

# LOWER AND UPPER LOCAL UNIFORM $K$ -MONOTONICITY IN SYMMETRIC SPACES

MACIEJ CIESIELSKI

ABSTRACT. Using the local approach to the global structure of a symmetric space  $E$  we establish a relationship between strict  $K$ -monotonicity, lower (resp. upper) local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity, order continuity and the Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure. We also answer the question under which condition upper local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity concludes upper local uniform monotonicity. Finally, we present a correlation between  $K$ -order continuity and lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity in a symmetric space  $E$  under some additional assumptions on  $E$ .

2010 Mathematics Subjects Classification: 46E30, 46B20, 46B42.

Key Words and Phrases: Symmetric space, Lorentz space,  $K$ -order continuity, lower (upper) local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity, the Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The first essential result devoted to upper local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity ( $ULUKM$ ) was published in [5] by Chilin, Dodds, Sedaev, and Sukochev in 1996. Authors presented a complete characterization of  $ULUKM$  written in terms of strict  $K$ -monotonicity and the Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure in symmetric spaces, among others. Recently, many interesting results have appeared in [4, 8, 11, 12, 14], where there have been explored the global and local  $K$ -monotonicity structure of Banach spaces.

The crucial inspiration for our discussion was found in paper [7], where there has been studied an application of strict  $K$ -monotonicity and  $K$ -order continuity to the best dominated approximation with respect to the Hardy-Littlewood-Pólya relation  $\prec$ . It is worth mentioning that in view of the previous result, in [9] there has been investigated, among others, a full criteria for  $K$ -order continuity in symmetric spaces.

The main goal of this manuscript is an investigation dedicated to a complete characterization of strict  $K$ -monotonicity and  $K$ -order continuity as well as upper and lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity in symmetric spaces. We organize the paper in the following way. Preliminaries contain all necessary definitions and notions.

In the section 3 we focus on a characterization of lower and upper local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity in symmetric space  $E$ . First, we investigate a relation between a point of lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity and a point of lower local

uniform monotonicity. We also characterize a full correlation between a point of lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity and a conjunction of a point of order continuity and a point of lower  $K$ -monotonicity and also an  $H_g$  point in a symmetric space  $E$ . Next, we show a correspondence between a point of upper local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity and a point of upper local uniform monotonicity and also an  $H_g$  point in  $E$  under some additional assumption. In our investigation we don't restrict ourself only to the local approach to  $K$ -monotonicity structure, but we also discuss as a consequence a complete characterization of global  $K$ -monotonicity properties in a symmetric space  $E$ . We answer the crucial question under which condition lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity and upper local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity coincide in symmetric spaces. In the spirit of the previous result, we also describe an essential connection between a point of  $K$ -order continuity and a point of lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity and also an  $H_g$  point in a symmetric space  $E$ . It is worth mentioning that several results and examples concerning respective global properties are also presented in this section.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Let  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^+$  and  $\mathbb{N}$  be the sets of reals, nonnegative reals and positive integers, respectively. In a Banach space  $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$  we use a notation  $S(X)$  (resp.  $B(X)$ ) for the unit sphere (resp. the closed unit ball). A nonnegative mapping  $\phi$  given on  $\mathbb{R}^+$  is called *quasiconcave* if  $\phi(t)$  is increasing and  $\phi(t)/t$  is decreasing on  $\mathbb{R}^+$  and also  $\phi(t) = 0 \Leftrightarrow t = 0$ . Denote as usual by  $\mu$  the Lebesgue measure on  $I = [0, \alpha)$ , where  $\alpha = 1$  or  $\alpha = \infty$ , and by  $L^0$  the set of all (equivalence classes of) extended real valued Lebesgue measurable functions on  $I$ . We also use the notation  $A^c = I \setminus A$  for any measurable set  $A$ . Let us recall that a Banach lattice  $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$  is said to be a *Banach function space* (or a *Köthe space*) if it is a sublattice of  $L^0$  satisfying the following conditions

- (1) If  $x \in L^0$ ,  $y \in E$  and  $|x| \leq |y|$  a.e., then  $x \in E$  and  $\|x\|_E \leq \|y\|_E$ .
- (2) There exists a strictly positive  $x \in E$ .

In addition, we employ in our investigation the symbol  $E^+ = \{x \in E : x \geq 0\}$ .

Given  $x \in E$  is said to be a *point of order continuity* if for any sequence  $(x_n) \subset E^+$  with  $x_n \leq |x|$  and  $x_n \rightarrow 0$  a.e. we have  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow 0$ . A Banach function space  $E$  is called *order continuous* (shortly  $E \in (OC)$ ) if any element  $x \in E$  is a point of order continuity (see [18]). It is said that a Banach function space  $E$  has the *Fatou property* whenever for every  $(x_n) \subset E^+$ ,  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_n\|_E < \infty$  and  $x_n \uparrow x \in L^0$  we have  $x \in E$  and  $\|x_n\|_E \uparrow \|x\|_E$ . In addition, we assume that  $E$  has the Fatou property, unless it is mentioned otherwise.

An element  $x \in E^+$  is called a *point of upper local uniform monotonicity* (resp. a *point of lower local uniform monotonicity*) shortly a *ULUM point* (resp. an *LLUM point*) if for any  $(x_n) \subset E$  such that  $x \leq x_n$  and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$  (resp.  $x_n \leq x$  and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ ), we get  $\|x_n - x\|_E \rightarrow 0$ . Let us recall that if each point of  $E^+ \setminus \{0\}$  is a *ULUM point* (resp. an *LLUM point*), then we say that  $E$  is *upper local uniformly monotone* (shortly  $E \in (ULUM)$ ) (resp. *lower local uniformly monotone* shortly  $E \in (LLUM)$ ).

Given  $x \in E$  is said to be an  $H_g$  *point* (resp. an  $H_l$  *point*) in  $E$  if for any sequence  $(x_n) \subset E$  with  $x_n \rightarrow x$  globally in measure (resp. locally in measure) and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ , then  $\|x_n - x\|_E \rightarrow 0$ . Let us recall that the space  $E$  has the *Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure* (resp. *Kadec-Klee property*

for local convergence in measure) if any element  $x \in E$  is an  $H_g$  point (resp. an  $H_l$  point) in  $E$  (see [5, 11]).

For any function  $x \in L^0$  we define its *distribution function* by

$$d_x(\lambda) = \mu \{s \in [0, \alpha) : |x(s)| > \lambda\}, \quad \lambda \geq 0.$$

The *decreasing rearrangement* for any element  $x \in L^0$  is given by

$$x^*(t) = \inf \{\lambda > 0 : d_x(\lambda) \leq t\}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

In the whole paper, it is used the notation  $x^*(\infty) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x^*(t)$  if  $\alpha = \infty$  and  $x^*(\infty) = 0$  if  $\alpha = 1$ . For any function  $x \in L^0$  we denote the *maximal function* of  $x^*$  by

$$x^{**}(t) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t x^*(s) ds.$$

Let us mention that for any function  $x \in L^0$  it is well known that  $x^* \leq x^{**}$ ,  $x^{**}$  is decreasing, continuous and subadditive. For more details of  $d_x$ ,  $x^*$  and  $x^{**}$  see [1, 17].

