

THE THRESHOLDING GREEDY ALGORITHM VERSUS APPROXIMATIONS WITH SIZES BOUNDED BY CERTAIN FUNCTIONS f

HÙNG VIỆT CHU

ABSTRACT. Let X be a Banach space and $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a basis. For a fixed function f in a certain collection \mathcal{F} (closed under composition), we define and characterize (f, greedy) and $(f, \text{almost greedy})$ bases. These bases nontrivially extend the classical notion of greedy and almost greedy bases. We study relations among $(f, (\text{almost}) \text{greedy})$ bases as f varies and show that while a basis is not almost greedy, it can still be (f, greedy) for some $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, we prove that for all non-identity function $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we have the surprising equivalence

$$(f, \text{greedy}) \iff (f, \text{almost greedy}).$$

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminary results	7
3. Characterizations of $(f, \text{almost greedy})$ bases	9
4. A modification of the Schreier space	11
5. About f -unconditionality	13
6. About (f, greedy) bases	16
7. Open problem	19
References	19

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and motivation. Let X be an infinite-dimensional Banach space (with dual X^*) over the field $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$. In this paper, we work with a general basis, which is a countable collection of vectors $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset X$ such that: i) $\overline{\text{span}(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty} = X$; ii) there exists a collection $(e_n^*)_{n=1}^\infty \subset X^*$, called the biorthogonal functionals, that satisfy $e_n^*(e_m) = \delta_{n,m}$; iii) there exist $\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2 > 0$ such that

$$0 < \mathbf{c}_1 := \inf_n \{\|e_n\|, \|e_n^*\|\} \leq \sup_n \{\|e_n\|, \|e_n^*\|\} := \mathbf{c}_2 < \infty.$$

One important goal of approximation theory is to efficiently approximate each vector $x \in X$ by a finite linear combination of vectors in a given basis. One possible method is

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

Key words and phrases. Thresholding Greedy Algorithm; almost greedy; bases.

The author is thankful to Timur Oikhberg for helpful feedback on earlier drafts of this paper and for showing the author that for certain functions f , a quasi-greedy and $(f, \text{disjoint superdemocratic})$ basis is f -unconditional.

to use the partial sums $\sum_{n=1}^k e_n^*(x)e_n$, where k is the size of the approximation. Though being convenient, the partial sums depend on the ordering of the basis and do not always yield the desired level of accuracy. In 1999, Konyagin and Temlyakov [14] introduced a natural, order-free method of approximation, called the Thresholding Greedy Algorithm (TGA). The algorithm chooses the largest coefficients (in modulus) of each vector x in its representation with respect to a basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$. Formally, a set $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ is a greedy set of a vector x of order m if

$$|A| = m \text{ and } \min_{n \in A} |e_n^*(x)| \geq \max_{n \notin A} |e_n^*(x)|.$$

Let $G(x, m)$ denote the set of all greedy sets of x of order m . For each $x \in X$, the TGA thus produces a sequence of approximants $(\sum_{n \in \Lambda_m} e_n^*(x)e_n)_{m=1}^\infty$, where $\Lambda_m \in G(x, m)$.

Konyagin and Temlyakov [14] defined greedy, quasi-greedy, and democratic bases. For a finite set $A \subset \mathbb{N}$, let $P_A(x) = \sum_{n \in A} e_n^*(x)e_n$, $P_{A^c}(x) = x - P_A(x)$, and $1_A = \sum_{n \in A} e_n$. Also, let $\mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ denote the collection of all finite subsets of \mathbb{N} .

Definition 1.1. A basis is said to be greedy if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\|x - P_\Lambda(x)\| \leq C\sigma_m(x), \forall x \in X, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \Lambda \in G(x, m),$$

where $\sigma_m(x) = \inf_{\substack{|A| \leq m \\ (a_n) \subset \mathbb{F}}} \|x - \sum_{n \in A} a_n e_n\|$.

Definition 1.2. A basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is said to be quasi-greedy¹ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|x - P_\Lambda(x)\| \leq C\|x\|, \forall x \in X, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \Lambda \in G(x, m). \quad (1.1)$$

In this case, we let C_ℓ denote the smallest constant C for (1.1) to hold, and we say that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is C_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy. Also, let C_q be the smallest constant such that

$$\|P_\Lambda(x)\| \leq C_q\|x\|, \forall x \in X, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \Lambda \in G(x, m).$$

We say that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is C_q -quasi-greedy.

Definition 1.3. A basis is said to be democratic if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\|1_A\| \leq C\|1_B\|, \forall A, B \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}, |A| \leq |B|.$$

To state the classical characterization of greedy bases due to Konyagin and Temlyakov, we also need to define unconditional bases.

Definition 1.4. A basis is said to be unconditional if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

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

In this case, the least constant C is denoted by \mathbf{K}_{su} , called the suppression unconditional constant.

¹This definition of the quasi-greedy property is equivalent to the convergence

$$P_{\Lambda_m}(x) \longrightarrow x, \forall x \in X, \forall \Lambda_m \in G(x, m)$$

if and only if the basis is strong. For details, see [5, Remark 6.2].

Theorem 1.5 (Konyagin and Temlyakov [14]). *A basis is greedy if and only if it is unconditional and democratic.*

Observe that in the definition of greedy bases, we compare the TGA, which involves projections onto greedy sets, against approximations with arbitrary coefficients. Hence, it is also natural to compare the TGA against projections only (without arbitrary coefficients). This thinking leads us to the so-called almost greedy bases, introduced by Dilworth et al. [10].

Definition 1.6. A basis is said to be almost greedy if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\|x - P_\Lambda(x)\| \leq C\tilde{\sigma}_m(x), \forall x \in X, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \Lambda \in G(x, m),$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_m(x) = \inf_{|A| \leq m} \|x - P_A(x)\|$.

It is worth noting that the requirement “ $|A| \leq m$ ” in the definition of $\tilde{\sigma}_m(x)$ can be replaced by “ $|A| = m$ ”, and the basis is still almost greedy with the same constant C . While greedy bases are almost greedy, the converse does not necessarily hold. A famous example of an almost greedy basis that is not greedy is due to Konyagin and Temlyakov [14] (also see [3, Example 10.2.9]). Dilworth et al. [10] gave the following nice and surprising characterization of almost greedy bases.

Theorem 1.7. [10, Theorem 3.3] *Let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a basis of a Banach space. The following are equivalent*

- i) $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is almost greedy.
- ii) $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is quasi-greedy and democratic.
- iii) For any (respectively, every) $\lambda > 1$, there is a constant $C = C_\lambda$ such that

$$\|x - P_\Lambda(x)\| \leq C_\lambda \sigma_m(x), \forall x \in X, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \Lambda \in G(x, \lceil \lambda m \rceil).$$

The equivalence between i) and ii) shares the same spirit as Theorem 1.5, while the equivalence between i) and iii) shows that enlarging the greedy sums in the definition of greedy bases brings us to the strictly larger realm of almost greedy bases. In other words, for almost greedy bases, an approximation using greedy sums of size $\lceil \lambda m \rceil$ gives us essentially the smallest error term from using an arbitrary m -term approximation.

Besides greedy and almost greedy bases, two other notable greedy-type bases are the so-called partially greedy (PG) (introduced by Dilworth et al. [10]) and reverse partially greedy (RPG) bases (introduced by Dilworth and Khurana [11]). They are not the focus of this paper; however, we would like to make a few remarks about these bases. Unlike (almost) greedy bases, the notion of both PG and RPG bases depends on the ordering of the basis. For example, in the definition of partially greedy bases, we compare the efficiency of the TGA against partial sums, the more convenient method of approximation. Recently, some authors expressed their concerns about the notion of partially greedy bases as it is order-dependent, while the TGA is order-free [2, page 6]. While that is a well-founded concern, one can also argue that partially greedy bases are crucial because they give us information about how the TGA performs against the most convenient method of approximation, namely partial summations. In other words, there is no point in choosing the largest coefficients for our approximation if we cannot outperform partial summations.

