it is enough to prove that  $\mathcal{P}_+(E, F) \ni T_\alpha \uparrow \leq U \in \mathcal{P}(E, F)$  implies  $T_\alpha \uparrow T \in \mathcal{P}(E, F)$ . Since  $F$  is Dedekind complete, there exists  $T \in \mathcal{L}_+(E, F)$  such that  $T_\alpha \uparrow T$  in  $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ . As  $0 \leq T \leq U \in \mathcal{P}(E, F)$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  satisfies the domination property,  $T \in \mathcal{P}(E, F)$ , and hence  $T_\alpha \uparrow T$  in  $\mathcal{P}(E, F)$  as desired.  $\square$

In general, quite a little is known about conditions on  $\mathcal{P}$ -operators under which every regular  $\mathcal{P}$ -operator is an  $r\mathcal{P}$ -operator, even for compact operators in a Banach lattice (see [16, 18] and references therein). By [1, Thm.4(ii)], there exists a compactly dominated compact operator on  $L^2[0, 1] \oplus c(L^2[0, 1])$  without modulus. So, in terms of Proposition 1.5.2 i), an  $r$ -compact operator need not to have modulus. By [17, Thm.2.2],  $r$ -compact (resp.  $r$ -w-compact,  $r$ -LW-,  $r$ -MW-) operators from  $E = L^2[0, 1]$  to  $F = c(L^2[0, 1])$  form a proper subspace of the space of regular compact (resp. regular w-compact, regular LW-, regular MW-) operators from  $E$  to  $F$ . In view of Proposition 1.5.2 ii), the following fact is a direct consequence of [26, Satz 7.1] and [17, Thm.2.9].

If  $F$  is an AM-space, then every compact (LW-) operator from  $E$  to  $F$  is  $r$ -compact (resp.  $r$ -LW-).

The domination property for compact, w-compact, LW-, MW-, and Dunford–Pettis operators was well investigated in the last quarter of 20th century. Recently, it was studied in [7, 23, 24] for KB and Levi operators between locally solid lattices.

The following example goes back to [25] (see, also [3, Ex.5.6],[1],[10]).

**Example 1.5.4.** Let  $A_n$  be a  $2^n \times 2^n$  matrix constructed inductively:

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{n+1} = \begin{bmatrix} A_n & A_n \\ A_n & -A_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

For each  $n$ , let  $T_n : \ell_{2^n}^2 \rightarrow \ell_{2^n}^2$  be the operator, whose matrix (with respect to the standard unit vectors of  $\ell_{2^n}^2 = \mathbb{R}^{2^n}$ ) is  $2^{-\frac{n}{2}} A_n$ . Since the matrix  $2^{-\frac{n}{2}} A_n$  is orthogonal, each  $T_n$  is an isometry. On the other hand,  $|T_n|$  is the operator, whose matrix is a  $2^n \times 2^n$  matrix with all of its entries equal to 1, and hence  $\| |T_n| \| = 2^{\frac{n}{2}}$  for all  $n$ . Consider the  $c_0$ -direct sum  $E := (\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_0$ . Note

that  $E' = (\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_1$ , in particular,  $E$  and  $E'$  both have o-continuous norms. By [20, Thm.4.5], compact operators on  $E$  satisfies the domination property. For any  $\alpha = (\alpha_n) \in \ell^\infty$ , define  $T : E \rightarrow E$ , by

$$Tx = T(x_1, x_2, \dots) := (\alpha_1 T_1 x_1, \alpha_2 T_2 x_2, \dots). \quad (6)$$

Then  $\|T\| \leq \|\alpha\|_\infty$ , and if  $\alpha_n \in c_0$ , then  $T \in K(E)$ . If  $\alpha_n = 2^{-\frac{n}{2}}$ , the modulus  $|T|$  exists and is given by

$$|T|x = (\alpha_1 |T_1| x_1, \alpha_2 |T_2| x_2, \dots). \quad (7)$$

As  $|T|$  is not a compact,  $T \in K_r(E) \setminus r\text{-K}(E)$  by Proposition 1.5.2 ii). For  $\alpha_n = 2^{-\frac{n}{3}}$ ,  $T$  is compact but not order bounded; so,  $|T|$  does not exist.

**1.6** The next two well known facts (cf. [3, Thm.4.59]; [34, 2.4.14]; [20, Cor.2.6, Cor.2.7]) are used freely in the present paper.

**Assertion 1.6.1.** *The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) *The norm on  $E'$  is o-continuous.*
- (ii)  *$E'$  is a KB space.*
- (iii) *Every disjoint bounded sequence in  $E$  is w-null.*

**Assertion 1.6.2.** *The following holds.*

- (i) *A sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $E$  is norm null iff  $|x_n|$  is w-null and  $f_n(x_n) \rightarrow 0$  for each disjoint bounded sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $E'_+$ .*
- (ii) *A sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $E'$  is norm null iff  $|f_n|$  is w\*-null and  $f_n(x_n) \rightarrow 0$  for each disjoint bounded sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $E_+$ .*

For further unexplained terminology and notations, we refer to [3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 14, 22, 23, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 37].

## 2 Disjoint sequence properties

In this section we discuss some facts and results on Banach lattices used in the paper. Some of them may have their own independent interest.



**2.1** Recall that  $E$  has *sequentially w-continuous* ( $w^*$ -continuous) *lattice operations* if, for every  $w$ -null  $(x_n)$  in  $E$  ( $w^*$ -null  $(x_n)$  in  $E'$ ), the sequence  $(|x_n|)$  is also  $w$ -null ( $w^*$ -null). The following useful fact was proved in [36, Prop.1.3] (It follows also from [3, Thm.4.34]).

**Assertion 2.1.1.** *For any disjoint  $w$ -null  $(x_n)$  in  $E$ , the sequence  $(|x_n|)$  is also  $w$ -null.*

**Definition 2.1.2.** ([21, Def.1]).  $E$  is said to have the *property (d)* (shortly,  $E \in (d)$ ) if  $(|f_n|)$  is also  $w^*$ -null for each disjoint  $w^*$ -null  $(f_n)$  in  $E'$ .

The property (d) is weaker than the sequential  $w^*$ -continuity of the lattice operations, as  $E = \ell^\infty$  shows. It was already studied in [36], where no name was assigned to this property. In particular, it was proved in [36, Prop.1.4] that every  $\sigma$ -Dedekind complete Banach lattice  $E$  has the property (d), and it was observed in [36, Rem.1.5] that  $\ell^\infty/c_0 \in (d)$ , but  $\ell^\infty/c_0$  is not  $\sigma$ -Dedekind complete. Example 2.2.3 below shows that  $C[0, 1] \notin (d)$ .

**Definition 2.1.3.** A Banach lattice  $E$  is said to have:

- a) the *Schur property* (shortly,  $E \in (SP)$ ) if  $w$ -null sequences in  $E$  are norm null (cf. [3, p.207]);
- b) the *positive Schur property* (shortly,  $E \in (PSP)$ ) if positive  $w$ -null sequences in  $E$  are norm null (cf. [36]);
- c) the *dual positive Schur property* (shortly,  $E \in (DPSP)$ ) if positive  $w^*$ -null sequences in  $E'$  are norm null [9, Def.3.3];
- d) the *dual disjoint Schur property* (shortly,  $E \in (DDSP)$ ) if disjoint  $w^*$ -null sequences in  $E'$  are norm null;
- e) the *Grothendieck property* (shortly,  $E \in (GP)$ ) if  $w^*$ -null sequences in  $E'$  are  $w$ -null (cf. [36, p.760]);
- f) the *positive Grothendieck property* (shortly,  $E \in (PGP)$ ) if positive  $w^*$ -null sequences in  $E$  are  $w$ -null (cf. [36, p.760]);
- g) the *disjoint Grothendieck property* (shortly,  $E \in (DGP)$ ) if disjoint  $w^*$ -null sequences in  $E'$  are  $w$ -null;
- h) the *dual disjoint  $w^*$ -property* (shortly,  $E \in (DDw^*P)$ ) if disjoint bounded sequences in  $E'$  are  $w^*$ -null.

The disjoint Grothendieck property was introduced under the name the *weak Grothendieck property* in [30, Def.4.8)], and the dual disjoint Schur property was introduced under the name the *dual Schur property* in [30, Def.3.2)].

**Proposition 2.1.4.** *For every Banach lattice  $E$  the following holds.*

$$E \in (\text{DGP}) \cap (\text{DDw}^*\text{P}) \implies E'' \text{ has o-continuous norm} \implies E \in (\text{DDw}^*\text{P}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $E \in (\text{DGP}) \cap (\text{DDw}^*\text{P})$  but the norm in  $E''$  is not o-continuous. Then  $(f_n)$  is not w-null for some disjoint bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $E'$  by Assertion 1.6.1. However  $f_n \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$  because  $E \in (\text{DDw}^*\text{P})$ , and hence  $f_n \xrightarrow{w} 0$  due to  $E \in (\text{DGP})$ . The obtained contradiction proves the first implication.

For the second implication, let the norm in  $E''$  be o-continuous. Then, by Assertion 1.6.1, every disjoint bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $E'$  is w-null and hence  $w^*$ -null. It follows  $E \in (\text{DDw}^*\text{P})$ .  $\square$

The next important fact was proved in [36, Prop.2.3]. Its proof is essentially based on Assertion 1.6.2(ii). We do not know whether or not in this assertion (DPSP) can be replaced by (PGP) and the norm null condition by the w-null condition.