We say that two functions  $x, y \in L^0$  are said to be *equimeasurable* (shortly  $x \sim y$ ) if  $d_x = d_y$ . A Banach function space  $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$  is called *symmetric* or *rearrangement invariant* (r.i. for short) if for any  $x \in L^0$  and  $y \in E$  with  $x \sim y$ , we have  $x \in E$  and  $\|x\|_E = \|y\|_E$ . In a symmetric space  $E$  we denote by  $\phi_E$  the *fundamental function* given by  $\phi_E(t) = \|\chi_{(0,t)}\|_E$  for any  $t \in [0, \alpha)$  (see [1]). For any two functions  $x, y \in L^1 + L^\infty$  it is defined the *Hardy-Littlewood-Pólya relation*  $\prec$  by

$$x \prec y \Leftrightarrow x^{**}(t) \leq y^{**}(t) \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

A symmetric space  $E$  is called  *$K$ -monotone* (shortly  $E \in (KM)$ ) if for any  $x \in L^1 + L^\infty$  and  $y \in E$  with  $x \prec y$ , we have  $x \in E$  and  $\|x\|_E \leq \|y\|_E$ . It is well known that a symmetric space is  $K$ -monotone if and only if  $E$  is exact interpolation space between  $L^1$  and  $L^\infty$ . It is worth mentioning that a symmetric space  $E$  equipped with an order continuous norm or with the Fatou property is  $K$ -monotone (see [17]).

An element  $x \in E$  is said to be a *point of lower  $K$ -monotonicity* shortly an *LKM point* of  $E$  if for any  $y \in E$ ,  $x^* \neq y^*$  and  $y \prec x$ , then  $\|y\|_E < \|x\|_E$ . Let us mention that a symmetric space  $E$  is called *strictly  $K$ -monotone* (shortly  $E \in (SKM)$ ) if any element of  $E$  is an *LKM point*.

An element  $x \in E$  we call a *point of  $K$ -order continuity* of  $E$  if for any sequence  $(x_n) \subset E$  with  $x_n \prec x$  and  $x_n^* \rightarrow 0$  a.e. we have  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow 0$ . Recall that a symmetric space  $E$  is said to be  *$K$ -order continuous* (shortly  $E \in (KOC)$ ) if every element  $x$  of  $E$  is a point of  $K$ -order continuity.

An element  $x \in E$  is said to be a *point of upper local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity* of  $E$  (shortly a *ULUKM point*) if for any  $(x_n) \subset E$  such that  $x \prec x_n$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ , then  $\|x^* - x_n^*\|_E \rightarrow 0$ . Given a point  $x \in E$  is said to be a *point of lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity* of  $E$  (shortly an *LLUKM point*) if whenever for any  $(x_n) \subset E$  with  $x_n \prec x$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ , we have  $\|x^* - x_n^*\|_E \rightarrow 0$ . A symmetric space  $E$  is said to be *upper local uniformly  $K$ -monotone* shortly  $E \in (ULUKM)$  (resp. *lower local uniformly  $K$ -monotone* shortly  $E \in (LLUKM)$ ) if whenever every element of  $E$  is a *ULUKM point* (resp. an *LLUKM point*). For more details we encourage to see [5, 8, 7, 9, 14].

Recall that the Marcinkiewicz function space  $M_\phi^{(*)}$  (resp.  $M_\phi$ ), where  $\phi$  is a quasiconcave function on  $I$ , is a subspace of  $L^0$  such that for all  $x \in M_\phi^{(*)}$  (resp.  $x \in M_\phi$ ),

$$\|x\|_{M_\phi^{(*)}} = \sup_{t>0} \{x^*(t)\phi(t)\} < \infty$$

$$\left( \text{resp. } \|x\|_{M_\phi} = \sup_{t>0} \{x^{**}(t)\phi(t)\} < \infty \right).$$

Obviously,  $\|x\|_{M_\phi^{(*)}} \leq \|x\|_{M_\phi}$  for all  $x \in M_\phi$ , i.e. the embedding of  $M_\phi$  in  $M_\phi^{(*)}$  has norm 1 (shortly  $M_\phi \hookrightarrow M_\phi^{(*)}$ ). Moreover, it is necessary to mention that the Marcinkiewicz space  $M_\phi^{(*)}$  (resp.  $M_\phi$ ) is a r.i. quasi-Banach function space (r.i. Banach function space) with the fundamental function  $\phi$  on  $I$ . Let us also recall that for any symmetric space  $E$  with the fundamental function  $\phi$  we have  $E \hookrightarrow M_\phi$  the embedding with norm 1 (see [1, 17]).

For given  $0 < p < \infty$  and a locally integrable weight function  $w \geq 0$  we define the Lorentz space  $\Lambda_{p,w}$  as a subspace of  $L^0$  such that

$$\|x\|_{\Lambda_{p,w}} = \left( \int_0^\alpha (x^*(t))^p w(t) dt \right)^{1/p} < \infty,$$

where  $W(t) = \int_0^t w < \infty$  for any  $t \in I$  and  $W(\infty) = \infty$  in the case when  $\alpha = \infty$ . It is worth mentioning that the spaces  $\Lambda_{p,w}$  were introduced by Lorentz in [19] and the space  $\Lambda_{p,w}$  is a norm space (resp. quasi-norm space) if and only if  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $w$  is decreasing, see [16] (resp.  $W$  satisfies the condition  $\Delta_2$ , see [21, 16]). It is also known that for any  $0 < p < \infty$  if  $W$  satisfies the condition  $\Delta_2$  and  $W(\infty) = \infty$ , then the Lorentz space  $\Lambda_{p,w}$  is an order continuous r.i. quasi-Banach function space (see [16]).

