

Enveloping norms on the spaces of regularly \mathcal{P} -operators in Banach lattices

December 2, 2022

Safak Alpay¹, Eduard Emelyanov², Svetlana Gorokhova³

¹ Department of Mathematics, Middle East Technical University, 06800 Ankara, Turkey, safak@metu.edu.tr

² Sobolev Institute of Mathematics, Acad. Koptyug avenue, 4, 630090, Novosibirsk, Russia, emelanov@math.nsc.ru

³ Uznyj matematicheskij institut VNC RAN, Vatutin str., 53, 362025, Vladikavkaz, Russia, lanagor71@gmail.com

Abstract

We introduce and study the enveloping norms of regularly \mathcal{P} -operators between Banach lattices E and F , where \mathcal{P} is a subspace of the space $L(E, F)$ of continuous operators from E to F . We prove that if \mathcal{P} is closed in $L(E, F)$ in the operator norm then the regularly \mathcal{P} -operators forms a Banach space under the enveloping norm. Conditions providing that regularly \mathcal{P} -operators forms a Banach lattice under the enveloping norm are given.

Keywords: Banach lattice, regularly \mathcal{P} -operator, enveloping norm
MSC2020: 46B25, 46B42, 46B50, 47B60

Throughout the paper, all vector spaces are real, all operators are linear, letters E and F denote Banach lattices, B_E denotes the closed unit ball of E , $L(E, F)$ ($K(E, F)$; $W(E, F)$) denotes the space of all continuous (resp.

compact; weakly compact) operators from E to F , and E_+ the positive cone of E . Let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq L(E, F)$. We call elements of \mathcal{P} by \mathcal{P} -operators and say that \mathcal{P} -operators satisfy the *domination property* if $0 \leq S \leq T \in \mathcal{P}$ implies $S \in \mathcal{P}$. An operator $T \in L(E, F)$ is called *\mathcal{P} -dominated* if $\pm T \leq U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{P}$. Under the assumption $\mathcal{P} \pm \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset$, \mathcal{P} -operators satisfy the domination property iff each \mathcal{P} -dominated operator lies in \mathcal{P} . We refer to [1, 10, 12] for unexplained terminology and notations.

0.1 In the present paper we continue the investigation of regularly \mathcal{P} -operators following [9, 2] and introduce enveloping norms on spaces of regularly \mathcal{P} -operators. An operator $T : E \rightarrow F$ is called *regular* if $T = T_1 - T_2$ for some $T_1, T_2 \in L_+(E, F)$. We denote by $L_r(E, F)$ (resp. $L_{ob}(E, F)$, $L_{oc}(E, F)$) the ordered space of all regular (resp. order bounded, o-continuous) operators in $L(E, F)$. The space $L_r(E, F)$ is a Banach space under the *regular norm* [12, Prop.1.3.6]

$$\|T\|_r := \inf\{\|S\| : \pm T \leq S \in L(E, F)\}. \quad (1)$$

Furthermore, for every $T \in L_r(E, F)$,

$$\|T\|_r = \inf\{\|S\| : S \in L(E, F), |Tx| \leq S|x| \forall x \in E\} \geq \|T\|, \quad (2)$$

and if F is Dedekind complete then $(L_r(E, F), \|\cdot\|_r)$ is a Banach lattice with $\|T\|_r = \||T|\|$ for each $T \in L_r(E, F)$ [12, Prop.1.3.6]. The following notion was introduced in [9, Def.2] (cf. also [2, Def.1.5.1]).

Definition 1. Let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq L(E, F)$. An operator $T : E \rightarrow F$ is called a *regularly \mathcal{P} -operator* (shortly, an *r- \mathcal{P} -operator*) if $T = T_1 - T_2$ with $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{P} \cap L_+(E, F)$. We denote by:

- $\mathcal{P}(E, F) := \mathcal{P}$ the set of all \mathcal{P} -operators in $L(E, F)$;
- $\mathcal{P}_r(E, F)$ the set of all regular operators in $\mathcal{P}(E, F)$;
- r- $\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ the set of all r- \mathcal{P} -operators in $L(E, F)$.

