COHEN STRONGLY *p*-SUMMING HOLOMORPHIC MAPPINGS ON BANACH SPACES

A. JIMÉNEZ-VARGAS, K. SAADI, AND J. M. SEPULCRE

ABSTRACT. Let *E* and *F* be complex Banach spaces, *U* be an open subset of *E* and $1 \le p \le \infty$. We introduce and study the notion of a Cohen strongly *p*-summing holomorphic mapping from *U* to *F*, a holomorphic version of a strongly *p*-summing linear operator. For such mappings, we establish both Pietsch domination/factorization theorems and analyse their linearizations from $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$ (the canonical predual of $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$) and their transpositions on $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$. Concerning the space $\mathcal{D}_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ formed by such mappings and endowed with a natural norm $d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}$, we show that it is a regular Banach ideal of bounded holomorphic mappings generated by composition with the ideal of strongly *p*-summing linear operators. Moreover, we identify the space $(\mathcal{D}_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F^{*}), d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}})$ with the dual of the completion of tensor product space $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U) \otimes F$ endowed with the Chevet–Saphar norm g_{p} .

INTRODUCTION

The linear theory of absolutely summing operators between Banach spaces was initiated by Grothendieck [9] in 1950 with the introduction of the concept of 1-summing operator. In 1967, Pietsch [18] defined the class of absolutely *p*-summing operators for any p > 0 and established many of their fundamental properties.

The nonlinear theory for such operators started with Pietsch [19] in 1983. Since then, the idea of extending the theory of absolutely *p*-summing operators to other settings has been developed by various authors, namely, the polynomial, multilinear, Lipschitz and holomorphic settings (see, for example, [1, 2, 7, 8, 17, 21, 22]). In 1996, Matos [12] obtained the first results about absolutely summing holomorphic mappings between Banach spaces. Our approach in this paper is different from that of Matos.

In 1973, Cohen [5] introduced the concept of a strongly *p*-summing linear operator to characterize those operators whose adjoints are absolutely *p*^{*}-summing operators, where *p*^{*} denotes the conjugate index of $p \in (1, \infty]$. Influenced by this class of operators, we introduce and study a new concept of summability in the category of bounded holomorphic mappings, which yields the called *Cohen strongly p*-summing holomorphic mappings.

We now describe the contents of the paper. Let E and F be complex Banach spaces, U be an open subset of E and $1 \le p \le \infty$. We denote by $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$ the Banach space of all bounded holomorphic mappings from U to F, equipped with the supremum norm. In particular, $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$ stands for the space $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, \mathbb{C})$. It is known that $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$ is a dual Banach space whose canonical predual, denoted $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$, is the norm-closed linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)^*$ generated by the evaluation functionals at the points of U.

Date: September 8, 2022.

²⁰²⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. 46E15, 46G20, 47B10.

Key words and phrases. Holomorphic mapping, p-summing operator, duality, linearization.

Research of the first author was partially supported by project UAL-FEDER grant UAL2020-FQM-B1858, by Junta de Andalucía grants P20_00255 and FQM194, and by Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación grant PID2021-122126NB-C31. The third author was also supported by PGC2018-097960-B-C22 (MCIU/AEI/ERDF, UE).

In Section 1, we fix the notations and recall some results on the space $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$, essentially, a remarkable linearization theorem due to Mujica [14] which is a key tool to establish our results.

In Section 2, we show that the space of all Cohen strongly *p*-summing holomorphic mappings from *U* to *F*, denoted $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ and equipped with a natural norm $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}$, is a regular Banach ideal of bounded holomorphic mappings. Furthermore, $\mathcal{D}_1^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F) = \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$.

It is well known that the elements of the tensor product of two linear spaces can be viewed as linear mappings or bilinear forms. Following this idea, in Section 3 we introduce the tensor product $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ as a space of linear functionals on the space $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$, and equip this space with the known Chevet–Saphar norms g_p and d_p .

Section 4 addresses the duality theory: the space $(\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F^*), d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}})$ is canonically isometrically isomorphic to the dual of the completion of the tensor product space $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U) \otimes_{g_p} F$. In particular, we deduce that $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ is a dual space.

Pietsch [18] established a domination/factorization theorem for *p*-summing linear operators between Banach spaces. Characterizing previously the elements of the dual space of $\Delta(U) \otimes_{g_p} F$, we present for Cohen strongly *p*-summing holomorphic mappings both versions of Pietsch domination theorem and Pietsch factorization theorem in Sections 5 and 6, respectively.

Moreover, in Section 5, we prove that a mapping $f: U \to F$ is Cohen strongly *p*-summing holomorphic if and only if Mujica's linearization $T_f: \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U) \to F$ is a strongly *p*-summing operator. Several interesting applications of this fact are obtained.

On the one hand, we show that the ideal $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ is generated by composition with the ideal \mathcal{D}_p of strongly *p*-summing linear operators, that is, every mapping $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ admits a factorization in the form $f = T \circ g$, for some complex Banach space $G, g \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, G)$ and $T \in \mathcal{D}_p(G, F)$. Moreover, $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ coincides with $\inf\{d_p(T) \|g\|_{\infty}\}$, where the infimum is extended over all such factorizations of f, and, curiously, this infimum is attained at Mujica's factorization of f. We also show that every $f \in \mathcal{D}_2^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ factors through a Hilbert space whenever F is reflexive, and establish some inclusion and coincidence properties of spaces $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$.

On the other hand, we analyse holomorphic transposition of their elements and prove that every member of $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ has relatively weakly compact range that becomes relatively compact whenever F is reflexive. Let us recall that the study of holomorphic mappings with relatively (weakly) compact range was initiated by Mujica [14] and followed in [11].

1. NOTATIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper, unless otherwise stated, E and F will denote complex Banach spaces and U an open subset of E.

We first introduce some notations. As usual, B_E denotes the closed unit ball of E. For two vector spaces E and F, L(E, F) stands for the vector space of all linear operators from E into F. In the case that E and F are normed spaces, $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ represents the normed space of all bounded linear operators from E to F endowed with the canonical norm of operators. In particular, the algebraic dual $L(E, \mathbb{K})$ and the topological dual $\mathcal{L}(E, \mathbb{K})$ are denoted by E' and E^* , respectively. For each $e \in E$ and $e^* \in E'$, we frequently will write $\langle e^*, e \rangle$ instead of $e^*(e)$. We denote by κ_E the canonical isometric embedding of E into E^{**} defined by $\langle \kappa_E(e), e^* \rangle = \langle e^*, e \rangle$ for $e \in E$ and $e^* \in E^*$. For a set $A \subseteq E$, co(A) denotes the convex hull of A.

We now recall some concepts and results of the theory of holomorphic mappings on Banach spaces.

Theorem 1.1. (see [16, 7 Theorem] and [13, Theorem 8.7]) Let E and F be complex Banach spaces and let U be an open set in E. For a mapping $f: U \to F$, the following conditions are equivalent:

(i) For each $a \in U$, there is an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(E, F)$ such that

$$\lim_{x \to a} \frac{f(x) - f(a) - T(x - a)}{\|x - a\|} = 0.$$

(ii) For each $a \in U$, there exist an open ball $B(a, r) \subseteq U$ and a sequence of continuous *m*-homogeneous polynomials $(P_{m,a})_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ from *E* into *F* such that

$$f(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P_{m,a}(x-a),$$

where the series converges uniformly for $x \in B(a, r)$.

(iii) f is G-holomorphic (that is, for all $a \in U$ and $b \in E$, the mapping $\lambda \mapsto f(a + \lambda b)$ is holomorphic on the open set $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : a + \lambda b \in U\}$ and continuous. \Box

A mapping $f: U \to F$ is said to be *holomorphic* if it verifies the equivalent conditions in Theorem 1.1. The mapping T in condition (i) is uniquely determined by f and a, and is called the *differential of f at a* and denoted by Df(a).

A mapping $f: U \to F$ is *locally bounded* if f is bounded on a suitable neighborhood of each point of U. Given a Banach space E, a subset $N \subseteq B_{E^*}$ is said to be *norming for* E if the functional

$$N(x) = \sup \{ |x^*(x)| : x^* \in N \} \qquad (x \in E)$$

defines the norm on *E*.

If $U \subseteq E$ and $V \subseteq F$ are open sets, $\mathcal{H}(U, V)$ will represent the set of all holomorphic mappings from U to V. We will denote by $\mathcal{H}(U, F)$ the linear space of all holomorphic mappings from Uinto F and by $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$ the subspace of all $f \in \mathcal{H}(U, F)$ such that f(U) is bounded in F. When $F = \mathbb{C}$, then we will write $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, \mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$.

It is easy to prove that the linear space $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$, equipped with the supremum norm:

$$||f||_{\infty} = \sup \{||f(x)|| : x \in U\}$$
 $(f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)),$

is a Banach space. Let $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$ denote the norm-closed linear hull in $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)^*$ of the set { $\delta(x): x \in U$ } of *evaluation functionals* defined by

$$\langle \delta(x), f \rangle = f(x) \qquad (f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U))$$

In [14, 15], Mujica established the following properties of $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$.

Theorem 1.2. [14, Theorem 2.1] Let E be a complex Banach space and let U be an open set in E.

(i) $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$ is isometrically isomorphic to $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^*$, via the evaluation mapping $J_U \colon \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U) \to \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^*$ given by

$$\langle J_U(f), \gamma \rangle = \gamma(f) \qquad (\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), \ f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U))$$

- (ii) The mapping $g_U: U \to \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$ defined by $g_U(x) = \delta(x)$ is holomorphic with $||g_U(x)|| = 1$ for all $x \in U$.
- (iii) For each complex Banach space F and each mapping $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$, there exists a unique operator $T_f \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$ such that $T_f \circ g_U = f$. Furthermore, $||T_f|| = ||f||_{\infty}$.
- (iv) The mapping $f \mapsto T_f$ is an isometric isomorphism from $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$ onto $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$.

(v) [14, Corollary 4.12] (see also [15, Theorem 5.1]). $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$ consists of all functionals $\gamma \in$ $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)^*$ of the form

$$\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \delta(x_i)$$

with $(\lambda_i)_{i\geq 1} \in \ell_1$ and $(x_i)_{i\geq 1} \in U^{\mathbb{N}}$. Moreover,

$$\|\gamma\| = \inf\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i|\right\}$$

where the infimum is taken over all such representations of γ .

2. Cohen strongly *p*-summing holomorphic mappings

Let *E* and *F* be Banach spaces and $1 \le p \le \infty$. Let us recall [6] that an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(E, F)$ is *p*-summing if there exists a constant $C \ge 0$ such that, regardless of the natural number n and regardless of the choice of vectors x_1, \ldots, x_n in *E*, we have the inequalities:

$$\begin{split} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|T(x_{i})\|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq C \sup_{x^{*} \in B_{E^{*}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |x^{*}(x_{i})|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } 1 \leq p < \infty, \\ \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|T(x_{i})\| &\leq C \sup_{x^{*} \in B_{E^{*}}} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x^{*}(x_{i})|\right) & \text{if } p = \infty. \end{split}$$

The infimum of such constants C is denoted by $\pi_p(T)$ and the linear space of all p-summing operators from E into F by $\Pi_p(E, F)$.

The analogous notion for holomorphic mappings could be introduced as follows.

Definition 2.1. Let E and F be complex Banach spaces, let U be an open subset of E, and let $1 \le p \le \infty$. A holomorphic mapping $f: U \to F$ is said to be *p*-summing if there exists a constant $C \ge 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in U$, we have

$$\begin{split} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|f(x_i)\|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq C \sup_{g \in B_{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |g(x_i)|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } 1 \leq p < \infty \\ \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|f(x_i)\| &\leq C \sup_{g \in B_{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)}} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |g(x_i)|\right) & \text{if } p = \infty. \end{split}$$

We denote by $\pi_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ the infimum of such constants *C*, and by $\Pi_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ the set of all *p*-summing holomorphic mappings from U into F.