Inspired by Theorem 1.7, the author of the present paper [7, 8] investigated what happens if we enlarge the greedy sums (by a constant factor $\lambda > 1$) in the definition of almost greedy, PG, and RPG bases. Surprisingly, while doing so gives new, weaker greedy-type bases in the case of PG and RPG bases (see [7, Theorem 1.5] and [8, Theorem 1.4]), [7, Theorem 5.4] states that we do not obtain a weaker greedy-type basis in the case of almost greedy bases. To put it another way, if the sizes of greedy sums and of the projective approximation terms in the definition of almost greedy bases are of the same order, i.e., $\lceil \lambda m \rceil$ and m , respectively, then we obtain only equivalences of being almost greedy. However, we suspect that such an equivalence no longer holds if the sizes are of different order, say m and $\log m$, for example. The main results in this paper not only confirm our suspicion but also provide a partial solution to the above-mentioned concern of some researchers regarding the order-dependent notion of PG and RPG bases. In particular, while some PG and PRG greedy bases are not almost greedy, they may satisfy a certain order-free condition, which involves resizing projective approximations in the definition of (almost) greedy bases.

1.2. Main results. Throughout this paper, let $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfy

- (1) $f(0) = 0$, $f(1) \leq 1$, and $f(x) > 0$ for all $x > 0$,
- (2) f is continuous, increasing, and concave on $[0, \infty)$, and
- (3) f is differentiable on $(0, \infty)$.

Let \mathcal{F} denote the set of all such functions. Then \mathcal{F} is closed under composition.

We now study greedy-type bases that satisfy the following condition: there exists a constant $\mathbf{C} > 0$ such that

$$\|x - P_{\Lambda}(x)\| \leq \mathbf{C} \tilde{\sigma}_{f(m)}(x), \forall x \in X, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \Lambda \in G(x, m). \quad (1.2)$$

At the first glance, we know that this definition only makes sense for functions f satisfying $f(m) < m + 1$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Otherwise, even the canonical basis of c_0 does not satisfy (1.2). For example, suppose that $f(3) = 4$ and consider the vector $x = (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, \dots)$. Let $\Lambda = \{1, 2, 3\}$ be a greedy set of x . While $\|x - P_{\Lambda}(x)\| = 1$, $\tilde{\sigma}_{f(3)}(x) = 0$. Therefore, there is no \mathbf{C} for (1.2) to hold. However, as we prove later, if $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then $f(m) \leq m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition 1.8. A basis that satisfies (1.2) is said to be $(f, \text{almost greedy})$. In this case, the least \mathbf{C} for (1.2) to hold is denoted by $\mathbf{C}_{a,f}$.

Definition 1.9. A basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is said to be (f, greedy) if there exists a constant $\mathbf{C} > 0$ such that

$$\|x - P_{\Lambda}(x)\| \leq \mathbf{C} \sigma_{f(m)}(x), \forall x \in X, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \Lambda \in G(x, m). \quad (1.3)$$

The least such \mathbf{C} is denoted by $\mathbf{C}_{g,f}$.

One main goal of this paper is to establish the following theorem.

Theorem 1.10. *Let f be a non-identity function in \mathcal{F} . Then a basis is $(f, \text{almost greedy})$ if and only if it is (f, greedy) .*

We shall prove Theorem 1.10 by characterizing (f, greedy) and $(f, \text{almost greedy})$ bases separately, then show that the two characterizations are equivalent when f is non-identity. Along the way, we encounter various interesting auxiliary results.

A sign ε is a sequence of scalars $(\varepsilon_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{F}$ with modulus 1. If $A \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$, we let $1_{\varepsilon A} = \sum_{n \in A} \varepsilon_n e_n$. For $x \in X$ and $A, B \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$, we write $x \sqcup A \sqcup B$ to mean that $\text{supp}(x)$, A , and B are pairwise disjoint. Similarly, write $\sqcup_i A_i$ to mean that the sets A_i are pairwise disjoint. Finally, $\|x\|_\infty := \max_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |e_n^*(x)|$.

Definition 1.11. A basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is said to be $(f, \text{disjoint superdemocratic})$ if there exists a constant $\mathbf{C} > 0$ such that

$$\|1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \mathbf{C} \|1_{\delta B}\|, \quad (1.4)$$

for all disjoint $A, B \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ with $|A| \leq f(|B|)$ and for all signs ε, δ . The least \mathbf{C} that verifies (1.4) is denoted by $\Delta_{sd,f}$. If $\varepsilon \equiv \delta \equiv 1$, we say that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$, and let $\Delta_{d,f}$ denote the corresponding constant.

Definition 1.12. A basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is said to have Property (A, f) if there exists a constant $\mathbf{C} \geq 1$ such that

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \mathbf{C} \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|, \quad (1.5)$$

for all $x \in X$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$, for all $A, B \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ with $|A| \leq f(|B|)$ and $x \sqcup A \sqcup B$, and for all signs ε, δ . The least such \mathbf{C} is denoted by $\Delta_{A,f}$.

Our first results characterize $(f, \text{almost greedy})$ bases as follows:

$$(f, \text{almost greedy}) \iff \text{quasi-greedy} + \text{Property } (A, f).$$

Theorem 1.13. Let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a basis of a Banach space X . The following hold.

- i) If $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $\mathbf{C}_{a,f}$ - $(f, \text{almost greedy})$, then $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $\mathbf{C}_{a,f}$ -suppression quasi-greedy and has $\mathbf{C}_{a,f}$ -Property (A, f) .
- ii) Conversely, if $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy and has $\Delta_{A,f}$ -Property (A, f) , then $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $\mathbf{C}_\ell \Delta_{A,f}$ - $(f, \text{almost greedy})$.

Corollary 1.14. Let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a basis of a Banach space X . The following are equivalent

- i) $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $(f, \text{almost greedy})$.
- ii) $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is quasi-greedy and has Property (A, f) .
- iii) $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is quasi-greedy and $(f, \text{disjoint superdemocratic})$.
- iv) $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is quasi-greedy and $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$.

Corollary 1.15. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that there exists a constant $\mathbf{c} > 0$ satisfying $f(m) \geq \mathbf{c}g(m)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. If $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $(f, \text{almost greedy})$, then it is $(g, \text{almost greedy})$.

Corollary 1.16. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that $0 < \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{f(m)}{g(m)} \leq \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{f(m)}{g(m)} < \infty$, then a basis is $(f, \text{almost greedy})$ if and only if it is $(g, \text{almost greedy})$.

Proof. Use Corollary 1.15. □

Corollary 1.17. If $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is almost greedy, then it is $(f, \text{almost greedy})$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Let $g(x) = x \in \mathcal{F}$. Being almost greedy is the same as being $(g, \text{almost greedy})$. Since $f \in \mathcal{F}$, by Proposition 2.1 item ii), $g(m) \geq f(m)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Now use Corollary 1.15. □

Our second set of results investigate (f, greedy) bases.

Theorem 1.18. *i) Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{f(m)}{g(m)} = \infty$. Then there exists a 1-unconditional basis that is (g, greedy) but is not $(f, \text{almost greedy})$.*

ii) There exists an 1-unconditional basis that is not $(f, \text{almost greedy})$ for all unbounded $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

Using two latter-proved results, we can do better than Corollary 1.17.