For  $0 < p < \infty$  and  $w \in L^0$  a nonnegative locally integrable weight function we consider the Lorentz space  $\Gamma_{p,w}$ , that is a subspace of  $L^0$  such that

$$\|x\|_{\Gamma_{p,w}} = \|x^{**}\|_{\Lambda_{p,w}} = \left( \int_0^\alpha x^{**p}(t)w(t)dt \right)^{1/p} < \infty.$$

Unless we say otherwise, we suppose that  $w$  belongs to the class  $D_p$ , i.e.

$$W(s) := \int_0^s w(t)dt < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad W_p(s) := s^p \int_s^\alpha t^{-p}w(t)dt < \infty$$

for all  $0 < s \leq 1$  if  $\alpha = 1$  and for all  $0 < s < \infty$  otherwise. It is easy to observe that if  $w \in D_p$ , then the Lorentz space  $\Gamma_{p,w}$  is nontrivial. Moreover, it is clear that  $\Gamma_{p,w} \subset \Lambda_{p,w}$ . On the other hand, the following inclusion  $\Lambda_{p,w} \subset \Gamma_{p,w}$  holds if and only if  $w \in B_p$  (see [15]). Let us also recall that  $(\Gamma_{p,w}, \|\cdot\|_{\Gamma_{p,w}})$  is a r.i. quasi-Banach function space with the Fatou property and was introduced by Calderón in [3]. It is well known that in the case when  $\alpha = \infty$  the Lorentz space  $\Gamma_{p,w}$  has order continuous norm if and only if  $\int_0^\infty w(t)dt = \infty$  (see [15]). It is also well known that by the Lions-Peetre  $K$ -method (see [2, 17]), the space  $\Gamma_{p,w}$  is an interpolation space between  $L^1$  and  $L^\infty$ . For more details about the properties of the spaces  $\Lambda_{p,w}$  and  $\Gamma_{p,w}$  the reader is referred to [8, 10, 11, 15, 16].

3. LOWER AND UPPER LOCAL UNIFORM  $K$ -MONOTONICITY IN SYMMETRIC SPACES

In this section we investigate a connection between lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity and lower local uniform monotonicity in symmetric spaces. We also present a complete characterization of an  $LLUKM$  point in terms of a point of order continuity and an  $LKM$  point.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $E$  be a symmetric space. If  $x \in E$  is  $LLUKM$  point, then  $x^*(\infty) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose for a contrary that  $x^*(\infty) > 0$ . Define  $x_n = x^* \chi_{[0,n]}$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $0 \leq x_n \leq x^*$  and also  $x_n \prec x$ . It is clear that  $x_n \uparrow x^*$  a.e. and  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_n\|_E \leq \|x\|_E < \infty$ . Hence, by the Fatou property we conclude that  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ . Consequently, by assumption that  $x$  is  $LLUKM$  point it follows that

$$\|x_n^* - x^*\|_E \rightarrow 0.$$

Since  $x^*(\infty) > 0$  we obtain  $\chi_I \in E$ , whence for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\|x_n^* - x^*\|_E = \|x^* \chi_{(n,\infty)}\|_E \geq \|x^*(\infty) \chi_{(n,\infty)}\|_E = x^*(\infty) \|\chi_I\|_E > 0.$$

So, we get a contradiction which finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $E$  be a symmetric space and  $\phi$  be the fundamental function of  $E$ . If  $x \in E$  is an  $LLUKM$  point and  $x^*(t)\phi(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0^+$ , then  $x$  is a point of order continuity.*

*Proof.* Let us assume for a contrary that  $x$  is not a point of order continuity in  $E$ . Then, by Lemma 2.6 [10] and Proposition 3.2 [1] there exist  $(A_n) \subset I$  a decreasing sequence of measurable sets and  $\delta > 0$  such that  $A_n \rightarrow \emptyset$  and

$$(1) \quad \delta \leq \|x^* \chi_{A_n}\|_E$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\epsilon \in (0, \delta)$ . We claim that there exists  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $k \geq K$ ,

$$\|x^* \chi_{[k,\infty)}\|_E < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Indeed, taking  $x_n = x^* \chi_{[0,n]}$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $x_n = x_n^* \uparrow x^*$  and also  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_n\|_E \leq \|x^*\|_E < \infty$ . Hence, by the Fatou property and by symmetry of  $E$ , it follows that  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ . Consequently, according to assumption that  $x$  is an  $LLUKM$  point, in view of  $x_n \prec x$  we obtain our claim. Moreover, it is easy to notice that  $x^* \chi_{A_n \cap [0,k)} \prec x^* \chi_{[0, \min\{\mu(A_n), k\})}$  for any  $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , whence by symmetry and by the triangle inequality of the norm in  $E$  we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^* \chi_{A_n}\|_E &\leq \|x^* \chi_{A_n \cap [0,k)}\|_E + \|x^* \chi_{A_n \cap [k,\infty)}\|_E \\ &\leq \|x^* \chi_{[0, \min\{\mu(A_n), k\})}\|_E + \|x^* \chi_{A_n \cap [k,\infty)}\|_E \end{aligned}$$

for any  $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, since  $\mu(A_n) < K$  for sufficiently large  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , passing to subsequence and relabelling if necessary, by the claim and by condition (1) we get

$$\delta \leq \|x^* \chi_{A_n}\|_E \leq \|x^* \chi_{[0, \mu(A_n))}\|_E + \|x^* \chi_{A_n \cap [K, \infty)}\|_E \leq \|x^* \chi_{[0, \mu(A_n))}\|_E + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$(2) \quad \frac{\delta}{2} \leq \|x^* \chi_{[0, \mu(A_n))}\|_E.$$

Define  $t_n = \mu(A_n)$  and  $z_n = x^*(t_n)\chi_{[0,t_n]} + x^*\chi_{[t_n,\infty)}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Clearly,  $z_n = z_n^* \leq x^*$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $z_n^* \uparrow x^*$  a.e. on  $I$ . In consequence, since  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|z_n^*\|_E \leq \|x^*\|_E$ , by the Fatou property and by symmetry of  $E$  this yields  $\|z_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ . Hence, since  $z_n \prec x$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and by assumption that  $x$  is an *LLUKM* point there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any  $n \geq N$ ,

$$\|(x^* - x^*(t_n))\chi_{[0,t_n]}\|_E < \frac{\epsilon}{4}.$$

So, by condition (2) and by the triangle inequality of the norm in  $E$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta}{2} &\leq \|x^*\chi_{[0,t_n]}\|_E \leq \|(x^* - x^*(t_n))\chi_{[0,t_n]}\|_E + \|x^*(t_n)\chi_{[0,t_n]}\|_E \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{4} + x^*(t_n)\phi(t_n) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $n \geq N$ . Consequently, for any  $n \geq N$  we have

$$(3) \quad x^*(t_n)\phi(t_n) \geq \delta/4,$$

whence by assumption  $x^*(t)\phi(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0^+$  we get a contradiction, which ends the proof.  $\square$

Now, we answer the crucial question whether the condition  $\phi(t)x^*(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0^+$  in Lemma 3.2 is necessary and whether it can be avoided. Namely, in the following example we provide a function, in the Lorentz space  $\Lambda_{1,\psi'} \cap L^\infty$ , that is an *LLUKM* point and it is not a point of order continuity.