Notice that *p*-summing holomorphic mappings are not worth attention since

$$\Pi_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U,F) = \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U,F)$$

with $\pi_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = ||f||_{\infty}$ for all $f \in \Pi_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$. Let $1 \le p \le \infty$ and let p^* denote the *conjugate index of p* given by

$$p^* = \begin{cases} \frac{p}{p-1} & \text{if } 1$$

In [5], Cohen introduced the following subclass of *p*-summing operators between Banach spaces: an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(E, F)$ is *strongly p*-summing if there exists a constant $C \ge 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, x_1, \ldots, x_n \in E$ and $y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^* \in F^*$, we have

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, T(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| &\leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_{i}\| \right)_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right| \right) & \text{if } p = 1, \\ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, T(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| &\leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_{i}\|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} & \text{if } 1$$

The infimum of such constants *C* is denoted by $d_p(T)$, and the space of all strongly *p*-summing operators from *E* into *F* by $\mathcal{D}_p(E, F)$. If p = 1, we have $\mathcal{D}_1(E, F) = \mathcal{L}(E, F)$.

We now introduce a version of this concept in the setting of holomorphic mappings.

Definition 2.2. Let *E* and *F* be complex Banach spaces, let *U* be an open subset of *E*, and let $1 \le p \le \infty$. A holomorphic mapping $f: U \to F$ is said to be *Cohen strongly p-summing* if there exists a constant $C \ge 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}, x_1, \ldots, x_n \in U$ and $y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^* \in F^*$, we have

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, f(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| &\leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \right) \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right| \right) & \text{if } p = 1, \\ \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, f(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| &\leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} & \text{if } 1$$

We denote by $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ the infimum of such constants *C*, and by $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ the set of all Cohen strongly *p*-summing holomorphic mappings from *U* into *F*.

We will show that $\mathcal{D}_1^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F) = \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$ (see Proposition 2.5).

The concept of an ideal of bounded holomorphic mappings is inspired by the analogous one for bounded linear operators between Banach spaces [20, Section 8.2].

Definition 2.3. An *ideal of bounded holomorphic mappings* (or simply, a *bounded-holomorphic ideal*) is a subclass $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}$ of \mathcal{H}^{∞} such that for each complex Banach space E, each open subset U of E and each complex Banach space F, the components

$$\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U,F) := \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}} \cap \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U,F)$$

satisfy the following properties:

- (I1) $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ is a linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$,
- (I2) For any $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$ and $y \in F$, the mapping $g \cdot y$: $x \mapsto g(x)y$ from U to F is in $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$,
- (I3) The ideal property: If H, G are complex Banach spaces, V is an open subset of $H, h \in \mathcal{H}(V, U), f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ and $S \in \mathcal{L}(F, G)$, then $S \circ f \circ h$ is in $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(V, G)$.

A bounded-holomorphic ideal $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}$ is said to be *normed (Banach)* if there exists a function $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}} : \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}} \to \mathbb{R}^+_0$ such that for every complex Banach space *E*, every open subset *U* of *E* and every complex Banach space *F*, the following conditions are satisfied:

- (N1) $(\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}})$ is a normed (Banach) space with $\|f\|_{\infty} \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}}$ for all $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$,
- (N2) $||g \cdot y||_{\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}} = ||g||_{\infty} ||y||$ for every $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$ and $y \in F$,
- (N3) If H, G are complex Banach spaces, V is an open subset of $H, h \in \mathcal{H}(V, U), f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ and $S \in \mathcal{L}(F, G)$, then $||S \circ f \circ h||_{\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}} \le ||S|| ||f||_{\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}}$.

A normed bounded-holomorphic ideal $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}$ is said to be *regular* if for any $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$, we have that $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $||f||_{\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}} = ||\kappa_F \circ f||_{\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}}$ whenever $\kappa_F \circ f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F^{**})$.

The following class of bounded holomorphic mappings appears involved in Definition 2.3.

Lemma 2.4. Let $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$ and $y \in F$. The mapping $g \cdot y \colon U \to F$, given by $(g \cdot y)(x) = g(x)y$, belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$ with $||g \cdot y||_{\infty} = ||g||_{\infty} ||y||$.

Proof. It is clear that $||(g \cdot y)(x)|| = |g(x)| ||y|| \le ||g||_{\infty} ||y||$ for all $x \in U$, and thus $g \cdot y$ is bounded with $||g \cdot y||_{\infty} \le ||g||_{\infty} ||y||$. For the converse inequality, note that $|g(x)| ||y|| = ||(g \cdot y)(x)|| \le ||g \cdot y||_{\infty}$ for all $x \in U$, and thus $||g||_{\infty} ||y|| \le ||g \cdot y||_{\infty}$.

We now prove that $g \cdot y$ is holomorphic. Given $a \in U \subseteq E$, since $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$ there exists an unique functional $Dg(a) \in E^*$ such that

$$\lim_{x \to a} \frac{g(x) - g(a) - Dg(a)(x - a)}{\|x - a\|} = 0.$$

Clearly, the mapping T(a): $x \mapsto yDg(a)(x)$ from E to F is in $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ and since

$$(g \cdot y)(x) - (g \cdot y)(a) - T(a)(x - a) = [g(x) - g(a) - Dg(a)(x - a)]y$$

for all $x \in E$, we conclude that

$$\lim_{x \to a} \frac{(g \cdot y)(x) - (g \cdot y)(a) - T(a)(x - a)}{||x - a||} = 0.$$

Thus $g \cdot y$ is holomorphic at a with $D(g \cdot y)(a) = yDg(a)$.

We are now ready to establish the main result of this section.

Proposition 2.5. The space $(\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F), d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}})$ is a regular Banach ideal of bounded holomorphic mappings. Furthermore, $\mathcal{D}_1^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F) = \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$ with $d_1^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = ||f||_{\infty}$ for all $f \in \mathcal{D}_1^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$.

Proof. We will only prove the case 1 . The cases <math>p = 1 and $p = \infty$ follow similarly.

(N1) We first show that $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$ with $||f||_{\infty} \leq d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$. Indeed, given $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$, we have

$$|\langle y^*, f(x) \rangle| \le d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} |y^{**}(y^*)| = d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$$

for all $x \in U$ and $y^* \in F^*$. By Hahn–Banach theorem, we obtain that $||f(x)|| \le d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ for all $x \in U$. Hence $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$ with $||f||_{\infty} \le d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$.

Let $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$, $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in U$ and $y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^* \in F^*$, we have

$$\begin{split} &\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, f_{1}(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| \leq d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_{1}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}}, \\ &\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, f_{2}(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| \leq d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_{2}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}}. \end{split}$$

Using the two inequalities above, we obtain

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, (f_{1}+f_{2})(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, f_{1}(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| + \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, f_{2}(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq \left(d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_{1}) + d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_{2}) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \end{split}$$

This tells us that $f_1 + f_2 \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_1 + f_2) \le d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_1) + d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_2)$.

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $x_i \in U$ and $y_i^* \in F^*$ for i = 1, ..., n, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_i| \left| \left\langle y_i^*, (\lambda f)(x_i) \right\rangle \right| = |\lambda| \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_i| \left| \left\langle y_i^*, f(x_i) \right\rangle \right|$$
$$\leq |\lambda| d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| y^{**}(y_i^*) \right|^{p^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}},$$

and thus $\lambda f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(\lambda f) \leq |\lambda| d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$. This implies that $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(\lambda f) = 0 = |\lambda| d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ if $\lambda = 0$. For $\lambda \neq 0$, we have $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(\lambda^{-1}(\lambda f)) \leq |\lambda|^{-1} d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(\lambda f)$, hence $|\lambda| d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \leq d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(\lambda f)$, and so $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(\lambda f) = |\lambda| d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$.

Moreover, if $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ and $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = 0$, then $||f||_{\infty} = 0$ by (N1), and so f = 0. Thus, $\left(\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F), d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}\right)$ is a normed space.

To prove that $(\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F), d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}})$ is complete, it suffices to prove that every absolutely convergent series is convergent. So let $(f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ such that $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_n)$ is convergent. Since $||f_n||_{\infty} \leq d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F), ||\cdot||_{\infty})$ is a Banach space, then the series $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} f_n$ converges in $(\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F), ||\cdot||_{\infty})$ to a function $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$. Given $m \in \mathbb{N}, x_1, \ldots, x_m \in U$, $y_1^*, \ldots, y_m^* \in F^*$ and $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\begin{split} \sum_{k=1}^{m} |\lambda_{k}| \left| \left\langle y_{k}^{*}, \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}(x_{k}) \right\rangle \right| &\leq d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i} \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} |\lambda_{k}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \left| y^{**}(y_{k}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_{i}) \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} |\lambda_{k}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \left| y^{**}(y_{k}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \end{split}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and by taking limits with $n \to \infty$ yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m} |\lambda_{k}| \left| \left\langle y_{k}^{*}, f(x_{k}) \right\rangle \right| \leq \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_{n}) \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} |\lambda_{k}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \left| y^{**}(y_{k}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}}$$

Hence $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $\pi_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_n)$. Moreover, we have

$$d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}\left(f-\sum_{i=1}^n f_i\right) = d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}\left(\sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} f_i\right) \le \sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_i)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus f is the $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}$ -limit of the series $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} f_n$.

(N2) Let $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$ and $y \in F$. If g = 0 or y = 0, there is nothing to prove. Assume $g \neq 0$ and $y \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.4, $g \cdot y \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}, x_1, \dots, x_n \in U, y_1^*, \dots, y_n^* \in F^*$ and

 $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, (g \cdot y)(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| &= ||g||_{\infty} ||y|| \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, \frac{g(x_{i})y}{||g||_{\infty} ||y||} \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq ||g||_{\infty} ||y|| \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, \frac{g(x_{i})y}{||g||_{\infty} ||y||} \right\rangle \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &= ||g||_{\infty} ||y|| \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| \left\langle \kappa_{F} \left(\frac{g(x_{i})y}{||g||_{\infty} ||y||} \right), y_{i}^{*}, \right\rangle \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &\leq ||g||_{\infty} ||y|| \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \end{split}$$

by applying the Hölder inequality, and therefore $g \cdot y \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(g \cdot y) \leq ||g||_{\infty} ||y||$. Conversely, by applying what was proved in (N1), we have $||g||_{\infty} ||y|| = ||g \cdot y||_{\infty} \le d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(g \cdot y)$.

(N3) Let H, G be complex Banach spaces, V be an open subset of $H, h \in \mathcal{H}(V, U), f \in$ $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U,F)$ and $S \in \mathcal{L}(F,G)$. We can suppose $S \neq 0$. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}, x_1, \ldots, x_n \in U, y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^* \in G^*$ and $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, S\left(f(h(x_{i}))\right) \right\rangle \right| &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*} \circ S, f(h(x_{i})) \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*} \circ S) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &= ||S|| d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| \left(y^{**} \circ \frac{S^{*}}{||S||} \right)(y_{i}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &\leq ||S|| d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{z^{**} \in B_{G^{**}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| z^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \end{split}$$

and therefore $S \circ f \circ h \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(V, G)$ with $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(S \circ f \circ h) \leq ||S|| d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$.