Assertion 2. ([2, Prop.1.5.2]) *Let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq L(E, F)$, $\mathcal{P} \pm \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset$, and $T \in L(E, F)$. Then the following holds.*

- (i) *T is an r- \mathcal{P} -operator iff T is a \mathcal{P} -dominated \mathcal{P} -operator.*

(ii) Suppose \mathcal{P} -operators satisfy the domination property and the modulus $|T|$ exists in $L(E, F)$. Then T is an $r\text{-}\mathcal{P}$ -operator iff $|T| \in \mathcal{P}$.

The next fact was established in [2, Prop.1.5.3].

Assertion 3. $r\text{-}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ is a Dedekind complete vector lattice if F is Dedekind complete and \mathcal{P} is a subspace of $L(E, F)$ satisfying the domination property.

0.2 In the definition (1) of the regular norm, we replace $L(E, F)$ by an arbitrary subspace \mathcal{P} of $L(E, F)$ as follows:

$$\|T\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}} := \inf\{\|S\| : \pm T \leq S \in \mathcal{P}\} \quad (T \in r\text{-}\mathcal{P}(E, F)). \quad (3)$$

Lemma 4. For a subspace \mathcal{P} of $L(E, F)$, the formula (3) defines a norm on $r\text{-}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$, called the enveloping norm. Moreover,

$$\|T\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}} = \inf\{\|S\| : S \in \mathcal{P} \ \& \ (\forall x \in E) \ |Tx| \leq S|x|\} \quad (T \in r\text{-}\mathcal{P}(E, F)). \quad (4)$$

If \mathcal{P}_1 is a subspace of \mathcal{P} then

$$\|T\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}_1} \geq \|T\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}} \geq \|T\|_r \geq \|T\| \quad (\forall T \in r\text{-}\mathcal{P}_1(E, F)). \quad (5)$$

Proof. Only the triangle inequality and the formula (4) require explanations.

(A) Let $T_1, T_2 \in r\text{-}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Pick $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\pm T_1 \leq S_1$, $\pm T_2 \leq S_2$, $\|S_1\| \leq \|T_1\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}} + \varepsilon$, and $\|S_2\| \leq \|T_2\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}} + \varepsilon$. Then $\pm(T_1 + T_2) \leq S_1 + S_2 \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\|T_1 + T_2\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}} \leq \|S_1 + S_2\| \leq \|S_1\| + \|S_2\| \leq \|T_1\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}} + \|T_2\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}} + 2\varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, $\|T_1 + T_2\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}} \leq \|T_1\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}} + \|T_2\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}}$.

(B) Denote the right side of (4) by $R(T)$. If $\pm T \leq S \in \mathcal{P}$ then

$$\pm Tx = \pm(T(x_+) - T(x_-)) = \pm T(x_+) \mp T(x_-) \leq S(x_+) + S(x_-) = S|x|$$

for all $x \in E$. Then $|Tx| \leq S|x|$ for all $x \in E$, and hence $\|T\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}} \geq R(T)$.

If $S \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfies $|Tx| \leq S|x|$ for all $x \in E$ then, for all $y \in E_+$, $|Ty| \leq Sy$ and consequently $\pm Ty \leq Sy$. Therefore $\pm T \leq S$, and hence $R(T) \geq \|T\|_{r\text{-}\mathcal{P}}$. \square

Let \mathcal{P} be a subspace of $L(E, F)$. What are the conditions for $\mathcal{P}_r(E, F) = r\text{-}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$? Trivially it happens for $\mathcal{P} = L(E, F)$. The following proposition shows that if $L(E, F)$ is non-trivial then we can always find a closed subspace \mathcal{P} such that $r\text{-}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ is a proper subspace of $\mathcal{P}_r(E, F)$. More interesting case of the question is included in Example 20 below.

Proposition 5. *Let $\dim(L(E, F)) > 1$. Then there exists a one-dimensional subspace \mathcal{P} of $L(E, F)$ such that $\text{r-}\mathcal{P}(E, F) \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_r(E, F)$.*

Proof. If $\dim(E) > 1$ then $\dim(E') > 1$ and hence there are two linearly independent functionals $g_1, g_2 \in E'_+$. We take a nonzero element $y \in F_+$ and set $\mathcal{P} := \text{span}((g_1 - g_2) \otimes y)$.

