



ACADEMIC
PRESS

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

Journal of Functional Analysis 202 (2003) 247–276

JOURNAL OF
Functional
Analysis

<http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jfa>

Multiplicator space and complemented subspaces of rearrangement invariant space[☆]

S.V. Astashkin,^a L. Maligranda,^{b,*} and E.M. Semenov^c

^a *Department of Mathematics, Samara State University, Akad. Pavlova 1, 443011 Samara, Russia*

^b *Department of Mathematics, Luleå University of Technology, 971 87 Luleå, Sweden*

^c *Department of Mathematics, Voronezh State University, Universitetskaya pl.1, 394693 Voronezh, Russia*

Received 20 May 2002; revised 23 August 2002; accepted 7 October 2002

Communicated by G. Pisier

Abstract

We show that the multiplicator space $\mathcal{M}(X)$ of an rearrangement invariant (r.i.) space X on $[0, 1]$ and the nice part $N_0(X)$ of X , that is, the set of all $a \in X$ for which the subspaces generated by sequences of dilations and translations of a are uniformly complemented, coincide when the space X is separable. In the general case, the nice part is larger than the multiplicator space. Several examples of descriptions of $\mathcal{M}(X)$ and $N_0(X)$ for concrete X are presented.

© 2002 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

MSC: 46E30; 46B42; 46B70

Keywords: Rearrangement invariant spaces; Multiplicator spaces; Lorentz spaces; Orlicz spaces; Marcinkiewicz spaces; Subspaces; Complemented subspaces; Projections

0. Introduction

For rearrangement invariant (r.i.) function space X on $I = [0, 1]$, we will consider the multiplicator space $\mathcal{M}(X)$ and the nice part $N_0(X)$ of the space X . The space

[☆] Research supported by a grant from the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences for cooperation between Sweden and the former Soviet Union (Project 35147). The second author was also supported in part by the Swedish Natural Science Research Council (NFR)-Grant M5105-20005228/2000 and the third author by the Russian Fund of Fundamental Research (RFFI)-Grant 02-01-00146 and the “Universities of Russia” Fund (UR)-Grant 04.01.051.

*Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: astashkn@ssu.samara.ru (S.V. Astashkin), lech@sm.luth.se (L. Maligranda), root@func.vsu.ru (E.M. Semenov).

URL: <http://www.sm.luth.se/~lech/>.

$\mathcal{M}(X)$ is connected with the tensor product of two functions $x(s)y(t)$, $s, t \in [0, 1]$, and $N_0(X)$ is the space given by uniformly bounded sequence in X of projections into $Q_{a,n}$ generated by the dilations and translations of the non-zero, decreasing function $a \in X$ on dyadic intervals $[\frac{k-1}{2^n}, \frac{k}{2^n})$ in I , $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. These functions are given by

$$a_{n,k}(t) = \begin{cases} a(2^n t - k + 1) & \text{if } t \in [\frac{k-1}{2^n}, \frac{k}{2^n}), \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases}$$

The spaces $\mathcal{M}(X)$ and $N_0(X)$ coincide when X is a separable space but in the non-separable case the nice part can be larger than the multiplier space. Such a description is helpful in the proofs of properties of $N_0(X)$ and it motivates us to investigate more the multiplier space $\mathcal{M}(X)$. We will describe $\mathcal{M}(X)$ for concrete r.i. spaces X as Lorentz, Orlicz and Marcinkiewicz spaces. Suitable results on $N_0(X)$, especially when X is a Marcinkiewicz space M_ϕ , are given.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1 we collect some necessary definitions and notations.

Section 2 contains results on the multiplier space $\mathcal{M}(X)$ of a r.i. space X on $[0, 1]$. At first we collect its properties. After that the multiplier space $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is described for concrete spaces like Lorentz $A_{p,\phi}$ spaces, Orlicz L_ϕ spaces and Marcinkiewicz M_ϕ spaces. The main result here is Theorem 1 which gives necessary and sufficient condition for the tensor product operator to be bounded between Marcinkiewicz spaces M_ϕ .

In Section 3, we consider a subspace $N_0(X)$ of X generated by dilations and translations in r.i. space on $[0, 1]$ of a decreasing function from X . The main result of the paper is Theorem 2 showing that the multiplier space $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is a subset of the nice part $N_0(X)$ of X and that they are equal when a space X is separable. In the general case, the nice part is larger than the multiplier space (cf. Example 2). Here we apply results on multipliers from Section 2 to the description of $N_0(X)$. Special attention is taken about $N_0(X)$ when X is a Marcinkiewicz space M_ϕ (see Corollary 5 and Theorem 3). Stability properties of the class $\mathcal{N}_0$ with respect to the complex and real interpolation methods are presented. There is also given, in Theorem 7, a characterization of L_p -spaces among the r.i. spaces on $[0, 1]$, which is saying that r.i. space X on $[0, 1]$ coincides with $L_p[0, 1]$ for some $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ if and only if X and its associated space X' belong to the class $\mathcal{N}_0$.

Finally, in Section 4 we show that, in general, you cannot compare the results on the interval $[0, 1]$ with the results on $[0, \infty)$ and vice versa.

1. Definitions and notations

We first recall some basic definitions. A Banach function space X on $I = [0, 1]$ is said to be a *rearrangement invariant* (r.i.) space provided $x^*(t) \leq y^*(t)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$ and $y \in X$ imply $x \in X$ and $\|x\|_X \leq \|y\|_X$, where x^* denotes the decreasing

rearrangement of $|x|$. Always we have imbeddings $L_\infty[0, 1] \subset X \subset L_1[0, 1]$. By X^0 we will denote the closure of $L_\infty[0, 1]$ in X .

An r.i. space X with a norm $\|\cdot\|_X$ has the *Fatou property* if for any increasing positive sequence (x_n) in X with $\sup_n \|x_n\|_X < \infty$ we have that $\sup_n x_n \in X$ and $\|\sup_n x_n\|_X = \sup_n \|x_n\|_X$.

We will assume that the r.i. space X is either separable or it has the Fatou property. Then, as follows from the Calderón–Mityagin theorem [BS,KPS], the space X is an interpolation space with respect to L_1 and L_∞ , i.e., if a linear operator T is bounded in L_1 and L_∞ , then T is bounded in X and $\|T\|_{X \rightarrow X} \leq C \max(\|T\|_{L_1 \rightarrow L_1}, \|T\|_{L_\infty \rightarrow L_\infty})$ for some $C \geq 1$.

If χ_A denotes the characteristic function of a measurable set A in I , then clearly $\|\chi_A\|_X$ depends only on $m(A)$. The function $\varphi_X(t) = \|\chi_A\|_X$, where $m(A) = t$, $t \in I$, is called the *fundamental function* of X .

For $s > 0$, the dilation operator σ_s given by $\sigma_s x(t) = x(t/s)\chi_I(t/s)$, $t \in I$ is well defined in every r.i. space X and $\|\sigma_s\|_{X \rightarrow X} \leq \max(1, s)$. The classical *Boyd indices* of X are defined by (cf. [BS,KPS,LT])

$$\alpha_X = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ln \|\sigma_s\|_{X \rightarrow X}}{\ln s}, \quad \beta_X = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|\sigma_s\|_{X \rightarrow X}}{\ln s}.$$

In general, $0 \leq \alpha_X \leq \beta_X \leq 1$. It is easy to see that $\bar{\varphi}_X(t) \leq \|\sigma_t\|_{X \rightarrow X}$ for any $t > 0$, where $\bar{\varphi}_X(t) = \sup_{0 < s < 1, 0 < st < 1} \frac{\varphi_X(st)}{\varphi_X(s)}$.

The associated space X' to X is the space of all (classes of) measurable functions $x(t)$ such that $\int_0^1 |x(t)y(t)| dt < \infty$ for every $y \in X$ endowed with the norm

$$\|x\|_{X'} = \sup \left\{ \int_0^1 |x(t)y(t)| dt : \|y\|_X \leq 1 \right\}.$$

For every r.i. space X the embedding $X \subset X''$ is isometric. If an r.i. space X is separable, then $X' = X^*$.

Let us recall some classical examples of r.i. spaces. Denote by $\mathcal{C}$ the set of increasing concave functions $\varphi(t)$ on $[0, 1]$ with $\varphi(0^+) = \varphi(0) = 0$. Each function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ generates the *Lorentz space* A_φ endowed with the norm

$$\|x\|_{A_\varphi} = \int_0^1 x^*(t) d\varphi(t)$$

and the *Marcinkiewicz space* M_φ endowed with the norm

$$\|x\|_{M_\varphi} = \sup_{0 < t \leq 1} \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \int_0^t x^*(s) ds.$$

If Φ is a positive convex function on $[0, \infty)$ with $\Phi(0) = 0$, then the *Orlicz space* $L_\Phi = L_\Phi[0, 1]$ (cf. [KR,M89]) consists of all measurable functions $x(t)$ on $[0, 1]$ for

which the functional $\|x\|_{L_\Phi}$ is finite, where

$$\|x\|_{L_\Phi} = \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : I_\Phi \left(\frac{x}{\lambda} \right) \leq 1 \right\} \quad \text{with } I_\Phi(x) := \int_0^1 \Phi(|x(t)|) dt.$$

An Orlicz space L_Φ is separable if and only if the function Φ satisfies the Δ_2 -condition (i.e. $\Phi(2u) \leq C\Phi(u)$ for every $u \geq u_0$ and some constants $u_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$).