**Assertion 2.1.5.**  *$E \in (\text{DPSP})$  iff every disjoint  $w^*$ -null sequence in  $E'_+$  is norm null.*

Clearly,  $(\text{DPSP}) \implies (\text{PGP})$ ; and  $(\text{DDSP}) \implies (\text{DGP})$ . In AM-spaces, (PGP) agrees with (DPSP), by [36, Prop.4.1]. (PSP) and (SP) coincide in the class of discrete Banach lattices [36, p.19]. By [34, Thm.5.3.13], (PGP) and (GP) agree in the class of Banach lattices with the interpolation property.

**2.2** The following proposition [31, Thm.3.3] describes the impact of the property (d) on dual Schur properties.

**Proposition 2.2.1.** *For every Banach lattice  $E$  the following holds.*

- i)  $E \in (\text{DDSP}) \implies E \in (\text{DPSP})$ ;
- ii) *if  $E$  has the property (d) then*  
 $E \in (\text{DDSP}) \iff E \in (\text{DPSP})$ .

*Proof.* i) Let  $E \in (\text{DDSP})$  and let  $(f_n)$  be a disjoint positive  $w^*$ -null sequence in  $E'$ . By Definition 2.1.3 d),  $(f_n)$  is norm null. Since the disjoint positive  $w^*$ -null sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $E'$  was taken arbitrary, Assertion 2.1.5 implies that  $E \in (\text{DPSP})$ .

ii) Assume now  $E \in (\text{d})$ . It suffices to prove  $(\Leftarrow)$ . Let  $E \in (\text{DPSP})$  and let  $(f_n)$  be a disjoint  $w^*$ -null in  $E'$ . Then  $(|f_n|)$  is a disjoint positive  $w^*$ -null sequence in  $E'$  by the property (d) of  $E$ . Since  $E \in (\text{DPSP})$ ,  $(|f_n|)$  is norm null. Then  $(f_n)$  is also norm null, and hence  $E \in (\text{DDSP})$ , as required.  $\square$

Clearly  $(\text{PGP}) \implies (\text{DGP})$  for Banach lattices with the property (d). For this implication, the property (d) is essential, as  $C[0, 1] \in (\text{PGP}) \setminus (\text{DGP})$  by Example 2.2.3 below. We have no example of  $E \in (\text{DGP}) \setminus (\text{PGP})$ . Recall that a subset  $A$  of  $E$  is called *almost order bounded* whenever, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $x \in E_+$  with  $A \subseteq [-x, x] + \varepsilon B_E$ . Clearly,

$$\text{every relatively compact subset of } E \text{ is almost order bounded.} \quad (8)$$

For the next assertion, we refer to [34, Cor.3.6.8], [35, Thm.7].

**Assertion 2.2.2.** *For a Banach lattice  $E$ , the following are equivalent.*

- (i)  $E \in (\text{PSP})$ .
- (ii) *Each disjoint  $w$ -null sequence in  $E$  is norm null.*
- (iii) *Each disjoint  $w$ -null sequence in  $E_+$  is norm null.*
- (iv) *Every disjoint sequence in the solid hull of each relatively  $w$ -compact subset of  $E$  is norm-null.*
- (v) *Almost order bounded subsets of  $E$  coincide with relatively  $w$ -compact subsets of  $E$ .*

By Assertion 2.2.2, if  $F \in (\text{PSP})$  then  $W(X, F) \subseteq LW(X, F)$ . The next example shows that the property (d) is essential in Proposition 2.2.1(ii).

**Example 2.2.3.** Consider the Banach lattice  $E = C[0, 1]$ . Let  $(f_n)$  be a positive  $w^*$ -null sequence in  $E'$ . It follows from  $\|f_n\| = f_n(\mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}) \rightarrow 0$  that  $C[0, 1] \in (\text{DPSP})$ , and hence  $C[0, 1] \in (\text{PGP})$ .

Take the sequence  $(r_n)$  of the Rademacher functions on  $[0, 1]$  and define a disjoint  $w^*$ -null sequence in  $E'$  as follows:

$$g_n = 2^{n+1} \cdot r_{2n} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}, \frac{1}{2^n}]}$$

Then  $(g_n)$  is disjoint  $w^*$ -null sequence in  $E'$ , yet  $\|g_n\| = 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore  $C[0, 1] \notin (\text{DDSP})$ , and hence by Proposition 2.2.1,  $C[0, 1] \notin (\text{d})$ .

Note that  $(g_n)$  is even not  $w$ -null. Indeed, for

$$y = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_{2n} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}, \frac{1}{2^n}]} \in L^\infty[0, 1] \subseteq E',$$

$y(g_n) \equiv 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . It also shows that  $C[0, 1] \notin (\text{DGP})$ .

### 3 a-LW- and l-LW-operators

Almost LW- and almost MW-operators were introduced in [14]. Here, apart of investigating them, we introduce and study limitedly LW- and limitedly MW-operators. They both likewise generalize LW- and MW-operators.

**3.1** We begin with the following definition.

**Definition 3.1.1.** An operator  $T : X \rightarrow F$  is called:

- i) *almost LW* ( $T$  is a-LW), if  $T$  carries relatively  $w$ -compact subsets of  $X$  onto LW-subsets of  $F$  [14, Def.2.1];
- ii) *limitedly LW* ( $T$  is l-LW), if  $T$  carries limited subsets of  $X$  onto LW-subsets of  $F$ .

We remind several facts on a-LW-operators. As  $w$ -compact sets are bounded, *each LW-operator is an a-LW-operator*. By (4), if  $S \in \text{W}(Y, X)$  and  $T \in \text{a-LW}(X, F)$  then  $T \circ S \in \text{LW}(Y, F)$ . Furthermore, each a-LW-operator  $T : X \rightarrow F$  is automatically bounded. Indeed, otherwise there exists a norm null sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $B_X$  satisfying  $\|Tx_n\| \geq n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , violating the fact that the LW-set  $\{Tx_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is bounded. Since  $\text{LW}(X, F) \subseteq \text{W}(X, F)$  then the identity operator  $I_{\ell^1} : \ell^1 \rightarrow \ell^1$  is not LW. It was shown in [22, Prop.1] that  $T \in \text{a-LW}(X, F)$  iff  $T(X) \subseteq F^a$  and  $f_n(Tx_n) \rightarrow 0$  for each disjoint bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $F'$  and each  $w$ -null  $(x_n)$  in  $X$ .

**3.2** Since  $\ell^1$  has the Schur property,  $I_{\ell^1} \in \text{a-LW}(\ell^1) \setminus \text{W}(\ell^1)$ . It was proved in [14, Thm.2.4], that

$$T \in \text{a-LW}(X, F) \text{ iff } T \circ S \in \text{LW}(Y, F) \text{ for all } Y \text{ and all } S \in \text{W}(Y, X). \quad (9)$$

**Assertion 3.2.1.** *For every two operators  $T$  and  $S$ :*

- (i) *if  $S \in \text{LW}(X, E)$  and  $T \in \text{a-LW}(E, F)$  then  $T \circ S \in \text{LW}(X, F)$ ;*
- (ii) *if  $S \in \text{L}(X, Y)$  and  $T \in \text{a-LW}(Y, F)$  then  $T \circ S \in \text{a-LW}(Y, F)$ ;*
- (iii) *if  $S \in \text{a-LW}(E, F)$  and  $T \in \text{LW}(F, G)$  then  $T \circ S \in \text{LW}(E, G)$ .*

*Proof.* (i) follows from (9) because LW-operators are w-compact.

(ii) Since  $S$  takes w-null sequences onto w-null ones.

(iii) follows from (4) because LW-sets are bounded. □

**Proposition 3.2.2.** *For any Banach lattice  $E$  the following holds.*

- i)  *$\text{LW}(E)$  is a closed subalgebra of  $\text{W}(E)$  which is unital iff the identity operator  $I_E$  is LW.*
- ii)  *$\text{a-LW}(E)$  is a closed right ideal in  $\text{L}(E)$  (and hence a subalgebra of  $\text{L}(E)$ ), which is unital iff  $I_E$  is a-LW.*

*Proof.* It is easy to see that both  $\text{LW}(E)$  and  $\text{a-LW}(E)$  are closed subspaces of  $\text{L}(E)$  (see, for example, [14, Prop.2.1]), and  $\text{LW}(E) \subseteq \text{W}(E)$ . The closeness of  $\text{LW}(E)$  under the composition follows from Assertion 3.2.1(i)(ii). The fact that  $\text{a-LW}(E)$  is a right ideal in  $\text{L}(E)$  follows from Assertion 3.2.1(ii). The conditions on  $I_E$ , which make the algebras  $\text{LW}(E)$  and  $\text{a-LW}(E)$  unital, are simply verified. □

As  $\text{a-LW}(E, F)$  satisfies the domination property by [2, Thm.1], the next lemma follows from Proposition 1.5.2 ii).

**Lemma 3.2.3.** *Let an operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  possess the modulus. TFAE.*

- i)  *$T$  is a regularly a-LW-operator.*
- ii)  *$|T|$  is an a-LW-operator.*

We also need the following fact [23, Lm.1].