We now prove that the ideal $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ is regular. Let $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$ and assume that $\kappa_F \circ f \in$ $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F^{**})$. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}, x_1, \ldots, x_n \in U, y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^* \in F^*$ and $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, f(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle \kappa_{F}(f(x_{i})), y_{i}^{*} \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(\kappa_{F} \circ f) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}|^{p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}}, \end{split}$$

and thus $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \leq d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(\kappa_F \circ f)$. The converse inequality follows from (N3). Finally, we have seen in (N1) that $\mathcal{D}_1^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$ with $||f||_{\infty} \leq d_1^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{D}_1^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$. For the converse, let $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$. If f = 0, there is nothing to prove. Assume

 $f \neq 0$. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in U$, $y_1^*, \ldots, y_n^* \in F^*$ and $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle y_{i}^{*}, f(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| &= ||f||_{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \left\langle \kappa_{F} \left(\frac{f(x_{i})}{||f||_{\infty}} \right), y_{i}^{*} \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq ||f||_{\infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \right) \max_{1 \le i \le n} \left(\sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right| \right) \\ &= ||f||_{\infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \right) \sup_{y^{**} \in B_{F^{**}}} \left(\max_{1 \le i \le n} \left| y^{**}(y_{i}^{*}) \right| \right), \end{split}$$

and therefore $f \in \mathcal{D}_1^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $d_1^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \leq ||f||_{\infty}$.

3. The tensor product $\Delta(U) \otimes F$

The elements of the tensor product of two linear spaces can be viewed as linear mappings or bilinear forms (see [20, Chapter 1]). Following this idea, we introduce the tensor product $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ as a space of linear functionals on $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$.

Definition 3.1. Let *E* and *F* be complex Banach spaces and let *U* be an open subset of *E*. For each $x \in U$, let $\delta(x) \colon \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U) \to \mathbb{C}$ be the linear functional defined by

$$\langle \delta(x), f \rangle = f(x) \qquad (f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)).$$

Let $\Delta(U)$ be the linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)'$ spanned by the set

$$\{\delta(x): x \in U\}.$$

For any $x \in U$ and $y \in F$, let $\delta(x) \otimes y \colon \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*) \to \mathbb{C}$ be the linear functional given by

$$(\delta(x) \otimes y)(f) = \langle f(x), y \rangle$$
 $(f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)).$

We define the tensor product $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ as the linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)'$ spanned by the set

$$\{\delta(x) \otimes y \colon x \in U, y \in F\}.$$

We say that $\delta(x) \otimes y$ is an *elementary tensor* of $\Delta(U) \otimes F$. Note that each element u in $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ is of the form $u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i (\delta(x_i) \otimes y_i)$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $x_i \in U$ and $y_i \in F$ for i = 1, ..., n. This representation of u is not unique.

It is worth noting that each element u of $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ can be represented as $u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i$ since $\lambda(\delta(x) \otimes y) = \delta(x) \otimes (\lambda y)$. This representation of u admits the following refinement (see [20, p. 3]).

Lemma 3.2. Every nonzero tensor $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$ has a representation in the form

$$u=\sum_{i=1}^m \delta(z_i)\otimes d_i,$$

where

$$m = \min\left\{k \in \mathbb{N} \colon \exists z_1, \dots, z_k \in U, \ d_1, \dots, d_k \in F \mid u = \sum_{i=1}^k \delta(z_i) \otimes d_i\right\},\$$

and the sets $\{\delta(z_1), \ldots, \delta(z_m)\} \subseteq \Delta(U)$ and $\{d_1, \ldots, d_m\} \subseteq F$ are both linearly independent. \Box

As a straightforward consequence from Definition 3.1, we describe the action of a tensor u in $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ on a function f in $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$:

Lemma 3.3. Let $u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$. Then

$$u(f) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \langle f(x_i), y_i \rangle$$

Our next aim is to characterize the zero tensor of $\Delta(U) \otimes F$. Compare to [20, Proposition 1.2].

Proposition 3.4. If $u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$, the following are equivalent:

(*i*) u = 0. (*ii*) $\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(x_i)\phi(y_i) = 0$ for every $g \in B_{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)}$ and $\phi \in B_{F^*}$.

Proof. (*i*) \Rightarrow (*ii*): If u = 0, then u(f) = 0 for all $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$. Since $u = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i$, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^n \langle f(x_i), y_i \rangle = 0$ for all $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ by Lemma 3.3. For any $g \in B_{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)}$ and $\phi \in B_{F^*}$, the function $g \cdot \phi$ is in $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ by Lemma 2.4, and therefore we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n g(x_i)\phi(y_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle g(x_i)\phi, y_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle (g \cdot \phi)(x_i), y_i \rangle = 0.$$

 $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$: By Lemma 3.2, we can write $u = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \delta(z_i) \otimes d_i$, where the vectors d_i in *F* are linearly independent. It follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i + \sum_{i=1}^m \delta(z_i) \otimes (-d_i) = u - u = 0,$$

and, by using the fact proved that (i) implies (ii), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(x_i)\phi(y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} g(z_i)\phi(-d_i) = 0$$

for all $g \in B_{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)}$ and $\phi \in B_{F^*}$. If (ii) holds, we get that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} g(z_i)\phi(d_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} g(x_i)\phi(y_i) = 0$$

for all $g \in B_{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)}$ and $\phi \in B_{F^*}$. Let $J_U(g)$ be the functional in $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^*$ considered in Theorem 1.2. We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \langle J_U(g), \delta(z_i) \rangle \phi(d_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m g(z_i) \phi(d_i) = 0$$

for all $g \in B_{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)}$ and $\phi \in B_{F^*}$. Since the mapping J_U is an isometric isomorphism from $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$ onto $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^*$ by Theorem 1.2, it follows that

$$\gamma\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\delta(z_i)\phi(d_i)\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\gamma(\delta(z_i))\phi(d_i) = 0$$

for all $\gamma \in B_{\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^*}$ and $\phi \in B_{F^*}$. As $B_{\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^*}$ separates points of $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$, this implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \delta(z_i)\phi(d_i) = 0$$

for all $\phi \in B_{F^*}$. Moreover, $\{d_1, \ldots, d_m\}$ are linearly independent in *F*, the Hahn–Banach theorem provides, for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, a functional $\phi_j \in B_{F^*}$ such that $\phi_j(d_j) = 1$ and $\phi_j(d_i) = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \setminus \{j\}$. Hence $0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \delta(z_i)\phi_j(d_i) = \delta(z_j)$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and thus u = 0. \Box

By Definition 3.1, $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ is a linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)'$. In fact, we have:

Proposition 3.5. $\langle \Delta(U) \otimes F, \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*) \rangle$ forms a dual pair, where the bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ associated to the dual pair is given by

$$\langle u, f \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \langle f(x_i), y_i \rangle$$

and $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$

for $u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$.

Proof. Since $\langle u, f \rangle = u(f)$ by Lemma 3.3, it is immediate that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is a well-defined bilinear map from $(\Delta(U) \otimes F) \times \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ to \mathbb{C} . On the one hand, if $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$ and $\langle u, f \rangle = 0$ for all $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$, then u = 0 follows easily from Proposition 3.4, and thus $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ separates points of $\Delta(U) \otimes F$. On the other hand, if $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ and $\langle u, f \rangle = 0$ for all $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$, then $\langle f(x), y \rangle = \langle \delta(x) \otimes y, f \rangle = 0$ for all $x \in U$ and $y \in F$, this means that f = 0 and thus $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ separates points of $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$.

Since $\langle \Delta(U) \otimes F, \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*) \rangle$ is a dual pair, we can identify $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ with a linear subspace of $(\Delta(U) \otimes F)'$ as follows.

Corollary 3.6. For each $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$, the functional $\Lambda_0(f) \colon \Delta(U) \otimes F \to \mathbb{C}$, given by

$$\Lambda_0(f)(u) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \langle f(x_i), y_i \rangle$$

for $u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$, is linear. We will say that $\Lambda_0(f)$ is the linear functional on $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ associated to f. Furthermore, the map $f \mapsto \Lambda_0(f)$ is a linear monomorphism from $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ into $(\Delta(U) \otimes F)'$.

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$. Note that $\Lambda_0(f)(u) = \langle u, f \rangle$ for all $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$. It is immediate that $\Lambda_0(f)$ is a well-defined linear functional on $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ and that $f \mapsto \Lambda_0(f)$ from $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ into $(\Delta(U) \otimes F)'$ is a well-defined linear map. Finally, let $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ and assume that $\Lambda_0(f) = 0$. Then $\langle u, f \rangle = 0$ for all $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$. Since $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ separates points of $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ by Proposition 3.5, it follows that f = 0 and this proves that Λ_0 is one-to-one.

Next, we will introduce several useful norms on the tensor product $\Delta(U) \otimes F$. We begin with the dual norm induced by the supremum norm of $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ that, as we will see, coincides with the projective norm.

Given two linear spaces *E* and *F*, the tensor product space $E \otimes F$ equipped with a norm α will be denoted by $E \otimes_{\alpha} F$, and the completion of $E \otimes_{\alpha} F$ by $E \widehat{\otimes}_{\alpha} F$. A *cross-norm* on $E \otimes F$ is a norm α such that $\alpha(x \otimes y) = ||x|| ||y||$ for all $x \in E$ and $y \in F$.

Theorem 3.7. The linear space $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ is contained in $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)^*$ and the norm H on $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ induced by the dual norm of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$, given by

$$H(u) = \sup \{ |u(f)| : f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*), ||f||_{\infty} \le 1 \} \qquad (u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F),$$

is a cross-norm on $\Delta(U) \otimes F$.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $x \in U$ and $y \in F$. Since $\lambda \delta(x) \otimes y$ is a linear map on $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ and

$$|(\lambda\delta(x)\otimes y)(f)| = |\lambda\langle f(x), y\rangle| \le |\lambda| ||f(x)|| ||y|| \le |\lambda| ||f||_{\infty} ||y||$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$, then $\lambda \delta(x) \otimes y \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)^*$ with $||\lambda \delta(x) \otimes y|| \le |\lambda| ||y||$, and thus $\Delta(U) \otimes F \subseteq \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)^*$.

We now prove that *H* is a cross-norm on $\Delta(U) \otimes F$. By the above proof, we have $|(\lambda \delta(x) \otimes y)(f)| \le |\lambda| ||y||$ for all $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ with $||f||_{\infty} \le 1$, and hence $H(\lambda \delta(x) \otimes y) \le |\lambda| ||y|| = ||\lambda \delta(x)|| ||y||$. For

the reverse estimate, take $\phi \in F^*$ with $||\phi|| = 1$ such that $|\langle \phi, y \rangle| = ||y||$, and define the constant mapping $f: U \to F^*$ by $f(z) = \phi$ for all $z \in U$. Clearly, $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ with $||f||_{\infty} = 1$ and

$$|(\lambda\delta(x)\otimes y)(f)| = |\lambda| |\langle f(x), y \rangle| = |\lambda| |\langle \phi, y \rangle| = |\lambda| ||y||,$$

and therefore $\|\lambda\delta(x)\| \|y\| = |\lambda| \|y\| \le H(\lambda\delta(x) \otimes y)$.

Given two Banach spaces *E* and *F*, the projective norm π on $E \otimes F$ (see [20, Chapter 2]) takes the following form on $\Delta(U) \otimes F$:

$$\pi(u) = \inf\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_i| \, ||y_i|| : u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i\right\} \qquad (u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F).$$

We next see that, on the space $\Delta(U) \otimes F$, the projective norm and the norm induced by the dual norm of the supremum norm of $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ coincide.

Proposition 3.8. $\pi(u) = H(u)$ for all $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$.