The Lorentz space $L_{p,q}$, $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, is the space generated by the functionals (quasi-norms)

$$\|x\|_{p,q} = \left(\int_0^1 [t^{1/p} x^*(t)]^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{1/q} \quad \text{if } q < \infty$$

and

$$\|x\|_{p,\infty} = \sup_{0 < t < 1} t^{1/p} x^*(t).$$

For $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ the Lorentz space $A_{p,\varphi}$ is the space generated by the norm

$$\|x\|_{p,\varphi} = \left(\int_0^1 [x^*(t)]^p d\varphi(t) \right)^{1/p}.$$

We will use the Calderón–Lozanovskii construction (see [C,M89]). Let (X_0, X_1) be a pair of r.i. spaces on $[0, 1]$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{U}$ ($\rho \in \mathcal{U}$ means that $\rho(s, t) = s\rho(t/s)$ for $s > 0$ with an increasing, concave function ρ on $[0, \infty)$ such that $\rho(0) = 0$ and $\rho(0, t) = 0$). By $\rho(X_0, X_1)$ we mean the space of all measurable functions $x(t)$ on $[0, 1]$ for which

$$|x(t)| \leq \lambda \rho(|x_0(t)|, |x_1(t)|) \quad \text{a.e. on } [0, 1]$$

for some $x_i \in X_i$ with $\|x_i\|_{X_i} \leq 1$, $i = 0, 1$, and with the infimum of these λ as the norm $\|x\|_\rho$. In the case of the power function $\rho_\theta(s, t) = s^{1-\theta}t^\theta$ with $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, $\rho_\theta(X_0, X_1)$ is the Calderón construction $X_0^{1-\theta}X_1^\theta$ (see [C,LT,M89]). The particular case $X^{1/p}(L_\infty)^{1-1/p} = X^{(p)}$ for $1 < p < \infty$ is known as the p -convexification of X defined as $X^{(p)} = \{x \text{ is measurable on } I : |x|^p \in X\}$ with the norm $\|x\|_{X^{(p)}} = \| |x|^p \|_X^{1/p}$ (see [LT,M89]).

For other general properties of lattices of measurable functions and r.i. spaces we refer to books [BS,KPS,LT].

2. Multiplier space of an r.i. space

Let $X = X(I)$ be an r.i. space on $I = [0, 1]$. Then the corresponding r.i. space $X(I \times I)$ on $I \times I$ is the space of measurable functions $x(s, t)$ on $I \times I$ such that $x^{(*)}(t) \in X(I)$ with the norm $\|x\|_{X(I \times I)} = \|x^{(*)}\|_{X(I)}$, where $x^{(*)}$ denotes the decreasing

rearrangement of $|x|$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure m_2 on $I \times I$. For two measurable functions $x = x(s), y = y(t)$ on $I = [0, 1]$ we define the bilinear operator of the tensor product $\otimes$ by

$$(x \otimes y)(s, t) = x(s)y(t), \quad s, t \in I.$$

Definition 1. The *multiplicator space* $\mathcal{M}(X)$ of an r.i. space X on $I = [0, 1]$ is the set of all measurable functions $x = x(s)$ such that $x \otimes y \in X(I \times I)$ for arbitrary $y \in X$ with the norm

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{M}(X)} = \sup\{\|x \otimes y\|_{X(I \times I)} : \|y\|_X \leq 1\}. \quad (1)$$

The multiplicator space $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is an r.i. space on $[0, 1]$ because for the product measure we have

$$m_2(\{(s, t) \in I \times I : |x(s)y(t)| > \lambda\}) = \int_0^1 m(\{s \in I : |x(s)y(t)| > \lambda\}) dt.$$

Let us collect some properties of $\mathcal{M}(X)$. First note that for any measurable set A in I the functions $\chi_A \otimes x$ and $\sigma_{m(A)}x$ are equimeasurable, i.e., their distributions are equal

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\chi_A \otimes x}(\lambda) &= m_2(\{(s, t) \in I \times I : \chi_A(s)|x(t)| > \lambda\}) \\ &= m(\{t \in I : |\sigma_{m(A)}x(t)| > \lambda\}) = d_{\sigma_{m(A)}x}(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\lambda > 0$. In particular, $\|x\|_{\mathcal{M}(X)} \geq \|x \otimes \chi_{[0,1]}/\varphi_X(1)\|_X = \|x\|_X/\varphi_X(1)$ gives the imbedding

$$\mathcal{M}(X) \subset X \text{ and } \|x\|_X \leq \varphi_X(1)\|x\|_{\mathcal{M}(X)} \text{ for } x \in \mathcal{M}(X). \quad (2)$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{M}(X) = X$ if and only if the operator $\otimes : X \times X \rightarrow X(I \times I)$ is bounded. In particular, $\mathcal{M}(L_{p,q}) = L_{p,q}$ for $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq p$ since from the O’Neil theorem (see [O, Theorem 7.4]) the tensor product $\otimes : L_{p,q} \times L_{p,q} \rightarrow L_{p,q}(I \times I)$ is bounded.

From the equality $(\chi_{[0,u]} \otimes \chi_{[0,v]})^{\otimes}(t) = \chi_{[0,uv]}(t)$ we obtain that if $X \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$, then fundamental function φ_X is submultiplicative on $[0, 1]$, i.e., there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\varphi_X(st) \leq c\varphi_X(s)\varphi_X(t)$ for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$.

Some other properties of the multiplicator space $\mathcal{M}(X)$ (cf. [A97] for the proofs):

- (a) $\varphi_{\mathcal{M}(X)}(t) = \|\sigma_t\|_{X \rightarrow X}$, $\|\sigma_t\|_{\mathcal{M}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X)} = \|\sigma_t\|_{X \rightarrow X}$ for $0 < t \leq 1$ and $\|\sigma_{1/t}\|_{X \rightarrow X}^{-1} \leq \|\sigma_t\|_{\mathcal{M}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X)} \leq \|\sigma_t\|_{X \rightarrow X}$ for $t > 1$. In particular, $\alpha_{\mathcal{M}(X)} = \alpha_X$ and $\beta_{\mathcal{M}(X)} \leq \beta_X$.

- (b) We have imbeddings $\Lambda_\psi \subset \mathcal{M}(X) \subset L_p$, where $\psi(t) = \|\sigma_t\|_{X \rightarrow X}$, $0 < t \leq 1$, $p = 1/\alpha_X$ and the constants of imbeddings are independent of X . In particular,
- (b₁) $\mathcal{M}(X) = L_\infty$ if and only if $\alpha_X = 0$.
- (b₂) If the operator $\otimes : X \times X \rightarrow X(I \times I)$ is bounded, then $X \subset L_{1/\alpha_X}$.
- (c) If X is an interpolation space between L_p and $L_{p,\infty}$ for some $1 < p < \infty$, then $\mathcal{M}(X) = L_p$. In particular, $\mathcal{M}(L_{p,q}) = L_p$ for $1 < p < \infty$ and $p \leq q \leq \infty$.

Note that the operation $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is not monotone, i.e., if X, Y are r.i. spaces on $[0, 1]$ such that $X \subset Y$ then, in general, it is not true that $\mathcal{M}(X) \subset \mathcal{M}(Y)$. Namely, consider the r.i. space X on $[0, 1]$ constructed by Shimogaki [S]. This space has Boyd lower index $\alpha_X = 0$ with $\varphi_X(t) = t^{1/2}$ and $L_2 \subset X$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{M}(L_2) = L_2$ but $\mathcal{M}(X) = L_\infty$ by (b₁).

Proposition 1. *We have $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{M}(X)) = \mathcal{M}(X)$ with equal norms.*

Proof. It is enough to show the imbedding $\mathcal{M}(X) \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{M}(X))$. Let $x \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ with the norm $\|x\|_{\mathcal{M}(X)} \leq C$. Then

$$\|x \otimes u\|_{X(I \times I)} \leq C \|u\|_{X(I)} \quad \forall u \in X.$$

In particular, for $u = (y \otimes z)^\otimes$ with fixed $y \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and any $z \in X$ with $\|z\|_{X(I)} \leq 1$ we have

$$\|x \otimes (y \otimes z)^\otimes\|_{X(I \times I)} \leq C \|(y \otimes z)^\otimes\|_{X(I)} = C \|y \otimes z\|_{X(I \times I)}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & m_2(\{(s, t) \in I \times I : |x(s)(y \otimes z)^\otimes(t)| > \lambda\}) \\ &= \int_0^1 m(\{t \in I : |x(s)(y \otimes z)^\otimes(t)| > \lambda\}) ds \\ &= \int_0^1 m_2(\{(t, \alpha) \in I \times I : |x(s)y(t)z(\alpha)| > \lambda\}) d\alpha \\ &= m_3(\{(s, t, \alpha) \in I \times I \times I : |x(s)y(t)z(\alpha)| > \lambda\}) \\ &= \int_0^1 m_2(\{(s, t) \in I \times I : |x(s)y(t)z(\alpha)| > \lambda\}) d\alpha \\ &= \int_0^1 m(\{t \in I : |(x \otimes y)^\otimes(t)z(\alpha)| > \lambda\}) d\alpha \\ &= m_2(\{(t, \alpha) \in I \times I : |(x \otimes y)^\otimes(t)z(\alpha)| > \lambda\}) \end{aligned}$$

for any $\lambda > 0$ it follows that

$$\|x \otimes (y \otimes z)^{\otimes}\|_{X(I \times I)} = \|(x \otimes y)^{\otimes} \otimes z\|_{X(I \times I)}.$$