**Example 3.3.** *Let  $\psi$  be a strictly concave function such that  $\psi(0^+) = 0$  and  $\psi(\infty) = \infty$ . Consider  $E = \Lambda_{1,\psi'} \cap L^\infty$  on  $I = [0, 1]$ , equipped with an equivalent norm given by*

$$\|x\|_E = \|x\|_{\Lambda_{1,\psi'}} + \|x\|_{L^\infty}$$

for any  $x \in E$ . Assuming that  $\phi$  is the fundamental function of  $E$  we easily observe  $\phi(t) = \psi(t) + 1$  for any  $t > 0$ . Define  $x(t) = (1-t)\chi_{[0,1]}(t)$  for any  $t \in I$ . First, we prove that the function  $x$  is not a point of order continuity in  $E$ . Indeed, taking  $x_n = x\chi_{(0,1/n)}$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  it is easy to see that  $x_n \rightarrow 0$  a.e. and  $x_n \leq x$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Next, since  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \phi(t)x^*(t) = 1$ , by Proposition 5.9 in [1] we have

$$\|x_n\|_E \geq \|x_n\|_{M_\phi} \geq \sup_{t \in (0,1/n]} \{(1-t)(1+\psi(t))\} \geq 1$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We claim that  $x$  is an *LLUKM* point in  $E$ . Since  $\psi(\infty) = \infty$  and  $\psi(0^+) = 0$ , by Proposition 1.4 in [15] it follows that the Lorentz space  $\Lambda_{1,\psi'}$  is order continuous. Hence, since  $\psi$  is strictly concave, by Theorem 2.11 in [5] we obtain that  $\Lambda_{1,\psi'}$  is strictly  $K$ -monotone and also *ULUKM*. Consequently, by Theorem 3.13 we conclude  $\Lambda_{1,\psi'}$  is *LLUKM*. Hence, the Lorentz space  $E$  endowed with the given norm is strictly  $K$ -monotone, whence  $x$  is an *LKM* point in  $E$ . Assume that  $(y_n) \subset E$ ,  $y_n \prec x$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\|y_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ . Then, since  $x$  is an *LKM* point and  $x^*(\infty) = 0$ , by Theorem 3.2 in [9] it follows that  $y_n^* \rightarrow x^*$  globally in measure. Therefore, by property 2.11 in [17] we get  $y_n^*(t) \rightarrow x^*(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . In consequence, by monotonicity of the decreasing rearrangement  $y_n^*$  and by continuity of  $x^*$  on  $I$ , in view of Dini's theorem for monotone functions (see [20]) it follows that  $y_n^*$  converges to  $x^*$  uniformly on  $I$ , i.e.

$$(4) \quad \|x^* - y_n^*\|_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0.$$

So, it is clear that

$$\|y_n\|_{L^\infty} = y_n^*(0) \rightarrow x^*(0) = \|x\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Furthermore, by assumption  $\|y_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$  and by definition of the norm in  $E$  we get  $\|y_n\|_{\Lambda_{1,\psi'}} \rightarrow \|x\|_{\Lambda_{1,\psi'}}$ . Thus, since  $y_n \prec x$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and by the fact that  $\Lambda_{1,\psi'}$  is *LLUKM* we have

$$\|x^* - y_n^*\|_{\Lambda_{1,\psi'}} \rightarrow 0.$$

and consequently, in view of condition (4) and by definition of the norm in  $E$  we are done.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $E$  be a symmetric space. If  $E$  is *LLUKM*, then  $E$  is order continuous.*

*Proof.* For a contrary, suppose that there exists  $x \in E$  that is not a point of order continuity. Let  $\phi$  be the fundamental function of  $E$ . By symmetry of  $E$  and by Proposition 5.9 in [1] we have for any  $t > 0$  and  $z \in E$ ,

$$(5) \quad z^*(t)\phi(t) \leq \|z\|_{M_\phi} \leq \|z\|_E.$$

Next, proceeding similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, in view of conditions (3) and (5) it is easy to see that

$$\frac{\delta}{4} \leq \|x\|_{L^\infty} \phi(0^+) \leq \|x\|_E.$$

Then, since  $\phi(0^+) > 0$ , applying condition (5) for any  $z \in E$  we observe

$$(6) \quad \|z\|_{L^\infty} \phi(0^+) \leq \|z\|_E.$$

Define  $y = \chi_{[0,1]}$  and  $y_n = \chi_{[0,1-1/n]}$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Obviously, by the Fatou property we get  $\|y_n\|_E \rightarrow \|y\|_E$ . Thus, since  $y_n \prec y$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , in view of assumption that  $E$  is *LLUKM* we get

$$\|\chi_{[0,1/n]}\|_E = \|y^* - y_n^*\|_E \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence, by condition (6) we obtain a contradiction and complete the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $E$  be a symmetric space and  $\phi$  be the fundamental function of  $E$ . If  $x \in E$  is an *LLUKM* point and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} x^*(t)\phi(t) = 0$ , then  $|x|$  is an *LLUM* point.*

*Proof.* Let  $(x_n) \subset E^+$  and  $0 \leq x_n \leq |x|$ ,  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ . Then, by property of the maximal function we obtain  $x_n \prec x$ . Hence, by assumption that  $x$  is an *LLUKM* point we have

$$(7) \quad \|x_n^* - x^*\|_E \rightarrow 0.$$

By Lemma 3.1 we get  $x^*(\infty) = 0$ , whence by Lemma 2.7 in [10] and by assumption that  $0 \leq x_n \leq |x|$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  it follows that  $x_n$  converges to  $|x|$  in measure. Moreover, since  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} x^*(t)\phi(t) = 0$ , by Lemma 3.2 this yields that  $x$  is a point of order continuity. Consequently, by condition (7) and by Proposition 2.4 in [13] we conclude

$$\|x_n - |x|\|_E \rightarrow 0.$$

$\square$

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $E$  be a symmetric space on  $I = [0, 1)$ , with  $\phi$  the fundamental function of  $E$ . A point  $x \in E$  is an *LLUKM* point and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} x^*(t)\phi(t) = 0$  if and only if  $x$  is an *LKM* point and a point of order continuity.*

*Proof. Necessity.* Immediately, by Remark 3.1 in [8] and by Lemma 3.2 we complete the proof.