Proof. Since π is the greatest cross-norm on $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ (see [20, pp. 15-16]), we have $H \leq \pi$ by Theorem 3.7. To prove that $H \geq \pi$, suppose by contradiction that $H(u_0) < 1 < \pi(u_0)$ for some $u_0 \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$. Denote $B = \{u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F : \pi(u) \leq 1\}$. Clearly, *B* is a closed and convex set in $\Delta(U) \otimes_{\pi} F$. Applying the Hahn–Banach separation theorem to *B* and $\{u_0\}$, we obtain a functional $\eta \in (\Delta(U) \otimes_{\pi} F)^*$ such that

$$1 = \|\eta\| = \sup\{\operatorname{Re} \eta(u) \colon u \in B\} < \operatorname{Re} \eta(u_0).$$

Define $f: U \to F^*$ by $\langle f(x), y \rangle = \eta (\delta(x) \otimes y)$ for all $y \in F$ and $x \in U$. It is easy to prove that f is well defined and $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ with $||f||_{\infty} \leq 1$. Moreover, $u(f) = \eta(u)$ for all $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$. Therefore $H(u_0) \geq |u_0(f)| \geq \operatorname{Re} u_0(f) = \operatorname{Re} \eta(u_0)$, so $H(u_0) > 1$ and this is a contradiction. \Box

We now will define the Chevet–Saphar norms on the tensor product $E \otimes F$. Let E and F be normed spaces and let $1 \le p \le \infty$. Given $u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \otimes y_i \in E \otimes F$, denote

$$\|(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\|_{\ell_p^n(E)} = \begin{cases} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } 1 \le p < \infty, \\\\ \max_{1 \le i \le n} \|x_i\| & \text{if } p = \infty, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\|(y_1, \dots, y_n)\|_{\ell_p^{n,w}(F)} = \begin{cases} \sup_{y^* \in B_{F^*}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |y^*(y_i)|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } 1 \le p < \infty, \\\\ \sup_{y^* \in B_{F^*}} \left(\max_{1 \le i \le n} |y^*(y_i)| \right) & \text{if } p = \infty. \end{cases}$$

If $E = F = \mathbb{C}$, we write $\ell_p^n(E) = \ell_p^n$ and $\ell_{p^*}^{n,w}(F) = \ell_{p^*}^{n,w}$. According to [20, Section 6.2], the Chevet–Saphar norms are defined on $E \otimes F$ by

$$d_p(u) = \inf \left\{ \|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_{\ell_{p^*}^{n,w}(E)} \|(y_1, \dots, y_n)\|_{\ell_p^n(F)} \right\},\$$

$$g_p(u) = \inf \left\{ \|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_{\ell_p^n(E)} \|(y_1, \dots, y_n)\|_{\ell_{p^*}^{n,w}(F)} \right\},\$$

the infimum being extended over all representations of u of the form $u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \otimes y_i \in E \otimes F$.

Since $||\delta(x)|| = 1$ for all $x \in U$, the norm g_p on $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ takes the form:

$$g_p(u) = \inf \left\{ \| (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \|_{\ell_p^n} \| (y_1, \dots, y_n) \|_{\ell_{p^*}^{n,w}(F)} : u = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i \right\}.$$

Notice that g_p is a cross-norm on $\Delta(U) \otimes F$.

We next show that the norm g_1 on $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ is justly the projective tensor norm π .

Proposition 3.9. $g_1(u) = \pi(u)$ for all $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$.

Proof. Let $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$ and let $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i$ be a representation of u. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(u) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \, ||y_{i}|| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left(\sup_{y^{*} \in B_{F^{*}}} |y^{*}(y_{i})| \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(\sup_{y^{*} \in B_{F^{*}}} |y^{*}(y_{i})| \right) = ||(\lambda_{1}, \dots, \lambda_{n})||_{\ell_{1}^{n}} \, ||(y_{1}, \dots, y_{n})||_{\ell_{\infty}^{n,w}(F)} \,, \end{aligned}$$

and taking the infimum over all representations of *u* gives $\pi(u) \leq g_1(u)$. For the converse inequality, notice that $g_1(\lambda \delta(x) \otimes y) \leq |\lambda| ||y||$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $x \in U$ and $y \in F$. Since g_1 is a norm on $\Delta(U) \otimes F$, it follows that

$$g_1(u) = g_1\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i\right) \le \sum_{i=1}^n g_1\left(\lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i\right) \le \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i| \left\|y_i\right\|$$

and taking the infimum over all representations of *u* yields $g_1(u) \le \pi(u)$.

4. Duality for Cohen strongly p-summing holomorphic mappings

We show now that the duals of the tensor product $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_{g_p}F$ can be canonically identified as spaces of Cohen strongly *p*-summing holomorphic mappings.

Theorem 4.1. Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Then $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}(U, F^*)$ is isometrically isomorphic to $(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_{g_p}F)^*$, via the mapping $\Lambda \colon \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}(U, F^*) \to (\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_{g_p}F)^*$ defined by

$$\Lambda(f)(u) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \langle f(x_i), y_i \rangle$$

for $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}(U, F^*)$ and $u = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$. Furthermore, its inverse is given by

$$\left\langle \Lambda^{-1}(\varphi)(x), y \right\rangle = \left\langle \varphi, \delta(x) \otimes y \right\rangle$$

for $\varphi \in (\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_{g_p}F)^*$, $x \in U$ and $y \in F$.

Proof. We prove it for 1 . The case <math>p = 1 is similarly proved.

Let $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}(U, F^*)$ and let $\Lambda_0(f) \colon \Delta(U) \otimes F \to \mathbb{C}$ be its associate linear functional. We claim that $\Lambda_0(f) \in (\Delta(U) \otimes_{g_p} F)^*$ with $\|\Lambda_0(f)\| \leq d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$. Indeed, given $u = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$,

we have

$$\begin{split} |\Lambda_{0}(f)(u)| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} \langle f(x_{i}), y_{i} \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \left| \langle \kappa_{F}(y_{i}), f(x_{i}) \rangle \right| \\ &\leq d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \left\| (\lambda_{1}, \dots, \lambda_{n}) \right\|_{\ell_{p}^{n}} \sup_{y^{***} \in B_{F^{***}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y^{***}(\kappa_{F}(y_{i}))|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &\leq d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \left\| (\lambda_{1}, \dots, \lambda_{n}) \right\|_{\ell_{p}^{n}} \sup_{y^{*} \in B_{F^{*}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y^{*}(y_{i})|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &= d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \left\| (\lambda_{1}, \dots, \lambda_{n}) \right\|_{\ell_{p}^{n}} \left\| (y_{1}, \dots, y_{n}) \right\|_{\ell_{p}^{n,w}(F)}, \end{split}$$

and taking infimum over all the representations of u, we deduce that $|\Lambda_0(f)(u)| \leq d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)g_p(u)$. Since u was arbitrary, then $\Lambda_0(f)$ is continuous on $\Delta(U) \otimes_{g_p} F$ with $||\Lambda_0(f)|| \leq d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$, as claimed. Since $\Delta(U)$ is a norm-dense linear subspace of $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$ and g_p is a cross-norm on $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U) \otimes F$,

Since $\Delta(U)$ is a norm-dense linear subspace of $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$ and g_p is a cross-norm on $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U) \otimes F$, then $\Delta(U) \otimes F$ is a dense linear subspace of $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U) \otimes_{g_p} F$ and therefore also of its completion $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_{g_p}F$. Hence there is a unique continuous mapping $\Lambda(f)$ from $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_{g_p}F$ to \mathbb{C} that extends $\Lambda_0(f)$. Further, $\Lambda(f)$ is linear and $\|\Lambda(f)\| = \|\Lambda_0(f)\|$.

Let $\Lambda: \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}(U, F^*) \to (\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_{g_p}F)^*$ be the mapping so defined. Since $\Lambda_0: \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}(U, F^*) \to (\Delta(U) \otimes F)'$ is a linear monomorphism by Corollary 3.6, it follows easily that Λ is so. To prove that Λ is a surjective isometry, let $\varphi \in (\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_{g_p}F)^*$ and define $f_{\varphi}: U \to F^*$ by

$$\langle f_{\varphi}(x), y \rangle = \varphi(\delta(x) \otimes y) \qquad (x \in U, \ y \in F)$$

Given $x \in U$, the linearity of both φ and the product tensor in the second variable yields that the functional $f_{\varphi}(x)$: $F \to \mathbb{C}$ is linear, and since

$$\left|\left\langle f_{\varphi}(x), y\right\rangle\right| = \left|\varphi(\delta(x) \otimes y)\right| \le \left|\left|\varphi\right|\right| g_{p}(\delta(x) \otimes y) \le \left|\left|\varphi\right|\right| \left|\left|y\right|\right|$$

for all $y \in F$, we deduce that $f_{\varphi}(x) \in F^*$ with $||f_{\varphi}(x)|| \le ||\varphi||$. Since x was arbitrary, we have that f_{φ} is bounded with $||f_{\varphi}||_{\infty} \le ||\varphi||$.

We now prove that $f_{\varphi} \colon U \to F^*$ is holomorphic. To this end, we first claim that, for every $y \in F$, the function $f_y \colon U \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$f_y(x) = \varphi(\delta(x) \otimes y) \qquad (x \in U)$$

is holomorphic. Let $a \in U$. Since $g_U \colon U \to \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$ is holomorphic by Theorem 1.2, there exists $Dg_U(a) \in \mathcal{L}(E, \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U))$ such that

$$\lim_{x \to a} \frac{\delta(x) - \delta(a) - Dg_U(a)(x-a)}{\|x-a\|} = 0.$$

Consider the function $T(a): E \to \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$T(a)(x) = \varphi(Dg_U(a)(x) \otimes y) \qquad (x \in E).$$

Clearly, $T(a) \in E^*$ and since

$$f_{y}(x) - f_{y}(a) - T(a)(x - a) = \varphi(\delta(x) \otimes y) - \varphi(\delta(a) \otimes y) - \varphi(Dg_{U}(a)(x - a) \otimes y)$$
$$= \varphi((\delta(x) - \delta(a) - Dg_{U}(a)(x - a)) \otimes y),$$

it follows that

$$\lim_{x \to a} \frac{f_y(x) - f_y(a) - T(a)(x - a)}{\|x - a\|} = \lim_{x \to a} \frac{\varphi\left((\delta(x) - \delta(a) - Dg_U(a)(x - a)) \otimes y\right)}{\|x - a\|}$$
$$= \lim_{x \to a} \varphi\left(\frac{\delta(x) - \delta(a) - Dg_U(a)(x - a)}{\|x - a\|} \otimes y\right)$$
$$= \varphi(0 \otimes y) = \varphi(0) = 0.$$

Hence f_y is holomorphic at a with $Df_y(a) = T(a)$, and this proves our claim. Now, notice that the set { $\kappa_F(y)$: $y \in B_F$ } $\subseteq B_{F^{**}}$ is norming for F^* since

$$||y^*|| = \sup \{|y^*(y)| : y \in B_F\} = \sup \{|\kappa_F(y)(y^*)| : y \in B_F\}$$

for every $y^* \in F^*$, and that $\kappa_F(y) \circ f_{\varphi} = f_y$ for every $y \in F$ since

$$(\kappa_F(y) \circ f_{\varphi})(x) = \kappa_F(y)(f_{\varphi}(x)) = \left\langle f_{\varphi}(x), y \right\rangle = \varphi(\delta(x) \otimes y) = f_y(x)$$

for all $x \in U$.

We are now ready to show that $f_{\varphi}: U \to F^*$ is holomorphic. Indeed, let $a \in U$ and $b \in E$. Denote $V = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : a + \lambda b \in U\}$. Clearly, the mapping $h: V \to U$ given by $h(\lambda) = a + \lambda b$ is holomorphic. Since $f_{\varphi} \circ h$ is locally bounded and $\kappa_F(y) \circ (f_{\varphi} \circ h) = f_y \circ h$ is holomorphic on the open set $V \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ for all $y \in F$, Proposition A.3 in [3] assures that $f_{\varphi} \circ h$ is holomorphic. This means that f_{φ} is G-holomorphic but since it is also locally bounded, we deduce that f_{φ} is continuous by [13, Proposition 8.6]. Now, we conclude that f_{φ} is holomorphic by Theorem 1.1.