Taking the supremum over all $z \in X$ with $\|z\|_{X(I)} \leq 1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(x \otimes y)^{\otimes}\|_{\mathcal{M}(X)} &= \sup\{\|(x \otimes y)^{\otimes} \otimes z\|_{X(I \times I)} : \|z\|_{X(I)} \leq 1\} \\ &= \sup\{\|x \otimes (y \otimes z)^{\otimes}\|_{X(I \times I)} : \|z\|_{X(I)} \leq 1\} \\ &\leq C \sup\{\|y \otimes z\|_{X(I \times I)} : \|z\|_{X(I)} \leq 1\} = C\|y\|_{\mathcal{M}(X)}. \end{aligned}$$

This means that $x \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{M}(X))$ and its norm is $\leq C$. $\square$

Note that if $X = \mathcal{M}(Y)$ for some r.i. space Y , then $X = \mathcal{M}(X)$. Indeed, $\mathcal{M}(X) = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{M}(Y)) = \mathcal{M}(Y) = X$.

For concrete r.i. spaces, like Lorentz, Orlicz and Marcinkiewicz, we have the following results about multiplier space. From the above discussion we have that if $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, then

$$\mathcal{M}(L_{p,q}) = L_{p,\min(p,q)}. \quad (3)$$

Proposition 2 (cf. Astashkin [A97] for $p = 1$). *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$. Then*

- (i) $A_{p,\tilde{\varphi}} \subset \mathcal{M}(A_{p,\varphi}) \subset A_{p,\varphi}$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{M}(A_{p,\varphi}) = A_{p,\varphi}$ if and only if φ is submultiplicative on $[0, 1]$.
- (iii) If $\tilde{\varphi}(t) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\varphi(st)}{\varphi(s)}$, then $\mathcal{M}(A_{p,\varphi}) = A_{p,\tilde{\varphi}}$.

The proof follows from [A97] (cf. also [Mi76, Mi78]), property (b) and the fact that $\mathcal{M}(X)^{(p)} = \mathcal{M}(X^{(p)})$, where $X^{(p)}$ is the p -convexification of X .

Proposition 3. *For the Orlicz space $L_\Phi = L_\Phi[0, 1]$ we have the following:*

- (i) If $\Phi \notin \Delta_2$, then $\mathcal{M}(L_\Phi) = L_\infty$.
- (ii) If $\Phi \in \Delta_2$, then $L_{\tilde{\Phi}} \subset \mathcal{M}(L_\Phi) \subset L_\Phi$, where $\tilde{\Phi}(u) = \sup_{v \geq 1} \frac{\Phi(uv)}{\Phi(v)}$, $u \geq 1$.
- (iii) If $\Phi \in \Delta_2$, then $\mathcal{M}(L_\Phi) = L_\Phi$ if and only if Φ is a submultiplicative function for large u , i.e., $\Phi(uv) \leq C\Phi(u)\Phi(v)$ for some positive C, u_0 and all $u, v \geq u_0$.

Proof. (i) It follows from property (b_1) and the fact that Boyd index $\alpha_{L_\Phi} = 0$.

(ii) The imbedding $L_{\tilde{\Phi}} \subset \mathcal{M}(L_\Phi)$ follows from Ando theorem [A, Theorem 6] on boundedness of tensor product between Orlicz spaces. In fact, if $x(s) \in L_{\tilde{\Phi}}$ and

$y(t) \in L_\Phi$, then $I_{\bar{\Phi}}(x/\lambda) + I_\Phi(y/\lambda) < \infty$ for some $\lambda \geq 1$, and so

$$\Phi(\lambda^{-2}|x(s)||y(t)|) \leq [1 + \bar{\Phi}(|x(s)|/\lambda)][\Phi(1) + \Phi(|y(t)|/\lambda)],$$

from which

$$I_\Phi(\lambda^{-2}x \otimes y) \leq [1 + I_{\bar{\Phi}}(x/\lambda)][\Phi(1) + I_\Phi(y/\lambda)] < \infty,$$

that is, $x \otimes y \in L_\Phi(I \times I)$. Therefore, $L_{\bar{\Phi}} \subset \mathcal{M}(L_\Phi)$. The second imbedding follows from (2).

(iii) It follows directly from (ii) and it was also proved in [A,A82,Mi81,O]. $\square$

The situation is different in the case of Marcinkiewicz spaces.

Theorem 1. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\mathcal{M}(M_\varphi) = M_\varphi$.
- (ii) *The tensor product $\otimes : M_\varphi \times M_\varphi \rightarrow M_\varphi(I \times I)$ is bounded.*
- (iii) $\varphi' \otimes \varphi' \in M_\varphi$.
- (iv) *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the inequality*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(u_i) \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right) \leq C \varphi\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i\right) \quad (4)$$

is valid for any $u_i \in [0, 1]$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. The equivalence (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii) is true for any r.i. space, in particular also for the Marcinkiewicz space M_φ .

Implication (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) follows from the fact that $\varphi' \in M_\varphi$.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv): Given an integer n and a sequence $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n \in [0, 1]$, consider the set

$$A = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n} \right) \times (0, u_i) \subset [0, 1] \times [0, 1].$$

Then

$$\int_A (\varphi' \otimes \varphi') dm_2 \leq C \varphi(m_2(A)),$$

where m_2 is the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$. Since

$$\int_A \varphi'(t)\varphi'(s) dt ds = \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(u_i) \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right)$$

and

$$m_2(A) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} u_i$$

it follows that estimate (4) holds.

(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): Assume that (4) is valid. It is sufficient to prove that the inequality

$$\|x \otimes y\|_{M_\varphi} \leq C$$

holds for $x, y \in M_\varphi$, $\|x\|_{M_\varphi} = \|y\|_{M_\varphi} = 1$ and $x = x^*$, $y = y^*$. Given $x = x^* \in M_\varphi$ with $\|x\|_{M_\varphi} = 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a strictly decreasing function $z = z^* \in M_\varphi$ such that $\|z\|_{M_\varphi} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ and $z \geq x$. Therefore, we can assume in addition that x and y are strictly decreasing and continuous on $(0, 1]$. We must prove the inequality

$$\int_{A_\tau} x(t)y(s) dt ds \leq C m_2(A_\tau)$$

for any set

$$A_\tau = \{(t, s) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1] : x(t)y(s) \geq \tau\}, \quad \tau > 0.$$

Given $\tau > 0$, there exists a continuous decreasing function $g(t) = g_\tau(t)$ such that $A_\tau = \{(t, s) : g(s) \geq t\}$.

Put

$$P_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \left[0, g\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) \right] \times \left(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n} \right]$$

and

$$Q_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \left[0, g\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right] \times \left(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n} \right].$$

Then

$$P_n \subset A_\tau \subset Q_n.$$

The continuity of the function g implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(Q_n \setminus P_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \left(g\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) - g\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(g\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) - g\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The function $x(t)y(s)$ belongs to $L_1(m_2)$. Hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{Q_n \setminus P_n} x(t)y(s) dt ds = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_\tau} x(t)y(s) dt ds &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{P_n} x(t)y(s) dt ds \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{g(\frac{i}{n})} x(t) dt \int_{\frac{i-1}{n}}^{\frac{i}{n}} y(s) ds \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi\left(g\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right) \left(\int_0^{\frac{i}{n}} y(s) ds - \int_0^{\frac{i-1}{n}} y(s) ds \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\varphi\left(g\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right) - \varphi\left(g\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right)\right) \right) \int_0^{\frac{i}{n}} y(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\varphi\left(g\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right) - \varphi\left(g\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right)\right) > 0$$

and

$$\int_0^{\frac{i}{n}} y(s) ds \leq \varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_\tau} x(t)y(s) dt ds &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\varphi\left(g\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right) - \varphi\left(g\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right)\right) \right) \varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi\left(g\left(\frac{i}{n}\right)\right) \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Denoting $g\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) = u_i$ and applying (4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_\tau} x(t)y(s) dt ds &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(u_i) \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right) \\ &\leq C \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i\right) = C \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(m_2(P_n)) = C m_2(A_\tau), \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. $\square$

Observe that we have even proved that the tensor multiplier norm in the space M_φ is equal

$$\sup_{0 < u_i \leq 1, i=1,2,\dots,n, n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(u_i) \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right)}{\varphi\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i\right)}.$$

The concavity of φ implies that the supremum is attained on the set of decreasing sequences $1 \geq u_1 \geq u_2 \geq \dots \geq u_n > 0$.