*Sufficiency.* Let  $(x_n) \subset E$ ,  $x_n \prec x$  and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ . Since  $x$  is a point of order continuity, it is easy to see that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} x^*(t)\phi(t) = 0$  and by Lemma 2.5 [10] it follows  $x^*(\infty) = 0$ . Moreover, since  $x$  is an *LKM* point, by Theorem 3.2 in [9] we obtain  $x_n^*$  converges to  $x^*$  in measure. Hence, by property 2.11 in [17], we get

$$(8) \quad (x_n^* - x^*)^+ \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (x^* - x_n^*)^+ \rightarrow 0$$

a.e. and in measure on  $I$ . Notice that, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$(9) \quad (x_n^* - x^*)^+ \leq x_n^* \quad \text{and} \quad (x^* - x_n^*)^+ \leq \sup_{k \geq n} (x^* - x_k^*)^+ \leq x^*$$

a.e. on  $I$ . In consequence, since  $\sup_{k \geq n} (x^* - x_k^*)^+ \downarrow 0$  a.e. and  $x$  is a point of order continuity, by Lemma 2.6 in [10] we obtain

$$\|(x^* - x_n^*)^+\|_E \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus, by the triangle inequality of the norm in  $E$ , to complete the proof it is enough to show the following condition

$$(10) \quad \|(x_n^* - x^*)^+\|_E \rightarrow 0.$$

First, by Lemma 3.1 [7] it is clear that  $x^{**}(\infty) = 0$ . Therefore, since  $x_n^* \prec x^*$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , by condition (9) it is easy to observe that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(11) \quad ((x_n^* - x^*)^+)^* \leq x_n^{**} \leq x^{**} \quad \text{and} \quad (x_n^* - x^*)^+ \prec x^*,$$

whence, by condition (8) and by property 2.12 in [17] we conclude

$$(12) \quad ((x_n^* - x^*)^+)^* \rightarrow 0$$

pointwise and also in measure. Furthermore, by condition (11) and by Hardy's lemma [1] for any  $y \in E$  and  $t > 0$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$(13) \quad \int_0^t ((x_n^* - x^*)^+)^* y^* \leq \int_0^t x^{**} y^*.$$

Define for any  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$M_n^k = \left\{ t \in I : ((x_n^* - x^*)^+)^*(t) > \frac{1}{k} \right\}.$$

Clearly, by condition (12) for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $\mu(M_n^k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Now, letting  $y = \chi_{M_n^k} \in E$ , by condition (13) and by symmetry of  $E$ , in view of Corollary 4.7 in [1] we get

$$\|((x_n^* - x^*)^+)^* \chi_{[0, \mu(M_n^k)]}\|_E \leq \|x^{**} \chi_{[0, \mu(M_n^k)]}\|_E$$

for every  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus, since  $x^{**} \chi_{[0, \mu(M_n^k)]} \leq x^{**}$  a.e. on  $I$  for all  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x^*$  is a point of order continuity, it follows that for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any  $n \geq N$ ,

$$\|((x_n^* - x^*)^+)^* \chi_{[0, \mu(M_n^k)]}\|_E \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Moreover, by construction of the set  $M_n^k$ , picking  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\|\chi_I\|_E / k < \epsilon/2$  it is easy to see that

$$\|((x_n^* - x^*)^+)^* \chi_{(\mu(M_n^k), 1)}\|_E \leq \left\| \frac{1}{k} \chi_{(\mu(M_n^k), 1)} \right\|_E \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$



for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Finally, by the triangle inequality of the norm in  $E$  we prove condition (10) and finish the proof.  $\square$

Now, we investigate a similar result as above for a symmetric space  $E$  on  $[0, \infty)$  under some additional assumptions of  $E$ .

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let  $E$  be a symmetric space on  $I = [0, \infty)$  and let  $\phi$  be the fundamental function of  $E$  such that  $\phi(t)/t \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and let  $x \in E \cap L^1$ . A point  $x$  is an *LLUKM* point and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} x^*(t)\phi(t) = 0$  if and only if  $x$  is an *LKM* point and a point of order continuity.*

*Proof.* Notice that proceeding analogously as in the proof of Theorem 3.6 in sufficiency it is enough to show condition (10). First, let us mention that by Lemma 2.5 in [10] and by Lemma 3.1 in [7] and in view of the assumption  $x$  is a point of order continuity it follows that  $x^*(\infty) = x^{**}(\infty) = 0$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $t_\epsilon = d_{x^*}(\epsilon)$ . Then, it is clear that  $t_\epsilon < \infty$ , and so by monotonicity of the decreasing rearrangement  $x^*$  we obtain  $x^*(t) \leq \epsilon$  for all  $t \geq t_\epsilon$ . For simplicity of our notation let us assume that  $y_n = (x_n^* - x^*)^+$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . First we claim that

$$(14) \quad \left\| y_n^* \chi_{[0, t_\epsilon]} \right\|_E \rightarrow 0.$$

Define a set

$$A_n = \{t \in [0, t_\epsilon] : x^*(t) \leq y_n^*(t)\}$$

for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, by monotonicity of  $x^*$ , it is easy to see that  $x^*(t) \geq \epsilon$  for any  $t \leq t_\epsilon$ . Next, in view of condition (12) we observe

$$(15) \quad \mu(A_n) \leq \mu(t \in [0, t_\epsilon] : y_n^*(t) \geq \epsilon) \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover, by condition (13) we obtain

$$\int_0^t y_n^* \chi_{[0, \mu(A_n)]} \leq \int_0^t x^* \chi_{[0, \mu(A_n)]}$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t > 0$ . Hence, by Proposition 1.1 in [6] for any  $t > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} (y_n^* \chi_{A_n})^{**}(t) &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t (y_n^* \chi_{A_n})^* \leq \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t y_n^* \chi_{[0, \mu(A_n)]} \\ &\leq (x^* \chi_{[0, \mu(A_n)]})^{**}(t) \leq x^{**}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by symmetry of  $E$  we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| y_n^* \chi_{[0, t_\epsilon]} \right\|_E &\leq \left\| y_n^* \chi_{A_n} \right\|_E + \left\| y_n^* \chi_{[0, t_\epsilon] \setminus A_n} \right\|_E \\ &\leq \left\| x^* \chi_{[0, \mu(A_n)]} \right\|_E + \left\| y_n^* \chi_{[0, t_\epsilon] \setminus A_n} \right\|_E \end{aligned}$$

for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consequently, since  $y_n^* \chi_{[0, t_\epsilon] \setminus A_n} \leq x^*$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , by conditions (12) and (15) as well as by assumption that  $x$  is a point of order continuity and in view of Lemma 2.6 in [10] we prove our claim (14). Now, without loss of generality passing to subsequence and relabelling we may assume that  $y_n^*(t_\epsilon) > 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , because otherwise in view of the claim (14) we finish the proof. Furthermore, by condition (11) and by assumption that  $x \in E \cap L^1$  it is easy to notice that

$$\int_{t_\epsilon}^\infty y_n^* \leq \int_0^\infty y_n^* \leq \int_0^\infty x^* < \infty$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Denote for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\delta_n = t_\epsilon + \frac{1}{y_n^*(t_\epsilon)} \int_{t_\epsilon}^{\infty} y_n^* \quad \text{and} \quad z_n = y_n^* \chi_{[0, t_\epsilon]} + y_n^*(t_\epsilon) \chi_{[t_\epsilon, \delta_n]}.$$

Now, we prove that

$$(16) \quad \left\| y_n^*(t_\epsilon) \chi_{[t_\epsilon, \delta_n]} \right\|_E \rightarrow 0.$$