Proposition 1.19. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that f is not the identity. If $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is almost greedy, then $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is (f, greedy) .*

Proof. Since f is not the identity, by Proposition 2.2, there exists $\lambda > 1$ such that $f(x) \leq \frac{x}{\lambda}$ for all sufficiently large x . As $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is almost greedy, Theorem 1.7 implies that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $(x/\lambda, \text{greedy})$. For sufficiently large m , since $f(m) \leq \frac{m}{\lambda}$, we have $\sigma_{m/\lambda}(x) \leq \sigma_{f(m)}(x)$ for all $x \in X$, which gives (1.3). For small m , use Lemma 2.8. \square

Remark 1.20. The converse of Proposition 1.19 is not true, as evidenced by unconditional bases of $\ell_p \oplus \ell_q$ ($1 \leq p < q < \infty$) and the multivariate Haar system in $L_p([0, 1]^d)$ ($p, d > 1$) (see the discussion below).

To give a characterization of (f, greedy) bases, we need to introduce the notion of f -unconditionality (see Definition 5.3), a restricted version of unconditionality.

Theorem 1.21. *Let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a basis of a Banach space. The following hold.*

- i) *If $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $\mathbf{C}_{g,f}$ - (f, greedy) , then it is $\mathbf{C}_{g,f}$ -suppression f -unconditional and has $\mathbf{C}_{g,f}$ -Property (A, f) .*
- ii) *If $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{K}_{su} -suppression f -unconditional and has $\Delta_{A,f}$ -Property (A, f) , then it is $\Delta_{A,f}(\mathbf{K}_{su}^2 + 2\mathbf{K}_{su})$ - (f, greedy) .*

Corollary 1.22. *Let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a basis of a Banach space and $f \in \mathcal{F}$. The following are equivalent*

- i) *$(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is (f, greedy) .*
- ii) *$(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is f -unconditional and has Property (A, f) .*
- iii) *$(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is f -unconditional and $(f, \text{disjoint superdemocratic})$.*
- iv) *$(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is f -unconditional and $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$.*

The following corollary is immediate from the fact that unconditionality is stronger than f -unconditionality.

Corollary 1.23. *If $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is unconditional and has Property (A, f) , then $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is (f, greedy) .*

Corollary 1.24. *If $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is unconditional and $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$, then $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is (f, greedy) .*

Proof. By Corollary 1.14, we know that if a basis is quasi-greedy and $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$, then it has Property (A, f) . Obviously, any unconditional basis is quasi-greedy. Use Corollary 1.23 and we are done. \square

Let us discuss an application of Corollary 1.24 to the space $\ell_p \oplus \ell_q$ ($1 \leq p < q < \infty$). Èdel'shtein and Wojtaszczyk [12] showed that any unconditional basis \mathcal{B} of the

direct sum $\ell_p \oplus \ell_q$ consists of two subsequences, one of which, denoted by \mathcal{B}_1 , is a basis for ℓ_p , while the other, denoted by \mathcal{B}_2 , is a basis for ℓ_q . By the gliding hump argument, we can find subsequences of \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 that are equivalent to the canonical bases of ℓ_p and ℓ_q , respectively. Therefore, none of the unconditional bases of $\ell_p \oplus \ell_q$ is democratic. However, $\ell_p \oplus \ell_q$ has an $(x^{p/q}, \text{greedy})$ basis. For example, let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be the canonical bases of ℓ_p and ℓ_q , respectively. Define the basis $\mathcal{X} = (x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, where $x_{2k-1} = (e_k, 0)$ and $x_{2k} = (0, f_k)$. It is easy to check that \mathcal{X} is $(x^{p/q}, \text{disjoint democratic})$. By Corollary 1.24, \mathcal{X} is $(x^{p/q}, \text{greedy})$.

Another application of Corollary 1.24 is to the multivariate Haar system \mathcal{H}_p^d ($d > 1$) in $L_p([0, 1]^d)$ for $1 < p < \infty$, which shall be discussed in Section 6. Roughly speaking, though the system is not greedy, it is close to being greedy in the sense that \mathcal{H}_p^d is $(x^{1-\varepsilon}, \text{greedy})$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 discusses some properties of functions in \mathcal{F} and of quasi-greedy bases and gives an equivalence of Property (A, f). These results will be used throughout the paper. Section 3 proves several equivalences of being $(f, \text{almost greedy})$. In particular, we prove Theorem 1.13, Corollary 1.14, and Corollary 1.15. We also show that if $g \in \mathcal{F}$ is bounded, being $(g, \text{almost greedy})$ is equivalent to being quasi-greedy. Section 4 generalizes an example in [6] to all functions $f \in \mathcal{F}$. The example serves to prove Theorem 1.18. As a corollary, though the basis in [6, Proposition 6.10] is not almost greedy, it is $(\sqrt{x}, \text{greedy})$. Section 6 proves Theorems 1.21 and 1.10 and discusses the multivariate Haar basis. The last section presents an open question for future research.

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Let us prove some important properties of functions in \mathcal{F} .

Proposition 2.1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$. The following hold*

- i) *If $0 < a \leq b$, then $\frac{f(a)}{a} \geq \frac{f(b)}{b}$.*
- ii) *For $x \geq 1$, $f(x) \leq x$.*
- iii) *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and k be a nonnegative integer such that $n \geq k$. If $n \leq f(m)$, then $n - k \leq f(m - k)$.*

Proof. i) Consider $g : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ defined by $g(x) = f(x)/x$. It suffices to prove that

$$g'(x) = (f'(x)x - f(x))/x^2 \leq 0, \forall x > 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Recall that if f is concave and differentiable on an interval (u, v) , then

$$f(s) \leq f(t) + f'(t)(s - t), \forall s, t \in (u, v).$$

Therefore, for $0 < \varepsilon < x$, we have

$$f(\varepsilon) \leq f(x) + f'(x)(\varepsilon - x).$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, by continuity, we obtain

$$0 \leq f(x) - xf'(x), \forall x > 0,$$

which implies (2.1).

- ii) Let $x \geq 1$. By item i), $\frac{f(x)}{x} \leq \frac{f(1)}{1} \leq 1$. Hence, $f(x) \leq x$.

iii) Since $f(m) \leq m$ by item ii), we get $k \leq n \leq m$. If $n = k$, there is nothing to prove. If $n > k$, by item i), we have

$$\frac{f(m-k)}{f(m)} \geq \frac{m-k}{m} \geq \frac{n-k}{n}.$$

Hence,

$$f(m-k) \geq f(m) \frac{n-k}{n} \geq n-k.$$

This completes our proof. \square

Proposition 2.2. *If $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then either f is the identity or there exists $\lambda > 1$ such that $f(x) \leq \frac{x}{\lambda}$ for all sufficiently large x .*

Proof. By Proposition 2.1 items i) and ii), we know that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{x} =: s \leq 1$. If $s < 1$, then for sufficiently large x , $\frac{f(x)}{x} < \frac{s+1}{2} < 1$, which gives $f(x) < \frac{x}{2/(s+1)}$ and we are done. Suppose that $s = 1$. Since $\frac{f(x)}{x}$ is decreasing for $x > 0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{x} = 1$, it follows that $f(x) \geq x$ for $x > 0$. On the other hand, Proposition 2.1 item ii) states that $f(x) \leq x$ for $x \geq 1$. Therefore, we get $f(x) = x$ for all $x \geq 1$. It remains to show that $f(x) \leq x$ for all $x \in [0, 1)$. Suppose, for a contradiction, that there exists a $p \in (0, 1)$ such that $f(p) = p + \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose $q = 2 - p$. We have

$$f(q) + f(p) = (2-p) + (p+\varepsilon) = 2 + \varepsilon > 2f(1) \implies \frac{1}{2}f(q) + \frac{1}{2}f(p) > f\left(\frac{q}{2} + \frac{p}{2}\right),$$

which contradicts concavity. Therefore, if $s = 1$, then f is the identity. \square

We provide an useful equivalence of Property (A, f).