Remark 1. Theorem 1 can be formulated in a more general form. Let $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3 \in \mathcal{C}$. Then the tensor product $\otimes : M_{\varphi_1} \times M_{\varphi_2} \rightarrow M_{\varphi_3}(I \times I)$ is bounded if and only if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_1(u_i) \left(\varphi_2\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi_2\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right) \leq C \varphi_3\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i\right) \quad (5)$$

is true for every integer n and every $u_i \in [0, 1]$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Condition (5) can be also written in the integral form

$$\int_0^1 \varphi_1(u(t)) \varphi_2'(t) dt \leq C \varphi_3\left(\int_0^1 u(t) dt\right)$$

for all functions $u(t)$ on $[0, 1]$ such that $0 \leq u(t) \leq 1$. The last integral condition is satisfied when for example

$$\int_0^1 \varphi_1\left(\frac{s}{t}\right) \varphi_2'(t) dt \leq C \varphi_3(s)$$

for all s in $[0, 1]$. A similar assumption appeared in papers [Mi76, Mi78].

We will find a condition on $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ under which estimate (4) will be true.

Lemma 1. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\varphi(t) \leq K\varphi(t^2)$ for some positive number K and for every $t \in [0, 1]$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(u_i) \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right) \leq (K+1) \varphi(1) \varphi\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i\right)$$

for every integer n and every $u_i \in [0, 1]$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Proof. The concavity of φ implies that we can suppose the monotonicity $1 \geq u_1 \geq u_2 \geq \dots \geq u_n \geq 0$. Denote

$$s = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i.$$

There exists a natural number m , $1 \leq m \leq n$, such that $u_m \leq \sqrt{s}$ and $u_i > \sqrt{s}$ for $i \leq m$. Since

$$ns = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^m u_i \geq m\sqrt{s}$$

it yields that $m \leq n\sqrt{s}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(u_i) \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right) &\leq \varphi(1) \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right) = \varphi(1) \varphi\left(\frac{m}{n}\right) \\ &\leq \varphi(1) \varphi\left(\frac{n\sqrt{s}}{n}\right) = \varphi(1) \varphi(\sqrt{s}) \leq K \varphi(1) \varphi(s). \end{aligned}$$

If $i > m$, then $\varphi(u_i) \leq \varphi(s)$ and so

$$\sum_{i=m+1}^n \varphi(u_i) \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right) \leq \varphi(s) \sum_{i=m+1}^n \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right) \leq \varphi(1) \varphi(s).$$

Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(u_i) \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \varphi\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right) \leq (K+1) \varphi(1) \varphi(s) = (K+1) \varphi(1) \varphi\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i\right). \quad \square$$

Immediately from Theorem 1 and Lemma 1 we have the following assertion.

Corollary 1. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\varphi(t) \leq K\varphi(t^2)$ for some positive number K and for every $t \in [0, 1]$. Then

$$\mathcal{M}(M_\varphi) = M_\varphi.$$

Let us note that the power function $\varphi(t) = t^\alpha$ with $0 < \alpha < 1$ does not satisfy inequality (4) but there are functions $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ which satisfy the estimate $\varphi(t) \leq K\varphi(t^2)$ for some positive number K and for every $t \in [0, 1]$. This estimate gives, of course, the supermultiplicativity of φ on $[0, 1]$.

Example 1. For each $\lambda > 0$ there exists $a = a(\lambda) \in (0, 1)$ such that the function

$$\varphi_\lambda(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t = 0, \\ \ln^{-\lambda} \frac{1}{t} & \text{if } 0 < t \leq a(\lambda), \\ \text{linear} & \text{if } t \in [a(\lambda), 1], \end{cases}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{C}$. Clearly, $\varphi_\lambda(t) \leq 2^\lambda \varphi_\lambda(t^2)$ for every $t \in [0, a(\lambda)]$. Consequently, φ_λ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 1.

Remark 2. There exists a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ such that the tensor product acts from $M_\varphi \times M_\varphi$ into M_φ and φ does not satisfy the condition $\varphi(t) \leq K\varphi(t^2)$ for some positive number K and for every $t \in [0, 1]$. It is enough to take $\varphi(t) = t^\alpha \ln^{-\beta} \frac{a}{t}$ for $0 < \alpha < 1$, $\beta > 1$ and $a > e^{2\beta/(1-\alpha)}$.

We finish this part with the imbeddings of Calderón–Lozanovskii construction on multiplier spaces.

Proposition 4. Let X_0, X_1 be r.i. spaces on $[0, 1]$. Then

- (i) $\mathcal{M}(X_0)^{1-\theta} \mathcal{M}(X_1)^\theta \subset \mathcal{M}(X_0^{1-\theta} X_1^\theta)$.
- (ii) If $\rho \in \mathcal{U}$ is a supermultiplicative function on $[0, \infty)$, i.e., there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\rho(st) \geq c\rho(s)\rho(t)$ for all $s, t \in [0, \infty)$, then

$$\rho(\mathcal{M}(X_0), \mathcal{M}(X_1)) \subset \mathcal{M}(\rho(X_0, X_1)).$$

Proof. (i) Observe first that $Y \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$ if and only if the operator $\otimes : Y \times X \rightarrow X(I \times I)$ is bounded.

Since $\otimes : \mathcal{M}(X_i) \times X_i \rightarrow X_i(I \times I)$, $i = 0, 1$, is bounded with the norm ≤ 1 and the Calderón construction is an interpolation method for positive bilinear operators (cf. [C]) it follows that

$$\otimes : \mathcal{M}(X_0)^{1-\theta} \mathcal{M}(X_1)^\theta \times X_0^{1-\theta} X_1^\theta \rightarrow X_0(I \times I)^{1-\theta} X_1(I \times I)^\theta = X_0^{1-\theta} X_1^\theta(I \times I)$$

is bounded with the norm ≤ 1 . Therefore, $\mathcal{M}(X_0)^{1-\theta} \mathcal{M}(X_1)^\theta \subset \mathcal{M}(X_0^{1-\theta} X_1^\theta)$.

(ii) When ρ is a supermultiplicative function the Calderón–Lozanovskii construction is an interpolation method for positive bilinear operators (see [As97, M] Theorem 2]) and the proof of the imbedding is similar as in (i). $\square$

Note that the inclusions in Proposition 4 can be strict. For the spaces $X_0 = L_{p,q}$, $X_1 = L_{p,\infty}$ with $1 \leq q < p < \infty$ we have

$$\mathcal{M}(X_0)^{1-\theta} \mathcal{M}(X_1)^\theta = \mathcal{M}(L_{p,q})^{1-\theta} \mathcal{M}(L_{p,\infty})^\theta = L_{p,q}^{1-\theta} L_p^\theta = L_{p,r},$$

where $1/r = (1-\theta)/q + \theta/p$ and

$$\mathcal{M}(X_0^{1-\theta} X_1^\theta) = \mathcal{M}(L_{p,q}^{1-\theta} L_{p,\infty}^\theta) = \mathcal{M}(L_{p,s}) = L_{p,\min(p,s)},$$

where $1/s = (1-\theta)/q$. The strict imbedding $L_{p,r} \subsetneq L_{p,\min(p,s)}$ gives then the corresponding example.

3. Subspaces generated by dilations and translations in r.i. spaces

Given an r.i. space X on $I = [0, 1]$ let us denote by

$$V_0(X) = \{a \in X : a \neq 0, a = a^*\}.$$

For a fixed function $a \in V_0(X)$ and dyadic intervals $\Delta_{n,k} = [\frac{k-1}{2^n}, \frac{k}{2^n})$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, let us consider the dilations and translations of a function a

$$a_{n,k}(t) = \begin{cases} a(2^n t - k + 1) & \text{if } t \in \Delta_{n,k}, \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases}$$

Then $\text{supp } a_{n,k} \subset \Delta_{n,k}$ and

$$m(\{t \in \Delta_{n,k} : |a_{n,k}(t)| > \lambda\}) = 2^{-n} m(\{t \in I : |a(t)| > \lambda\}) \quad \text{for all } \lambda > 0.$$

For $a \in V_0(X)$ and $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ we denote by $Q_{a,n}$ the linear span $[\{a_{n,k}\}_{k=1}^{2^n}]$ generated by functions $a_{n,k}$ in X .

Definition 2. For an r.i. function space X on $[0, 1]$ the *nice part* $N_0(X)$ of X is defined by

$$N_0(X) = \{a \in V_0(X) : \text{there exists a sequence of projections } \{P_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \text{ on } X \text{ such that } \text{Im } P_n = Q_{a,n} \text{ and } \sup_{n=0,1,\dots} \|P_n\|_{X \rightarrow X} < \infty\}.$$

We say that X is a *nice space* (or shortly $X \in \mathcal{N}_0$) if a^* belongs to $N_0(X)$ for every a from X .

We are using here similar notions as in the paper [HS99]. They were considering r.i. space $X = X[0, \infty)$ on $[0, \infty)$, the corresponding set $V(X) = \{a \in X : a \neq 0, \text{supp } a \subset [0, 1], a = a^*\}$ and the set $N(X)$ of all $a \in V(X)$ such that Q_a is a complemented subspace of $X = X[0, \infty)$, where Q_a is the linear closed span generated by the sequence $(a_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ with

$$a_k(t) = a(t - k + 1) \quad \text{for } t \in [k - 1, k) \text{ and } a_k(t) = 0 \text{ elsewhere.}$$

If $N(X) = X$, then they write that $X \in \mathcal{N}$ (or say that X is a nice space).