If $\dim(F) > 1$, there are two linearly independent elements $y_1, y_2 \in F_+$. We take a nonzero functional $g \in E'_+$ and set $\mathcal{P} := \text{span}(g \otimes (y_1 - y_2))$.

In the both cases \mathcal{P} is one-dimensional subspace of $L(E, F)$. Moreover, $\text{r-}\mathcal{P}(E, F) = \{0\} \neq \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_r(E, F)$. \square

0.3 The following result is an extension of [12, Prop.1.3.6], [9, Lm.1] (see also [6, Prop.2.2] and [7, Thm.2.3] for particular cases). Its proof is a modification of the proof of [12, Prop.1.3.6].

Theorem 6. *Let \mathcal{P} be a subspace of $L(E, F)$ closed in the operator norm. Then $\text{r-}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ is a Banach space under the enveloping norm.*

Proof. Let (T_n) be a $\|\cdot\|_{\text{r-}\mathcal{P}}$ -Cauchy sequence in $\text{r-}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$, say $T_n = P_n - R_n$ for $P_n, R_n \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{L}_+(E, F)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume

$$\|T_{n+1} - T_n\|_{\text{r-}\mathcal{P}} < 2^{-n} \quad (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Since $\|\cdot\|_{\text{r-}\mathcal{P}} \geq \|\cdot\|$, there exists a $T \in L(E, F)$ with $\|T - T_n\| \rightarrow 0$. We obtain $T \in \mathcal{P}$ because $T_n \in \mathcal{P}$ and \mathcal{P} is closed in the operator norm. Pick $S_n \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\|S_n\| < 2^{-n}$ and $\pm(T_{n+1} - T_n) \leq S_n$. By (4),

$$|(T_{n+1} - T_n)x| \leq S_n|x| \quad (\forall x \in E)(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

As \mathcal{P} is closed, $Q_n := \|\cdot\| - \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} S_k \in \mathcal{P}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since

$$|(T - T_n)x| = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |(T_k - T_n)x| \leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} |(T_{k+1} - T_n)x| \leq Q_n|x| \quad (\forall x \in E),$$

then $\pm(T - T_n) \leq Q_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $-Q_n \leq (T - T_n) \leq Q_n$ and hence $0 \leq (T - T_n) + Q_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular,

$$T = [(T - T_n) + Q_n] + [T_n - Q_n] = [(T - T_n) + Q_n + P_n] - [R_n + Q_n] \in \text{r-}\mathcal{P}(E, F),$$

and hence $(T - T_n) \in \mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now,

$$\|T - T_n\|_{\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}} \leq \|Q_n\| < 2^{1-n}$$

implies $(T_n) \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}}} T$. □

Theorem 7. *Let F be Dedekind complete and let \mathcal{P} be a closed in the operator norm subspace of $L(E, F)$ satisfying the domination property. Then $\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ is a Dedekind complete Banach lattice under the enveloping norm.*

Proof. By Assertion 3, $\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ is a Dedekind complete vector lattice. Theorem 6 implies that $\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ is $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}}$ -complete. Let $|S| \leq |T|$ for some $S, T \in \mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$. By Assertion 2 (ii), $|S|, |T| \in \mathcal{P}$, and hence

$$\|S\|_{\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}} = \| |S| \| = \sup_{x \in E_+ \cap B_E} \| |S|x \| \leq \sup_{x \in E_+ \cap B_E} \| |T|x \| = \| |T| \| = \|T\|_{\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}}.$$

Therefore, $(\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}(E, F), \|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}})$ is a Banach lattice. □

0.4 In general, $\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}(E, F) \subsetneq \overline{\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}}(E, F)$, where $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ is the norm-closure of \mathcal{P} in $L(E, F)$. From the other hand, for $\mathcal{P} := \mathfrak{r}\text{-L}_{ob}(E, F)$ (which is almost never closed in $L(E, F)$ in the operator norm), $\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}(E, F) = \overline{\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}}(E, F) = L_r(E, F)$. The enveloping norms on these three spaces agree with the regular norm. The next result coupled with Example 9 shows that the enveloping norm on $\mathfrak{r}\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ can be complete even if $\mathcal{P}(E, F)$ is not complete in the operator norm.