We now prove that $f_{\varphi} \in \mathcal{D}_p^{H^{\infty}}(U, F^*)$. For it, take $n \in \mathbb{N}, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}, x_i \in U$ and $y_i^{**} \in F^{**}$ for i = 1, ..., n. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and consider the finite-dimensional subspaces $V = \lim\{y_1^{**}, ..., y_n^{**}\} \subseteq F^{**}$ and $W = \lim\{f_{\varphi}(x_1), \dots, f_{\varphi}(x_n)\} \subseteq F^*$. The principle of local reflexivity [6, Theorem 8.16] gives us a bounded linear operator $T_{(\varepsilon,V,W)}: V \to F$ such that

i) $T_{(\varepsilon,V,W)}(y^{**}) = y^{**}$ for every $y^{**} \in V \cap \kappa_F(F)$,

ii) $(1 - \varepsilon) ||y^{**}|| \le ||T_{(\varepsilon, V, W)}(y^{**})|| \le (1 + \varepsilon) ||y^{**}||$ for every $y^{**} \in V$, iii) $\langle y^*, T_{(\varepsilon, V, W)}(y^{**}) \rangle = \langle y^{**}, y^* \rangle$ for every $y^{**} \in V$ and $y^* \in W$.

Using iii) and taking $y_i = T_{(\varepsilon, V, W)}(y_i^{**})$, we first have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} \left\langle y_{i}^{**}, f_{\varphi}(x_{i}) \right\rangle \right| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} \left\langle f_{\varphi}(x_{i}), T_{(\varepsilon, V, W)}(y_{i}^{**}) \right\rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} \left\langle f_{\varphi}(x_{i}), y_{i} \right\rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \varphi \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} \delta(x_{i}) \otimes y_{i} \right) \right| \\ &\leq ||\varphi|| \left\| g_{p} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} \delta(x_{i}) \otimes y_{i} \right) \\ &\leq ||\varphi|| \left\| |(\lambda_{1}, \dots, \lambda_{n})||_{\ell_{p}^{n}} \left\| (y_{1}, \dots, y_{n}) \right\|_{\ell_{p}^{n, W}(F)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{split} \|(y_{1},\ldots,y_{n})\|_{\ell_{p^{*}}^{n,w}(F)} &= \sup_{y^{*}\in B_{F^{*}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y^{*}(y_{i})|^{p^{*}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &= \sup_{y^{*}\in B_{F^{*}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\langle y^{*}, T_{(\varepsilon,V,W)}(y_{i}^{**})\rangle|^{p^{*}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &= \sup_{y^{*}\in B_{F^{*}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\langle \kappa_{F}(T_{(\varepsilon,V,W)}(y_{i}^{**})), y^{*}\rangle|^{p^{*}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &\leq \left\|\kappa_{F} \circ T_{(\varepsilon,V,W)}\right\| \sup_{y^{*}\in B_{F^{*}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\langle y^{**}, y^{*}\rangle|^{p^{*}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &= \left\|T_{(\varepsilon,V,W)}\right\| \sup_{y^{*}\in B_{F^{*}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\langle \kappa_{F^{*}}(y^{*}), y^{**}_{i}\rangle|^{p^{*}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &\leq (1+\varepsilon) \sup_{y^{***}\in B_{F^{***}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y^{***}(y^{**}_{i})|^{p^{*}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &= (1+\varepsilon) \left\|(y^{**}_{1},\ldots,y^{**}_{n})\right\|_{\ell_{p^{*}}^{n,w}(F^{**})}, \end{split}$$

it follows that

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \left\langle y_i^{**}, f_{\varphi}(x_i) \right\rangle\right| \le \|\varphi\| \|(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)\|_{\ell_p^n} (1+\varepsilon) \left\| (y_1^{**}, \dots, y_n^{**}) \right\|_{\ell_{p^*}^{n,w}(F^{**})}.$$

By the arbitrariness of ε , we deduce that

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \left\langle y_i^{**}, f_{\varphi}(x_i) \right\rangle\right| \le \|\varphi\| \|(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)\|_{\ell_p^n} \left\| (y_1^{**}, \dots, y_n^{**}) \right\|_{\ell_{p^*}^{n,w}(F^{**})},$$

and this implies that $f_{\varphi} \in \mathcal{D}_{p}^{H^{\infty}}(U, F^{*})$ with $d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_{\varphi}) \leq ||\varphi||$. For any $u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} \delta(x_{i}) \otimes y_{i} \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$, we get

$$\Lambda(f_{\varphi})(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \left\langle f_{\varphi}(x_i), y_i \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \varphi(\delta(x_i) \otimes y_i) = \varphi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i\right) = \varphi(u).$$

Hence $\Lambda(f_{\varphi}) = \varphi$ on a dense subspace of $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_{g_p}F$ and, consequently, $\Lambda(f_{\varphi}) = \varphi$, which shows the last statement of the theorem. Moreover, $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f_{\varphi}) \leq ||\varphi|| = ||\Lambda(f_{\varphi})||$ and the theorem holds. \Box

In particular, in view of Theorem 4.1 and taking into account Propositions 2.5, 3.8 and 3.9, we can identify the space $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ with the dual space of $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_H F$.

Corollary 4.2. $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ is isometrically isomorphic to $(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_H F)^*$, via $\Lambda : \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*) \to (\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_H F)^*$ given by

$$\Lambda(f)(u) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \langle f(x_i), y_i \rangle$$

for $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ and $u = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$. Furthermore, its inverse is given by $\left\langle \Lambda^{-1}(\varphi)(x), y \right\rangle = \langle \varphi, \delta(x) \otimes y \rangle$ for $\varphi \in (\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)\widehat{\otimes}_{H}F)^{*}$, $x \in U$ and $y \in F$.

Remark 4.3. It is known (see [20, p. 24]) that if *E* and *F* are Banach spaces, then $\mathcal{L}(E, F^*)$ is isometrically isomorphic to $(\widehat{E\otimes}_{\pi}F)^*$, via $\Phi: \mathcal{L}(E, F^*) \to (\widehat{E\otimes}_{\pi}F)^*$ given by

$$\left\langle \Phi(T), \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \otimes y_i \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\langle T(x_i), y_i \right\rangle$$

for $T \in \mathcal{L}(E, F^*)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \otimes y_i \in E \otimes F$. Notice that the identification Λ in Corollary 4.2 is justly $\Phi \circ \Phi_0$, where $\Phi_0: f \mapsto T_f$ is the isometric isomorphism from $\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^*)$ onto $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$ given in Theorem 1.2.

5. PIETSCH DOMINATION FOR COHEN STRONGLY *p*-SUMMING HOLOMORPHIC MAPPINGS

In [18], Pietsch established a domination theorem for *p*-summing linear operators between Banach spaces. In order to present a version of this theorem for Cohen strongly *p*-summing holomorphic mappings on Banach spaces, we first characterize the elements of the dual space of $\Delta(U) \otimes_{g_p} F$.

Theorem 5.1. Let $\varphi \in (\Delta(U) \otimes F)'$, C > 0 and 1 . The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $|\varphi(u)| \leq Cg_p(u)$ for all $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$.
- (ii) For any representation $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i$ of $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\varphi(\lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i)| \le C g_p(u).$$

(iii) There exists a Borel regular probability measure μ on B_{F^*} such that

$$|\varphi(\lambda\delta(x)\otimes y)| \le C |\lambda| ||y||_{L_{p^*}(\mu)}$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $x \in U$ and $y \in F$, where

$$||y||_{L_{p^*}(\mu)} = \left(\int_{B_{F^*}} |y^*(y)|^{p^*} d\mu(y^*)\right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}}.$$

Proof. (*i*) \Rightarrow (*ii*): Let $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$ and let $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i$ be a representation of u. It is elementary that the function $T : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$T(t_1,\ldots,t_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n t_i \varphi(\lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i), \qquad \forall (t_1,\ldots,t_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$$

is linear and continuous on $(\mathbb{C}^n, \|\cdot\|_{\ell_{\infty}^n})$ with

$$||T|| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\varphi(\lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i)|.$$

For any $(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $||(t_1, \ldots, t_n)||_{\ell_{\infty}^n} \le 1$, by (i) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |T(t_1, \dots, t_n)| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^n t_i \varphi(\lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i) \right| \\ &= \left| \varphi\left(\sum_{i=1}^n t_i \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i \right) \right| \\ &\leq C g_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n t_i \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i \right) \\ &\leq C \left\| (t_1 \lambda_1, \dots, t_n \lambda_n) \right\|_{\ell_p^n} \left\| (y_1, \dots, y_n) \right\|_{\ell_{p^*}^{n,w}(F)}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\varphi(\lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i)| \le C \, \|(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)\|_{\ell_p^n} \, \|(y_1, \ldots, y_n)\|_{\ell_{p^*}^{n, w}(F)} \, .$$

Taking infimum over all the representations of u, we deduce that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\varphi(\lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i)| \le C g_p(u).$$

 $(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$: Let *C* be the set of all Borel regular probability measures μ on B_{F^*} . Clearly, it is a convex compact subset of $(C(B_{F^*})^*, w^*)$. Assume first 1 . Let*M*be set of all functions from*C* $to <math>\mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$f_{(\lambda_i)_{i=1}^n,(x_i)_{i=1}^n,(y_i)_{i=1}^n)}(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^n |\varphi(\lambda_i \delta_U(x_i) \otimes y_i)| - \left(\frac{C}{p} \left\| (\lambda_i)_{i=1}^n \right\|_{\ell_p^n}^p + \frac{C}{p^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \|y_i\|_{L_p^*(\mu)}^p \right),$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $x_i \in U$ and $y_i \in F$ for i = 1, ..., n.

We now check that *M* satisfies the three conditions of Ky Fan's lemma (see [6, 9.10]):

Condition 1. Each $f_{(\lambda_i)_{i=1}^n, (x_i)_{i=1}^n, (y_i)_{i=1}^n)} \in M$ is convex and lower semicontinuous.

It suffices to show that $f := f_{(\lambda_i)_{i=1}^n, (x_i)_{i=1}^n, (y_i)_{i=1}^n)}$ is affine and Lipschitz. Denoting

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\varphi(\lambda_i \delta_U(x_i) \otimes y_i)| - \frac{C}{p} \left\| (\lambda_i)_{i=1}^n \right\|_{\ell_p^n}^p,$$

we can write

$$f(\mu) = A - \frac{C}{p^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{B_{F^*}} |y^*(y_i)|^{p^*} d\mu(y^*) \qquad (\mu \in C).$$

Given $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in C$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$f(\alpha\mu_1 + (1 - \alpha)\mu_2) = (\alpha A + (1 - \alpha)A) - \frac{C}{p^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{B_{F^*}} |y^*(y_i)|^{p^*} d(\alpha\mu_1 + (1 - \alpha)\mu_2)(y^*)$$
$$= \alpha f(\mu_1) + (1 - \alpha)f(\mu_2)$$

and

$$\begin{split} |f(\mu_1) - f(\mu_2)| &= \frac{C}{p^*} \left| \int_{B_{F^*}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |y^*(y_i)|^{p^*} \right) d(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(y^*) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{p^*} \int_{B_{F^*}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n ||y_i||^{p^*} \right) d|\mu_1 - \mu_2|(y^*) \\ &= \frac{C}{p^*} \left\| (y_1, \dots, y_n) \right\|_{\ell_{p^*}}^{p^*} \left\| \mu_1 - \mu_2 \right\|. \end{split}$$

Condition 2. If $g \in co(M)$, there is an $f_{((\lambda_i)_{i=1}^n, (x_i)_{i=1}^n, (y_i)_{i=1}^n)} \in M$ with $g(\mu) \leq f_{((\lambda_i)_{i=1}^n, (x_i)_{i=1}^n, (y_i)_{i=1}^n)}(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in C$.