Proposition 2.3. *A basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has $\Delta_{A,f}$ -Property (A, f) if and only if*

$$\|x\| \leq \Delta_{A,f} \|x - P_A(x) + 1_{\varepsilon B}\|, \quad (2.2)$$

for all $x \in X$ with $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1$, for all $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ such that $|A| \leq f(|B|)$ and $(x - P_A(x)) \sqcup A \sqcup B$, and for all signs ε .

Proof. Assume that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has $\Delta_{A,f}$ -Property (A, f). Let x, A, B, ε be chosen as in (2.2). We have

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

Conversely, let $x, A, B, \varepsilon, \delta$ be chosen as in Definition 1.12. Let $y = x + 1_{\varepsilon A}$. We have

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| = \|y\| \leq \Delta_{A,f} \|y - P_A(y) + 1_{\delta B}\| = \Delta_{A,f} \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|.$$

This completes our proof. \square

Next, we mention two well-known properties of a quasi-greedy basis.

Definition 2.4. A basis is said to have the UL property if there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C_1} \min |a_n| \|1_A\| \leq \left\| \sum_{n \in A} a_n e_n \right\| \leq C_2 \max |a_n| \|1_A\|,$$

for all $A \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ and scalars $(a_n)_{n \in A} \subset \mathbb{F}$.

Theorem 2.5. [10, Lemma 2.1] *If $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy, then $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has the UL property. In particular,*

$$\frac{1}{2\mathbf{C}_\ell} \min |a_n| \|1_A\| \leq \left\| \sum_{n \in A} a_n e_n \right\| \leq 2\mathbf{C}_\ell \max |a_n| \|1_A\|,$$

for all $A \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ and scalars $(a_n)_{n \in A} \subset \mathbb{F}$.

An application of the UL property is that for a quasi-greedy basis, $(f, \text{disjoint superdemocracy})$ is equivalent to $(f, \text{disjoint democracy})$.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a quasi-greedy basis. Then $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$ if and only if it is $(f, \text{disjoint superdemocratic})$.*

Proof. Let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy basis. By definition, if $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $(f, \text{disjoint superdemocratic})$, then it is $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$. Conversely, assume that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $\Delta_{d,f}$ - $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$. Let $A, B \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ be disjoint and $|A| \leq f(|B|)$. Pick signs ε, δ . By the UL property, we have

$$\frac{1}{2\mathbf{C}_\ell} \|1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \|1_A\| \leq \Delta_{d,f} \|1_B\| \leq 2\Delta_{d,f} \mathbf{C}_\ell \|1_{\delta B}\|.$$

Therefore, $\|1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq 4\Delta_{d,f} \mathbf{C}_\ell^2 \|1_{\delta B}\|$. \square

Another property of a quasi-greedy basis is the uniform boundedness of the truncation operators. Let $\alpha > 0$ and define $T_\alpha : X \rightarrow X$ by

$$T_\alpha(x) = \sum_{n \in A_x} \alpha \operatorname{sgn}(e_n^*(x)) e_n + P_{A_x^c}(x),$$

where $A_x = \{n : |e_n^*(x)| > \alpha\}$.

Theorem 2.7. [4, Lemma 2.5] *If $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy, then $\|T_\alpha\| \leq \mathbf{C}_\ell$ for all $\alpha > 0$.*

The final result in this section follows from a well-known Lebesgue-type inequality.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a basis of a Banach space X . For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\|x - P_\Lambda(x)\| \leq (1 + 3\mathbf{c}_2^2 N) \sigma_m(x), \forall x \in X, \forall m \leq N, \forall \Lambda \in G(x, m).$$

Proof. The statement follows directly from [4, Theorem 1.8]. \square

3. CHARACTERIZATIONS OF $(f, \text{ALMOST GREEDY})$ BASES

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.13, Corollary 1.14, and Corollary 1.15, all of which give equivalences of $(f, \text{almost greedy})$ bases.

Proof of Theorem 1.13. i) Assume that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $\mathbf{C}_{a,f}$ - $(f, \text{almost greedy})$. Since by definition, $\tilde{\sigma}_m(x) \leq \|x\|$ for all $x \in X$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, (1.2) implies that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $\mathbf{C}_{a,f}$ -suppression quasi-greedy. Let $x, A, B, \varepsilon, \delta$ be chosen as in Definition 1.12. Form $y = x + 1_{\varepsilon A} + 1_{\delta B}$. We have

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

ii) Assume that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy and has $\Delta_{A,f}$ -Property (A, f). Let $x \in X$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Lambda \in G(x, m)$, and a set $B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|B| \leq f(|\Lambda|)$, which implies that $|B \setminus \Lambda| \leq f(|\Lambda \setminus B|)$ by Proposition 2.1 item iii). Let $\varepsilon = (\text{sgn}(e_n^*(x)))$ and $\alpha = \min_{n \in \Lambda} |e_n^*(x)|$. By Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - P_\Lambda(x)\| &\leq \Delta_{A,f} \|x - P_\Lambda(x) - P_{B \setminus \Lambda}(x) + \alpha 1_{\varepsilon \Lambda \setminus B}\| \\ &\leq \Delta_{A,f} \|T_\alpha(x - P_\Lambda(x) - P_{B \setminus \Lambda}(x) + P_{\Lambda \setminus B}(x))\| \\ &\leq \Delta_{A,f} \mathbf{C}_\ell \|x - P_B(x)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since B is arbitrary, we know that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $\Delta_{A,f} \mathbf{C}_\ell$ -(f , almost greedy). \square

Proof of Corollary 1.14. The equivalence between i) and ii) is due to Theorem 1.13. Obviously, ii) \implies iii) \implies iv). According to Proposition 2.6, iii) \iff iv). It remains to show iii) \implies ii). Indeed, let $x, A, B, \varepsilon, \delta$ as in Definition 1.12. Assume that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{C}_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy and $\Delta_{sd,f}$ -(f , disjoint superdemocratic). We have

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

Hence, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has Property (A, f). \square

Proof of Corollary 1.15. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ such that there exists $\mathbf{c} > 0$ satisfying $f(m) \geq \mathbf{c}g(m)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Due to Corollary 1.14, it suffices to prove that a $\Delta_{d,f}$ -(f , disjoint democratic) basis is (g , disjoint democratic). Let $A, B \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ be disjoint and $|A| \leq g(|B|)$. We have

$$|A| \leq g(|B|) \leq \frac{1}{\mathbf{c}} f(|B|).$$

If $\frac{1}{\mathbf{c}} \leq 1$, then by (f , disjoint democracy), we obtain $\|1_A\| \leq \Delta_{d,f} \|1_B\|$. Suppose that $\frac{1}{\mathbf{c}} > 1$. We consider two cases.

Case 1: $f(|B|) \leq 2$. Then $|A| \leq \frac{2}{\mathbf{c}}$. We have

$$\|1_A\| \leq |A| \mathbf{c}_2 \leq \frac{2}{\mathbf{c}} \mathbf{c}_2 \leq \frac{2}{\mathbf{c}} \mathbf{c}_2 \sup_n \|e_n^*\| \|1_B\| \leq \frac{2\mathbf{c}_2^2}{\mathbf{c}} \|1_B\|.$$

Case 2: $f(|B|) > 2$. Partition A into $s := \lceil \frac{2}{\mathbf{c}} \rceil$ disjoint subsets A_1, \dots, A_s such that for all $1 \leq i \leq s$,

$$|A_i| \leq \frac{|A|}{s} + 1 \leq \frac{\mathbf{c}|A|}{2} + 1 \leq \frac{f(|B|)}{2} + 1 < f(|B|).$$

By (f , disjoint democracy), we get

$$\|1_{A_i}\| \leq \Delta_{d,f} \|1_B\|, \forall 1 \leq i \leq s.$$

Therefore,

$$\|1_A\| \leq s \Delta_{d,f} \|1_B\|.$$

In general, we have shown that

$$\|1_A\| \leq \max \left\{ \frac{2\mathbf{c}_2^2}{\mathbf{c}}, \left\lceil \frac{2}{\mathbf{c}} \right\rceil \Delta_{d,f} \right\} \|1_B\|,$$

and hence, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is (g , disjoint democratic). \square

The following corollary shall be used in the proof of Theorem 1.18.