Proposition 8. *Let the norm in F be o -continuous. Then $\mathfrak{r}\text{-L}_{oc}(E, F)$ is a Banach space under the enveloping norm.*

Proof. Let (T_n) be a Cauchy sequence in $\mathfrak{r}\text{-L}_{oc}(E, F)$ in the enveloping norm. We can assume that $\|T_{n+1} - T_n\|_{\mathfrak{r}\text{-L}_{oc}(E, F)} < 2^{-n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $T \in L(E, F)$ satisfy $\|T - T_n\| \rightarrow 0$. Pick $S_n \in L_{oc}(E, F)$ with $\|S_n\| < 2^{-n}$ and $\pm(T_{n+1} - T_n) \leq S_n$. First, we claim $Q_n := \|\cdot\| - \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} S_k \in L_{oc}(E, F)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. To prove the claim, it suffices to show that $Q_1 \in L_{oc}(E, F)$. So, let $x_\alpha \downarrow 0$ in E . Passing to a tail we can assume that $\|x_\alpha\| \leq M \in \mathbb{R}$ for all α . Since $Q_1 \geq 0$ then $Q_1 x_\alpha \downarrow \geq 0$ and hence in order to show that $Q_1 x_\alpha \downarrow 0$ it is enough to prove that $\|Q_1 x_\alpha\| \rightarrow 0$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Fix an

$m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\|Q_{m+1}\| \leq \varepsilon$. Since the positive operators S_1, \dots, S_m are all \circ -continuous, and since the norm in F is \circ -continuous, there exists an α_1 such that $\sum_{k=1}^m \|S_k x_\alpha\| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_1$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, it follows from

$$\|Q_1 x_\alpha\| \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m S_k x_\alpha \right\| + \|Q_{m+1} x_\alpha\| \leq \varepsilon + M \|Q_{m+1}\| \leq 2\varepsilon \quad (\forall \alpha \geq \alpha_1)$$

that $\|Q_1 x_\alpha\| \rightarrow 0$, which proves our claim that $Q_n \in L_{oc}(E, F)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\pm(T_{n+1} - T_n) \leq S_n$ then by formula (4),

$$|(T - T_n)x| = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |(T_k - T_n)x| \leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} |(T_{k+1} - T_n)x| \leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} S_n |x| = Q_n |x|$$

for all $x \in E$. In particular, $|T - T_1| \leq Q_1 \in L_{oc}(E, F)$ and, since $L_{oc}(E, F)$ is an order ideal in $L_r(E, F)$, then $(T - T_1) \in L_{oc}(E, F)$. Since $T_1 \in L_{oc}(E, F)$, it follows $T \in L_{oc}(E, F)$. Now, $\|T - T_n\|_{r-L_{oc}(E, F)} \leq \|Q_n\| < 2^{1-n}$ implies $(T_n) \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|_{r-L_{oc}(E, F)}} T$. \square

Example 9. Consider the following modification of Kregel's example [11] (cf. [1, Ex.5.6]). Define a sequence (S_n) in $L_{oc}((\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_0)$ by

$$S_n x := (2^{-\frac{1}{3}} T_1 x_1, 2^{-\frac{2}{3}} T_2 x_2, \dots, 2^{-\frac{n}{3}} T_n x_n, 0, 0, \dots),$$

where $T_n : \ell_{2^n}^2 \rightarrow \ell_{2^n}^2$ is an isometry as in [1, Ex.5.6]. Then $\|S_n - S\| \rightarrow 0$ for an operator $S \in L(E, F)$, defined by

$$Sx := (2^{-\frac{1}{3}} T_1 x_1, 2^{-\frac{2}{3}} T_2 x_2, \dots, 2^{-\frac{n}{3}} T_n x_n, \dots).$$

Notice that $(\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_0$ has \circ -continuous norm, and hence is Dedekind complete. However $|S|$ does not exist. Thus, S is not order bounded and hence $S \notin L_{oc}((\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_0)$.