It suffices to show that M is convex. Let f_1, f_2 be in M such that

$$f_{1}(\mu) = f_{\left((\lambda_{1i})_{i=1}^{s_{1}}, (x_{1i})_{i=1}^{s_{1}}, (y_{1i})_{i=1}^{s_{1}}\right)}(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{s_{1}} |\varphi(\lambda_{1i}\delta_{U}(x_{1i}) \otimes y_{1i})| - \left(\frac{C}{p} \left\| (\lambda_{1i})_{i=1}^{s_{1}} \right\|_{\ell_{p}^{s_{1}}}^{p} + \frac{C}{p^{*}} \sum_{i=1}^{s_{1}} \|y_{1i}\|_{L_{p^{*}}(\mu)}^{p^{*}}\right)$$

and

$$f_{2}(\mu) = f_{\left((\lambda_{2i})_{i=1}^{s_{2}}, (x_{2i})_{i=1}^{s_{2}}, (y_{2i})_{i=1}^{s_{2}}\right)}(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{s_{2}} |\varphi(\lambda_{2i}\delta_{U}(x_{2i}) \otimes y_{2i})| - \left(\frac{C}{p} \left\| (\lambda_{2i})_{i=1}^{s_{2}} \right\|_{\ell_{p}^{s_{2}}}^{p} + \frac{C}{p^{*}} \sum_{i=1}^{s_{2}} \|y_{2i}\|_{L_{p^{*}}(\mu)}^{p^{*}}\right).$$

for all $\mu \in C$. Given $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, an easy verification shows that

$$\alpha f_1(\mu) + (1 - \alpha) f_2(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^n |\varphi(\lambda_i \delta_U(x_i) \otimes y_i)| - \left(\frac{C}{p} \left\| (\lambda_i)_{i=1}^n \right\|_{\ell_p^n}^p + \frac{C}{p^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \|y_i\|_{L_p^*(\mu)}^p \right)$$

for all $\mu \in C$, with $n = s_1 + s_2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} x_i &= \begin{cases} x_{1i} & \text{if } 1 \le i \le s_1, \\ x_{2(i-s_1)} & \text{if } s_1 + 1 \le i \le n, \end{cases} \\ y_i &= \begin{cases} \alpha^{1/p^*} y_{1i} & \text{if } 1 \le i \le s_1, \\ (1-\alpha)^{1/p^*} y_{2(i-s_1)} & \text{if } s_1 + 1 \le i \le n, \end{cases} \\ \lambda_i &= \begin{cases} \alpha^{1/p} \lambda_{1i} & \text{if } 1 \le i \le s_1, \\ (1-\alpha)^{1/p} \lambda_{2(i-s_1)} & \text{if } s_1 + 1 \le i \le n. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Condition 3. There exists an $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that each $f_{(\lambda_i)_{i=1}^n, (x_i)_{i=1}^n, (y_i)_{i=1}^n)} \in M$ has a value less or equal than r.

Let us show that r = 0 verifies this condition. Let $f_{((\lambda_i)_{i=1}^n, (x_i)_{i=1}^n, (y_i)_{i=1}^n)} \in M$. There exists $y_0^* \in B_{F^*}$ such that

$$\sup_{y^* \in B_{F^*}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |y^*(y_i)|^{p^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |y_0^*(y_i)|^{p^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}}.$$

Let $\delta_{y_0^*}$ be the Dirac's measure on B_{F^*} supported by y_0^* . Taking

$$\alpha = \left\| (\lambda_i)_{i=1}^n \right\|_{\ell_p^n}, \ \beta = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| y_0^*(y_i) \right|^{p^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}}$$

in the identity (see [10, p. 48]):

$$\alpha\beta = \min_{\epsilon>0} \left\{ \frac{1}{p} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\epsilon} \right)^p + \frac{1}{p^*} \left(\epsilon\beta \right)^{p^*} \right\} \qquad (\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^+),$$

we obtain that

$$f\left(\delta_{y_{0}^{*}}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\varphi\left(\lambda_{i}\delta_{U}(x_{i})\otimes y_{i}\right)| - \left(\frac{C}{p}\left\|\left(\lambda_{i}\right)_{i=1}^{n}\right\|_{\ell_{p}^{n}}^{p} + \frac{C}{p^{*}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\|y_{i}\right\|_{L_{p^{*}}\left(\delta_{y_{0}^{*}}\right)}^{p^{*}}\right)$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\varphi\left(\lambda_{i}\delta_{U}(x_{i})\otimes y_{i}\right)| - \left(\frac{C}{p}\left\|\left(\lambda_{i}\right)_{i=1}^{n}\right\|_{\ell_{p}^{n}}^{p} + \frac{C}{p^{*}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|y_{0}^{*}(y_{i})\right|^{p^{*}}\right)$$
$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\varphi\left(\lambda_{i}\delta_{U}(x_{i})\otimes y_{i}\right)| - C\left\|\left(\lambda_{i}\right)_{i=1}^{n}\right\|_{\ell_{p}^{n}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|y_{0}^{*}(y_{i})\right|^{p^{*}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}}$$
$$\leq 0$$

by (ii). By Ky Fan's lemma, there exists a $\mu \in C$ such that $f(\mu) \leq 0$ for all $f \in M$. In particular, we have

$$f_{(t\lambda,x,t^{-1}y)}(\mu) = \left|\varphi(t\lambda\delta_U(x)\otimes t^{-1}y)\right| - \frac{C}{p}t^p |\lambda|^p - \frac{C}{p^*}t^{-p^*} ||y||_{L_{p^*}(\mu)}^{p^*} \le 0$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $x \in U$ and $y \in F$. It follows that

$$|\varphi(\lambda\delta_U(x)\otimes y)| \le C\left(\frac{t^p |\lambda|^p}{p} + \frac{t^{-p^*} ||y||_{L_{p^*}(\mu)}^p}{p^*}\right),$$

and, applying again the aforementioned identity, we conclude that

$$|\varphi(\lambda \delta_U(x) \otimes y)| \le C |\lambda| ||y||_{L_{p^*}(\mu)}$$

The case $p = \infty$ is similarly proved but without applying the cited identity and taking C/p = 0 and $p^* = 1$.

 $(iii) \Rightarrow (i)$: Let $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F$ and let $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i$ be a representation of u. Using (iii) and the Hölder inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{split} |\varphi(u)| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\varphi(\lambda_{i}\delta(x_{i}) \otimes y_{i})| \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_{i}| \, ||y_{i}||_{L_{p^{*}}(\mu)} \\ &\leq C \, ||(\lambda_{1}, \dots, \lambda_{n})||_{\ell_{p}^{n}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||y_{i}||_{L_{p^{*}}(\mu)}^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &= C \, ||(\lambda_{1}, \dots, \lambda_{n})||_{\ell_{p}^{n}} \left(\int_{B_{F^{*}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y^{*}(y_{i})|^{p^{*}} \, d\mu(y^{*}) \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &\leq C \, ||(\lambda_{1}, \dots, \lambda_{n})||_{\ell_{p}^{n}} \left(\sup_{y^{*} \in B_{F^{*}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |y^{*}(y_{i})|^{p^{*}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \\ &= C \, ||(\lambda_{1}, \dots, \lambda_{n})||_{\ell_{p}^{n}} \left(||y_{1}, \dots, y_{n}||_{\ell_{p^{*}}^{n,w}(F)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^{*}}} \end{split}$$

and taking infimum over all the representations of *u*, we conclude that $|\varphi(u)| \leq Cg_p(u)$.

We are now ready to present the announced result. Compare to [5, Theorem 2.3.1].

Theorem 5.2. (*Pietsch domination*). Let $1 and <math>f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) f is Cohen strongly p-summing holomorphic.
- (ii) For any $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i^* \in \Delta(U) \otimes F^*$, we have

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \left\langle y_i^*, f(x_i) \right\rangle\right| \le d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \left\| (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \right\|_{\ell_p^n} \left\| (y_1^*, \dots, y_n^*) \right\|_{\ell_{p^*}^{n, w}(F^*)}.$$

(iii) There is a constant C > 0 and a Borel regular probability measure μ on $B_{F^{**}}$ such that

$$|\langle y^*, f(x) \rangle| \le C \, ||y^*||_{L_{p^*}(\mu)}$$

for all $x \in U$ and $y^* \in F^*$, where

$$||y^*||_{L_{p^*}(\mu)} = \left(\int_{B_{F^{**}}} |y^{**}(y^*)|^{p^*} d\mu(y^{**})\right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}}.$$

In this case, $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ is the minimum of all constants C > 0 satisfying the preceding inequality.

Proof. (*i*) \Rightarrow (*ii*) is immediate from Definition 2.2.

 $(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$: Clearly, $\kappa_F \circ f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F^{**})$. Appealing to Corollary 3.6, consider its associate linear functional $\Lambda_0(\kappa_F \circ f)$: $\Delta(U) \otimes F^* \to \mathbb{C}$. Given $u = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i^* \in \Delta(U) \otimes F^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda_0(\kappa_F \circ f)(u)| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \left\langle (\kappa_F \circ f)(x_i), y_i^* \right\rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \left\langle y_i^*, f(x_i) \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \left\| (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \right\|_{\ell_p^n} \left\| (y_1^*, \dots, y_n^*) \right\|_{\ell_{p^*}^{n,w}(F^*)} \end{aligned}$$

by (ii). Since it holds for each representation of *u*, we deduce that

$$|\Lambda_0(\kappa_F \circ f)(u)| \le d_p^{\mathcal{H}^\infty}(f)g_p(u).$$

By Theorem 5.1, there exists a Borel regular probability measure μ on $B_{F^{**}}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle y^*, f(x) \rangle| &= |\Lambda_0(\kappa_F \circ f)(\delta(x) \otimes y^*)| \\ &\le d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \left(\int_{B_{F^{**}}} |y^{**}(y^*)|^{p^*} \ d\mu(y^{**}) \right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in U$ and $y^* \in F^*$. Moreover, $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ belongs to the set of all constants C > 0 satisfying the inequality in (iii).

 $(iii) \Rightarrow (i)$: Given $x \in U$ and $y^* \in F^*$, we have

$$|\Lambda_0(\kappa_F \circ f)(\delta(x) \otimes y^*)| = |\langle y^*, f(x) \rangle| \le ||y^*||_{L_{p^*}(\mu)}$$

by applying (iii). Now, Theorem 5.1 guarantees that for any representation $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i^*$ of $u \in \Delta(U) \otimes F^*$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_i| \left| \langle y_i^*, f(x_i) \rangle \right| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_i| \left| \langle (\kappa_F \circ f)(x_i), y_i^* \rangle \right|$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| \Lambda_0(\kappa_F \circ f)(\lambda_i \delta(x_i) \otimes y_i^*) \right|$$
$$\leq C g_p(u)$$
$$\leq C \left\| (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \right\|_{\ell_p^n} \left\| (y_1^*, \dots, y_n^*) \right\|_{\ell_{p^*}^{n, W}(F^*)}.$$

Hence $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \leq C$. This also shows the last assertion of the statement. \Box

We now study the relationship between a Cohen strongly *p*-summing holomorphic mapping from *U* to *F* and its associate linearization from $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$ to *F*.