Corollary 3.1. *Let $g \in \mathcal{F}$ and g is bounded. Then a basis is $(g, \text{almost greedy})$ if and only if it is quasi-greedy.*

Proof. By Corollary 1.14, it suffices to show that if g is bounded, then every basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $(g, \text{disjoint democratic})$. Indeed, let $A, B \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ be disjoint and $|A| \leq g(|B|)$. If $|B| = 0$, then $|A| = 0$, and there is nothing to prove. Assume that $|B| \geq 1$ and let $\sup_m g(m) = s$. We have

$$\|1_A\| \leq |A|c_2 \leq sc_2 \leq sc_2 \sup_n \|e_n^*\| \|1_B\| \leq sc_2^2 \|1_B\|.$$

Hence, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $(g, \text{disjoint democratic})$, as desired. \square

4. A MODIFICATION OF THE SCHREIER SPACE

We now turn our attention to a notable example (in [6]) of a PG basis that is not almost greedy. The main goals of this section are to prove Theorem 1.18 and to show that though some PG bases are not almost greedy, they can be (f, greedy) for a well-chosen f . Since the notion of being (f, greedy) is order-free, this provides a partial solution to the concern of some researchers regarding the order-dependent nature of PG bases.

Let us generalize the construction in [6] to any function $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ A \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty} : A \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \frac{1}{f(1)} f(\min A) \geq |A| \right\}$$

(thus all singletons are in \mathcal{A}) and X_f be the completion of c_{00} under the following norm: for $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$,

$$\|x\| = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{n \in A} |x_n|.$$

Let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be the normalized canonical basis, which is clearly 1-unconditional.

Lemma 4.1. *For all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that*

$$\frac{1}{2}f(N) - 1 \leq \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N e_n \right\| \leq \frac{1}{f(1)}f(N).$$

Proof. Let $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $\min A \leq N$. Because f is increasing,

$$\sum_{n \in A} \left| e_n^* \left(\sum_{n=1}^N e_n \right) \right| = |A| \leq \frac{1}{f(1)} f(\min A) \leq \frac{1}{f(1)} f(N).$$

We conclude that $\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N e_n \right\| \leq \frac{1}{f(1)} f(N)$.

Next, we establish a lower bound. Choose a nonnegative integer $k \leq N - 1$ to be the smallest such that $A = \{k + 1, \dots, k + (N - k)\} \in \mathcal{A}$, i.e., $f(k + 1) \geq f(1)(N - k)$. If $k = 0$, then $|A| = N \geq f(N)$. Suppose that $k \geq 1$. Then $f(k) < f(1)(N - k + 1)$. We consider two cases.

Case 1: if $k > N/2$, then

$$|A| = N - k > \frac{f(k)}{f(1)} - 1 \geq \frac{f(N/2)}{f(1)} - 1 \geq \frac{1}{2f(1)} f(N) - 1.$$

Case 2: if $k \leq N/2$, then $N \geq 2$ because $k \geq 1$. By Proposition 2.1 item ii),

$$|A| = N - k \geq \frac{N}{2} \geq f\left(\frac{N}{2}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}f(N).$$

Therefore, $\left\|\sum_{n=1}^N e_n\right\| \geq \frac{1}{2}f(N) - 1$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.18. We prove item i). Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{f(m)}{g(m)} = \infty$. Clearly, f is unbounded. We first assume that g is also unbounded. We claim that the canonical basis of X_g is (g, greedy) but is not $(f, \text{almost greedy})$.

$(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is (g, greedy) : let $A, B \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ with $|A| \leq g(|B|)$. By Lemma 4.1, we get

$$\|1_B\| \geq \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{|B|} e_n\right\| \geq \frac{1}{2}g(|B|) - 1 \geq \frac{1}{2}|A| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{2}\|1_A\| - 1.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{2}\|1_A\| \leq \|1_B\| + 1 \leq \|1_B\| + \sup_n \|e_n^*\| \|1_B\| = (c_2 + 1)\|1_B\|.$$

Therefore, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $(g, \text{disjoint democratic})$. By unconditionality and Corollary 1.24, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is (g, greedy) .

$(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is not $(f, \text{almost greedy})$: let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $B = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $A \subset \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ such that $|A| = \lfloor f(m) \rfloor$, $\frac{1}{g(1)}g(\min A) \geq |A|$ (which is possible since $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x) = \infty$), and $A \sqcup B$. By Lemma 4.1,

$$\|1_B\| \leq \frac{1}{f(1)}g(m) \text{ and } \|1_A\| = \lfloor f(m) \rfloor,$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\|1_A\|}{\|1_B\|} \geq f(1) \frac{\lfloor f(m) \rfloor}{g(m)}.$$

Since $\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{f(m)}{g(m)} = \infty$, we do not have $(f, \text{disjoint democracy})$. By Corollary 1.14, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is not $(f, \text{almost greedy})$.

In the case when g is bounded, define $h = \sqrt{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ because \mathcal{F} is closed under compositions. Note that h is unbounded. Using the same argument as above, the canonical basis of X_h is $(h, \text{almost greedy})$ but is not $(f, \text{almost greedy})$. By the proof of Corollary 3.1, the canonical basis of X_h is $(g, \text{disjoint democratic})$, and according to Corollary 1.24, the basis is (g, greedy) .

Next, we prove item ii). Consider the space $(\ell_1 \oplus c_0)_{\ell_1}$ with the basis $\mathcal{X} = (x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ defined as

$$x_n = \begin{cases} e_k & \text{if } n = 2k - 1, \\ f_k & \text{if } n = 2k. \end{cases}$$

where $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ are the canonical bases of ℓ_1 and c_0 , respectively. Clearly, \mathcal{X} is 1-unconditional. Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$ be unbounded. Then \mathcal{X} is not $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$. Indeed, pick $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $A = \{1, 3, \dots, 2\lfloor f(m) \rfloor - 1\}$, and $B = \{2, 4, \dots, 2m\}$. It follows that $\frac{\|1_A\|}{\|1_B\|} = \lfloor f(m) \rfloor \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, \mathcal{X} is not $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$ and thus, not $(f, \text{almost greedy})$. \square

Remark 4.2. We consider the PG basis in [6, Proposition 6.10], which is the canonical basis of X_f , when f is the square-root function. According the proof of Theorem 1.18, we know that the basis is (f, greedy) though it is not almost greedy.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$.*

- i) *If $\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{f(m)}{g(m)} < \infty$, then the canonical basis of X_g is (f, greedy) .*
- ii) *If $\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{f(m)}{g(m)} = \infty$ and g is unbounded, then the canonical basis of X_g is not $(f, \text{almost greedy})$.*
- iii) *If g is bounded, then the canonical basis of X_g is equivalent to the canonical basis of c_0 . In this case, the canonical basis of X_g is (f, greedy) for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. i) Suppose that $\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{f(m)}{g(m)} =: \mathbf{c} < \infty$. Then $f(m) \leq \mathbf{c}g(m), \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the canonical basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of X_g is $(g, \text{disjoint democratic})$ according to the proof of Theorem 1.18, Corollary 1.15 states that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$. By Corollary 1.24, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is (f, greedy) .

ii) Use the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 1.18.

iii) Suppose that $\sup g = \mathbf{c}$. Let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be the canonical basis of X_g . For all $A \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ and sign ε , we have $\|1_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \frac{\mathbf{c}}{g(1)}$. Hence, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is equivalent to the canonical basis of c_0 . \square

5. ABOUT f -UNCONDITIONALITY

This section introduces f -unconditionality and give several useful characterizations.