0.5 We include several applications of Theorem 6 and Assertion 2. We begin with recalling the following definition (see [5, 8]).

Definition 10. A continuous operator $T : E \rightarrow F$ is called *limited* (resp. *almost limited*) if T' takes w^* -null (resp. disjoint w^* -null) sequences of F' to norm null sequences of E' . By $\text{Lm}(E, F)$ (by $\text{a-Lm}(E, F)$) we denote the space of limited (resp. almost limited) operators from E to F .

Lemma 11. *The spaces $\text{a-Lm}(E, F)$ and $\text{Lm}(E, F)$ are both closed in $\text{L}(E, F)$ under the operator norm.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{a-Lm}(E, F) \ni T_k \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} T \in \text{L}(E, F)$. Let (f_n) be disjoint w^* -null in F' . We need to show that $(T'f_n)$ is norm null X' . Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose any k with $\|T'_k - T'\| \leq \varepsilon$. Since $T_k \in \text{a-Lm}(X, F)$, there exists n_0 such that $\|T'_k f_n\| \leq \varepsilon$ whenever $n \geq n_0$. As (f_n) is w^* -null, there exists $M \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|f_n\| \leq M$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\|T'f_n\| \leq \|T'_k f_n\| + \|T'_k f_n - T'f_n\| \leq \varepsilon + \|T'_k - T'\| \|f_n\| \leq \varepsilon + M\varepsilon$$

for $n \geq n_0$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary then $(T'f_n)$ is norm null, as desired.

Similarly, the space $\text{Lm}(E, F)$ is closed. \square

The next result follows from Theorem 6 and Lemma 11.

Corollary 12. *For arbitrary Banach lattices E and F , $\text{r-Lm}(E, F)$ and $\text{r-a-Lm}(E, F)$ are both Banach spaces (each under its enveloping norm).*

Definition 13. (see [10]) A continuous operator $T : E \rightarrow F$ is called *Grothendieck* (resp. *almost Grothendieck*) if T' takes w^* -null (resp. disjoint w^* -null) sequences of F' to w -null sequences of E' . By $\text{G}(E, F)$ (by $\text{a-G}(E, F)$) we denote the space of Grothendieck (resp. almost Grothendieck) operators from E to F .

By Definitions 10 and 13,

$$\text{K}(E, F) \subseteq \text{Lm}(E, F) \subseteq \text{a-Lm}(E, F) \subseteq \text{a-G}(E, F), \quad (6)$$

and

$$\text{Lm}(E, F) \subseteq \text{G}(E, F) \subseteq \text{a-G}(E, F). \quad (7)$$

Lemma 14. *The spaces $\text{a-G}(E, F)$ and $\text{G}(E, F)$ are both closed in $\text{L}(E, F)$ under the operator norm.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{a-G}(E, F) \ni T_k \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} T \in \text{L}(E, F)$. Let (f_n) be disjoint w^* -null in F' . We need to show that $(T'f_n)$ is w -null in E' . So, take any $g \in F''$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Pick a k with $\|T'_k - T'\| \leq \varepsilon$. Since $T_k \in \text{a-G}(E, F)$, there exists

n_0 such that $|g(T'_k f_n)| \leq \varepsilon$ whenever $n \geq n_0$. Note that $\|f_n\| \leq M$ for some $M \in \mathbb{R}$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, it follows from

$$|g(T' f_n)| \leq |g(T'_k f_n - T' f_n)| + |g(T' f_n)| \leq \|g\| \|T'_k - T'\| \|f_n\| + \varepsilon \leq (\|g\| M + 1)\varepsilon$$

for $n \geq n_0$, that $g(T' f_n) \rightarrow 0$. Since $g \in F''$ is arbitrary, $T \in \text{a-G}(E, F)$.

Similarly, the space $\text{G}(E, F)$ is closed. \square

The next result follows from Theorem 6 and Lemma 14.