Theorem 5.3. Let $1 and <math>f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $f: U \to F$ is Cohen strongly p-summing holomorphic.
- (ii) $T_f: \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U) \to F$ is strongly p-summing.

In this case, $d_p(T_f) = d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$. Furthermore, the mapping $f \mapsto T_f$ is an isometric isomorphism from $(\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U,F), d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}})$ onto $(\mathcal{D}_p(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U),F), d_p)$.

Proof. (*i*) \Rightarrow (*ii*): Assume that $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$. By Theorem 5.2, there exists a constant C > 0 and a Borel regular probability measure μ on $B_{F^{**}}$ such that

$$|\langle y^*, f(x) \rangle| \le C \, ||y^*||_{L_{p^*}(\mu)}$$

for all $x \in U$ and $y^* \in F^*$.

Let $y^* \in F^*$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$. By Theorem 1.2, given $\varepsilon > 0$, we can take a representation $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \delta(x_i)$ of γ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i| \le ||\gamma|| + \varepsilon$. We have

$$\begin{split} \left| \left\langle y^*, T_f(\gamma) \right\rangle \right| &= \left| \left\langle y^*, \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i T_f(\delta_U(x_i)) \right\rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \left\langle y^*, \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i f(x_i) \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i| \left| \left\langle y^*, f(x_i) \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq C \left\| y^* \right\|_{L_{p^*}(\mu)} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i| \\ &\leq C \left\| y^* \right\|_{L_{p^*}(\mu)} \left(\left\| \gamma \right\| + \varepsilon \right). \end{split}$$

As ε was arbitrary, it follows that

$$\left|\left\langle y^*, T_f(\gamma)\right\rangle\right| \le C \left|\left|y^*\right|\right|_{L_{p^*}(\mu)} \left|\left|\gamma\right|\right|.$$

Taking infimum over all such constants C, we have

$$\left|\left\langle y^*, T_f(\gamma)\right\rangle\right| \le d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \left\|y^*\right\|_{L_{p^*}(\mu)} \left\|\gamma\right\|$$

by Theorem 5.2. It follows that

$$\sup\left\{\left|\left\langle y^*, T_f(\gamma)\right\rangle\right| : y^* \in F^*, \|y^*\|_{L_{p^*}(\mu)} \le 1\right\} \le d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \|\gamma\|$$

for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$. Therefore $T_f \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$ with $d_p(T_f) \leq d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ by Pietsch's domination theorem for strongly *p*-summing operators [5, Theorem 2.3.1].

 $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$: Assume that $T_f \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$. Given $x \in U$ and $y^* \in F^*$, we have

1.

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle y^*, f(x) \rangle| &= \left| \left\langle y^*, T_f(\delta_U(x)) \right| \\ &\leq d_p(T_f) \left| |y^*| \right|_{L_{p^*(\mu)}} \left| |\delta_U(x)| \\ &= d_p(T_f) \left| |y^*| \right|_{L_{p^*(\mu)}} \end{aligned}$$

by [5, Theorem 2.3.1] for some Borel regular probability measure μ on $B_{F^{**}}$. It follows that $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \leq d_p(T_f)$ by Theorem 5.2.

Since $d_p(T_f) = d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$, in order to prove the last assertion of the statement, it suffices to show that the mapping $f \mapsto T_f$ from $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ to $\mathcal{D}_p(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$ is surjective. Indeed, take $T \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$ and then $T = T_f$ for some $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$ by Theorem 1.2. Hence $T_f \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$, and thus $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ by the above proof.

The equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) of Theorem 5.2 admits the following reformulation.

Corollary 5.4. Let $1 and <math>f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $f: U \to F$ is Cohen strongly p-summing holomorphic.
- (ii) There exists a complex Banach space G and an operator $S \in \mathcal{D}_p(G, F)$ such that

$$|\langle y^*, f(x) \rangle| \le ||S^*(y^*)||$$
 $(x \in U, y^* \in F^*).$

In this case, $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ is the infimum of all $d_p(S)$ with S satisfying (ii), and this infimum is attained at T_f (Mujica's linearization of f).

Proof. (*i*) \Rightarrow (*ii*): If $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$, then $T_f \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$ with $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = d_p(T_f)$ by Theorem 5.3. From Theorem 1.2, we infer that

$$\begin{split} |\langle \mathbf{y}^*, f(\mathbf{x}) \rangle| &= \left| \left\langle \mathbf{y}^*, T_f(\delta_U(\mathbf{x}) \right\rangle \right| \\ &= \left| \left\langle (T_f)^*(\mathbf{y}^*), \delta_U(\mathbf{x}) \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq \left\| (T_f)^*(\mathbf{y}^*) \right\| \end{split}$$

for all $x \in U$ and $y^* \in F^*$.

 $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$: Assume that (ii) holds. Then $S^* \in \prod_{p^*}(F^*, G^*)$ with $\pi_{p^*}(S^*) = d_p(S)$ by [5, Theorem 2.2.2]. By Pietsch domination theorem for *p*-summing linear operators (see [6, Theorem 2.12]), there is a Borel regular probability measure μ on $B_{F^{**}}$ such that

$$||S^{*}(y^{*})|| \leq \pi_{p^{*}}(S^{*}) ||y^{*}||_{L_{p^{*}}(\mu)}$$

for all $y^* \in F^*$. It follows that

$$|\langle y^*, f(x) \rangle| \le ||S^*(y^*)|| \le \pi_{p^*}(S^*) ||y^*||_{L_{p^*}(\mu)}$$

for all $x \in U$ and $y^* \in F^*$. Hence $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \leq \pi_{p^*}(S^*) = d_p(S)$ by Theorem 5.2.

As a consequence of Theorem 5.3, an application of [4, Theorem 3.2] shows that the Banach ideal $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}$ is generated by composition with the Banach operator ideal \mathcal{D}_p , but we prefer to give here a proof to complete the information.

Corollary 5.5. Let $1 and <math>f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $f: U \to F$ is Cohen strongly p-summing holomorphic.
- (ii) $f = T \circ g$ for some complex Banach space $G, g \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, G)$ and $T \in \mathcal{D}_p(G, F)$.

In this case, $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = \inf\{d_p(T) ||g||_{\infty}\}$, where the infimum is taken over all factorizations of f as in (ii), and this infimum is attained at $T_f \circ g_U$ (Mujica's factorization of f).

Proof. (*i*) \Rightarrow (*ii*): If $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$, we have $f = T_f \circ g_U$, where $\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)$ is a complex Banach space, $T_f \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$ and $g_U \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U))$ by Theorems 1.2 and 5.3. Moreover,

 $\inf \left\{ d_p(T) \left\| g \right\|_{\infty} \right\} \le d_p(T_f) \left\| g_U \right\|_{\infty} = d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f).$

 $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$: Assume $f = T \circ g$ with G, g and T being as in (ii). Since $g = T_g \circ g_U$ by Theorem 1.2, it follows that $f = T \circ T_g \circ g_U$ which implies that $T_f = T \circ T_g$, and thus $T_f \in \mathcal{D}_p(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$ by the ideal property of \mathcal{D}_p . By Theorem 5.3, we obtain that $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with

$$d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = d_p(T_f) = d_p(T \circ T_g) \le k_p(T) \left\| T_g \right\| = d_p(T) \left\| g \right\|_{\infty},$$

and so $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \leq \inf\{d_p(T) \|g\|_{\infty}\}$ by taking the infimum over all factorizations of f.

When F is reflexive, every $f \in \mathcal{D}_2^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ factors through a Hilbert space as we see below.

Corollary 5.6. Let *F* be a reflexive complex Banach space. If $f \in \mathcal{D}_2^{H^{\infty}}(U, F)$, then there exist a Hilbert space *H*, an operator $T \in \mathcal{D}_2(H, F)$ and a mapping $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, H)$ such that $f = T \circ g$.

Proof. Assume that $f \in \mathcal{D}_2^{H^{\infty}}(U, F)$. By Theorem 5.3, $T_f \in \mathcal{D}_2(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$. Hence $(T_f)^* \in \Pi_2(F^*, \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^*)$ by [5, Theorem 2.2.2]. By [6, Corollary 2.16 and Examples 2.9 (b)], there exist a Hilbert space H and operators $T_1 \in \Pi_2(F^*, H)$ and $T_2 \in \mathcal{L}(H, \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^*)$ such that $(T_f)^* = T_2 \circ T_1$.

On the one hand, we have $(T_f)^{**} = (T_1)^* \circ (T_2)^*$, where $(T_1)^* \in \mathcal{D}_2(H, F^{**})$ by [5, Theorem 2.2.2]. On the other hand, we have $(T_f)^{**} \circ \kappa_{\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)} = \kappa_F \circ T_f$ with κ_F being bijective (since F is reflexive). Consequently, we obtain $f = T \circ g$, where $T = (\kappa_F)^{-1} \circ (T_1)^* \in \mathcal{D}_2(H, F)$ and $g = (T_2)^* \circ \kappa_{\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)} \circ g_U \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, H)$.

Applying Theorem 5.3 and [5, Theorem 2.4.1], we get useful inclusion relations.

Corollary 5.7. Let $1 < p_1 \le p_2 \le \infty$. If $f \in \mathcal{D}_{p_2}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$, then $f \in \mathcal{D}_{p_1}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ and $d_{p_1}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \le d_{p_2}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$.

These inclusion relations can become coincidence relations when F^* has cotype 2 (see [6, pp. 217–221] for definitions and results on this class of spaces). Compare to [6, Corollary 11.16].

Corollary 5.8. Let $2 . If <math>F^*$ has cotype 2, then $\mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F) = \mathcal{D}_2^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ and $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = d_2^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$.

Proof. By Corollary 5.7, we have $\mathcal{D}_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{2}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $d_{2}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \leq d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{D}_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$. For the converse, let $f \in \mathcal{D}_{2}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$. Then $T_{f} \in \mathcal{D}_{2}(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$ with $d_{2}(T_{f}) = d_{2}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$ by Theorem 5.3. Hence $(T_{f})^{*} \in \Pi_{2}(F^{*}, \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^{*})$ with $\pi_{2}((T_{f})^{*}) = d_{2}(T_{f})$ by [5, Theorem 2.2.2]. Then, by [6, Corollary 11.16], $(T_{f})^{*} \in \Pi_{1}(F^{*}, \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^{*})$ with $\pi_{1}((T_{f})^{*}) = \pi_{2}((T_{f})^{*})$. Hence $(T_{f})^{*} \in \Pi_{p^{*}}(F^{*}, \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^{*})$ with $\pi_{p^{*}}((T_{f})^{*}) \leq \pi_{1}((T_{f})^{*})$ by [6, Theorem 2.8]. Then, by [5, Theorem 2.2.2], $T_{f} \in \mathcal{D}_{p}(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$ with $d_{p}(T_{f}) = \pi_{p^{*}}((T_{f})^{*})$. Finally, $f \in \mathcal{D}_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = d_{p}(T_{f})$ by Theorem 5.3, and therefore $d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) \leq d_{2}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f)$. □

Given $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$, the *transpose* of f is the mapping $f^t \colon F^* \to \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$ defined by

$$f^{t}(y^{*}) = y^{*} \circ f$$
 $(y^{*} \in F^{*}).$

It is known (see [11, Proposition 1.6]) that $f^t \in \mathcal{L}(F^*, \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U))$ with $||f^t|| = ||f||_{\infty}$. Furthermore, $f^t = J_U^{-1} \circ (T_f)^*$ with $J_U : \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U) \to \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^*$ being the identification established in Theorem 1.2.

The next result establishes the relation of a Cohen strongly *p*-summing holomorphic mapping $f: U \to F$ and its transpose $f^t: F^* \to \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$. Compare to [5, Theorem 2.2.2].