Definition 5.1. Fix $f \in \mathcal{F}$. A set $A \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ is an f -greedy set of x if A can be written as the disjoint union of $E \sqcup F$, where $|E| \leq f(|A|)$ and

$$|e_n^*(x)| \geq \|x - P_A(x)\|_\infty, \forall n \in F.$$

We call (E, F) the f -greedy decomposition of A . Let $G(x, f)$ denote the collection of all f -greedy sets of x .

Proposition 5.2. *Fix $x \in X$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$. A set $A \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ is an f -greedy set of x if and only if there exists $B \subset A$ such that B is a greedy set of x of size at least $|A| - f(|A|)$.*

Proof. Let $x \in X$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Assume that $A \in G(x, f)$. Let (E, F) be an f -greedy decomposition of A . Then $|E| \leq f(|A|)$. If $F = \emptyset$, then $A = E$ and $|A| = |E| \leq f(|A|)$; that is, $|A| - f(|A|) = 0$ and there is nothing to prove. If $F \neq \emptyset$, let $\alpha = \min_{n \in F} |e_n^*(x)|$. Define $E' = \{n \in E : |e_n^*(x)| \geq \alpha\}$. It is easy to check that $E' \cup F$ is a greedy set of x . Furthermore,

$$|E' \cup F| = |E'| + |F| = |A| - |E \setminus E'| \geq |A| - f(|A|).$$

Conversely, pick $A \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ such that there exists $B \subset A$ and B is a greedy set of x of size at least $|A| - f(|A|)$. We claim that $(A \setminus B, B)$ is an f -greedy decomposition of A . Indeed,

$$\min_{n \in B} |e_n^*(x)| \geq \|x - P_B(x)\|_\infty \geq \|x - P_A(x)\|_\infty$$

and

$$|A \setminus B| = |A| - |B| \leq |A| - (|A| - f(|A|)) = f(|A|).$$

Therefore, A is an f -greedy set of x . \square

Definition 5.3. A basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is said to be f -unconditional if there exists a constant $\mathbf{C} \geq 1$ such that

$$\|x - P_A(x)\| \leq \mathbf{C}\|x\|, \forall x \in X, \forall A \in G(x, f).$$

The smallest such \mathbf{C} is denoted by \mathbf{K}_{su} , and we say that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{K}_{su} -suppression f -unconditional. In this case, let \mathbf{K}_u denote the smallest constant such that

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq \mathbf{K}_u\|x\|, \forall x \in X, \forall A \in G(x, f).$$

Proposition 5.4. *If a basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{K}_{su} -suppression f -unconditional, then it is \mathbf{K}_{su} -suppression quasi-greedy. If a basis is \mathbf{K}_u - f -unconditional, then it is \mathbf{K}_u -quasi-greedy.*

Proof. Simply note that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $G(x, m) \subset G(x, f)$. \square

Let us prove a characterization of f -unconditional bases using thresholding operators. For some $\alpha > 0$, define $T_{\alpha, f} : X \rightarrow X$ as

$$T_{\alpha, f}(x) := P_A(x) + \sum_{\substack{|e_n^*(x)| > \alpha \\ n \notin A}} e_n^*(x)e_n,$$

for some finite set $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|A| \leq f(|A| + |\{n \notin A : |e_n^*(x)| > \alpha\}|).$$

Observe that for fixed α and f , $T_{\alpha, f}$ may not be unique as we have freedom in choosing the set A .

Proposition 5.5. *Fix $f \in \mathcal{F}$. A basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{K}_u - f -unconditional if and only if*

$$\sup_{\alpha > 0} \|T_{\alpha, f}\| \leq \mathbf{K}_u.$$

Proof. Assume first that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{K}_u - f -unconditional. Pick $x \in X$, $\alpha > 0$, and a finite set $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|A| \leq f(|A| + |\{n \notin A : |e_n^*(x)| > \alpha\}|).$$

Clearly, the set $A \cup \{n \notin A : |e_n^*(x)| > \alpha\}$ is an f -greedy set of x . By f -unconditionality, we obtain

$$\left\| P_A(x) + \sum_{\substack{|e_n^*(x)| > \alpha \\ n \notin A}} e_n^*(x)e_n \right\| \leq \mathbf{K}_u\|x\|,$$

and so, $\sup_{\alpha > 0} \|T_{\alpha, f}\| \leq \mathbf{K}_u$.

Conversely, assume that $\sup_{\alpha > 0} \|T_{\alpha, f}\| \leq \mathbf{K}_u$. Pick $x \in X$ and $A \in G(x, f)$ with an f -greedy decomposition (E, F) . If $F = \emptyset$, then $|E| \leq f(|E|)$. Choose $\alpha > \|x\|_\infty$ and $T_{\alpha, f}(x) := P_E(x)$. Then

$$\|P_A(x)\| = \|P_E(x)\| = \|T_{\alpha, f}(x)\| \leq \mathbf{K}_u\|x\|.$$

If $F \neq \emptyset$, let $\alpha = \min_{n \in F} |e_n^*(x)|$. We use the standard perturbation technique. Fix $\eta > 0$ and choose $\gamma > 0$ small enough such that

$$\left\| \sum_{n \in F} \gamma \operatorname{sgn}(e_n^*(x))e_n \right\| < \eta.$$

Form

$$y := \sum_{n \in F} \gamma \operatorname{sgn}(e_n^*(x)) e_n + x.$$

Find a thresholding operator $T_{\alpha+\gamma/2, f}$ such that

$$T_{\alpha+\gamma/2, f}(y) = P_E(y) + \sum_{\substack{|e_n^*(y)| > \alpha + \gamma/2 \\ n \notin E}} e_n^*(y) e_n,$$

which is possible because

$$F = \{n \notin E : |e_n^*(y)| > \alpha + \gamma/2\} \text{ and } |E| \leq f(|E| + |F|).$$

Therefore,

$$\left\| P_A(x) + \sum_{n \in F} \gamma \operatorname{sgn}(e_n^*(x)) e_n \right\| = \|T_{\alpha+\gamma/2, f}(y)\| \leq \mathbf{K}_u \|y\| \leq \mathbf{K}_u (\|x\| + \eta).$$

Letting $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ then $\eta \rightarrow 0$, we get the desired result. \square

We have yet another characterization of f -unconditionality.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$. A basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is f -unconditional if and only if it is quasi-greedy and there exists a constant $\mathbf{C} > 0$ such that*

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq \mathbf{C} \|x\|, \tag{5.1}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and for all $A \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ such that $|A| \leq f(|A| + |B|)$ for some greedy set B of x that is disjoint from A .

Proof. Assume that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{K}_u - f -unconditional. By Proposition 5.4, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{K}_u -quasi-greedy. To see (5.1), we fix $x \in \mathbb{X}$, a greedy set B of x , and $A \subset \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ such that $A \sqcup B$ and $|A| \leq f(|A| + |B|)$. We have

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq \|P_{A \cup B}(x)\| + \|P_B(x)\| \leq \|P_{A \cup B}(x)\| + \mathbf{K}_u \|x\|.$$

Since $A \cup B \in G(x, f)$, we get

$$\|P_{A \cup B}(x)\| \leq \mathbf{K}_u \|x\|.$$

We conclude that $\|P_A(x)\| \leq 2\mathbf{K}_u \|x\|$.

