



Rendiconti

Accademia Nazionale delle Scienze detta dei XL

*Memorie di Matematica*

104<sup>a</sup> (1986), Vol. X, fasc. 18, pagg. 207-212

ESTEBAN INDURAIN (\*) - PAOLO TERENCE (\*\*)

### A Characterization of Basic Sequences in Banach Spaces (\*\*\*)

#### Una caratterizzazione delle Successioni Basiche negli spazi di Banach.

SUNTO. — Una successione di uno spazio di Banach è *basica* se e solo se ogni sua blocco-perturbazione è *M-basica forte*.

Let  $(x_n)$  be a sequence of a Banach space  $B$  and let  $(f_n)$  be a sequence of  $B^*$  (the dual of  $B$ ), we say that  $(x_n, f_n)$  is *biorthogonal* if  $f_m(x_n) = \delta_{mn}$  (Kronecker indices) for every  $m$  and  $n$ . Let  $(x_n, f_n)$  be biorthogonal, we say that  $(x_n)$  is

- i) *M-basis* of  $B$  if  $B = [x_n]$  ( $= \overline{\text{span}}(x_n)$ ) and if  $\{0\} = [f_n]_\perp$  ( $= \{x \in B; f_n(x) = 0 \text{ for every } n\}$ );
- ii) *strong M-basis* of  $B$  if  $B = [x_n]$  and if  $[f_{n_k}]_\perp = [x_{n_k}]$  for every complementary subsequences  $(n_k)$  and  $(n'_k)$  of  $(n)$ ;
- iii) *basal* of  $B$  if  $x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(x)x_n$  for every  $x$  of  $B$ .

Moreover we say that  $(x_n)$  is *M-basica (basica)* if it is *M-basis (basis)* of  $[x_n]$ . If  $(x_n) \subset B$ ,  $g_0 = 0$  and  $(g_n)$  is an increasing sequence of positive integers, we say that  $(y_n)$  is

*block perturbation* of  $(x_n)$  if  $[y_n]_{n=g_{m-1}+1}^{g_m} = [x_n]_{n=g_{m-1}+1}^{g_m}$  for every  $m$ .

Our aim is to prove the following

**THEOREM I:** *A sequence is basic if and only if every block perturbation is strong M-basica.*

(\*) Departamento Geometria Topologia - Universidad Zaragoza.

(\*\*) Dipartimento di Matematica - Piazza Leonardo da Vinci, 32 - 20133, Milano.

(\*\*\*) Memoria presentata il 18 febbraio 1986 da Luigi Amerio, uno dei XL.

In § 1 we shall prove the theorem by means of a geometric characterization of the basic sequences and by a recent result ofPlans.

In § 2 we shall give another direct proof of Th. I by means of the concept of unitary position.

# 1. - A NEW GEOMETRIC CHARACTERIZATION OF THE BASIC SEQUENCES

We shall prove the following

THEOREM II: Let  $(x_n, f_n)$  be biorthogonal in  $B$ , then

$$(x_n) \text{ is basic} \Leftrightarrow \cap \left\{ \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(x) x_n \right]_{k+1}^{\infty} : (w_k) \subset (x) \right\} = [x] \text{ for every } x \text{ of } [x_n].$$

In [4] Th. II is proved for the reflexive case.

In [3] it is proved that Th. II implies Th. I.

PROOF OF TH. II: Obviously it is sufficient to prove the inverse implication. Let  $x \in [x_n]$ , by [6] (p. 146, Th. 13.1, a),  $1^\circ \Rightarrow 3^\circ$ ) it is sufficient to prove that

$$(r_n) \text{ weakly converges to } x, \text{ where } r_n = \sum_{k=1}^n f_k(x) x_k \text{ for every } n.$$

We affirm that  $(r_n)$  is bounded, because if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|r_n\| = +\infty$  for a subsequence  $(w_k)$  of  $(r_n)$ ,  $(r_{w_k}/\|r_{w_k}\|)$  would not have subsequence weakly convergent to  $x' \neq 0$  (if  $(w'_k) \subset (w_k)$  with  $(r_{w'_k}/\|r_{w'_k}\|)$  weakly convergent to  $x' \neq 0$ , it would be  $f_n(x') = 0$  for every  $n$ , which is impossible since  $(x_n)$  is obviously  $AF$ -basic and  $x' \in [x_n]$ ), therefore it would follow by [7] (p. 172) that

$$(1) \quad \cap \{ (r_{w'_k})_{k=1}^{\infty} : (w'_k) \subset (w_k) \} = \{0\},$$

which contradicts the hypothesis.