Assume for a contrary that  $a = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\| y_n^*(t_\epsilon) \chi_{[t_\epsilon, \delta_n]} \right\|_E > 0$ . Then, passing to subsequence and relabelling if necessary we obtain

$$\left\| y_n^*(t_\epsilon) \chi_{[t_\epsilon, \delta_n]} \right\|_E \downarrow a.$$

Hence, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} a &\leq \left\| y_n^*(t_\epsilon) \chi_{[t_\epsilon, \delta_n]} \right\|_E = y_n^*(t_\epsilon) \phi(\delta_n - t_\epsilon) \\ &= y_n^*(t_\epsilon) \phi \left( \frac{1}{y_n^*(t_\epsilon)} \int_{t_\epsilon}^{\infty} y_n^* \right) \\ &\leq y_n^*(t_\epsilon) \phi \left( \frac{1}{y_n^*(t_\epsilon)} \int_0^{\infty} x^* \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, letting  $s_n = \int_0^{\infty} x^* / y_n^*(t_\epsilon)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$a \leq \frac{\phi(s_n)}{s_n} \int_0^{\infty} x^*$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . According to condition (12) we observe  $y_n^*(t_\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$  and so  $s_n \rightarrow \infty$ . In consequence, by assumption that  $\phi(t)/t \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  we get a contradiction which provides condition (16). Now, we show that  $y_n \prec z_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Obviously,  $y_n^{**} = z_n^{**}$  on  $[0, t_\epsilon]$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \in (t_\epsilon, \delta_n)$  we have

$$\int_0^t z_n^* = \int_0^{t_\epsilon} y_n^* + y_n^*(t_\epsilon)(t - t_\epsilon) \geq \int_0^{t_\epsilon} y_n^* + \int_{t_\epsilon}^t y_n^* = \int_0^t y_n^*$$

and also for any  $t \geq \delta_n$ ,

$$\int_0^t z_n^* = \int_0^{t_\epsilon} y_n^* + y_n^*(t_\epsilon)(\delta_n - t_\epsilon) = \int_0^{t_\epsilon} y_n^* + \int_{t_\epsilon}^{\infty} y_n^* \geq \int_0^t y_n^*.$$

Therefore, by symmetry of  $E$  we get  $\|z_n\|_E \geq \|y_n\|_E$ . Thus, by conditions (14) and (16) and by the triangle inequality of the norm in  $E$  we complete the proof.  $\square$

Immediately, in view of Remark 3.1 in [8], by Proposition 3.4 and Theorems 3.6 and 3.7 we obtain the following results.

**Corollary 3.8.** *Let  $E$  be a symmetric space on  $I = [0, \alpha)$  with  $\alpha < \infty$ . The space  $E$  is LLUKM if and only if  $E$  is strictly  $K$ -monotone and order continuous.*

**Corollary 3.9.** *Let  $E$  be a symmetric space on  $I = [0, \infty)$  with the fundamental function  $\phi$  such that  $\phi(t)/t \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and let  $F \subset E$  be a symmetric sublattice that is embedded in  $L^1[0, \infty)$ . Then, the space  $F$  is LLUKM if and only if  $F$  is strictly  $K$ -monotone and order continuous.*

Now, we investigate a relation between lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity and the Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure. First, we show an example of a function in a symmetric space  $E$  on  $I = [0, \infty)$  that is a point of lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity but it is no  $H_g$  point in  $E$ . We also discuss in this example a symmetric space  $E$  on  $I = [0, 1)$  that is lower local uniformly  $K$ -monotone but it does not have the Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure. We recall Example 2.8 [5] and modify to the case when  $I = [0, \alpha)$ , where  $\alpha \leq \infty$ . For the sake of the reader's convenience we present the details of the modified example.

**Example 3.10.** Let  $\delta > 0$  and let  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  be strictly concave functions such that

$$\phi_i(0) = \phi_i(0^+) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_i(\infty) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi_i(t) = \infty \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2,$$

and also

$$\phi_2(1) > \phi_1(1) + \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\phi_2(t)}{\phi_1(t)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi_i(t)}{t} = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Consider the space  $E = \Lambda_{1, \phi'_1} \cap \Lambda_{1, \phi'_2}$  with a norm given by

$$\|x\|_E = \max\{\|x\|_{\Lambda_{1, \phi'_1}}, \|x\|_{\Lambda_{1, \phi'_2}}\}$$

for all  $x \in E$ . Since  $\phi_i(\infty) = \infty$  for  $i = 1, 2$  it follows that the symmetric space  $E$  is order continuous (see [5, 15]). Hence, since  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  are strictly concave, by Theorem 2.11 in [5] we get  $E$  is strictly  $K$ -monotone. Consequently, in case when  $I = [0, 1)$ , by Corollary 3.8 we obtain  $E$  is  $LLUKM$ . Define

$$x = \chi_{[0, 1]} \quad \text{and} \quad x_n = x + \frac{\delta}{\phi_1(\frac{1}{n})} \chi_{[0, \frac{1}{n})}$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Obviously,  $x_n \rightarrow x$  in measure and

$$\|x_n\|_E = \frac{\delta \phi_2(\frac{1}{n})}{\phi_1(\frac{1}{n})} + \phi_2(1) \rightarrow \phi_2(1) = \|x\|_E.$$

On the other hand, we observe  $\|x_n - x\|_E \geq \delta$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , which concludes that  $x$  is no  $H_g$  point in  $E$  and consequently  $E$  does not have the Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure. However, since  $x \in L^1[0, \infty)$ , by Theorem 3.7 we get  $x$  is an  $LLUKM$  point in the space  $E$  on  $I = [0, \infty)$ .

**Theorem 3.11.** Let  $E$  be a symmetric space and  $x, x_n \in E$  with  $x^*(\infty) = 0$  and let:

- (i)  $x$  is an  $LKM$  point and an  $H_g$  point.
- (ii)  $x$  is an  $LKM$  point and

$$x_n^{**} \rightarrow x^{**} \quad \text{in measure,} \quad \|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|x_n^* - x^*\|_E \rightarrow 0.$$

- (iii)  $x$  is an  $LLUKM$  point.

Then, (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii). If  $x$  is an  $H_g$  point, then (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i).

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). Let  $x, x_n \in E$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x_n^{**} \rightarrow x^{**}$  in measure and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ . Now, proceeding analogously as in the proof of Theorem 3.8 [8], under the assumption that  $x$  is an  $H_g$  point and  $x^*(\infty) = 0$ , in view of Theorem 3.3 [11] we complete the proof.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii). Let  $x, x_n \in E$ ,  $x_n \prec x$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ . Hence, by Theorem 3.2 in [9] it follows that  $x_n^{**} \rightarrow x^{**}$  in measure. Therefore, by condition

(ii) we get  $\|x_n^* - x^*\|_E \rightarrow 0$ , which proves that  $x$  is an *LLUKM* point.  
 (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i). Let  $x$  be an  $H_g$  point in  $E$ . Immediately, by Remark 3.1 in [8] we get  $x$  is an *LKM* point and this ends the proof.  $\square$

In the next example we present a symmetric space with the Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure which does not have *LLUKM* property.