Conversely, assume that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{C}_q -quasi-greedy and satisfies (5.1). Let $x \in X$ and $A \in G(x, f)$ with an f -greedy decomposition (E, F) . If $F = \emptyset$, then $A = E$ and $|E| \leq f(|E|)$. By (5.1), we obtain

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq \mathbf{C} \|x\|.$$

If $F \neq \emptyset$, let $\alpha = \min_{n \in F} |e_n^*(x)|$ and $E' = \{n \in E : |e_n^*(x)| < \alpha\}$. Then $F' = F \cup (E \setminus E')$ is a greedy set of x . We get

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq \|P_{E'}(x)\| + \|P_{F'}(x)\| \leq \|P_{E'}(x)\| + \mathbf{C}_q \|x\|.$$

Furthermore,

$$|E'| \leq |E| \leq f(|A|) = f(|E'| + |F'|).$$

Hence, (5.1) implies that $\|P_{E'}(x)\| \leq \mathbf{C} \|x\|$. Therefore,

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq (\mathbf{C}_q + \mathbf{C}) \|x\|.$$

This completes our proof. \square

Definition 5.7. A basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is said to have Property (f) if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq C \|x + 1_{\varepsilon B}\|,$$

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

Proposition 5.8. A basis is f -unconditional if and only if it is quasi-greedy and has Property (f) .

Proof. By Propositions 5.4 and 5.6, it suffices to prove that for a quasi-greedy basis, Property (f) is equivalent to (5.1). Assume (5.1). Let x, A, B, ε as in Definition 5.7. Set $y = x + 1_{\varepsilon B}$. Then B is a greedy set of y and $|A| \leq f(|A| + |B|)$. By (5.1),

$$\|P_A(x)\| = \|P_A(y)\| \leq C \|y\| = C \|x + 1_{\varepsilon B}\|.$$

Conversely, assume that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has Δ -Property (f) and is C_ℓ -suppression quasi-greedy. Choose x, A, B as in (5.1). If $B = \emptyset$, then $|A| \leq f(|A|)$. By Property (f) , $\|P_A(x)\| \leq \Delta \|x\|$. If $B \neq \emptyset$, let $\alpha = \min_{n \in B} |e_n^*(x)|$ and $\varepsilon = (\text{sgn}(e_n^*(x)))$. By Theorem 2.7, we have

$$\|P_{B^c}(x) + \alpha 1_{\varepsilon B}\| \leq C_\ell \|x\|.$$

Let $A' = A \cap \text{supp}(P_{B^c}(x))$, which satisfies $|A'| \leq f(|A'| + |B|)$ due to Proposition 2.1 item iii). By Property (f) ,

$$\|P_A(x)\| = \|P_{A'}(P_{B^c}(x))\| \leq \Delta \|P_{B^c}(x) + \alpha 1_{\varepsilon B}\|.$$

Therefore,

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq C_\ell \Delta \|x\|,$$

as desired. \square

6. ABOUT (f, GREEDY) BASES

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.21 and 1.10.

Proof of Theorem 1.13. i) Assume that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $C_{g,f}$ - (f, greedy) . First, we show that it is $C_{g,f}$ -suppression f -unconditional. Let $x \in X$, $A \in G(x, f)$, and (E, F) be an f -greedy decomposition of A . Choose $\alpha > 0$ sufficiently large such that $y := x + \alpha 1_E$ has E as a greedy set. It follows that A is a greedy set of y . We have

$$\|x - P_A(x)\| = \|y - P_A(y)\| \leq C_{g,f} \sigma_{f(|A|)}(y) \leq C_{g,f} \|y - \alpha 1_E\| = C_{g,f} \|x\|.$$

Therefore, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $C_{g,f}$ -suppression f -unconditional. To see that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has $C_{g,f}$ -Property (A, f) , let $x, A, B, \varepsilon, \delta$ be chosen as in Definition 1.12. Form $y = x + 1_{\varepsilon A} + 1_{\delta B}$. We have

$$\|x + 1_{\varepsilon A}\| = \|y - P_B(y)\| \leq C_g \tilde{\sigma}_{f(|B|)}(y) \leq C_g \|x + 1_{\delta B}\|.$$

ii) Assume that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{K}_{su} -suppression f -unconditional and has $\Delta_{A,f}$ -Property (A, f) . Let $x \in X$, $\Lambda \in G(x, m)$, $A \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ with $|A| \leq f(m)$, and $(a_n)_{n \in A}$ be arbitrary scalars. Set $\varepsilon = (\text{sgn}(e_n^*(x)))$ and $\alpha = \min_{n \in \Lambda} |e_n^*(x)|$. Note that $|A \setminus \Lambda| \leq f(|\Lambda \setminus A|)$. By Proposition 2.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - P_\Lambda(x)\| &\leq \Delta_{A,f} \|x - P_\Lambda(x) - P_{A \setminus \Lambda}(x) + \alpha 1_{\varepsilon \Lambda \setminus A}\| \\ &= \Delta_{A,f} \|x - P_{\Lambda \cup A}(x) + \alpha 1_{\varepsilon \Lambda \setminus A}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

On the other hand, write

$$y := x - \sum_{n \in A} a_n e_n = x - P_{\Lambda \cup A}(x) + \sum_{n \in A} (e_n^*(x) - a_n) e_n + P_{\Lambda \setminus A}(x).$$

Observe that $\Lambda \cup A \in G(y, f)$ because $f(|\Lambda \cup A|) \geq f(m) \geq |A|$ and

$$|e_n^*(y)| \geq \alpha \geq \|x - P_{\Lambda \cup A}(x)\|_\infty, \forall n \in \Lambda \setminus A.$$

Therefore,

$$\|x - P_{\Lambda \cup A}(x)\| = \|y - P_{\Lambda \cup A}(y)\| \leq \mathbf{K}_{su} \|y\|. \quad (6.2)$$

Also, by Proposition 5.4 and Theorem 2.7, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|y\| &\geq \frac{1}{\mathbf{K}_{su}} \left\| x - P_{\Lambda \cup A}(x) + \sum_{n \in A} T_\alpha(e_n^*(x) - a_n) e_n + \alpha 1_{\varepsilon \Lambda \setminus A} \right\| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mathbf{K}_{su}(\mathbf{K}_{su} + 1)} \|\alpha 1_{\varepsilon \Lambda \setminus A}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

where the last inequality is due to $\Lambda \setminus A$ being a greedy set of

$$x - P_{\Lambda \cup A}(x) + \sum_{n \in A} T_\alpha(e_n^*(x) - a_n) e_n + \alpha 1_{\varepsilon \Lambda \setminus A}.$$

From (6.2) and (6.3), we obtain

$$\|x - P_A(x) + \alpha 1_{\varepsilon \Lambda \setminus A}\| \leq (\mathbf{K}_{su}^2 + 2\mathbf{K}_{su}) \|y\|,$$

which, combined with (6.1), gives

$$\|x - P_\Lambda(x)\| \leq \Delta_{A,f}(\mathbf{K}_{su}^2 + 2\mathbf{K}_{su}) \left\| x - \sum_{n \in A} a_n e_n \right\|,$$

as desired. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.22. The equivalence of i) and ii) is due to Theorem 1.21. The equivalence of iii) and iv) follows from Propositions 2.6 and 5.4. Finally, ii) \implies iii) is obvious, while iii) \implies ii) is immediate from Proposition 5.4 and the proof of Corollary 1.14. \square

Remark 6.1. We see that Theorem 1.5 is a special case of Corollary 1.14 when f is the identity function. Indeed, when $f(x) = x$, f -unconditionality is equivalent to unconditionality.

Remark 6.2. It is worth mentioning that the converse of Corollary 1.23 does not hold in general. For example, let $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a conditional almost greedy basis. By Proposition 1.19, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is (f, greedy) for all non-identity $f \in \mathcal{F}$ but it is not unconditional.

We are now ready to prove the equivalence between $(f, \text{almost greedy})$ and (f, greedy) bases for each non-identity $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.10. We need only to show that an $(f, \text{almost greedy})$ basis is (f, greedy) . Assume that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is $(f, \text{almost greedy})$; that is, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is \mathbf{C}_q -quasi-greedy and $\Delta_{sd,f}$ - $(f, \text{disjoint superdemocratic})$ according to Corollary 1.14.