Corollary 15. *For arbitrary Banach lattices E and F , $\text{r-G}(E, F)$ and $\text{r-a-G}(E, F)$ are both Banach spaces (each under its enveloping norm).*

We continue with the following definition.

Definition 16. A continuous operator $T : E \rightarrow F$ is called:

- a) *Dunford–Pettis* (shortly, $T \in \text{DP}(E, F)$) if T takes w-null sequences to norm null ones (cf. [1, p.340]).
- b) *weak Dunford–Pettis* (shortly, $T \in \text{wDP}(E, F)$) if $f_n(Tx_n) \rightarrow 0$ whenever (f_n) is w-null in F' and (x_n) is w-null in E [1, p.349].
- c) *almost Dunford–Pettis* (shortly, $T \in \text{a-DP}(E, F)$) if T takes disjoint w-null sequences to norm null ones [13];
- d) *almost weak Dunford–Pettis* (shortly, $T \in \text{a-wDP}(E, F)$) if $f_n(Tx_n) \rightarrow 0$ whenever (f_n) is w-null in F' and (x_n) is disjoint w-null in E .

Clearly,

$$\text{K}(E, F) \subseteq \text{DP}(E, F) \subseteq \text{wDP}(E, F) \bigcap \text{a-DP}(E, F), \quad (8)$$

and

$$\text{wDP}(E, F) \subseteq \text{a-wDP}(E, F). \quad (9)$$

The operator $L^1[0, 1] \xrightarrow{T} \ell^\infty$, $Tf = \left(\int_0^1 f(t)r_k^+(t) dt \right)_{k=1}^\infty$ is wDP yet not DP, as $r_n \xrightarrow{w} 0$ and $\|Tr_n\| \geq \int_0^1 r_n(t)r_n^+(t) dt \equiv \frac{1}{2}$. By [3, Thm.4.1], $\text{a-DP}(E, F) = \text{DP}(E, F)$ for all F iff the lattice operations in E are sequentially w-continuous. The identity operator:

$I : L^1[0, 1] \rightarrow L^1[0, 1]$ is a-DP yet not DP;

$I : c \rightarrow c$ is a-wDP yet neither wDP nor a-DP.

The domination property for a-DP-operators was established in [4, Cor.2.3]. We omit the proof of the next proposition as it is a modification of the proof of the Kalton–Saab domination theorem (cf. [1, Thm.5.101]).

Proposition 17. *Any positive operator dominated by an a-wDP-operator is likewise an a-wDP-operator.*

We also omit the straightforward proof of the following fact.

Lemma 18. *The spaces a-DP(E, F) and a-wDP(E, F) are both closed in $L(E, F)$ under the operator norm.*

By [4, Cor.2.3], Proposition 17, and Lemma 18, the next result follows from Theorem 7.

Corollary 19. *If F is Dedekind complete then r-a-DP(E, F) and r-a-wDP(E, F) are both Banach lattices under their enveloping norms.*

0.6 Finally, we discuss once more the Krengel example (cf. [1, Ex.5.6]).

Example 20. 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 an isometry defined by the orthogonal matrix $2^{-\frac{n}{2}} A_n$. Then $|T_n| \in L(\ell_{2^n}^2)$ is the operator, whose $2^n \times 2^n$ coordinate matrix has all entries equal to $2^{-\frac{n}{2}}$, in particular $\| |T_n| \| = 2^{\frac{n}{2}}$ for all n . Consider the c_0 -direct sum $E := (\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_0$. Note that E has o-continuous norm and hence is Dedekind complete. Define $T : E \rightarrow E$, by

$$Tx := (2^{-\frac{n}{2}} T_n x_n) \quad (x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \dots) \in E). \quad (10)$$