We are putting “sub-zero” notions, that is, $V_0(X)$ and $N_0(X)$, so that we have difference between of our case of r.i. spaces on $[0, 1]$ and their case $[0, \infty)$.

Theorem 2. Let X be an r.i. space on $[0, 1]$ and let X^0 denote the closure of $L_\infty[0, 1]$ in X . Then we have embeddings

- (i) $\mathcal{M}(X) \subset N_0(X)$,
- (ii) $N_0(X^0) \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$.

Before the proof of this theorem we will need some auxiliary results.

Let $a \in V_0(X)$ and $f \in V_0(X')$ be such that

$$\int_0^1 f(t)a(t) dt = 1. \tag{6}$$

Define the sequence of natural projections (averaging operators)

$$P_n x(t) = P_{n,af} x(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \left(2^n \int_{\Delta_{n,k}} f_{n,k}(s) x(s) ds \right) a_{n,k}(t), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (7)$$

Lemma 2. *The sequence of norms $\{\|P_{n,af}\|_{X \rightarrow X}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a non-decreasing sequence.*

Proof. For $x = x(t)$ with $\text{supp } x \subset \Delta_{n,k}$ we define

$$R_{n,k} x(t) = x\left(2t - \frac{k-1}{2^n}\right), \quad S_{n,k} x(t) = x\left(2t - \frac{k}{2^n}\right).$$

Then

$$\text{supp } R_{n,k} x \subset \Delta_{n+1,2k-1}, \quad \text{supp } S_{n,k} x \subset \Delta_{n+1,2k}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m(\{t \in \Delta_{n+1,2k-1} : |R_{n,k} x(t)| > \lambda\}) &= m(\{t \in \Delta_{n+1,2k} : |S_{n,k} x(t)| > \lambda\}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} m(\{t \in I : |x(t)| > \lambda\}) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\lambda > 0$. Therefore,

$$\int_{\Delta_{n+1,2k-1}} R_{n,k} x(t) dt = \int_{\Delta_{n+1,2k}} S_{n,k} x(t) dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Delta_{n,k}} x(t) dt.$$

Moreover,

$$R_{n,k}(f_{n,k} x \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}})(t) = f_{n+1,2k-1} R_{n,k}(x \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}})(t),$$

$$S_{n,k}(f_{n,k} x \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}})(t) = f_{n+1,2k} S_{n,k}(x \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}})(t)$$

and

$$m(\{t \in \Delta_{n+1,j} : a_{n+1,j}(t) > \lambda\}) = \frac{1}{2} m(\{t \in \Delta_{n,i} : a_{n,i}(t) > \lambda\})$$

for all $\lambda > 0$ and any $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{n+1}$.

Denote $P_n = P_{n,af}$. The last equality and the equality of integrals give that the function $P_n x(t)$ is equimeasurable with the function

$$\begin{aligned} P_{n+1} y(t) &= \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \left(2^{n+1} \int_{\Delta_{n+1,2k-1}} f_{n+1,2k-1}(s) R_{n,k}(x \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}})(s) ds \right) a_{n+1,2k-1}(t) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \left(2^{n+1} \int_{\Delta_{n+1,2k}} f_{n+1,2k}(s) S_{n,k}(x \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}})(s) ds \right) a_{n+1,2k}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$y(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} [R_{n,k}(x\chi_{\Delta_{n,k}})(t) + S_{n,k}(x\chi_{\Delta_{n,k}})(t)].$$

From the above we can see that y is equimeasurable with x and so

$$\|P_n x\|_X = \|P_{n+1} y\|_X \leq \|P_{n+1}\| \|y\|_X = \|P_{n+1}\| \|x\|_X,$$

that is, $\|P_n\| \leq \|P_{n+1}\|$. $\square$

Lemma 3. *Let X be a separable r.i. space. If $a \in N_0(X)$, then there exists a function $f \in N_0(X')$ such that (6) is fulfilled and for the sequence of projections $\{P_{n,a,f}\}$ defined by (7) we have*

$$\sup_{n=0,1,2,\dots} \|P_{n,a,f}\|_{X \rightarrow X} < \infty.$$

Proof. Since X is a separable space and $a \in N_0(X)$ it follows that there are functions $g_{n,k} \in X'(k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots)$ such that

$$\int_0^1 g_{n,k}(s) a_{n,k}(s) ds = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^1 g_{n,k}(s) a_{n,j}(s) ds = 0, \quad j \neq k,$$

and for the projections

$$T_n x(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \left(\int_0^1 g_{n,k}(s) x(s) ds \right) a_{n,k}(t)$$

we have $\sup_{n=0,1,\dots} \|T_n\|_{X \rightarrow X} < \infty$. Let $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be the first n Rademacher functions on the segment $[0, 1]$. Since X is an r.i. space it follows that for every $u \in [0, 1]$ the norms of the operators

$$T_{n,u} x(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} r_k(u) \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} r_i(u) \left(\int_{\Delta_{n,i}} g_{n,k}(s) x(s) ds \right) a_{n,k}(t)$$

are the same as the norms of T_n . Let us consider the operators

$$S_n x(t) = \int_0^1 T_{n,u} x(t) du = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \left(\int_{\Delta_{n,k}} g_{n,k}(s) x(s) ds \right) a_{n,k}(t).$$

Then

$$\|S_n\| \leq \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \|T_{n,u}\| = \|T_n\| \leq C.$$

Therefore, we can assume that

$$\text{supp } g_{n,k} \subset \Delta_{n,k} \text{ and } g_{n,k} \text{ is decreasing on } \Delta_{n,k}.$$

Moreover, we shift supports of the functions $g_{n,k}(k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n)$ to the segment $[0, 2^{-n}]$ and consider the averages

$$G_n(t) = 2^{-n} \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \tau_{-(k-1)2^{-n}} g_{n,k}(t),$$

where $\tau_s g(t) = g(t-s)$.

Then the shifts $h_{n,k}(t) = 2^{-n} \tau_{(k-1)2^{-n}} G_n(t)$ generate operators

$$U_n x(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \left(2^n \int_{\Delta_{n,k}} h_{n,k}(s) x(s) ds \right) a_{n,k}(t)$$

and we can show that $\|U_n\|_{X \rightarrow X} \leq C$.

Since $h_{n,k}(t) = (F_n)_{n,k}(t)$, where $F_n(t) = 2^{-n} G_n(2^{-n}t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 F_n(t) a(t) dt &= \int_0^{2^{-n}} G_n(t) a_{n,1}(t) dt \\ &= 2^{-n} \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \int_0^{2^{-n}} \tau_{-(k-1)2^{-n}} g_{n,k}(t) a_{n,1}(t) dt \\ &= 2^{-n} \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \int_{\Delta_{n,k}} g_{n,k}(t) a_{n,k}(t) dt = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let us show that there exists a subsequence $\{F_{n_k}(t)\}$ of $F_n(t)$ which converges at every $t \in (0, 1]$.

Lemma 2 gives that the norm of the one-dimensional operator

$$L_n x(t) = \left(\int_0^1 F_n(s) x(s) ds \right) a(t)$$

does not exceed $\|U_n\|_{X \rightarrow X}$, and consequently also not C . Therefore,

$$\|F_n\|_{X'} \leq \frac{C}{\|a\|_X}. \quad (8)$$

By the definition of F_n we have $F_n^*(t) = F_n(t)$ and

$$1 = \int_0^1 F_n(s) a(s) ds \geq F_n(t) \int_0^t a(s) ds$$

or

$$F_n(t) \leq \left(\int_0^t a(s) ds \right)^{-1} \text{ for all } t \in (0, 1].$$

Applying Helly selection theorem (see [N]) we can choose subsequences

$$\{F_n\} \supset \{F_{n,1}\} \supset \{F_{n,2}\} \supset \dots \supset \{F_{n,m}\} \supset \dots$$

that converge on the intervals

$$\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1 \right], \left[\frac{1}{3}, 1 \right], \dots, \left[\frac{1}{m+1}, 1 \right], \dots,$$

respectively. Then the diagonal sequence $f_n(t) = F_{n,n}(t)$ converges at every $t \in (0, 1]$ to a function $f(t) = f^*(t)$. Using estimate (8) we obtain

$$\int_0^s f_n(t) a(t) dt \leq \|f_n\|_{X'} \|a\chi_{(0,s)}\|_X \leq \frac{C}{\|a\|_X} \|a\chi_{(0,s)}\|_X.$$

Since X is a separable r.i. space it follows that $\|a\chi_{(0,s)}\|_X \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow 0^+$. Therefore, the equalities $f_n^* = f_n$ and $a^* = a$ imply that $\{f_n a\}$ is an equi-integrable sequence of functions on $[0, 1]$. Hence (see [E, Theorem 1.21], or [HM, Theorem 6, Chapter V])

$$\int_0^1 f(t) a(t) dt = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 f_n(t) a(t) dt = 1.$$

Let $m \in \mathbf{N}$ be fixed. By the estimate $\|U_n\|_{X \rightarrow X} \leq C$, the definition of f_n , and Lemma 2 we have

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^m} \left(2^m \int_{\Delta_{m,k}} (f_n)_{m,k}(t) x(t) dt \right) a_{m,k} \right\|_X \leq C \|x\|_X \quad (9)$$

for all $n \geq m$ and all $x \in X$.