**Example 3.12.** Consider the Lorentz space  $\Gamma_{p,w}$  with  $0 < p < \infty$  and  $w$  a non-negative weight function. If  $W(\infty) < \infty$  or  $W(t) = \int_0^t w$  is not strictly increasing, then by Proposition 1.4 in [15] or by Theorem 2.10 in [12] respectively, we obtain the Lorentz space  $\Gamma_{p,w}$  is not order continuous or it is not strictly  $K$ -monotone respectively. Moreover, we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \|x^* \chi_{[0,t]}\|_{\Gamma_{p,w}} = 0$  (see [15]), whence and by the monotonicity of the decreasing rearrangement  $x^*$  we get  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} x^*(t)\phi(t) = 0$ , where  $\phi$  is the fundamental function of  $\Gamma_{p,w}$ . In consequence, by Remark 3.1 in [8] or by Lemma 3.2 respectively, it follows that  $\Gamma_{p,w}$  is not *LLUKM*. On the other hand, by Theorem 4.1 in [11] we know that the Lorentz space  $\Gamma_{p,w}$  has the Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure.

Now, we present the full characterization of lower and upper local uniform  $K$  monotonicity in a symmetric space  $E$  with order continuous norm. Next, we establish a correlation between upper local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity and upper local uniform monotonicity in  $E$ .

**Theorem 3.13.** Let  $E$  be a symmetric space with order continuous norm. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.

- (i)  $E$  is *SKM* and for any  $(x_n) \subset E$ ,  $x \in E$ ,  
 $x_n^{**} \rightarrow x^{**}$  in measure and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E \Rightarrow \|x_n^* - x^*\|_E \rightarrow 0$ .
- (ii)  $E$  is *LLUKM* and has the Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure.
- (iii)  $E$  is *SKM* and has the Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure.
- (iv)  $E$  is *SKM* and has the Kadec-Klee property for local convergence in measure.
- (v)  $E$  is *ULUKM*.

*Proof.* It is well known that the equivalences (iii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iv)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (v) follows directly from Theorem 2.7 in [5]. Immediately, by Theorem 3.8 in [8] and by Theorem 3.5 in [11] we get (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (v). Finally, the consequence of Lemma 2.5 in [10] and Theorem 3.11 is the following conclusion (ii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii).  $\square$

**Theorem 3.14.** Let  $E$  be a symmetric space. If  $x \in E$  is a point of order continuity and a *ULUKM* point, then  $|x|$  is a *ULUM* point and  $x$  is an  $H_g$  point.

*Proof.* Let  $(x_n) \subset E^+$ ,  $|x| \leq x_n$  and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ . Then, by Proposition 3.2 in [1] we get  $x \prec x_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and consequently by assumption that  $x$  is a *ULUKM* point we have  $\|x_n^* - x^*\|_E \rightarrow 0$ . Hence, by the implication (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) in the proof of Theorem 3.2 in [5] it follows that  $x_n$  converges to  $|x|$  in measure. Consequently, by assumption that  $x$  is a point of order continuity and by Proposition 2.4 in [13] we have  $\|x_n - |x|\|_E \rightarrow 0$ . Finally, in view of assumptions, by Theorem 3.8 in [8] and by Theorem 3.5 in [11] we conclude  $x$  is an  $H_g$  point in  $E$ .  $\square$

In the next example we show that if the assumption  $x$  is a point of order continuity of the above theorem is missing, then the implication is not true.

**Example 3.15.** Take  $E = L^\infty$  on  $I = [0, \infty)$  and  $x = \chi_I$ . Let  $(x_n) \subset E$  be such that  $x \prec x_n$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ . Since  $x^* = 1$  on  $I$ , we claim that  $x^* \leq x_n^*$  a.e for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Indeed, if it is not true, then there exist  $(n_k) \subset \mathbb{N}$  and  $(t_k) \subset I$  such that for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \geq t_k$  we have

$$x_{n_k}^*(t) \leq x_{n_k}^*(t_k) < 1.$$

Hence, setting  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  we observe for sufficiently large  $t > t_k$ ,

$$x_{n_k}^{**}(t) < x^{**}(t) = 1.$$

Therefore, by assumption  $x \prec x_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we get a contradiction which proves our claim. It is easy to notice that  $x$  is a ULUM point in  $E$  (see also [10]). Thus, according to the claim and by assumption  $\|x_n^*\|_E \rightarrow \|x^*\|_E$  we obtain

$$\|x_n^* - x^*\|_E \rightarrow 0.$$

In consequence, we get  $x$  is a ULUKM point. On the other hand, taking  $y_n = \chi_{(\frac{1}{n}, \infty)}$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , it is easy to see that  $y_n \rightarrow x$  in measure and  $\|y_n\|_E = \|x\|_E = 1$  and also  $\|x - y_n\|_E = 1$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . So, it follows that  $x$  is no  $H_g$  point in  $E$ .

Now we discuss a correlation between  $K$ -order continuity and lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity in symmetric spaces.

**Theorem 3.16.** Let  $E$  be a symmetric space. If  $x \in E$  is a point of  $K$ -order continuity and an LKM point and also  $x^*(\infty) = 0$ , then  $x$  is an LLUKM point.

*Proof.* Let  $(x_n) \subset E$  with  $x_n \prec x$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$ . Observe that for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(17) \quad (x^* - x_n^*)^+ \leq x^* \quad \text{and} \quad (x_n^* - x^*)^+ \prec x_n^* \prec x^*.$$

Moreover, since  $x$  is LKM point and  $x^*(\infty) = 0$ , by assumption that  $x_n \prec x$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\|x_n\|_E \rightarrow \|x\|_E$  and by Theorem 3.2 in [9] it follows that  $x_n^*$  converges to  $x^*$  in measure. Hence, by property 2.11 in [17] we get

$$((x_n^* - x^*)^+)^* \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad ((x^* - x_n^*)^+)^* \rightarrow 0$$

a.e. on  $I$ . In consequence, by condition (17) and by assumption that  $x$  is a point of  $K$ -order continuity we have

$$\|((x^* - x_n^*)^+)^*\|_E \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|((x_n^* - x^*)^+)^*\|_E \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus, by symmetry of  $E$  and by the triangle inequality of the norm in  $E$  we conclude  $x_n^*$  converges to  $x^*$  in norm of  $E$ .  $\square$

We present an example of a symmetric space having upper and lower local uniform  $K$ -monotonicity but not satisfying  $K$ -order continuity.