**Assertion 3.2.4.** *Let  $\text{P}$  be a closed in the operator norm subspace of  $\text{L}(E)$ . Then the formula  $\|T\|_{\text{r-P}} = \inf\{\|S\| : \pm T \leq S \in \text{P}\}$  defines a norm on the space  $\text{r-P}(E)$ . Furthermore,  $\|T\|_{\text{r-P}} \geq \|T\|_r \geq \|T\|$  for all  $T \in \text{r-P}(E)$ , and  $(\text{r-P}(E), \|\cdot\|_{\text{r-P}})$  is a Banach space.*

**Theorem 3.2.5.** *For a Banach lattice  $E$  the following holds.*

- i) The set  $\text{r-a-LW}(E)$  of regularly  $\text{a-LW}$ -operators on  $E$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . Moreover,  $\text{r-a-LW}(E) = \mathcal{L}_r(E)$  iff  $I_E$  is an  $\text{a-LW}$ -operator.
- ii) If, additionally  $E$  is Dedekind complete then  $\text{r-a-LW}(E)$  is a Riesz subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . Furthermore,  $(\text{r-a-LW}(E), \|\cdot\|_{\text{r-a-LW}})$  is a Banach lattice algebra.

*Proof.* i) Since regular operators on  $E$  are bounded, it follows from Assertion 3.2.1(ii) that  $\text{r-a-LW}(E)$  is a right algebra ideal and hence is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . The condition on  $I_E$  for  $\text{r-a-LW}(E) = \mathcal{L}_r(E)$  is obvious.

ii) It follows from Lemma 3.2.3 that the subalgebra  $\text{r-a-LW}(E)$  is closed under lattice operations, and hence is a Riesz subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ .

Let  $S, T \in \text{r-a-LW}(E)$  satisfy  $|S| \leq |T|$ . In order to show  $\|S\|_{\text{r-a-LW}(E)} \leq \|T\|_{\text{r-a-LW}(E)}$ , observe that  $|S|, |T| \in \text{r-a-LW}(E)$  by Lemma 3.2.3. Then  $\|S\|_{\text{r-a-LW}(E)} = \| |S| \| \leq \| |T| \| = \|T\|_{\text{r-a-LW}(E)}$ . By Assertion 3.2.4, it follows from [14, Prop.2.1] that  $(\text{r-a-LW}(E), \|\cdot\|_{\text{r-a-LW}})$  is a Banach space. It remains to show that the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{r-a-LW}}$  is submultiplicative. Let  $S, T \in \text{r-a-LW}(E)$ . Take  $\varepsilon > 0$  and pick  $S_1, T_1 \in \text{a-LW}(E)$  with

$$\pm S \leq S_1, \quad (1 + \varepsilon)\|S\|_{\text{r-a-LW}} \geq \|S_1\|,$$

$$\pm T \leq T_1, \quad (1 + \varepsilon)\|T\|_{\text{r-a-LW}} \geq \|T_1\|.$$

Then  $\pm S \circ T \leq S_1 \circ T_1 \in \text{a-LW}(E)$ . Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, it follows from

$$(1 + \varepsilon)^2 \|S\|_{\text{r-a-LW}} \|T\|_{\text{r-a-LW}} \geq \|S_1\| \|T_1\| \geq \|S_1 \circ T_1\| \geq \|S \circ T\|_{\text{r-a-LW}}$$

that  $\|S \circ T\|_{\text{r-a-LW}} \leq \|S\|_{\text{r-a-LW}} \|T\|_{\text{r-a-LW}}$ , as desired.  $\square$

**3.3 l-LW-operators.** Here we include basic properties of l-LW-operators.

**Lemma 3.3.1.**  $T \in \text{l-LW}(X, F) \iff T'f_n \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$  in  $X'$  for each disjoint bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $F'$ .

*Proof.* ( $\implies$ ): Let  $T \in \text{l-LW}(X, F)$ ,  $(f_n)$  be disjoint bounded in  $F'$ , and  $x \in X$ . As  $\{Tx\}$  is an LW-subset of  $F$  then  $T'f_n(x) = f_n(Tx) \rightarrow 0$  by Assertion 1.3.1. Since  $x \in X$  is arbitrary,  $(T'f_n)$  is  $w^*$ -null.

( $\impliedby$ ): Let  $T'f_n \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$  for each disjoint bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $F'$ . Suppose in contrary  $T \notin \text{l-LW}(X, F)$ . So,  $T(L)$  is not an LW-subset of  $F$  for some nonempty limited subset  $L$  of  $X$ . Then there exists a disjoint sequence  $(g_n)$

in  $B_{F'}$  which is not uniformly null on  $T(L)$  by Assertion 1.3.1. Therefore,  $(T'g_n)$  is not uniformly null on  $L$  violating that  $T'g_n \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$  and that  $L$  is limited subset of  $X$ . The obtained contradiction proves the implication.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.3.2.** *Let  $0 \leq S \leq T \in \text{l-LW}(E, F)$  then  $S \in \text{l-LW}(E, F)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(f_n)$  be disjoint bounded in  $F'$ . Then  $(|f_n|)$  is also disjoint bounded, and hence  $T'|f_n| \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$  by Lemma 3.3.1. It follows from

$$|S'f_n(x)| \leq S'|f_n|(|x|) \leq T'|f_n|(|x|) \rightarrow 0 \quad (\forall x \in E)$$

that  $S'f_n \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$ , and hence  $S \in \text{l-LW}(E, F)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.3.** *Let  $\text{l-LW}(X, F) \ni T_n \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} T$ . Then  $T \in \text{l-LW}(X, F)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(f_n)$  be disjoint bounded in  $F'$ , and  $x \in X$ . By Lemma 3.3.1, we need to show  $T'f_n(x) \rightarrow 0$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Pick any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\|T - T_k\| \leq \varepsilon$ . Since  $T_k \in \text{l-LW}(X, F)$  then  $|T'_k f_n(x)| \leq \varepsilon$  for  $n \geq n_0$ . As  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, it follows from

$$|T'f_n(x)| \leq |T'f_n(x) - T'_k f_n(x)| + |T'_k f_n(x)| \leq$$

$$\|T' - T'_k\| \|f_n\| \|x\| + |T'_k f_n(x)| \leq (\|f_n\| \|x\| + 1)\varepsilon \quad (\forall n \geq n_0)$$

that  $T'f_n(x) \rightarrow 0$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.3.4.** The following are equivalent:

- (i)  $F \in (\text{DDw}^*\text{P})$ ;
- (ii)  $I_F \in \text{l-LW}(F)$ ;
- (iii) each limited subset of  $F$  is an LW-set;
- (iv)  $\text{l-LW}(F) = \text{L}(F)$ ;
- (v)  $\text{l-LW}(X, F) = \text{L}(X, F)$  for each Banach space  $X$ .

*Proof.* (i)  $\iff$  (ii): It follows from Lemma 3.3.1.

The implications (v)  $\implies$  (iv)  $\implies$  (ii)  $\iff$  (iii) are trivial.

(iii)  $\implies$  (v): Let  $T \in \text{L}(X, F)$  and let  $L$  is a limited subset of  $X$ . Then  $T(L)$  is a limited subset of  $F$ , and hence  $T(L)$  is an LW-subset of  $F$ . Thus,  $T \in \text{l-LW}(X, F)$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.3.5.**  $l\text{-LW}(E)$  is a closed right ideal in  $L(E)$  (and hence a subalgebra of  $L(E)$ ), which is unital iff  $I_E$  is  $l\text{-LW}$ .

*Proof.*  $l\text{-LW}(E)$  is a closed subspace of  $L(E)$  by Lemma 3.3.3. Since each bounded operator maps limited sets onto limited,  $l\text{-LW}(E)$  is a right ideal in  $L(E)$ . The condition on  $I_E$  making algebra  $l\text{-LW}(E)$  unital is trivial.  $\square$

In view of Proposition 3.3.2, the next lemma follows from Proposition 1.5.2 ii).

**Lemma 3.3.6.** Let an operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  possess the modulus. TFAE.

- i)  $T$  is a regularly  $l\text{-LW}$ -operator.
- ii)  $|T|$  is an  $l\text{-LW}$ -operator.

**Theorem 3.3.7.** For a Banach lattice  $E$  the following holds.

- i)  $r\text{-l-LW}(E)$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . Moreover,  $r\text{-l-LW}(E) = \mathcal{L}_r(E)$  iff  $I_E \in r\text{-l-LW}(E)$ .
- ii) If, additionally  $E$  is Dedekind complete then  $r\text{-l-LW}(E)$  is a Riesz subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . Furthermore,  $(r\text{-l-LW}(E), \|\cdot\|_{r\text{-l-LW}})$  is a Banach lattice algebra.

*Proof.* i) It follows from Proposition 3.3.5 that  $r\text{-l-LW}(E)$  is a right ideal and hence is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . The condition on  $I_E$  under which  $r\text{-l-LW}(E) = \mathcal{L}_r(E)$  is trivial.

ii) It follows from Lemma 3.3.6 that  $r\text{-l-LW}(E)$  is a Riesz subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2.5.  $\square$

### 3.4 Notions of a-MW- and l-MW-operators

**Definition 3.4.1.** An operator  $S : E \rightarrow Y$  is called:

- a) an *almost* MW-operator ( $S$  is a-MW), if  $f_n(Sx_n) \rightarrow 0$  for every disjoint bounded  $(x_n)$  in  $E$  and every  $w$ -convergent  $(f_n)$  in  $Y'$  [14, Def.2.2];
- b) a *limitedly* MW-operator ( $S$  is l-MW), if  $Sx_n \xrightarrow{w} 0$  for every disjoint bounded  $(x_n)$  in  $E$ .