Then  $(r_n)$  weakly converges to  $x$ , otherwise by the «third Fréchet's axiom» [1] there would exist a subsequence  $(r_{n_k})$  without subsequences weakly convergent to  $x$ , hence without weakly convergent subsequences (since if  $(w'_k) \subset (n_k)$  with  $(r_{w'_k})$  weakly convergent to  $x'$ , it would be  $f_n(x - x') = 0$  for every  $n$  hence  $x = x'$ ); therefore, since  $(r_n)$  is bounded, it would follow by [7] (p. 172) (1) again, which contradicts the hypothesis. This completes the proof of Th. II.

# 2. - ON THE CONCEPT OF UNITARY POSITION

Given  $(x_n)$  we say that  $x \in [x_n]$  is in unitary position as regards  $(x_n)$  if there exists a subsequence  $(n_k)$  of  $(n)$  such that  $x \in [x_{n_k}]$ ,  $x \notin [x_{n_k}]_{k \in K'}$  for every  $K'$ .

In [5] (see also [2] p. 121-126) it is proved, in the frame of biorthogonal

sequences, that

$(x_n)$  is strong  $M$ -basic  $\Leftrightarrow$  every element of  $\{x_n\}$  is in unitary position as regards  $(x_n)$ .

Then in order to prove Th. I it is sufficient to prove that, if  $(x_n)$  is not basic, there exist  $\bar{x} \in [x_n]$  and a block perturbation  $(\bar{x}_n)$  of  $(x_n)$  so that  $\bar{x}$  is not in unitary position as regards  $(\bar{x}_n)$ .

Firstly we prove the following

**PROPOSITION I:** Let  $(v_n)$  be a basic sequence of  $B$  and let  $(u_n)$  be a sequence of a finite dimensional subspace  $U$  of  $B$ ; then, if  $x_n = u_n + v_n$  for every  $n$ , it follows that:

$$(x_n) \text{ is } M\text{-basic} \Leftrightarrow (u_n) \text{ is basic.}$$

**PROOF:** Indeed suppose that  $(x_n)$  is  $M$ -basic but not basic.

By [6] (p. 58) there exists a block sequence  $(x'_n)$  of  $(x_n)$  (that is there exists an increasing sequence  $(q_n)$  of positive integers so that, setting  $q_0 = 0$ ,  $x'_n \in \text{span}(x_n)_{q_{n-1}+1}^{q_n}$  for every  $n$ ) such that

$$(2) \quad x'_n = u'_n + v'_n \text{ and } \|x'_n\| = 1 \text{ for every } n, \text{ with } (u'_n) \subset U, (v'_n) \text{ basic and } x'_{2n-1} - x'_{2n} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since  $(u'_n)$  is bounded (otherwise  $(u'_n/\|u'_n\|)$  would have a convergent subsequence, while it is basic), there exist  $(u_n) \subset (u')$  and  $(v_n) \subset (v')$  so that

$$u'_{2n-1} \rightarrow u', \quad v'_{2n} \rightarrow v';$$

then  $u' = u' = u$  (otherwise by (2) it would be  $v'_{2n-1} - v'_{2n} \rightarrow u' - u' \neq 0$ , impossible since  $(v'_n)$  is basic); hence by (2)  $v'_{2n-1} - v'_{2n} \rightarrow 0$ , that is  $v'_{2n-1} \rightarrow 0$  and  $v'_{2n} \rightarrow 0$  since  $(v'_n)$  is basic; therefore by (2)  $x'_{2n} \rightarrow u$ , impossible since  $(x'_n)$  (block sequence of  $(x_n)$ ) is  $M$ -basic. This completes the proof of Proposition I.

**PROPOSITION II:** Every  $M$ -basic but not basic sequence has a block perturbation with a subsequence which is basic with brackets but not basic.

Where  $(x_n)$  is basic with brackets if there exists an increasing sequence of positive integers  $(q_n)$  such that, setting  $q_0 = 0$ ,

$$x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{n=q_{n-1}+1}^{q_n} \alpha_n x_n \right),$$

with  $(\alpha_n)$  unique, for every  $x$  of  $[x_n]$ .