Theorem 5.9. Let $1 and <math>f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$. Then $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}(U, F^*)$ if and only if $f^t \in \Pi_{p^*}(F^*, \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U))$. In this case, $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = \pi_{p^*}(f^t)$.

Proof. Applying Theorem 5.3, [5, Theorem 2.2.2] and [6, 2.4 and 2.5], respectively, we have

$$f \in \mathcal{D}_{p}^{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}(U, F^{*}) \Leftrightarrow T_{f} \in \mathcal{D}_{p}(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U), F)$$
$$\Leftrightarrow (T_{f})^{*} \in \Pi_{p^{*}}(F^{*}, \mathcal{G}^{\infty}(U)^{*})$$
$$\Leftrightarrow f^{t} = J_{U}^{-1} \circ (T_{f})^{*} \in \Pi_{p^{*}}(F^{*}, \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)).$$

In this case, $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = d_p(T_f) = \pi_{p^*}((T_f)^*) = \pi_{p^*}(J_U \circ f^t) = \pi_{p^*}(f^t).$

The study of holomorphic mappings with relatively (weakly) compact range was initiated by Mujica [14] and followed in [11].

Corollary 5.10. *Let* 1*.*

- (i) Every Cohen strongly p-summing holomorphic mapping $f: U \to F$ has relatively weakly compact range.
- (ii) If F is reflexive, then every Cohen strongly p-summing holomorphic mapping $f: U \to F$ has relatively compact range.

Proof. If $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}(U, F^*)$, then $f^t \in \Pi_{p^*}(F^*, \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U))$ by Theorem 5.9. Hence the linear operator f^t is weakly compact and completely continuous by [6, 2.17]. Since f^t is weakly compact, this means that f has relatively weakly compact range by [11, Theorem 2.7]. Since f^t is completely continuous and F^* is reflexive, it is known that f^t is compact and, equivalently, f has relatively compact range by [11, Theorem 2.2].

6. Pietsch factorization for Cohen strongly p-summing holomorphic mappings

We devote this section to the analogue of Pietsch factorization theorem for *p*-summing linear operators [6, Theorem 2.13] for the class of Cohen strongly *p*-summing holomorphic mappings. Recall that, for every Banach space *F*, we have the canonical isometric injections $\kappa_F \colon F \to F^{**}$ and $\iota_F \colon F \to C(B_{F^*})$ defined, respectively, by

 $\langle \kappa_F(y), y^* \rangle = y^*(y) \qquad (y \in F, y^* \in F^*), \\ \langle \iota_F(y), y^* \rangle = y^*(y) \qquad (y \in F, y^* \in B_{F^*}).$

Moreover, if μ is a regular Borel measure on $(B_{F^{**}}, w^*)$, j_p denotes the canonical map from $C(B_{F^*})$ to $L_p(\mu)$.

Theorem 6.1. (*Pietsch factorization*). Let $1 and <math>f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, F)$. The following conditions are equivalent:

(i) $f: U \to F$ is Cohen strongly p-summing holomorphic.

(ii) There exist a regular Borel probability measure μ on $(B_{F^{**}}, w^*)$, a closed subspace S_{p^*} of $L_{p^*}(\mu)$ and a bounded holomorphic mapping $g: U \to (S_{p^*})^*$ such that the following diagram commutes:



In this case, $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = ||g||_{\infty}$.

Proof. (*i*) \Rightarrow (*ii*): Let $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}(U, F)$. Then $f^t \in \Pi_{p^*}(F^*, \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U))$ by Theorem 5.9. By [6, Theorem 2.13], there exist a regular Borel probability measure μ on $(B_{F^{**}}, w^*)$, a subspace $S_{p^*} := \overline{j_{p^*}(i_{F^*}(F^*))}$ of $L_{p^*}(\mu)$, and an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(S_{p^*}, \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U))$ with $||T|| = ||f^t||$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\iota_{F^*}(F^*) \xrightarrow{j_{p^*}} S_{p^*}$$

$$\iota_{F^*} \uparrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow_T$$

$$F^* \xrightarrow{f^t} \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)$$

Dualizing, we obtain

$$U \xrightarrow{J} F$$

$$\delta_U \downarrow \qquad \downarrow \kappa_F$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U)^* \xrightarrow{(f^t)^*} F^{**}$$

$$T^* \downarrow \qquad (\iota_{F^*})^* \uparrow$$

$$(S_{p^*})^* \xrightarrow{(j_{p^*})^*} (\iota_{F^*}(F^*))^*$$

Define $g := T^* \circ g_U$. Clearly, $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}(U, (S_{p^*})^*)$ with $||g||_{\infty} \leq ||T||$, and thus

$$||g||_{\infty} \le ||f^t|| = ||f||_{\infty} \le d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f).$$

Moreover, since $f^t = T \circ j_{p^*} \circ \iota_{F^*}$, we have

$$\kappa_F \circ f = (f^t)^* \circ g_U = (\iota_{F^*})^* \circ (j_{p^*})^* \circ T^* \circ g_U = (\iota_{F^*})^* \circ (j_{p^*})^* \circ g_U$$

 $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$: Since $\kappa_F \circ f = (\iota_{F^*})^* \circ (j_{p^*})^* \circ g$, it follows that $f^t \circ (\kappa_F)^* = ((\iota_{F^*})^* \circ (j_{p^*})^* \circ g)^t$. As $(\kappa_F)^* \circ \kappa_{F^*} = \mathrm{id}_{F^*}$, we obtain that

$$f^{t} = ((\iota_{F^{*}})^{*} \circ (j_{p^{*}})^{*} \circ g)^{t} \circ \kappa_{F^{*}}.$$

Since $j_{p^*} \in \prod_{p^*} (\iota_{F^*}(F^*), S_{p^*})$ (see [6, Examples 2.9]), then $(j_{p^*})^* \in \mathcal{D}_p((S_{p^*})^*, (i_{F^*}(F^*))^*)$ by [5, Theorem 2.2.2]. Hence $(\iota_{F^*})^* \circ (j_{p^*})^* \circ g \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(U, F^{**})$ with

$$d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}((\iota_{F^{*}})^{*} \circ (j_{p^{*}})^{*} \circ g) \leq d_{p}((\iota_{F^{*}})^{*} \circ (j_{p^{*}})^{*}) ||g||_{\infty} = \pi_{p^{*}}(j_{p^{*}} \circ \iota_{F^{*}}) ||g||_{\infty}$$

by the ideal property of \mathcal{D}_p , Corollary 5.5 and [5, Theorem 2.2.2]. Applying Theorem 5.9 and the ideal property of Π_p , we deduce that $f^t = ((\iota_{F^*})^* \circ (j_{p^*})^* \circ g)^t \circ \kappa_{F^*} \in \Pi_{p^*}(F^*, \mathcal{H}_{\infty}(U))$. Again,

Theorem 5.9 gives that $f \in \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{H}_{\infty}}(U, F)$ with $d_p^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}(f) = \pi_{p^*}(f^t)$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{r}}(f) &= \pi_{p^{*}}(((\iota_{F^{*}})^{*} \circ (j_{p^{*}})^{*} \circ g)^{t} \circ \kappa_{F^{*}}) \\ &\leq \pi_{p^{*}}(((\iota_{F^{*}})^{*} \circ (j_{p^{*}})^{*} \circ g)^{t}) ||\kappa_{F^{*}}|| \\ &\leq d_{p}^{\mathcal{H}^{\infty}}((\iota_{F^{*}})^{*} \circ (j_{p^{*}})^{*} \circ g) \\ &\leq \pi_{p^{*}}(j_{p^{*}} \circ \iota_{F^{*}}) ||g||_{\infty} \\ &\leq \pi_{p^{*}}(j_{p^{*}}) ||\iota_{F^{*}}|| ||g||_{\infty} \\ &\leq ||g||_{\infty} . \end{aligned}$$

References

- D. Achour and L. Mezrag, On the Cohen strongly *p*-summing multilinear operators, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 327 (2007), no. 1, 550–563.
- [2] J. C. Angulo-López and M. Fernández-Unzueta, Lipschitz *p*-summing multilinear operators, J. Funct. Anal. 279 (2020), no. 4, 108572, 20 pp.
- [3] W. Arendt, C. J. K. Batty, M. Hieber and F. Neubrander, Vector-valued Laplace transforms and Cauchy problems, Monographs in Mathematics, Vol. 96, Birkhauser Verlag, Basel-Boston-Berlin, 2001.
- [4] R. Aron, G. Botelho, D. Pellegrino and P. Rueda, Holomorphic mappings associated to composition ideals of polynomials. Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl. 21 (2010), no. 3, 261–274.
- [5] J. S. Cohen, Absolutely *p*-summing, *p*-nuclear operators and their conjugates, Math. Ann. **201** (1973) 177–200.
- [6] J. Diestel, H. Jarchow and A. Tonge, Absolutely summing operators, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 43, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [7] V. Dimant, Strongly *p*-summing multilinear mappings, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 278 (2003) 182–193.
- [8] J. Farmer and W. B. Johnson, Lipschitz p-summing operators, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 137 (2009) 2989–2995.
- [9] A. Grothendieck, Produits tensoriels topologiques et espaces nucléaires, Memoirs American Mathematical Society 16, Providence, Rhode Island 1955.
- [10] H. Jarchow, Locally convex spaces. Mathematische Leitfäden. B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1981.
- [11] A. Jiménez-Vargas, D. Ruiz-Casternado and J. M. Sepulcre, On holomorphic mappings with compact type range, avalaible at https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.01576.
- [12] M. C. Matos, Absolutely summing holomorphic mappings, An. Acad. Brasil. Cienc. 68 (1996) 1–13.
- [13] J. Mujica, Complex analysis in Banach spaces. Holomorphic functions and domains of holomorphy in finite and infinite dimensions. North-Holland Mathematics Studies, 120. Notas de Matemática [Mathematical Notes], 107. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1986.
- [14] J. Mujica, Linearization of bounded holomorphic mappings on Banach spaces, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 324 (1991), 867–887.
- [15] J. Mujica, Linearization of holomorphic mappings of bounded type. Progress in functional analysis (Peñíscola, 1990), 149–162, North-Holland Math. Stud., 170, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992.
- [16] J. Mujica, Holomorphic functions on Banach spaces, Note Mat. 25 (2005/06), no. 2, 113–138.
- [17] D. Pellegrino, Strongly almost summing holomorphic mappings, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 287 (2003), no. 1, 244– 252.
- [18] A. Pietsch, Absolut *p*-summierende Abbildungen in normierten Räumen, Studia Math. 28 (1967), 333–353.
- [19] A. Pietsch, Ideals of multilinear functionals (designs of a theory), in: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Operator Algebras, Ideals, and Their Applications in Theoretical Physics, Leipzig, 1983, in: Teubner-Texte Math., vol. 67, Teubner, Leipzig, 1984, pp. 185–199.
- [20] R. A. Ryan, Introduction to tensor products of Banach spaces, Series: Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, 2002.
- [21] K. Saadi, Some properties for Lipschitz strongly p-summing operators, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 423 (2015) 1410– 1426.
- [22] R. Yahi, D. Achour and P. Rueda, Absolutely summing Lipschitz conjugates, Mediterr. J. Math. 13 (2016), no. 4, 1949–1961.

(A. Jiménez-Vargas) Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad de Almería, 04120, Almería, Spain *Email address*: ajimenez@ual.es

(K. Saadi) Laboratoire d'Analyse Fonctionnelle et Géométrie des Espaces, University of M'sila, 28000 M'sila, Algeria

Email address: kh_saadi@yahoo.fr

(J. M. Sepulcie) Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad de Alicante, 03080 Alicante, Spain *Email address*: JM.Sepulcie@ua.es