**Remark 3.17.** Let  $\psi(t) = t^{1/4}$  for any  $t \in I$ . Consider the space  $E = \Lambda_{1, \psi'} \cap L^1$  on  $I$  endowed with the equivalent norm given by  $\|x\|_E = \|x\|_{\Lambda_{1, \psi'}} + \|x\|_{L^1}$ . We claim that  $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$  is LLUKM and ULUKM, but it is not KOC. First denote  $\phi(t) = \psi(t) + t$  for any  $t \in I$ . Observe that  $E = \Lambda_{1, \phi'}$  and  $\phi(t)/t \rightarrow 1$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Define

$$x(t) = \chi_{[0,1)}(t) + \frac{1}{t^2} \chi_{[1, \infty)}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad x_n(t) = \frac{1}{n} \chi_{[0, n)}(t)$$

for any  $t > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . It is easy to see that  $x = x^*$ ,  $x_n = x_n^* \rightarrow 0$  a.e. Clearly,

$$x^{**}(t) = \chi_{[0,1)}(t) + \frac{2t-1}{t^2}\chi_{[1,\infty)}(t)$$

and

$$x_n^{**}(t) = \frac{1}{n}\chi_{[0,n)}(t) + \frac{1}{t}\chi_{[n,\infty)}(t)$$

for any  $t > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , whence  $x_n \prec x$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Notice that  $x \in E$  and

$$\|x_n\|_E = \|x_n\|_{\Lambda_{1,\psi'}} + \|x_n\|_{L^1} = 1 + \frac{1}{n^{3/4}}$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore,  $\|x_n\|_E \geq 1$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , which concludes that  $E$  is not KOC. On the other hand, since  $\phi(\infty) = \int_0^\infty \phi' = \infty$ , by Proposition 1.4 in [15] it follows that the Lorentz space  $\Lambda_{1,\phi'}$  is order continuous. Hence, since  $\phi$  is strictly concave, by Theorem 2.11 and Proposition 1.7 in [5] we obtain that  $\Lambda_{1,\phi'}$  is strictly  $K$ -monotone and also has the Kadec-Klee property for global convergence in measure. Finally, by Theorem 3.13 we get  $E$  is ULUKM and LLUKM.

According to Theorem 4.8 in [9] and by Remark 3.1 in [8] and also Lemma 3.2 as well as Theorem 3.16 we conclude with the next theorem.

**Theorem 3.18.** *Let  $E$  be a symmetric space and let  $\phi$  be the fundamental function of  $E$  and  $x \in E$ . Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(i)  $x$  is an LLUKM point and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \phi(t)x^*(t) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \phi(s)x^{**}(s) = 0.$$

(ii)  $x$  is an LKM point and a point of order continuity and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \phi(s)x^{**}(s) = 0.$$

(iii)  $x$  is an LKM point and a point of  $K$ -order continuity and  $x^*(\infty) = 0$ .

**Acknowledgement.** We wish to express our gratitude to the reviewer for many valuable suggestions and remarks.

#### REFERENCES

1. C. Bennett and R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of operators*, Pure and Applied Mathematics Series 129, Academic Press Inc., Boston, MA, 1988.
2. Yu. A. Brudnyi and N. Ya. Kruglyak *Interpolation Functors and Interpolation Spaces. Vol. I*, Translated from the Russian by Natalie Wadhwa. With a preface by Jaak Peetre. North-Holland Mathematical Library, 47. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1991.
3. A. P. Calderón, *Intermediate spaces and interpolation, the complex method*, Studia Math. **24** (1964), 113-190.
4. J. Cerdà, H. Hudzik, A. Kamińska and M. Mastyło, *Geometric Properties of Symmetric Spaces with Applications to Orlicz-Lorentz Spaces*, Positivity **2** (1998), no. 4, 311-337.
5. V. I. Chilin, P. G. Dodds, A. A. Sedaev and F. A. Sukochev, *Characterizations of Kadec-Klee properties in symmetric spaces of measurable functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **348** (1996), no. 12, 4895-4918.
6. V. I. Chilin and F. A. Sukochev, *Weak convergence in non-commutative symmetric spaces*, J. Operator Theory **31** (1994), no. 1, 35-65.
7. M. Ciesielski, *Hardy-Littlewood-Pólya relation in the best dominated approximation in symmetric spaces*, J. Approx. Theory **213** (2017), 78-91.
8. M. Ciesielski, *On geometric structure of symmetric spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **430** (2015), no. 1, 98-125.
9. M. Ciesielski, *Strict  $K$ -monotonicity and  $K$ -order continuity in symmetric spaces*, preprint of 12 pages submitted on 17 May 2017 at arXiv:1705.06062.

10. M. Ciesielski, P. Kolwicz and A. Panfil, *Local monotonicity structure of symmetric spaces with applications*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **409** (2014), no. 2, 649-662.
11. M. Ciesielski, P. Kolwicz and R. Phlucienik, *Local approach to Kadec-Klee properties in symmetric function spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **426** (2015), no. 2, 700-726.
12. M. Ciesielski, P. Kolwicz and R. Phlucienik, *A note on strict  $K$ -monotonicity of some symmetric function spaces*, Comm. Math. **53** (2013), no. 2, 311-322.
13. M. M. Czerwińska, A. Kamińska, *Complex rotundities and midpoint local uniform rotundity in symmetric spaces of mea-surable operators*, Studia Math. **201** (2010), no. 3, 253-285.
14. H. Hudzik, A. Kamińska and M. Mastyló, *On geometric properties of Orlicz-Lorentz spaces*, Canad. Math. Bull. **40** (1997), no. 3, 316-329.
15. A. Kamińska and L. Maligranda, *On Lorentz spaces  $\Gamma_{p,w}$* , Israel J. Math. **140** (2004), 285-318.
16. A. Kamińska and L. Maligranda, *Order convexity and concavity of Lorentz spaces  $\Lambda_{p,w}$ ,  $0 < p < \infty$* , Studia Math. **160** (2004), no. 3, 267-286.
17. S. G. Krein, Yu. I. Petunin and E. M. Semenov, *Interpolation of linear operators*, Translated from the Russian by J. Szűcs. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 54. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1982.
18. J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach spaces. II. Function spaces*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas], 97. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1979.
19. G. G. Lorentz, *On the theory of spaces  $\Lambda$* , Pacific J. Math. **1** (1951), 411-429.
20. G. Pólya and G. Szegő, *Problems and theorems in analysis. Vol. I: Series, integral calculus, theory of functions*, Translated from the German by D. Aeppli Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 193. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1972.
21. A. Sparr, *On the conjugate space of the Lorentz space  $L(\phi, q)$* , (English summary) Interpolation theory and applications, 313-336, Contemp. Math., 445, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, POZNAŃ UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, PIOTROWO 3A, 60-965 POZNAŃ, POLAND

*E-mail address:* maciej.ciesielski@put.poznan.pl