**PROOF:** Let  $(x_n)$  be  $M$ -basic and not basic.

We shall prove that there exist a sequence  $(j_n)$  of  $B$ ,  $1 < k < \infty$  and an increasing sequence  $(q_n)$  of positive integers so that, setting  $q_0 = 0$ , for every  $n > 1$

$$(3) \quad \begin{cases} (i) & (j_{2n-1}, j_{2n}) \text{ is block sequence of a block perturbation of } (x_n)_{n=q_{n-1}+1}^{q_n} \\ (ii) & \|j_{2n+1} + j_{2n+2}\| < 1/2^{n+1} \text{ and } \|j_n\| > K2^{n+1}, \\ & \text{moreover } \|j_1 + j_2\| = 1; \\ (iii) & \text{dist}(j, [x_n]_{n>2n+1}) > \|j\|/K \text{ for every } j \text{ of } [x_n]_{n=1}^{2n}. \end{cases}$$

We can suppose  $(x_n)$  in  $C_{0n-1}$  then, if  $(e_n)$  is the Schauder basis of  $C_{0n-1}$ ,

$$(4) \quad x_n = \sum_{s=1}^n e_{s_n} e_s \quad \text{for every } n.$$

Since  $(x_n)$  is not basic, by [6] (p. 58) there exist  $j_1, j_2$  so that (i) for  $n = 1$  is true moreover  $\|j_1\| > 2^2$  and  $\|j_1 + j_2\| = 1$ .

Fix a positive integer  $p > 1$ .

Suppose to have  $(e_n)_{n=1}^{q_{p-1}}$  of positive integers and  $(j_n)_{n=1}^{2p-1}$  of  $B$  which verify (i) and (ii) of (3) for  $1 < n < p$ ; moreover for every  $1 < n < p$  and for every  $j$  of  $[x_n]_{n=1}^{2n}$

$$\text{dist}(j, [x_n]_{n=2n+1}^{q_n} + [e_n]_{n>e_n}) > (1 - 1/2^{n+1})\|j\|$$

where  $[x_n]_{n=2n+1}^{q_n}$  does not appear if  $n = p$ .

By (4) it is easy to see that there exist a positive integer  $r_p$  and numbers  $d_{pm}$  so that, if

$$x_{pm} = x_m + \sum_{s=r_p+1}^{e_n} d_{pm} x_s \quad \text{for } m > r_p,$$

then  $(x_{pm})_{m>r_p} \subset [e_n]_{n>r_p}$ . By Propos. I  $(x_{pm})_{m>r_p}$  is not basic, hence there exist  $q_{p+1}$  and  $(j_{2p+1}, j_{2p+2})$  block sequence of  $(x_{pm})_{m>r_p}$  so that

$$\|j_{2p+1} + j_{2p+2}\| < 1/2^{p+1}, \quad \|j_{2p+1}\| > 2^{p+1}, \quad (j_{2p+1}, j_{2p+2}) \subset [x_n]_{n=q_{p+1}+1}^{q_{p+1}};$$

finally there exists a positive integer  $r_{p+1}$  so that

$$\text{dist}(j, [x_n]_{n>r_{p+1}}) > (1 - 1/2^{p+1})\|j\| \quad \text{for every } j \text{ of } [x_n]_{n=1}^{2p+2}.$$

So proceeding we get  $(j_n)$  as in (3) for  $k = 2$ ; which completes the proof of Propos. II.

2<sup>nd</sup> PROOF OF TH. 1: We consider the particular case of  $(x_n)$  norming, that is (see [7] p. 174) there exist  $1 < k < \infty$  and a not decreasing sequence  $(l_n)$  of positive integers so that  $\|x\| < K \text{dist}(x, [x_n]_{n>l_n})$  for every  $x$  of  $[x_n]_{n=1}^{l_n}$  and for every  $n$ . Suppose that every block perturbation of  $(x_n)$  is strong  $M$ -basic. If  $(x_n)$  is not basic, by Propos. II we have a sequence  $(j_n)$  as in (3)

for (ii) and (iii), moreover with  $y_n \in [x_n]_{k=0, \dots, n-1}^{m-1}$  for every  $n$ , then set

$$(5) \quad \bar{x} = \sum_{n=1}^m (y_{2n-1} + y_{2n}); \quad y_1 = y_1, \quad y_{n+1} = y_{2n} + y_{2n+1} \quad \text{for every } n > 1.$$

If  $\bar{x} \notin [y_n]$  the theorem will be proved; indeed setting by (3)

$$\bar{z}_1 = y_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{z}_n = x_n \quad \text{for } 2 \leq n \leq q_1;$$

moreover for  $m > 1$

$$\bar{z}_{q_{2m-1}+1} = y_{2m} + y_{2m+1} = y_{m+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{z}_n = x_n \quad \text{for } q_{2m-1} + 2 \leq n \leq q_{2m+1},$$

then it follows

$$x \notin [\bar{z}_1 \cup (z_{q_{2m-1}+1})_{n=1}^m], \quad \text{while} \quad \text{dist}(\bar{x}, [\bar{z}_1 \cup (z_{q_{2m-1}+1})_{n=1}^m] + [\bar{z}_n]_{n=q_{2m-1}+1}^{q_{2m+1}}) <$$

$$\left\| \bar{x} - \sum_{n=1}^m (y_{2n-1} + y_{2n}) \right\| < \sum_{n=m+1}^m \|y_{2n-1} + y_{2n}\| < 1/2^m$$

for every  $m$ ; that is  $\bar{x}$  is not in unitary position as regards the block perturbation  $(\bar{z}_n)$  of  $(x_n)$ , which contradicts the hypothesis.