**Remark 3.4.2.** It is easily seen that the identity operator  $I_E$

- i) in any infinite dimensional reflexive Banach lattice  $E$  is not a-MW;
- ii) is an l-MW-operator iff  $E'$  is a KB-space.



**3.5** We remind several facts on a-MW-operators. The next important semi-duality result was proved in [14, Thm.2.5].

**Assertion 3.5.1.** *The following holds.*

- (i)  $T \in \text{a-MW}(E, Y) \iff T' \in \text{a-LW}(Y', E')$ .
- (ii)  $S' \in \text{a-MW}(F', X') \implies S \in \text{a-LW}(X, F)$ .

In general,  $S \in \text{a-LW}(X, F) \not\iff S' \in \text{a-MW}(F', X')$  (see [14, Rem.2.1]). Since w-convergent sequences in  $Y'$  are bounded,  $\text{MW}(E, Y) \subseteq \text{a-MW}(E, Y)$ . The last inclusion may be proper: e.g. the identity operator  $I_{c_0} : c_0 \rightarrow c_0$  is a-MW yet not w-compact, and therefore  $I_{c_0}$  is not MW. In general,  $\text{K}(E, F) \not\subseteq \text{a-LW}(E, F) \cup \text{a-MW}(E, F)$ , as the next example shows.

**Example 3.5.2.** Define an operator  $T \in \text{K}(\ell^1, c)$  by  $T\alpha = (\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{N}}$ . As  $\{Te_1\} = \{\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{N}}\}$  is not an LW-subset of  $c$  then  $T \notin \text{a-LW}(\ell^1, c)$ . Furthermore,  $T \notin \text{a-MW}(\ell^1, c)$ . Indeed, for the disjoint bounded sequence  $(e_n)$  of unit vectors in  $B_{\ell^1}$  and for any  $f \in c'$  with  $f(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{N}}) = 1$ , the constant sequence  $(f_n)$ ,  $f_n \equiv f$ , is w-convergent, yet  $f_n(Te_n) \equiv 1 \not\rightarrow 0$ .

Since  $f_n(Tx_n) \rightarrow 0$  for every disjoint bounded  $(x_n)$  in  $\ell^1$  and every w-null  $(f_n)$  in  $c'$ , a w-convergent sequence  $(f_n)$  in Definition 3.4.1 a) can not be replaced by w-null  $(f_n)$ .

The implication below is straightforward (cf. [5, Prop.2.1]).

$$T \in \text{a-MW}(E, X) \ \& \ S \in \text{L}(X, Y) \implies S \circ T \in \text{a-MW}(E, Y). \quad (10)$$

### 3.6 Algebraic properties of a-MW-operators.

**Lemma 3.6.1.** *For every two operators  $T$  and  $S$ :*

- i) *if  $T \in \text{a-MW}(E, F)$  and  $S \in \text{MW}(F, Y)$  then  $S \circ T \in \text{MW}(E, Y)$ ;*
- ii) *if  $T \in \text{a-MW}(E, X)$  and  $S \in \text{L}(X, Y)$  then  $S \circ T \in \text{a-MW}(E, Y)$ ;*
- iii) *if  $T \in \text{MW}(F, G)$  and  $S \in \text{a-MW}(E, F)$  then  $T \circ S \in \text{MW}(E, G)$ .*

*Proof.* i) Let  $T \in \text{a-MW}(E, F)$  and  $S \in \text{MW}(F, Y)$ . Then  $T' \in \text{a-LW}(F', E')$  by Assertion 3.5.1(i), and  $S' \in \text{LW}(Y', F')$  by Assertion 1.3.5(i). It follows from Assertion 3.2.1(i), that  $(S \circ T)' = T' \circ S' \in \text{LW}(Y', E')$ . Hence  $S \circ T \in \text{MW}(E, Y)$  by Assertion 1.3.5(i).

ii) Follows from (10).

iii) Let  $T \in \text{MW}(F, G)$  and  $S \in \text{a-MW}(E, F)$ . Then  $T' \in \text{LW}(G', F')$  by Assertion 1.3.5(i) and  $S' \in \text{a-LW}(F', E')$  by Assertion 3.5.1(i). Hence  $(T \circ S)' = S' \circ T' \in \text{LW}(G', E')$  by Assertion 3.2.1(iii). Assertion 1.3.5(i) gives  $T \circ S \in \text{MW}(E, G)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.6.2.** *For any Banach lattice  $E$  the following holds.*

*$\text{MW}(E)$  is a closed subalgebra of  $\text{W}(E)$  which is unital iff the identity operator  $I_E$  is MW.*

*$\text{a-MW}(E)$  is a closed left ideal in  $\text{L}(E)$  (and hence a subalgebra of  $\text{L}(E)$ ), which is unital iff  $I_E$  is a-MW.*

*Proof.* Both  $\text{MW}(E)$  and  $\text{a-MW}(E)$  are closed subspaces of  $\text{W}(E)$  by Proposition 3.2.2 and Assertion 1.3.5. The closeness of  $\text{MW}(E)$  under the composition follows from Lemma 3.6.1(i)(ii). The fact that  $\text{a-MW}(E)$  is a right ideal in  $\text{L}(E)$  follows from Lemma 3.6.1(ii). Conditions on  $I_E$  making algebras  $\text{MW}(E)$  and  $\text{a-MW}(E)$  to be unital, are trivial.  $\square$

The following fact was established in [2, Thm.2].

**Assertion 3.6.3.** *For all Banach lattices  $E$  and  $F$  the a-MW-operators from  $E$  to  $F$  satisfy the domination property.*

In view of Assertion 3.6.3, the next lemma follows from Proposition 1.5.2 ii).

**Lemma 3.6.4.** *Let an operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  possess the modulus. TFAE.*

- i)  $T$  is a regularly a-MW-operator.
- ii)  $|T|$  is an a-MW-operator.

**Theorem 3.6.5.** *For a Banach lattice  $E$  the following holds.*

- i) *The set  $\text{r-a-MW}(E)$  of regularly a-MW-operators on  $E$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . Moreover,  $\text{r-a-MW}(E) = \mathcal{L}_r(E)$  iff  $I_E$  is an a-MW-operator.*
- ii) *If, additionally  $E$  is Dedekind complete then  $\text{r-a-MW}(E)$  is a Riesz subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . Furthermore,  $(\text{r-a-MW}(E), \|\cdot\|_{\text{r-a-MW}})$  is a Banach lattice algebra.*

*Proof.* i) It follows from Assertion 3.6.1(ii) that  $\text{r-a-MW}(E)$  is a left algebra ideal and hence is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . The condition on  $I_E$  under which  $\text{r-a-MW}(E) = \mathcal{L}_r(E)$  is trivial.

ii) It follows from Lemma 3.6.4 that  $\text{r-a-MW}(E)$  is closed under lattice operations, and hence is a Riesz subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ .

The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2.5.  $\square$

**3.7** In certain cases a-LW- or a-MW-operators may coincide with bounded operators, as the following proposition shows.

**Proposition 3.7.1.** *For any Banach space  $X$  the following holds.*

i) *If  $F$  is an AL-space then  $\text{a-LW}(X, F) = \text{L}(X, F)$ .*

ii) *If  $E$  is an AM-space then  $\text{a-MW}(E, Y) = \text{L}(E, Y)$ .*

*Proof.* i) Let  $S : X \rightarrow F$  be a bounded operator and let  $C$  be a relatively w-compact subset of  $X$ . Then  $S(C)$  is relatively w-compact subset of  $F$ . By [3, Thm.5.56],  $S(C)$  is an LW-subset of  $F$ , and hence  $S \in \text{a-LW}(X, F)$ .

ii) Let  $T \in \text{L}(E, Y)$ . Since  $E'$  is an AL-space, it follows from i) that  $T' \in \text{a-LW}(Y', E')$ . Then  $T \in \text{a-MW}(E, Y)$  by Assertion 3.5.1(i).  $\square$

**3.8** The next result describes some restrictions on  $E$  and  $F$  under which  $\text{a-MW}_+(E, F) \subseteq \text{MW}(E, F)$ .

**Proposition 3.8.1.** *Let the norm in  $E'$  be o-continuous,  $F$  be Dedekind complete, and  $\text{a-MW}_+(E, F) \subseteq \text{MW}(E, F)$ . Then either  $E \in (\text{PSP})$  or  $F$  has o-continuous norm.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $E \notin (\text{PSP})$  and  $F$  has no o-continuous norm. It suffices to construct a positive a-MW-operator from  $E$  to  $F$  which is not MW. By Assertion 2.2.2, there exists a disjoint w-null sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $E_+$  which is not norm null. Then, for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist a subsequence  $(x_{n_m})$  and a sequence  $(f_m)$  in  $E'_+$  with  $\|f_m\| = 1$ , such that  $f_m(x_{n_m}) \geq \varepsilon$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Define a positive operator  $T : E \rightarrow \ell^\infty$  as  $T(x) := (f_m(x))_{m=1}^\infty$  for  $x \in E$ . Since  $F$  is Dedekind complete and the norm in  $F$  is not o-continuous, there is a lattice embedding  $S : \ell^\infty \rightarrow F$  (cf. [3, Thm.4.51]). Then, for some  $M_1, M_2 > 0$ :

$$M_2 \|a\|_\infty \geq \|Sa\| \geq M_1 \|a\|_\infty \quad (\forall a \in \ell^\infty).$$

Consider the operator  $S \circ T : E \rightarrow F$ . Since  $\ell^\infty$  has the weak Dunford–Pettis property,  $S \circ T$  is a weak Dunford–Pettis operator [3, p.349]. Since  $E'$  has o-continuous norm, each disjoint sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $E$  is w-null and, for a w-convergent sequence  $(h_n)$  in  $F'$ , we have  $h_n(ST(x_n)) \rightarrow 0$ , that is:  $S \circ T \in \text{a-MW}(E, F)$ . However,

$$\|ST(x_{n_m})\| = \|S((f_k(x_{n_m}))_k)\| \geq M_1 \|(f_k(x_{n_m}))_k\|_\infty \geq M_1 \cdot \varepsilon$$

shows that  $S \circ T \notin \text{MW}(E, F)$ , and we are done.  $\square$

The following result is an LW-version of Proposition 3.8.1.