Suppose that $x(t)$ is a non-negative and non-increasing function on every interval $\Delta_{m,k}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^m$. As above, from (8) it follows that $\{(f_n)_{m,k} x\chi_{\Delta_{m,k}}\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is an equi-integrable sequence on $\Delta_{m,k}$. Hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Delta_{m,k}} (f_n)_{m,k}(t) x(t) dt = \int_{\Delta_{m,k}} (f)_{m,k}(t) x(t) dt$$

and for all such functions $x(t)$ estimate (9) implies

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^m} \left(2^m \int_{\Delta_{m,k}} f_{m,k}(t) x(t) dt \right) a_{m,k} \right\|_X \leq C \|x\|_X.$$

Since X is an r.i. space we can prove that the above estimate holds for all $x \in X$. The proof is complete. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2. (i) At first by the result in [A97, Theorem 1.14], we have that $a \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ if and only if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X \leq C \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X \quad (10)$$

for all $c_{n,k} \in \mathbf{R}$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$.

Suppose that $a \in V_0(X) \cap \mathcal{M}(X)$, that is, estimate (10) holds. If $e(t) \equiv 1$, then the operators

$$P_{n,e} x(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \left(2^n \int_{\Delta_{n,k}} x(s) ds \right) \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}}(t) \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots) \quad (11)$$

are bounded projections in every r.i. space X and $\|P_{n,e}\|_{X \rightarrow X} \leq 1$ (see [KPS, Theorem 4.3]).

Define operators $R_{n,a} : Q_{e,n} = \text{Im } P_{n,e} \rightarrow Q_{a,n}$ as follows:

$$R_{n,a} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k}.$$

By the assumption $a \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ or equivalently by estimate (10) we have $\|R_{n,a}\|_{Q_{e,n} \rightarrow X} \leq C$. Therefore, for the operators

$$P_{n,a} = \frac{1}{\|a\|_{L_1}} R_{n,a} P_{n,e}.$$

We have

$$\|P_{n,a}\|_{X \rightarrow X} \leq C \|a\|_{L_1}^{-1}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

It is easy to check that $P_{n,a}$ are projections and $\text{Im } P_{n,a} = Q_{a,n}$. Therefore, $a \in N_0(X)$.

(ii) If $X = L_\infty$, then $\mathcal{M}(X) = N_0(X^0) = L_\infty$.

If $X \neq L_\infty$, then X^0 is a separable r.i. space. In this case, by Lemma 3, for any $a \in N_0(X^0)$ there exists a function $f \in V_0((X^0)')$ such that (6) is fulfilled and for the projections $P_{n,a,f}$ defined as in (7) we have

$$C = \sup_{n=0,1,2,\dots} \|P_{n,a,f}\|_{X^0 \rightarrow X^0} < \infty. \quad \square$$

If x is a function of the form $x(s) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}}(s)$, then

$$P_{n,a,f}x = \|f\|_{L_1} \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k}.$$

Therefore,

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_{X^0} \leq C \|f\|_{L_1}^{-1} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_{X^0},$$

and we obtain (10) for X^0 .

If $X^0 = X$, that is, X is a separable r.i. space, then the theorem is proved. If X is a non-separable r.i. space, then X^0 is an isometric subspace of $X = X''$. By using the Fatou property, we can extend the above inequality to the whole space X and obtain (10), which gives that $a \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. The proof of Theorem 2 is complete. $\square$

Immediately from Theorem 2 and the properties of the multiplier space we obtain the following corollaries.

Corollary 2. *If X is a separable r.i. space, then $\mathcal{M}(X) = N_0(X)$.*

Corollary 3. *If $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, then $N_0(L_{p,q}) = L_{p,q}$ for $1 \leq q \leq p$ and $N_0(L_{p,q}) = N_0(L_{p,\infty}^0) = L_p$ for $p < q < \infty$.*

Corollary 4. *Let X_0 and X_1 be separable r.i. spaces. If $X_0, X_1 \in \mathcal{N}_0$, then $X_0^{1-\theta} X_1^\theta \in \mathcal{N}_0$.*

Corollaries 3 and 4 show that the class of nice spaces $\mathcal{N}_0$ is stable with respect to the complex method of interpolation but it is not stable with respect to the real interpolation method.

Corollary 5. *If $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\varphi(t) \leq K\varphi(t^2)$ for some positive number K and for every $t \in [0, 1]$, then $N_0(M_\varphi) = M_\varphi$.*

By $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0$ we mean $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{t}{\varphi(t)} = 0$.

Theorem 3. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0$.*

(i) *If*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\varphi(2t)}{\varphi(t)} = 2 \tag{12}$$

then

$$L_\infty \subset N_0(M_\varphi) \subset L_\infty \cup (M_\varphi \setminus M_\varphi^0). \tag{13}$$

(ii) If

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\varphi(2t)}{\varphi(t)} = 2$$

then

$$N_0(M_\varphi) = L_\infty \cup (M_\varphi \setminus M_\varphi^0).$$

Proof. (i) By Theorem 2 the left part of (13) is valid for any r.i. space. Assumption (12) implies

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\varphi(t)}{\varphi(ts)} = \frac{1}{s}, \quad 0 < s < 1$$

and so

$$\|\sigma_s\|_{M_\varphi \rightarrow M_\varphi} \geq s \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\varphi(t)}{\varphi(st)} = 1$$

for every $0 < s \leq 1$. This means that $\alpha_{M_\varphi} = 0$.

Let $x \in N_0(M_\varphi) \cap M_\varphi^0$. By using Corollary 2 and property (b_1) we get

$$x \in N_0(M_\varphi^0) = \mathcal{M}(M_\varphi^0) = L_\infty.$$

This proves the right part of (13).

(ii) We must only prove the inclusion

$$M_\varphi \setminus M_\varphi^0 \subset N_0(M_\varphi).$$

Let $a \in M_\varphi \setminus M_\varphi^0$, $\|a\|_{M_\varphi} = 1$ and $\psi(t) = \int_0^t a^*(s) ds$. It is well known that

$$\text{dist}(a, M_\varphi^0) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \int_0^t a^*(s) ds.$$

Therefore,

$$\gamma = \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\psi(t)}{\varphi(t)} > 0$$

and there exists a sequence $\{t_m\}$ tending to 0 such that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(t_m)}{\varphi(t_m)} = \gamma.$$

Since

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(t_m)}{2^n \varphi(\frac{t_m}{2^n})} = 1$$

for every natural n , it follows that

$$\|a_{n,k}\|_{M_\varphi} \geq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(t_m)}{2^n \varphi(\frac{t_m}{2^n})} = \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(t_m)}{\varphi(t_m)} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(t_m)}{2^n \varphi(\frac{t_m}{2^n})} = \gamma$$

for every $1 \leq k \leq 2^n$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$.

Consider the subspaces $H_{n,k} = \text{closed span } [\{a_{n,i}\}_{i \neq k}]$. These subspaces are closed subspaces of M_φ and $a_{n,k} \notin H_{n,k}$. Thus, by the Hahn–Banach theorem, there are $b_{n,k} \in (M_\varphi)^*$ such that $b_{n,k}|_{H_{n,k}} = 0$, $b_{n,k}(a_{n,k}) = 1$ and $\|b_{n,k}\| = \frac{1}{\|a_{n,k}\|} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}$. Then the operators

$$P_n x = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} b_{n,k}(x) a_{n,k}$$

are projections from M_φ onto $Q_{a,n}$. Moreover, P_n are uniformly bounded since

$$\|P_n x\|_{M_\varphi} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \|x\|_{M_\varphi} a_{n,k} \right\|_{M_\varphi} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \|x\|_{M_\varphi}.$$

Therefore, $a \in N_0(M_\varphi)$. The proof is complete. $\square$

Example 2. There exists a non-separable r.i. space X such that $\mathcal{M}(X) \neq N_0(X)$.

Take $X = M_\varphi$ with $\varphi(t) = t \ln \frac{e}{t}$ on $(0, 1]$. Since $\alpha_{M_\varphi} = 0$ it follows that $\mathcal{M}(M_\varphi) = L_\infty$. The function $a(t) = \ln \frac{e}{t}$ for $t \in (0, 1]$ as unbounded is not in $\mathcal{M}(X)$ but it is in $M_\varphi \setminus M_\varphi^0$ and by Theorem 3(ii) it shows that $a \in N_0(X)$. Therefore, $N_0(X) \neq \mathcal{M}(X)$.

Corollary 6. If $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0$ and $\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\varphi(2t)}{\varphi(t)} = 2$, then $\varphi' \in N_0(M_\varphi)$ and consequently $N_0(M_\varphi)$ is neither a linear space nor a lattice.

Problem 1. For $1 < p < \infty$ describe $N_0(L_{p,\infty})$.

Note that $\mathcal{M}(L_{p,\infty}) = L_p$ and $N_0(L_{p,\infty}^0) = \mathcal{M}(L_{p,\infty}^0) = L_p$.

Theorem 4. Let X be an r.i. space X on $[0, 1]$. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $\otimes : X \times X \rightarrow X(I \times I)$ is bounded.
- (ii) $\mathcal{M}(X) = X$.

- (iii) $X \in \mathcal{N}_0$, i.e., $N_0(X) = X$.
 (iv) There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X \leq C \|a\|_X \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X \quad (14)$$

for all $a \in X$ and all $c_{n,k} \in \mathbf{R}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$.