In order to prove that  $\bar{x} \notin [y_n]$  it is sufficient to prove that

$$(6) \quad \left\| \bar{x} - \sum_{n=1}^m a_n y_n \right\| < 1 \quad \text{implies } |a_n| < 1/2^n \quad \text{for } 1 \leq n \leq m;$$

indeed, if  $(y_n, b_n)$  is biorthogonal, by (5)  $b_n(x) = 1$  for every  $n$ , while by (5)

$$b_1\left(\sum_{n=1}^m a_n y_n\right) = a_1 \quad \text{and} \quad b_{2k}\left(\sum_{n=1}^m a_n y_n\right) = b_{2k+1}\left(\sum_{n=1}^m a_n y_n\right) = a_{k+1} \quad \text{for } 1 < k \leq m.$$

Fix  $1 < p \leq m$ , setting  $a_{m+1} = 0$  we can suppose true the thesis of (6) for  $p+1 \leq n \leq m+1$  and we shall prove the thesis for  $n=p$ . By (3) and (5) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| a_{p+1} y_{2p+1} + \sum_{n=p+2}^m a_n y_n \right\| &< \left\| \sum_{n=1}^m a_n y_n \right\| + \left\| \sum_{n=1}^p a_n y_n + a_{p+1} y_{2p} \right\| < \\ &< \left\| \sum_{n=1}^m a_n y_n \right\| + \left\| \sum_{n=1}^m a_n y_n \right\| K. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by the hypothesis of (6) and by (3)

$$\begin{aligned} (7) \quad \|a_p y_{2p-1} + a_{p+1} y_{2p}\| &< \left\| \sum_{n=1}^m a_n y_n \right\| + \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{p-1} a_n y_n + a_p y_{2p-2} \right\| + \\ &+ \|a_{p+1} y_{2p+1} + \sum_{n=p+2}^m a_n y_n\| < \left\| \sum_{n=1}^m a_n y_n \right\| (2 + 2K) < \\ &< (\|\bar{x}\| + 1)(2 + 2K) < 4K(\|\bar{x}\| + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since the thesis of (6) is true for  $\sigma_{p+1}$ , by (3) we have that

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} |\sigma_p \mathcal{I}_{2p-1} + \sigma_{p+1} \mathcal{I}_{2p}| &> (|\sigma_p| - |\sigma_{p+1}|) |\mathcal{I}_{2p-1}| - |\sigma_{p+1}| |\mathcal{I}_{2p-1} + \mathcal{I}_{2p}| > \\ &> (|\sigma_p| - 1/2^{p+1}) |\mathcal{I}_{2p-1}| - 1/2^{2p+1} > (|\sigma_p| - 1/2^{p+1}) 2^{2p+2} K - 1/2^{2p+1}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3) and (5)  $1/2 < |\mathcal{I}| < 3/2$ ; hence by (7) and (8) we have that

$$|\sigma_p| < (4K(|\mathcal{I}| + 1) + 1/2^{2p+2} K + 1/2^{2p+1}) < 1/2^{2p} + 1/2^{2p+1} < 1/2^p.$$

This completes the proof.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] K. KURATOWSKI, *Topologie*, Polish Academy of Sciences, 1952.
- [2] E. INDURAIN, *Dottoral Thesis*, Universidad de Zaragoza, 1985.
- [3] A. PLANE, *A characterization of basic sequences in reflexive Banach spaces*, Collected papers dedicated to H. Schaeffer, Tübingen, 1985.
- [4] A. REYES, *A geometrical characterization of Schauder basis*, Arch. Math., 39 (1982), 176-179.
- [5] A. REYES, *A geometrical characterization of strong M-basis*, Rev. Roum. Math. Pures Appl., 30 (1985), 459-461.
- [6] I. SINGER, *Bases in Banach spaces - I*, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1970.
- [7] P. TERRELL, *Biorthogonal systems in Banach spaces*, Riv. Mat. Univ. Parma, (4) 4 (1978), 165-204.