We know that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{x} = \mathbf{c}$ exists by Proposition 2.1. Since f is non-identity, the proof of Proposition 2.1 shows that $\mathbf{c} < 1$. Suppose first that $0 < \mathbf{c} < 1$. Since $f(x)/x$

is decreasing, we know that $cx \leq f(x)$ for all $x > 0$. By Corollary 1.15, $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is almost greedy. We use Proposition 1.19 to conclude that the basis is (f, greedy) .

For the rest of the proof, we assume that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{x} = 0$. By Corollary 1.22 and Proposition 5.8, it suffices to verify that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has Property (f) . Choose x, A, B, ε as in Definition 5.7. We want to show that there exists a constant C (independent of x, A, B, ε) such that

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq C\|x + 1_{\varepsilon B}\|.$$

Since f is concave, we have

$$|A| \leq f(|A| + |B|) \leq f(|A|) + f(|B|).$$

Choose $N \geq 6$ be such that $f(x) \leq x/3$ for all $x \geq N$. If $|A| \leq N$, then

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq \|P_A\|\|x\| \leq \mathbf{c}_2^2\|x\| \leq \mathbf{c}_2^2(\mathbf{C}_q + 1)\|x + 1_{\varepsilon B}\|.$$

If $|A| > N$, then

$$f(|B|) \geq |A| - f(|A|) \geq \frac{2|A|}{3}.$$

Partition A into two sets A_1, A_2 such that

$$|A_i| \leq \frac{|A|}{2} + 1 \leq \frac{2|A|}{3} \leq f(|B|).$$

By $\Delta_{sd,f}$ - $(f, \text{disjoint superdemocratic})$, we get

$$\sup_{\delta} \|1_{\delta A}\| \leq \sup_{\delta'} \|1_{\delta' A_1}\| + \sup_{\delta''} \|1_{\delta'' A_2}\| \leq 2\Delta_{sd,f}\|1_{\varepsilon B}\|.$$

Therefore, by convexity and the quasi-greedy property,

$$\|P_A(x)\| \leq \sup_{\delta} \|1_{\delta A}\| \leq 2\Delta_{sd,f}\|1_{\varepsilon B}\| \leq 2\Delta_{sd,f}\mathbf{C}_q\|x + 1_{\varepsilon B}\|.$$

We conclude that $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has Property (f) , which completes our proof. \square

Before closing this section, let us show an application of Corollary 1.24 to the (normalized) multivariate Haar basis \mathcal{H}_p^d of $L^p([0, 1]^d)$ for $1 < p < \infty$. A famous result by Temlyakov [15] states that the univariate \mathcal{H}_p^1 is a greedy basis of $L^p[0, 1]$. However, the same conclusion does not hold for the general multivariate basis $\mathcal{H}_p^d = \mathcal{H}_p \times \cdots \times \mathcal{H}_p$. While $\mathcal{H}_p^d = \{h_n\}$ is an unconditional basis for $L^p([0, 1]^d)$, the system is not democratic and thus, not greedy [16, (1.3)]. However, one has the following result from [13] (see also [9, Proposition 7.6]).

Proposition 6.3. *For any $A \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ with $|A| = m \geq 2$, there exist $\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2 > 0$ such that if $p \in [2, \infty)$,*

$$\mathbf{C}_1 m^{1/p} \leq \left\| \sum_{n \in A} h_n \right\| \leq \mathbf{C}_2 (\ln m)^{h(p,d)} m^{1/p},$$

while if $p \in (1, 2)$,

$$\mathbf{C}_1 m^{1/p} (\ln m)^{-h(p,d)} \leq \left\| \sum_{n \in A} h_n \right\| \leq \mathbf{C}_2 m^{1/p},$$

where $h(p, d) := (d - 1) \left| \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} \right|$.

Theorem 6.4. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, let $f(x) = x^{1-\varepsilon}$. The d -multivariate system $\mathcal{H}_p^d = \{h_n\}$ is (f, greedy) .*

Proof. By Corollary 1.24, it suffices to show that \mathcal{H}_p^d is $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$. Let $A, B \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ such that $|A| \leq |B|^{1-\varepsilon}$. Also let $\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2$ be as in Proposition 6.3. Choose $N \geq 2$ to be sufficiently large such that

$$x^{\varepsilon/p} \geq \frac{\mathbf{C}_2}{\mathbf{C}_1} (\ln x)^{h(p,d)}, \forall x \geq N.$$

Without loss of generality, assume $|B|^{1-\varepsilon} \geq |A| \geq N$. (If $|A| \leq N$, we use semi-normalization of the basis.) We consider only the case $p \in [2, \infty)$ as the case $p \in (1, 2)$ is similar. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|1_A\| &\leq \mathbf{C}_2 (\ln |A|)^{h(p,d)} |A|^{1/p} \leq \mathbf{C}_2 (\ln |B|)^{h(p,d)} |B|^{(1-\varepsilon)/p} \\ &\leq (\mathbf{C}_1 |B|^{\varepsilon/p}) |B|^{(1-\varepsilon)/p} = \mathbf{C}_1 |B|^{1/p} \leq \|1_B\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, \mathcal{H}_p^d is $(f, \text{disjoint democratic})$, as desired. \square

7. OPEN PROBLEM

We close by discussing an open problem that our paper leaves open.

Definition 7.1. A basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is said to be $(f, \text{superdemocratic})$ if there exists a constant $\mathbf{C} > 0$ such that

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

for all $A, B \in \mathbb{N}^{<\infty}$ with $|A| \leq f(|B|)$ and for all signs ε, δ .

Problem 7.2. It is an easy exercise to show that for $f \in \mathcal{F}$, an $(f, \text{disjoint superdemocratic})$ basis is $(f \circ f, \text{superdemocratic})$. If $f(x) = o(x)$ and f is unbounded, is the result optimal in the sense that generally, an $(f, \text{disjoint superdemocratic})$ basis is not $(g, \text{superdemocratic})$ for any function $g \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\sup \frac{g}{f \circ f} = \infty$?

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Albiac and P. Wojtaszczyk, Characterization of 1-greedy bases, *J. Approx. Theory* **138** (2006), 65–86.
- [2] F. Albiac, J. L. Ansorena, M. Berasategui, P. M. Berná, and S. Lassalle, Bidemocratic bases and their connections with other greedy-type bases, preprint. Available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2105.15177.pdf>.
- [3] F. Albiac and N. Kalton, Topics in Banach Space Theory, second edition, ISBN 978-3-319-31555-3 (2016).
- [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] 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.
- [6] 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.
- [7] H. V. Chu, Performance of the Thresholding Greedy Algorithm with larger greedy sums, preprint. Available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2205.00268.pdf>.
- [8] H. V. Chu, Larger greedy sums for reverse partially greedy bases, preprint. Available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2208.13291.pdf>.

- [9] S. J. Dilworth, G. Garrigós, E. Hernández, D. Kutzarova, and V. N. Temlyakov, Lebesgue-type inequalities in greedy approximation, *J. Funct. Anal.* **280** (2021), 1–37.
- [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] I. S. Édel’shtein and P. Wojtaszczyk, On projections and unconditional bases in direct sums of Banach spaces, *Studia Math.* **56** (1976), 263–276.
- [13] G. Kerkycharian, D. Picard, and V.N. Temlyakov, Some inequalities for the tensor product of greedy bases and weight-greedy bases, *East J. Approx.* **12** (2006), 103–118.
- [14] S. V. Konyagin and V. N. Temlyakov, A remark on greedy approximation in Banach spaces, *East J. Approx.* **5** (1999), 365–379.
- [15] V. N. Temlyakov, The best m -term approximation and greedy algorithms, *Adv. Comput. Math.* **8** (1998), 249–265.
- [16] V. N. Temlyakov, Nonlinear m -term approximation with regard to the multivariate Haar system, *East J. Approx.* **4**, 87–106.

Email address: hungchu2@illinois.edu

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