Proof. Implication (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) follows by definition (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) from Theorem 2 and (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i) by the result in [A97, Theorem 1.14]. Therefore, it only remains to prove that (iii) implies (iv).

First, assume additionally that X is separable. If $X \in \mathcal{N}_0$, then, similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2, for any $a \in X$ there exist $C_1 > 0$ and $f \in V_0(X')$ such that $\int_0^1 f(t)a(t) dt = 1$ and

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X \leq C_1 \|f\|_{L_1}^{-1} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X.$$

Let us introduce a new norm on X defined by

$$\|a\|_1 = \sup \left\{ \frac{\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X}{\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X} : c_{n,k} \in \mathbf{R}, k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \right\}.$$

Then $\|a\|_X \leq \|a\|_1$ and $\|a\|_1 < \infty$ for all $a \in X$. By the closed graph theorem we obtain that $\|a\|_1 \leq C \|a\|_X$ and (14) is proved.

Now, let X be a non-separable r.i. space. In the case $X = L_\infty$ both conditions (iii) and (iv) are fulfilled. Therefore, consider the case $X \neq L_\infty$. Then X^0 is a separable r.i. space. The canonical isometric imbedding $X^0 \subset X = X''$ gives that $X^0 \in \mathcal{N}_0$. Let $a \in V_0(X)$. The separability of X^0 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} [a^{(m)}]_{n,k} \right\|_{X^0} &\leq C \|a^{(m)}\|_{X^0} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_{X^0} \\ &= C \|a^{(m)}\|_{X^0} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X, \end{aligned}$$

where $a^{(m)}(t) = \min(a(t), m)$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$.

Since $X = X''$ has the Fatou property and $[a^{(m)}]_{n,k} = [a_{n,k}]^{(m)}$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left[\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right]^{(m)} \right\|_X \\ &\leq C \|a\|_X \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X \end{aligned}$$

and Theorem 4 is proved. $\square$

Theorem 5. Let X be an r.i. space X on $[0, 1]$. Then $X \in \mathcal{N}_0$ if and only if $X'' \in \mathcal{N}_0$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 4. The essential part is the proof of the estimate (14). We leave the details to the reader.

Theorem 6. Let X be a separable r.i. space X on $[0, 1]$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $a \in N_0(X)$.
- (ii) The operators $R_{n,a} : Q_{e,n} \rightarrow Q_{a,n}$ given by

$$R_{n,a} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k}$$

are uniformly bounded.

- (iii) The operators $R_{n,a}$ and their inverses are uniformly bounded.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): Let $a \in N_0(X)$. Then $\|R_{n,a}\| \leq C$ for all $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, by Theorem 2. Next, since $a \neq 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n_0) > 0$ such that $a(t) \geq u(t) = \varepsilon \chi_{(0, 2^{-n_0})}(t)$. Therefore, for all $c_{n,k} \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X &\geq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} u_{n,k} \right\|_X = \varepsilon \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{((k-1)2^{-n}, (k-1+2^{n_0})2^{-n})} \right\|_X \\ &= \varepsilon \left\| \sigma_{2^{-n_0}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right) \right\|_X \geq \varepsilon \|\sigma_{2^{n_0}}\|_{X \rightarrow X}^{-1} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that the inverses $(R_{n,a})^{-1}$ are uniformly bounded.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): If the operators $R_{n,a}$ are uniformly bounded, then we have estimate (14) or equivalently $a \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and Theorem 2(i) gives that $a \in N_0(X)$. $\square$

Now, we present a characterization of L_p spaces among all r.i. spaces on $[0, 1]$.

Theorem 7. Let X be an r.i. space X on $[0, 1]$. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $X \in \mathcal{N}_0$ and $X' \in \mathcal{N}_0$.
- (ii) There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$C^{-1} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X \leq C \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X \quad (15)$$

for all $a \in V_0(X)$ with $\|a\|_X = 1$ and all $c_{n,k} \in \mathbf{R}$ with $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$.

- (iii) For any pair of functions (a, f) such that $a \in V_0(X)$, $f \in V_0(X')$ satisfying (6) the operators $P_{n,a,f}$ defined in (7) are uniformly bounded in X .
- (iv) The operator of the tensor product $\otimes$ is bounded from $X \times X$ into $X(I \times I)$ and from $X' \times X'$ into $X'(I \times I)$.
- (v) There exists a $p \in [1, \infty]$ such that $X = L_p$.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iv). This follows from Theorem 4.

(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): Let $a \in V_0(X)$, $\|a\|_X = 1$. Assumption (iv) implies, by Theorem 4, that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X \leq C_1 \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$.

Therefore it only remains to prove left estimate in (15). For arbitrary $b \in V_0(X')$ such that

$$\int_0^1 a(t)b(t) dt = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} d_{n,k} b_{n,k} \right\|_{X'} \leq 1 (d_{n,k} \in \mathbf{R})$$

we obtain $\int_{\Delta_{n,k}} a_{n,k}(t)b_{n,k}(t) dt = 2^{-n}$ and

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X \geq \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k}(t) \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} d_{n,k} b_{n,k}(t) \right) dt = 2^{-n} \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} d_{n,k}.$$

Since $\otimes$ is bounded from $X' \times X'$ into $X'(I \times I)$ it follows, again by Theorem 4 used to X' , that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} d_{n,k} b_{n,k} \right\|_{X'} \leq C_2 \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} d_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_{X'}$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$, from which we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X &\geq C_2^{-1} \sup_d \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k}(t) \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} d_{n,k} b_{n,k}(t) \right) dt \\ &= 2^{-n} C_2^{-1} \sup_d \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} d_{n,k}, \end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is taken over all $d = (d_{n,k})_{k=1}^{2^n}$ such that $\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} d_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_{X'} \leq 1$.

The operator $P_{n,e}$ defined as in (11) by

$$P_{n,e} x(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \left(2^n \int_{\Delta_{n,k}} x(s) ds \right) \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}}(t) \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots)$$

satisfies $\|P_{n,e}\|_{X' \rightarrow X'} \leq 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X &= \sup_{\|y\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}}(t) \right) y(t) dt \\ &= \sup_{\|y\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}}(t) \right) P_{n,e} y(t) dt \\ &\leq \sup_{\|P_{n,e} y\|_{X'} \leq 1} \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}}(t) \right) P_{n,e} y(t) dt \\ &\leq 2^{-n} \sup_d \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} d_{n,k}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X \leq C_2 \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X.$$

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (v): By Krivine's theorem [K,LT, p. 141] for every r.i. space X there exists $p \in [1, \infty]$ with the following property:

for any $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist disjoint and equimeasurable functions $v_k \in X$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n$, such that

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \|c\|_p \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} v_k \right\|_X \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|c\|_p \quad (16)$$

for any $c = (c_{n,k})_{k=1}^{2^n}$, where $\|c\|_p = \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} |c_{n,k}|^p \right)^{1/p}$. Hence, in particular, it follows (with the notion $\frac{n}{\infty} = 0$) that

$$(1 - \varepsilon) 2^{n/p} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} v_k \right\|_X \leq (1 + \varepsilon) 2^{n/p}.$$

Let

$$a(t) = r^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} v_k \right)^* (t), \quad \text{where } r = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} v_k \right\|_X.$$

Then $\|a\|_X = 1$ and $a_{n,k}$ are equimeasurable functions with $r^{-1}v_k$ for every $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^n$. Therefore,

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} 2^{-n/p} \|c\|_p \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X \leq \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} 2^{-n/p} \|c\|_p,$$

that is,

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_p \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} a_{n,k} \right\|_X \leq \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_p.$$

Hence, by assumption (15), we have

$$C_\varepsilon^{-1} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_p \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X \leq C_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} c_{n,k} \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_p, \quad (17)$$

where $C_\varepsilon = C(1+\varepsilon)/(1-\varepsilon)$.

Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. If X is a separable r.i. space, then (17) implies that $X = L_p$. In the case when $X = X''$ it is sufficient to consider r.i. spaces $X \neq L_\infty$. Then X^0 satisfies (15) and so $X^0 = L_p$. Hence, $X' = (X^0)' = L_{p'}$ and $X = X'' = (L_{p'})' = L_p$.

Let $p = \infty$. Suppose that there is a function $x \in X \setminus L_\infty$. Then from (17) we obtain

$$\|x\|_X \geq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} x^*(k2^{-n}) \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_X \geq C_\varepsilon^{-1} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} x^*(k2^{-n}) \chi_{\Delta_{n,k}} \right\|_\infty = C_\varepsilon^{-1} x^*(2^{-n}).$$

Since $x \notin L_\infty$ it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^*(2^{-n}) = \infty$. This contradiction shows that $X \subset L_\infty$. The reverse imbedding is always true.