**Proposition 3.8.2.** *If  $\text{a-LW}_+(E, F) \subseteq \text{LW}(E, F)$ , then either  $E'$  has o-continuous norm or  $F' \in (\text{PSP})$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose, in contrary, that the norm in  $E'$  is not o-continuous and  $F' \notin (\text{PSP})$ . Then we can find a disjoint sequence  $(x'_n)$  in  $E'$  and  $x' \in E'$  such that  $0 \leq x'_n \leq x'$  and  $\|x'_n\| = 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By Assertion 2.2.2(iii), there is a disjoint w-null sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $F'_+$  which is not norm null. By passing to a subsequence and by scaling, we may assume that  $\|f_n\| \geq 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Choose a sequence  $(y_n)$  in  $F_+$  with  $\|y_n\| = 1$  and  $|f_n(y_n)| \geq \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let positive operators  $T : E \rightarrow \ell^1$  and  $S : \ell^1 \rightarrow F$  be defined by

$$Tx = (x'_k(x))_{k=1}^\infty \quad \& \quad S(\alpha) = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \alpha_k f_k.$$

Clearly, both of  $T$  and  $S$  are well defined. Then  $U = S \circ T : E \rightarrow \ell^1 \rightarrow F$  is a-LW. Indeed, for each w-null  $(a_n)$  in  $E$ ,  $Ta_n \xrightarrow{w} 0$  in  $\ell^1$ . As  $\ell^1$  has the Schur property,  $\|Ta_n\| \rightarrow 0$  so that, for each disjoint  $(b'_n)$  in  $B_{F'}$ , we have

$$|b'_n(S \circ T)a_n| \leq \|b'_n\| \cdot \|S \circ T(a_n)\| \rightarrow 0$$

proving  $U \in \text{a-LW}_+(E, F)$ . If  $U$  were to be LW, then  $U'$  would be MW. But

$$\|U'(f_n)\| = \|T' \circ S'(f_n)\| = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^\infty f_n(y_k) \right\| \geq |f_n(y_n)| \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

for each  $n$ , which shows that  $U'$  is not MW and so  $U$  cannot be LW. This contradiction completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.8.3.** *Suppose the norm in  $E'$  is  $o$ -continuous,  $F$  be Dedekind complete, and  $F'$  has the Schur property. Then, for every order bounded  $T : E \rightarrow F$ ,  $|T|$  is a-MW and  $|T|'$  is a-LW.*

*Proof.* Let  $(x_n)$  be a disjoint bounded sequence in  $E$  and  $f_n \xrightarrow{w} f$  in  $F'$ . By the Schur property of  $F'$ , we have  $\|f_n - f\| \rightarrow 0$ . Hence

$$|(f_n - f)(|T|x_n)| \leq \|f_n - f\| \cdot \||T|x_n\| \rightarrow 0. \quad (11)$$

Since  $E'$  has  $o$ -continuous norm,  $(x_n)$  is  $w$ -null by Assertion 1.6.1 and hence  $f(|T|x_n) = |T|'(f)(x_n) \rightarrow 0$ . It follows from (11) that  $f_n(|T|x_n) \rightarrow 0$ , and hence  $|T|$  is a-MW. By Assertion 3.5.1 (i),  $|T|' \in \text{a-LW}(F', E')$ .  $\square$

### 3.9 Basic properties of l-MW-operators.

**Proposition 3.9.1.** *Let  $0 \leq S \leq T \in \text{l-MW}(E, F)$  then  $S \in \text{l-MW}(E, F)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(x_n)$  be disjoint bounded sequence in  $E$ . Then  $(|x_n|)$  is also disjoint bounded, and then  $T|x_n| \xrightarrow{w} 0$ . It follows from  $|Sx_n| \leq S|x_n|$  that

$$|f(Sx_n)| \leq |f|(S|x_n|) \leq |f|(T|x_n|) \rightarrow 0 \quad (\forall f \in F'),$$

and hence  $Sx_n \xrightarrow{w} 0$ . Thus,  $S \in \text{l-MW}(E, F)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9.2.** *Let  $\text{l-MW}(E, Y) \ni T_n \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} T$ . Then  $T \in \text{l-MW}(E, Y)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(x_n)$  be a disjoint sequence in  $B_E$ , and  $f \in Y'$ . Take  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and pick an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\|T - T_m\| \leq \varepsilon$ . Since  $T_m \in \text{l-MW}(E, Y)$  then  $|f(T_mx_n)| \leq \varepsilon$  for  $n \geq n_0$ . It follows from

$$|f(Tx_n)| \leq |f(Tx_n) - f(T_mx_n)| + |f(T_mx_n)| \leq$$

$$\|T' - T'_m\| \|f\| \|x_n\| + |f(T_mx_n)| \leq (\|f\| + 1)\varepsilon \quad (\forall n \geq n_0),$$

that  $f(Tx_n) \rightarrow 0$ , and hence  $T \in \text{l-MW}(E, Y)$ .  $\square$

In view of Proposition 3.9.1, the next lemma follows from Proposition 1.5.2 ii).

**Lemma 3.9.3.** *Let an operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  possess the modulus. TFAE.*

- i)  $T \in \text{r-l-MW}(E, F)$ .
- ii)  $|T| \in \text{l-MW}(E, F)$ .

**Theorem 3.9.4.** *For a Banach lattice  $E$  the following holds.*

- i)  $\text{r-l-MW}(E)$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . Moreover,  $\text{r-l-MW}(E) = \mathcal{L}_r(E)$  iff  $I_E$  is an l-MW-operator.
- ii) If, additionally  $E$  is Dedekind complete then  $\text{r-l-MW}(E)$  is a Riesz subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . Furthermore,  $(\text{r-l-MW}(E), \|\cdot\|_{\text{r-l-MW}})$  is a Banach lattice algebra.

*Proof.* i) Since each bounded operator is w-continuous,  $\text{r-l-MW}(E)$  is a left ideal and hence is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . The condition on  $I_E$  under which  $\text{r-l-MW}(E) = \mathcal{L}_r(E)$  is trivial.

ii) By Lemma 3.9.3,  $\text{r-l-MW}(E)$  is closed under lattice operations, and hence is a Riesz subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . It follows from Assertion 3.2.4 and Lemma l-MW-closed that  $(\text{r-l-LW}(E), \|\cdot\|_{\text{r-l-LW}})$  is a Banach space. The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2.5.  $\square$

**3.10** We we include also the following semi-duality result.

**Proposition 3.10.1.** *The following holds.*

- i)  $T' \in \text{l-LW}(Y', E') \implies T \in \text{l-MW}(E, Y)$ , and if additionally  $E' \in (\text{DDw}^*\text{P})$  then  $T' \in \text{l-LW}(Y', E') \iff T \in \text{l-MW}(E, Y)$ .
- ii)  $S' \in \text{l-MW}(F', X') \implies S \in \text{l-LW}(X, F)$ , and if additionally  $X \in (\text{GP})$  then  $S' \in \text{l-MW}(F', X') \iff S \in \text{l-LW}(X, F)$ .

*Proof.* i) ( $\implies$ ): Let  $T' \in \text{l-LW}(Y', E')$ . Take a disjoint bounded sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $E$ . Then  $(\hat{x}_n)$  is disjoint bounded in  $E''$ . By Lemma 3.3.1,  $T''\hat{x}_n \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$  in  $Y''$ , and hence

$$y(Tx_n) = (T'y)x_n = \hat{x}_n(T'y) = T''\hat{x}_n(y) \rightarrow 0 \quad (\forall y \in Y').$$

Thus  $Tx_n \xrightarrow{w} 0$ , and hence  $T \in \text{l-MW}(E, Y)$ .

Now, let  $T \in \text{l-MW}(E, Y)$  and  $E' \in (\text{DDw}^*\text{P})$ . Take a disjoint bounded sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $E''$ . Since  $E' \in (\text{DDw}^*\text{P})$  then  $f_n \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$  in  $E''$ , and hence  $T''f_n \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$  in  $Y''$ . Lemma 3.3.1 implies  $T' \in \text{l-LW}(Y', E')$ .

ii) ( $\implies$ ): Let  $S' \in \text{l-MW}(F', X')$ . Take a disjoint bounded sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $F'$ . Then  $S'f_n \xrightarrow{w} 0$  in  $X'$ , and hence  $S'f_n \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$  in  $X'$ . It follows from Lemma 3.3.1 that  $S \in \text{l-LW}(X, F)$ .