It is straightforward to see that $T \in K(E)$, and then $T \in \text{a-G}(E)$ by (6), and $T \in \text{a-DP}(E)$ by (8). The modulus $|T|$ exists and is given by

$$|T|x = (2^{-\frac{n}{2}} |T_n| x_n) \quad (x \in E). \quad (11)$$

However, $|T| \notin \text{a-G}(E)$. Indeed, consider a disjoint w^* -null sequence (f_n) in $E' = (\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_1$, where all terms in f_n are zero, except the n -th term which

is equal to $(2^{-\frac{n}{2}}, 2^{-\frac{n}{2}}, \dots, 2^{-\frac{n}{2}}) \in \ell_{2^n}^2$. Since $|T|' \in L((\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_1)$ satisfies $|T|'y = (2^{-\frac{n}{2}}|T_n|'y_n)$ for all $y \in E'$, where the coordinate matrix of $|T_n|'$ has all entries equal to $2^{-\frac{n}{2}}$, then all terms of $|T|'f_n$ are zero, except the n -th term which is equal to $(2^{-\frac{n}{2}}, 2^{-\frac{n}{2}}, \dots, 2^{-\frac{n}{2}}) \in \ell_{2^n}^2$. Take $g \in E'' = (\oplus_{k=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^k}^2)_{\infty}$ by letting each k -th term of g equals to $(2^{-\frac{k}{2}}, 2^{-\frac{k}{2}}, \dots, 2^{-\frac{k}{2}}) \in \ell_{2^k}^2$, then

$$g(|T|'f_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} = \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} 2^{-n} = 1 \neq 0,$$

and hence $T \notin \text{a-G}(E)$. In particular, $T \notin \text{a-Lm}(E)$ by (6). Now, take a disjoint w-null sequence (x_n) in $E = (\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_0$, whose terms are zero, except the n -th one which is equals to $(2^{-\frac{n}{2}}, 2^{-\frac{n}{2}}, \dots, 2^{-\frac{n}{2}}) \in \ell_{2^n}^2$. Then $|T|x_n$ has all the terms zero, except the n -th term which is equal to $(2^{-\frac{n}{2}}, 2^{-\frac{n}{2}}, \dots, 2^{-\frac{n}{2}})$. Thus $\| |T|x_n \| = 1$ for all n , and hence $|T| \notin \text{a-DP}(E)$.

Since a-G- and a-DP-operators satisfy the domination property, it follows from Assertion 2 (ii) that $T \in \text{a-G}_r((\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_0) \setminus \text{r-a-G}((\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_0)$ and $T \in \text{a-DP}_r((\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_0) \setminus \text{r-a-DP}((\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_{2^n}^2)_0)$.

References

- [1] C. D. Aliprantis, O. Burkinshaw, *Positive Operators*. Springer, Dordrecht, 2006.
- [2] S. Alpay, E. Emelyanov, S. Gorokhova, Generalizations of L- and M-weakly compact operators. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.02718v4>
- [3] B. Aqzzouz, K. Bouras, (L) sets and almost (L) sets in Banach lattices. *Quaest. Math.* 36, no.1 (2013), 107–118.
- [4] B. Aqzzouz, A. Elbour, Some characterizations of almost Dunford–Pettis operators and applications. *Positivity* 15 (2011), 369–380.
- [5] J. Bourgain, J. Diestel, Limited operators and strict cosingularity. *Math. Nachr.* 119 (1984), 55–58.
- [6] Z. L. Chen, A. W. Wickstead, Incompleteness of the linear span of the positive compact operators. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 125 (1997), 3381–3389.
- [7] N. Cheng, Dedekind σ -complete vector lattice of b-AM-compact operators. *Quaest. Math.* 40 (2017), no. 3, 313–318.
- [8] A. Elbour, Some characterizations of almost limited operators. *Positivity* 21 (2017), 865–874.
- [9] E. Emelyanov, Algebras of Lebesgue and KB regular operators on Banach lattices. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.08326v3>
- [10] P. Galindo, V. C. C. Miranda, Grothendieck-type subsets of Banach lattices. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 506 (2022)
- [11] U. Krengel, Remark on the modulus of compact operators. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 72 (1966), 132–133.
- [12] P. Meyer-Nieberg, *Banach Lattices*. Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1991.
- [13] J. A. Sanchez, *Operators on Banach lattices*. Ph. D. Thesis, Complutense University, Madrid, 1985.