(v) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): This follows from the estimate of the norm of natural projections in L_p space

$$\|P_{n,a,f}\|_{L_p \rightarrow L_p} \leq \|a\|_p \|f\|_{p'}.$$

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): By definition of the operators $P_{n,a,f}$ we have that $X \in \mathcal{N}_0$. We want to show that also $X' \in \mathcal{N}_0$. For all $x \in X$ and $y \in X'$

$$\int_0^1 P_{n,a,f} x(t) y(t) dt = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} 2^n \int_{\Delta_{n,k}} f_{n,k}(s) x(s) ds \int_{\Delta_{n,k}} a_{n,k}(t) y(t) dt = \int_0^1 P_{n,f,a} y(s) x(s) ds.$$

Therefore, the conjugate operator $(P_{n,a,f})^*$ to $P_{n,a,f}$ is $P_{n,f,a}$ on the space X' . Since X' is isometrically imbedded in X^* the last equality implies that the operators $P_{n,f,a}$ are uniformly bounded, and so $X' \in \mathcal{N}_0$. The proof is complete. $\square$

4. Additional remarks and results

First we describe the difference between the cases on $[0, 1]$ and $[0, \infty)$. Let $X[0, \infty)$ denote an r.i. space on $[0, \infty)$ and $X = \{x \in X[0, \infty) : x(t) = 0 \text{ for } t > 1\}$ the corresponding r.i. space on $[0, 1]$. We use here also the notion $X[0, \infty) \in \mathcal{N}$ from the paper [HS99, p. 56] (cf. also our explanation after Definition 2). Let us present examples showing that no one of the following statements:

- (i) $X[0, \infty) \in \mathcal{N}$,
- (ii) $X \in \mathcal{N}_0$

implies the other one, in general.

Example 3. The Orlicz space $L_{\Phi_p}[0, \infty)$, where $\Phi_p(u) = e^{u^p} - 1$, $1 < p < \infty$, belongs to the class $\mathcal{N}$. On the other hand, the lower Boyd index $\alpha_{L_{\Phi_p}}$ of L_{Φ_p} on $[0, 1]$ equals 0 and so $\mathcal{M}(L_{\Phi_p}) = L_\infty$. Therefore, by Theorem 4, $L_{\Phi_p} \notin \mathcal{N}_0$.

Example 4. Consider the function

$$\varphi(t) = \begin{cases} t^\alpha & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq 1, \\ t^\alpha \ln^{-\beta}(t + e - 1) & \text{if } 1 \leq t < \infty, \end{cases}$$

where $0 < \beta \leq \alpha < 1$. Then φ is a quasi-concave function on $[0, \infty)$, i.e., $\varphi(t)$ is increasing on $[0, \infty)$ and $\varphi(t)/t$ is decreasing on $(0, \infty)$. Let $\tilde{\varphi}$ be the smallest concave majorant of φ . Then

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq 1, n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\tilde{\varphi}(nt)}{\tilde{\varphi}(n)\tilde{\varphi}(t)} = \infty.$$

In fact, for every $n = 1, 2, \dots$, we can choose $t \in [0, 1]$ such that $nt < 1$. Then

$$\frac{\tilde{\varphi}(nt)}{\tilde{\varphi}(n)\tilde{\varphi}(t)} \geq \frac{1}{4} \frac{\varphi(nt)}{\varphi(n)\varphi(t)} = \ln^\beta(n + e - 1) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This implies that the Lorentz space $\Lambda_{\tilde{\varphi}}[0, \infty) \notin \mathcal{N}$ (see [HS99, Theorem 4.1]). At the same time for $\Lambda_{\tilde{\varphi}} = \Lambda_{t^\alpha} = L_{p,1}$ with $p = 1/\alpha$ on $[0, 1]$ we have, by (3), that $\mathcal{M}(\Lambda_{\tilde{\varphi}}) = \mathcal{M}(L_{p,1}) = L_{p,1} = \Lambda_{\tilde{\varphi}}$, and, by Theorem 4, $\Lambda_{\tilde{\varphi}} \in \mathcal{N}_0$.

The reason of non-equivalences (i) and (ii) is coming from the fact that the dilation operator σ_t in r.i. spaces on $[0, \infty)$ does not satisfy an equation of the form

$$\|\sigma_t x\|_{X[0, \infty)} = f(t) \|x\|_{X[0, \infty)}, \quad \text{for } x \in X[0, \infty) \text{ and for all } t > 0.$$

If this equation is satisfied, then the function $f(t)$ is a power function $f(t) = t^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and then the above statements (i) and (ii) are equivalent. This observation allows us to improve, for example, Theorem 4.2 from [HS99]: if

$1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, then

$$N(L_{p,q}[0, \infty)) = L_{p,q} \Leftrightarrow 1 \leq q \leq p.$$

We can characterize $N(L_{p,q}[0, \infty))$ for $1 < p \leq q < \infty$.

Theorem 8. *If $1 < p \leq q < \infty$, then $N(L_{p,q}[0, \infty)) = L_p$.*

Proof. Let $a \in N(L_{p,q}[0, \infty))$. The spaces $L_{p,q}[0, \infty)$ are separable for $q < \infty$. Therefore, similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2, we can show that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n c_k a_k \right\|_{L_{p,q}[0, \infty)} \leq C \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n c_k \chi_{[k-1, k)} \right\|_{L_{p,q}[0, \infty)} \quad (18)$$

for all $c_k \in \mathbf{R}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Since

$$\|\sigma_t x\|_{L_{p,q}[0, \infty)} = t^{1/p} \|x\|_{L_{p,q}[0, \infty)} \quad \text{for } x \in L_{p,q}[0, \infty) \text{ and all } t > 0, \quad (19)$$

it follows that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n c_k a_k^n \right\|_{L_{p,q}} \leq C \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n c_k \chi_{[\frac{k-1}{n}, \frac{k}{n})} \right\|_{L_{p,q}},$$

and, by Theorem 1.14 in [A97] together with property (c), we obtain $a \in L_p$.

Conversely, if $a \in L_p$ then, by using property (c), Theorem 1.14 in [A97] and equality (19), we get (18) for all n of the form 2^m , $m = 1, 2, \dots$. The space $L_{p,q}$ has the Fatou property, thus passing to the limit, we obtain

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k a_k \right\|_{L_{p,q}[0, \infty)} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k \chi_{[k-1, k)} \right\|_{L_{p,q}[0, \infty)}.$$

Next, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 2 (see also [HS99, Theorem 2.3]) we obtain $a \in N(L_{p,q}[0, \infty))$.

References

- [A] T. Ando, On products of Orlicz spaces, *Math. Ann.* 140 (1960) 174–186.
- [A82] S.V. Astashkin, On a bilinear multiplicative operator, *Issled. Teor. Funkts. Mnogikh Veshchestv. Perem. Yaroslavl* (1982) 3–15 (in Russian).
- [A97] S.V. Astashkin, Tensor product in symmetric function spaces, *Collect. Math.* 48 (1997) 375–391.
- [As97] S.V. Astashkin, Interpolation of positive polylinear operators in Calderón–Lozanovskiĭ spaces, *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.* 38 (1997) 1211–1218 (English translation in *Siberian Math. J.* 38 (1997) 1047–1053).
- [BS] C. Bennett, R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of Operators*, Academic Press, Boston, 1988.

- [C] A.P. Calderón, Intermediate spaces and interpolation, *Studia Math.* 24 (1964) 113–190.
- [E] R.J. Elliott, *Stochastic Calculus and Applications*, Springer, New York, 1982.
- [HM] S. Hartman, J. Mikusiński, *The Theory of Lebesgue Measure and Integration*, Pergamon Press, New York, Oxford, London, Paris, 1961.
- [HS99] F.L. Hernandez, E.M. Semenov, Subspaces generated by translations in rearrangement invariant spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* 169 (1999) 52–80.
- [KR] M.A. Krasnoselskii, Ya.B. Rutickii, *Convex Functions and Orlicz Spaces*, Noordhoff Ltd., Groningen, 1961.
- [KPS] S.G. Krein, Yu.I. Petunin, E.M. Semenov, *Interpolation of Linear Operators*, Nauka, Moscow, 1978 (in Russian) (English translation in *Amer. Math. Soc.*, Providence, 1982).
- [K] J.L. Krivine, Sous-espaces de dimension finie des espaces de Banach réticulés, *Ann. of Math.* 104 (1976) 1–29.
- [LT] J. Lindenstrauss, L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach Spaces, II. Function Spaces*, Springer, Berlin, New York, 1979.
- [M89] L. Maligranda, *Orlicz Spaces and Interpolation*, *Seminars in Mathematics*, Vol. 5, University of Campinas, Campinas SP, Brazil, 1989.
- [M] L. Maligranda, Positive bilinear operators in Calderón–Lozanovskii spaces, Luleå University of Technology, Department of Mathematics, Research Report, No. 11, 2001, pp. 1–17.
- [Mi76] M. Milman, Tensor products of function spaces, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 82 (1976) 626–628.
- [Mi78] M. Milman, Embeddings of Lorentz–Marcinkiewicz spaces with mixed norms, *Anal. Math.* 4 (1978) 215–223.
- [Mi81] M. Milman, A note on $L(p, q)$ spaces and Orlicz spaces with mixed norms, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 83 (1981) 743–746.
- [N] I.P. Natanson, *Theory of Functions of a Real Variable*, Vol. II, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 1961.
- [O] R. O’Neil, Integral transforms and tensor products on Orlicz spaces and $L(p, q)$ spaces, *J. Analyse Math.* 21 (1968) 1–276.
- [S] T. Shimogaki, A note on norms of compression operators on function spaces, *Proc. Japan Acad.* 46 (1970) 239–242.