Now, let  $S \in \text{l-LW}(X, F)$  and  $X \in (\text{GP})$ . Take a disjoint bounded sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $F'$ . By Lemma 3.3.1,  $S'f_n \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$  in  $X'$ . Since  $X \in (\text{GP})$  then  $S'f_n \xrightarrow{w} 0$ , and hence  $S' \in \text{l-MW}(F', X')$ .  $\square$

## 4 Order LW- (MW-) operators

Order LW- (MW-) operators were introduced recently in [27, 28]. Here we continue investigation of these classes of operators. The idea of definition of an order LW-operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  lies in choosing in Assertion 1.3.1,

$$A := T[-x, x] \text{ for arbitrary } x \in E_+; \text{ and } B := B_{F'}. \quad (12)$$

### 4.1 Preliminaries.

**Definition 4.1.1.** A bounded operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  is called:

- a) *order LW* (shortly,  $T$  is o-LW) if  $T[0, x]$  is an L-weakly compact subset of  $F$  for every  $x \in E_+$  [28, Def.2.1];
- b) *order MW* (shortly,  $T$  is o-MW) if, for every disjoint bounded sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $E$  and every order bounded sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $F'$ , we have  $f_n(Tx_n) \rightarrow 0$  (see [27, Def.2.2] and [28, Def.2.2]).

Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} W(E, Y) &\subseteq \text{o-W}(E, Y); \\ LW(E, F) &\subseteq \text{o-LW}(E, F); \\ MW(E, F) &\subseteq \text{o-MW}(E, F). \end{aligned}$$

Since the operators  $I_{c_0}$  and  $I_c$  are not w-compact, one can directly derive from Definition 4.1.1 that

$$I_{c_0} \in \text{o-LW}(c_0) \setminus LW(c_0) \quad \text{and} \quad I_c \in \text{o-MW}(c) \setminus MW(c).$$

The following two assertions (see [28, Thm.2.1 and Thm.2.2]) give important characterizations of o-LW-operators.

**Assertion 4.1.2.** *For an operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $T \in \text{o-LW}(E, F)$ .
- (ii)  $(|T'f_n|)$  is  $w^*$ -null for every disjoint bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $F'$ .
- (iii)  $f_n(Tx_n) \rightarrow 0$  for every order bounded  $(x_n)$  in  $E$  and every disjoint bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $F'$ .

**Assertion 4.1.3.**  $S \in \text{o-LW}(E', F')$  iff

$$(Sf_n)(y_n) = y_n(Sf_n) = (S'y_n)(f_n) \rightarrow 0$$

for every order bounded  $(f_n)$  in  $E'$  and every disjoint bounded  $(y_n)$  in  $F$ .

The next semi-duality result [28, Thm.2.3] plays a key role in the investigation of o-LW- and o-MW-operators.

**Assertion 4.1.4.** *The following holds.*

- (i)  $T \in \text{o-MW}(E, F) \iff T' \in \text{o-LW}(F', E')$ .
- (ii)  $S' \in \text{o-MW}(F', E') \implies S \in \text{o-LW}(E, F)$ .

It was also observed in [28, Rem.2.3] that, in general,

$$S \in \text{o-LW}(E, F) \not\iff S' \in \text{o-MW}(F', E'),$$

as  $I_{c_0} \in \text{o-LW}(c_0)$ , but  $(I_{c_0})' = I_{\ell^1} \notin \text{o-MW}(\ell^1)$ .

**4.2** A rank one bounded operator need not to be o-LW. Consider an operator  $T : \ell^2 \rightarrow \ell^\infty$  defined by  $T\alpha = (\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k)\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{N}}$ . Then  $Te_n = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{N}}$  and, as  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{N}} \notin (\ell^\infty)^a$ , the operator  $T$  is not o-LW. The following result is an improvement of [28, Thm.2.5]:

**Proposition 4.2.1.** *For a Banach lattice  $E$ , the following are equivalent.*

- i) *The norm in  $E'$  is o-continuous.*
- ii) *For every  $F$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{ob}(E, F) \subseteq \text{o-MW}(E, F)$ .*
- iii) *For every  $F$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_r(E, F) \subseteq \text{o-MW}(E, F)$ .*
- iv) *For every  $F$ ,  $\text{K}(E, F) \subseteq \text{o-MW}(E, F)$ .*
- v) *Each rank one bounded operator  $T : E \rightarrow E$  is o-MW.*

*Proof.* i)  $\iff$  ii) is in [28, Thm.2.5] and the implication ii)  $\implies$  iii) is trivial.

iii)  $\implies$  i). If not, there is a disjoint bounded sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $E$  and a functional  $f \in E'$  such that  $f(x_n) \geq 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  by Assertion 1.6.1. The identity operator  $T = I : E \rightarrow E$  is o-MW by iii). However, for the order bounded sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $F'$  with  $f_n \equiv f$ , it holds  $f_n(Tx_n) = f(x_n) \geq 1$ , and



hence  $f_n(Tx_n) \not\rightarrow 0$ , violating Assertion 4.1.3. The obtained contradiction proves the implication.

i)  $\implies$  iv). Let  $T \in K(E, F)$  and let  $x \in F'_+$ . Since  $T' \in K(F', E')$ , then  $T'[0, x]$  is relatively compact and hence is almost order bounded. As the norm in  $E'$  is o-continuous,  $T'[0, x]$  is an LW-subset of  $E'$  by Assertion 1.2.2. This yields  $T' \in \text{o-LW}(F', E')$ , and hence  $T \in \text{o-MW}(E, F)$ , by Assertion 4.1.4(i).

iv)  $\implies$  v). It is obvious.

v)  $\implies$  i). If the norm in  $E'$  is not o-continuous, take  $g \in E'_+ \setminus (E')^a$ . Let  $T$  be a bounded rank one operator defined by  $T(x) = g(x)y_0$  with  $y_0 \in E_+ \setminus \{0\}$ . Then  $T \in K(E) \subseteq \text{o-MW}(E)$ . Since  $T'f = f(y_0)g = g \notin (E')^a$ ,  $T'[0, f]$  is not an LW-subset of  $E'$  as each LW-subset of  $E'$  must lie in  $(E')^a$ . Therefore  $T' \notin \text{o-LW}(E')$ . This yields  $T \notin \text{o-MW}(E)$  by Assertion 4.1.4(i). The obtained contradiction completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.2.2.** *There is a Banach lattice  $E$  with  $\mathcal{L}_r(E) \subsetneq \text{o-MW}(E)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $E$  be as in Example 1.5.4. It follows from Proposition 4.2.1 that  $\mathcal{L}_r(E) \subseteq \text{o-MW}(E)$ . Consider the operator  $T$  defined by (6) in Example 1.5.4 for  $\alpha_n = 2^{-\frac{n}{3}}$ . As  $T \in K(E)$ , applying Proposition 4.2.1 again gives  $T \in \text{o-MW}(E)$ . However  $|T|$  does not exist and hence  $T \notin \mathcal{L}_r(E)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.2.3.** *Let  $E$  and  $F$  be Banach lattices with  $\dim(E) \geq 1$  and  $\dim(F) \geq 1$  then:*

- i)  $E'$  has o-continuous norm  $\iff$  every rank one bounded operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  is o-MW;
- ii)  $F$  has o-continuous norm  $\iff$  every rank one bounded operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  is o-LW.

*Proof.* i) It is a part of Proposition 4.2.1.

ii) The implication ( $\implies$ ) is obvious.

ii) ( $\impliedby$ ) If not, there exist  $y \in F_+$  and a disjoint sequence  $(y_n)$  in  $[0, y]$ , which is not norm null. Choose  $x \in E_+$ ,  $f \in E'_+$  with  $f(x) = 1$  and define a rank one operator  $T$  as  $Tz = f(z)y$ . Then  $Tx = y$  and  $(y_n)$  is a disjoint sequence in  $\text{sol}(T[0, x])$  which is not norm null, violating that  $T$  must be o-LW. A contradiction.  $\square$

**4.3** It follows directly from the definitions:

$$\text{LW}(E, F) \subseteq \text{o-LW}(E, F) \cap \text{a-LW}(E, F); \quad (13)$$

$$\text{MW}(E, F) \subseteq \text{o-MW}(E, F) \cap \text{a-MW}(E, F). \quad (14)$$

If  $F$  has o-continuous norm, then  $\mathcal{L}_{ob}(E, F) \subseteq \text{o-LW}(E, F)$ . In particular, order bounded operators in  $\text{a-LW}(E, F)$  are o-LW [28, Thm.2.4]. If  $E'$  has o-continuous norm, then  $\mathcal{L}_{ob}(E, F) \subseteq \text{o-MW}(E, F)$  by [28, Thm.2.5]. Clearly,

$$I_{c_0} \in \text{o-LW}(c_0) \setminus \text{a-LW}(c_0) \text{ and } I_{\ell^1} \in \text{a-LW}(\ell^1) \setminus \text{a-MW}(\ell^1). \quad (15)$$

It can be easily shown that  $I_{\ell^2} \in \text{o-MW}(\ell^2) \setminus \text{a-MW}(\ell^2)$  (cf. Remark 3.4.2). By Proposition 3.7.1, for each  $X$ :  $\text{o-LW}(X, F) = \text{a-LW}(X, F) = \text{L}(X, F)$  whenever  $F$  is an AL-space; and  $\text{o-MW}(E, X) = \text{a-MW}(E, X) = \text{L}(E, X)$  whenever  $E$  is an AM-space. In general,  $\text{a-MW}(E, Y) \not\subseteq \text{o-MW}(E, Y)$ . Indeed,

$$I_{C[0,1]} \in \text{a-MW}(C[0, 1]) \text{ (e.g., by Proposition 3.7.1 ii)}. \quad (16)$$

However,

$$I_{C[0,1]} \notin \text{o-MW}(C[0, 1]) \text{ (e.g., by Proposition 4.5.3 below)}. \quad (17)$$

It follows directly that  $\text{a-LW}(\ell^2) \subseteq \text{o-LW}(\ell^2)$ . Then  $\text{a-MW}(\ell^2) \subseteq \text{o-MW}(\ell^2)$  by the duality. Since  $I_{\ell^2} \in \text{o-MW}(\ell^2) \setminus \text{a-MW}(\ell^2)$  then

$$\text{a-MW}(\ell^2) \subsetneq \text{o-MW}(\ell^2). \quad (18)$$

**4.4 Algebraic properties of o-LW- and o-MW- operators.** The first of the following two elementary lemmas is a version of Assertion 3.2.1 for o-LW-operators.

**Lemma 4.4.1.** *If  $S \in \mathcal{L}_{ob}(E, F)$  and  $T \in \text{o-LW}(F, G)$  then  $T \circ S \in \text{o-LW}(E, G)$ .*

Since o-LW-operators satisfy the domination property by [28, Cor.2.3], the second lemma follows from Proposition 1.5.2 ii).

**Lemma 4.4.2.** *Let an operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(E, F)$  possess the modulus. TFAE.*

- i)  $T$  is a regularly o-LW-operator.
- ii)  $|T|$  is an o-LW-operator.

We include a version of Theorem 3.2.5 for o-LW-operators.

**Theorem 4.4.3.** *For a Banach lattice  $E$  the following holds.*

- i) *The set  $\text{r-o-LW}(E)$  of regularly o-LW-operators on  $E$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ , which coincides with  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$  iff  $I_E \in \text{r-o-LW}(E)$ .*
- ii) *If, additionally  $E$  is Dedekind complete then  $\text{r-o-LW}(E)$  is a Riesz subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . Furthermore,  $(\text{r-o-LW}(E), \|\cdot\|_{\text{r-o-LW}})$  is a Banach lattice algebra.*

*Proof.* i) Due to Lemma 4.4.1,  $\text{r-o-LW}(E)$  is a right algebra ideal and hence is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . The condition on  $I_E$ , which makes  $\text{r-o-LW}(E) = \mathcal{L}_r(E)$ , is clear.

ii) It follows from Lemma 4.4.2 that the subalgebra  $\text{r-o-LW}(E)$  is closed under taking of modulus, and hence it is Riesz subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ .

As  $\text{o-LW}(E)$  is a closed subspace of  $L(E)$  by [28, Prop.2.1], the rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2.5.  $\square$

The following lemma is a version of Assertion 3.6.1 for o-MW-operators.

**Lemma 4.4.4.** *If  $T \in \text{o-MW}(E, F)$  and  $S \in \mathcal{L}_{ob}(F, G)$ , then  $S \circ T \in \text{o-MW}(E, G)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T \in \text{o-MW}(E, F)$  and  $S \in \mathcal{L}_{ob}(F, G)$ . Then  $T' \in \text{o-LW}(F', E')$  by Assertion 4.1.4 (i). It follows from Lemma 4.4.1 that  $(S \circ T)' = T' \circ S' \in \text{o-LW}(G', E')$ . Applying Assertion 4.1.4 (i) again, we get  $S \circ T \in \text{o-MW}(E, G)$ .  $\square$

It is straightforward that o-MW-operators satisfy the domination property. Thus, the next lemma follows from Proposition 1.5.2 ii).

**Lemma 4.4.5.** *Let an operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(E, F)$  possess the modulus. TFAE.*

- i)  *$T$  is a regularly o-MW-operator.*
- ii)  *$|T|$  is an o-MW-operator.*

The next result is a version of Proposition 3.6.2 for o-MW-operators. We omit its proof as it is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.4.3, with replacement of Lemma 4.4.2 by Lemma 4.4.5.

**Theorem 4.4.6.** *For a Banach lattice  $E$  the following holds.*

- i) The space  $\text{r-o-MW}(E)$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ , which coincides with  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$  iff  $I_E \in \text{r-o-MW}(E)$ .
- ii) If, additionally  $E$  is Dedekind complete then  $\text{r-o-MW}(E)$  is a Riesz subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . Furthermore,  $(\text{r-o-MW}(E), \|\cdot\|_{\text{r-o-MW}})$  is a Banach lattice algebra.

So, in certain cases,  $\text{r-o-LW}(E)$  or  $\text{r-o-MW}(E)$  may coincide with  $\mathcal{L}_r(E)$ . The following proposition develops this observation further.

**Proposition 4.4.7.** *Let  $X$  be a Banach space.*

- i) If  $F$  is an AL-space then  $\text{r-o-LW}(E, F) = \mathcal{L}_r(E, F)$ .
- ii) If  $E$  is an AM-space then  $\text{r-o-MW}(E, F) = \mathcal{L}_r(E, F)$ .

*Proof.* i) Let  $S = S_1 - S_2$  with both  $S_1, S_2 : E \rightarrow F$  positive, and let  $x \in X_+$ . Then  $S_1([-x, x])$  and  $S_2([-x, x])$  are both relatively w-compact in  $F$ . By [3, Thm.5.56], the sets  $S_1([-x, x])$  and  $S_2([-x, x])$  are both LW-subsets of  $F$ . Then  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are positive o-LW-operators and hence  $S$  is a regularly o-LW-operator.

ii) Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}_r(E, F)$ . Since  $E'$  is an AL-space, it follows from i) that  $T' \in \text{r-o-LW}(F', E')$ . Then  $T \in \text{r-o-MW}(E, F)$  by Assertion 4.1.4 (i).  $\square$

**4.5 Miscellanea.** Since order intervals in o-continuous Banach lattices are w-compact, and since LW-sets are w-compact, we have:

$$\text{If } E \text{ has o-continuous norm then } \text{o-LW}(E, F) \subseteq \text{o-W}(E, F) \quad (19)$$

for every  $F$ .

An operator  $T : E \rightarrow X$  is said to be *AM-compact*, if  $T[0, x]$  is relatively compact in  $X$  for each  $x \in E_+$ . An operator  $T : E \rightarrow X$  is said to be *b-AM-compact*, if it carries each b-order bounded subset of  $E$  into a relatively compact subset of  $X$  [8]. Denote by  $\text{AM}(E, X)$  (by  $\text{b-AM}(E, X)$ ) the set of all AM-compact (resp. b-AM-compact) operators from  $E$  to  $X$ . Clearly,  $\text{b-AM}(E, X) \subseteq \text{AM}(E, X)$ .

**Theorem 4.5.1.** *Let  $F^a$  be discrete. Then  $\text{o-LW}(E, F) \subseteq \text{AM}(E, F)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T \in \text{o-LW}(E, F)$ . Take  $x \in E_+$ . Since  $T[0, x]$  is an LW-subset of  $F$ , for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $u_\varepsilon \in F_+^a$  with

$$T[0, x] \subseteq [-u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon] + \varepsilon B_F, \quad (20)$$

by Assertion 1.2.2. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $F^a$  is discrete,  $[-u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon]$  is compact. As  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, (20) implies that  $T[0, x]$  is totally bounded and hence is relatively compact. Since  $x \in E_+$  is arbitrary,  $T \in \text{AM}(E, F)$ .  $\square$

While LW-operators are w-compact, o-LW-operators are generally not, e.g.  $I_{c_0} \in \text{o-LW}(c_0) \setminus \text{W}(c_0)$ . The following corollary describes some conditions for w-compactness of o-LW-operators.

**Corollary 4.5.2.** *Let  $F^a$  be discrete and let either  $E'$  be KB or  $F$  be reflexive. Then  $\text{o-LW}(E, F) \subseteq \text{W}(E, F)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T \in \text{o-LW}(E, F)$ . By Theorem 4.5.1,  $T \in \text{AM}(E, F)$ . In view of [11, Thm.2.4],  $T \in \text{W}(E, F)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5.3.** *Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}_r(E, F)$  and  $x \in E_+$ . Then the restriction of  $T : (I_x, \|\cdot\|_x) \rightarrow F$  is o-MW.*

*Proof.* We may suppose  $T \geq 0$ . The principal order ideal  $I_x$  of  $E$  is a Banach lattice equipped with the norm  $\|y\|_x = \inf_{|y| \leq \lambda x} \lambda$ . Let  $(x_n)$  be a disjoint sequence in  $I_x$ . Then  $x_n \rightarrow 0$  in  $\sigma(I_x, I'_x)$ . Since the lattice operations in  $(I_x, \|\cdot\|_x)$  are sequentially w-continuous by [36, Prop.13], we have  $|x_n| \rightarrow 0$  in  $\sigma(I_x, I'_x)$ . Since  $T$  is positive,  $T : (I_x, \|\cdot\|_x) \rightarrow F$  is continuous. The operator  $T$  is also continuous when the both spaces are equipped with their w-topologies. Let  $(f_n)$  be an order bounded sequence in  $F'$ , say  $|f_n| \leq f$  for some  $f \in F'$ . Then

$$|f_n(Tx_n)| \leq |f_n|(|Tx_n|) \leq |f_n|(T|x_n|) \leq f(T|x_n|),$$

which can be made less than any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if  $n$  is large enough. Therefore  $T \in \text{o-MW}(I_x, F)$ .  $\square$

**Definition 4.5.4.** An operator  $T : X \rightarrow F$  is called *semicompact* if it takes bounded subsets of  $X$  onto almost order bounded subsets of  $F$ .

It is straightforward that  $\text{K}(X, F) \subseteq \text{semi-K}(X, F)$ , where  $\text{semi-K}(X, F)$  denotes the space of all semicompact operators from  $X$  to  $F$ . It is also well known that  $\text{semi-K}(X, F) \subseteq \text{W}(X, F)$  for every  $X$ , whenever the norm in  $F$  is o-continuous. In view of Assertion 2.2.2(v), if  $F \in (\text{PSP})$  then  $\text{semi-K}(X, F) = \text{W}(X, F)$  for every  $X$ .

**Proposition 4.5.5.** *Let  $S \in \text{semi-K}(E, F)$  and  $T \in \text{o-LW}(F, G)$ . Then  $T \circ S \in \text{LW}(E, G)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $T$  is bounded, there is  $\delta > 0$  with  $T(\delta B_F) \subseteq \varepsilon B_G$ . For this  $\delta$ , choose  $u \in F_+$  with  $S(B_E) \subseteq [-u, u] + \delta B_F$ . Then

$$TS(B_E) \subseteq T[-u, u] + \delta T(B_F) \subseteq T[-u, u] + \varepsilon B_G.$$

Since  $T$  is o-LW,  $T[-u, u]$  is an LW-subset of  $G$ ; and since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary,  $TS(B_E)$  is also an LW-subset of  $G$ .  $\square$

Finally, we include the following result. A bounded operator  $T : E \rightarrow Y$  is called *order weakly compact* (shortly,  $T \in \text{o-W}(E, Y)$ ), if  $T$  takes order bounded subsets of  $E$  onto relatively w-compact subsets of  $Y$  [19]. By [3, Cor.5.53], positive operators of  $\text{o-W}(E, F)$  satisfy the domination property. A notion of *almost order weakly compact* operators was introduced in [32] as follows: a bounded operator  $T : E \rightarrow Y$  is *almost order weakly compact* (shortly,  $T \in \text{ao-W}(E, Y)$ ), if  $T$  takes almost order bounded subsets of  $E$  onto relatively w-compact subsets of  $Y$ . It turns out that these two notions agree.

**Proposition 4.5.6.**  $\text{ao-W}(E, Y) = \text{o-W}(E, Y)$ .

*Proof.* Clearly,  $\text{ao-W}(E, Y) \subseteq \text{o-W}(E, Y)$ .

Let  $T \in \text{o-W}(E, Y)$ , and let  $A$  be an almost order bounded subset of  $E$ . Take  $\varepsilon > 0$ . There exists  $x \in E_+$  with  $A \subseteq [-x, x] + \varepsilon B_E$ . Then

$$T(A) \subseteq T[-x, x] + \varepsilon \|T\| B_Y \subseteq \text{cl}_{\|\cdot\|}(T[-x, x]) + \varepsilon \|T\| B_Y,$$

with a w-compact subset  $\text{cl}_{\|\cdot\|}(T[-x, x])$  of  $Y$ . Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, [3, Thm.3.44] implies that  $T(A)$  is relatively w-compact, and hence  $T \in \text{ao-W}(E, Y)$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] Y.A. Abramovich, A.W. Wickstead, Solutions of several problems in the theory of compact positive operators. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 123 (1995), 3021–3026.
- [2] B. Akay, and Ö. Gök, On the Lattice Properties of Almost L-Weakly and Almost M-Weakly Compact Operators. J. Funct. Spaces (2021), Art. ID 1755373, 5 pp.
- [3] C.D. Aliprantis, O. Burkinshaw, Positive Operators. Springer, Dordrecht, 2006.
- [4] S. Alpay, B. Altın, C. Tonyali, On Property (b) of Vector Lattices. Positivity 7 (2003), 135–139.

- [5] F. Afkir, K. Bouras, A. Elbour, S. El Filali, Weak compactness of almost L-weakly and almost M-weakly compact operators. *Quaestiones Mathematicae* 44(9) (2021), 1145–1154.
- [6] S. Alpay, E. Emelyanov, S. Gorokhova, Bibounded uo-convergence and b-property in vector lattices. *Positivity* 25 (2021), 1677–1684.
- [7] Alpay, S., Emelyanov, E., Gorokhova, S.  *$\sigma$ -Continuous, Lebesgue, KB, and Levi Operators Between Vector Lattices and Topological Vector Spaces*. *Results Math* 77, 117 (2022), 25pp.
- [8] B. Aqzzouz, J. H'Michane, The class of b-AM-compact operators. *Quaest. Math.* 36 (2013), 309–319.
- [9] B. Aqzzouz, A. Elbour, A.W. Wickstead, Positive almost Dunford–Pettis operators and their duality. *Positivity* 15 (2011), 185–197.
- [10] B. Aqzzouz, R. Nouira, The order  $\sigma$ -complete vector lattice or AM-compact operators. *Czechoslovak Math. J.* 59(134) (2009), no.3, 827–834.
- [11] B. Aqzzouz, J. H'Michane, O. Aboutafail, Weak compactness of AM-compact operators. *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin* 19 (2012), no. 2, 329–338.
- [12] B. Aqzzouz, R. Nouira, L. Zraoula, The duality problem for the class of AM-compact operators on Banach lattices. *Canad. Math. Bull.* 51, no.1 (2008), 15–20.
- [13] H. Baklouti, M. Hajji, R. Moulahi, On the class of b-weakly compact operators *Positivity* (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11117-022-00892-3>
- [14] K. Bouras, D. Lhaimer, M. Moussa, On the class of almost L-weakly and almost M-weakly compact operators. *Positivity* 22 (2018), 1433–1443.
- [15] O. Burkinshaw, P. G. Dodds, Disjoint sequences, compactness and semireflexivity in locally convex Riesz spaces, *Illinois J. Math.* 21 (1977), 759–75.
- [16] Z. L. Chen, A. W. Wickstead, Incompleteness of the linear span of the positive compact operators. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 125 (1997), 3381–3389.
- [17] Z. L. Chen, A. W. Wickstead, L-weakly and M-weakly compact operators. *Indag. Math. (N.S.)* 10, no.3 (1999), 321–336.
- [18] N. Cheng, Dedekind  $\sigma$ -complete vector lattice of b-AM-compact operators. *Quaest. Math.* 40 (2017), no. 3, 313–318.
- [19] P. G. Dodds,  $\sigma$ -weakly compact mappings of Riesz spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 214 (1975), 389–402.
- [20] P. G. Dodds, D. H. Fremlin, Compact operators in Banach lattices. *Isr. J. Math.* 34 (1979), 287–320.
- [21] A. Elbour, Some characterizations of almost limited operators. *Positivity* 21 (2017), 865–874.
- [22] A. Elbour, F. Afkir, M. Sabiri, Some properties of almost L-weakly and almost M-weakly compact operators. *Positivity* 24 (2020), 141–149.
- [23] E. Emelyanov, Algebras of Lebesgue and KB regular operators on Banach lattices. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.08326v3>
- [24] E. Emelyanov, S. Gorokhova, On Operators Dominated by Kantorovich-Banach Operators and Levy Operators in Locally Solid Lattices. *Vladikavkaz Math. J.* 24, Issue 3 (2022), 55–61.
- [25] U. Krengel, Remark on the modulus of compact operators. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 72 (1966), 132–133.
- [26] U. Krengel, Über den Absolutbetrag stetiger linearer Operatoren und seine Anwendung auf ergodische Zerlegungen. *Math. Scand.* 13 (1963), 151–187.
- [27] D. Lhaimer, K. Bouras, M. Moussa, On the class of b-L-weakly and order M-weakly compact operators. *Math. Bohem.* 145, no. 3 (2020), 255–264.
- [28] D. Lhaimer, K. Bouras, M. Moussa, On the class of order  $L$ - and order  $M$ -weakly compact operators. *Positivity* 25 (2021), 1569–1578.
- [29] M. L. Lourenco, V. C. C. Miranda, The property (d) and the almost limited completely continuous operators. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2011.02890v3>
- [30] N. Machrafi, K. El Fahri, M. Moussa, B. Altin, A note on weak almost limited operators. *Hacet. J. Math. Stat.* 48(3) (2019) 759–770.
- [31] N. Machrafi, A. Elbour, M. Moussa, Some characterizations of almost limited sets and applications. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.2770v2>
- [32] M. Matin, K. H. Azar, A. Ebadi, Almost order-weakly compact operators on Banach lattices. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.02219v1>
- [33] P. Meyer-Nieberg, Über Klassen schwach kompakter Operatoren in Banachverbänden. *Math. Z.* 138 (1974), 145–159.
- [34] P. Meyer-Nieberg, *Banach Lattices*. Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1991).
- [35] W. Wnuk, Banach spaces with properties of the Schur type – a survey. *Confer. Sem. Mat. Univ. Bari.* 29 (1993), 1–25.
- [36] W. Wnuk, On the dual positive Schur property in Banach lattices, *Positivity* 17 (2013), 759–773.
- [37] A.C. Zaanen, *Riesz spaces II*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: North-Holland Publishing, 1983.