

NON-LINEAR APPROXIMATION BY 1-GREEDY BASES

PABLO M. BERNÁ AND DAVID GONZÁLEZ

ABSTRACT. The theory of greedy-like bases started in 1999 when S. V. Konyagin and V. N. Temlyakov introduced in [9] the famous Thresholding Greedy Algorithm. Since this year, different greedy-like bases appeared in the literature, as for instance: quasi-greedy, almost-greedy and greedy bases. The purpose of this paper is to introduce some new characterizations of 1-greedy bases. Concretely, given a basis $\mathcal{B} = (\mathbf{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in a Banach space \mathbb{X} , we know that \mathcal{B} is C -greedy with $C > 0$ if $\|f - \mathcal{G}_m(f)\| \leq C\sigma_m(f)$ for every $f \in \mathbb{X}$ and every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\sigma_m(f)$ is the best m th error in the approximation for f , that is, $\sigma_m(f) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{X}: |\text{supp}(y)| \leq m} \|f - y\|$. Here, we focus our attention when $C = 1$ showing that a basis is 1-greedy if and only if $\|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\| = \sigma_1(f)$ for every $f \in \mathbb{X}$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Let \mathbb{X} be a Banach space over the field $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} , and let $\mathcal{B} = (\mathbf{x}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a semi-normalized Markushevich basis of \mathbb{X} , that is,

- $\overline{\text{span}(\mathbf{x}_n : n \in \mathbb{N})} = \mathbb{X}$;
- there exists a unique sequence $(\mathbf{x}_n^*)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{X}^*$ (called biorthogonal functionals) such that $\mathbf{x}_n^*(\mathbf{x}_j) = \delta_{n,j}$;
- $\overline{\text{span}(\mathbf{x}_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N})}^{w^*} = \mathbb{X}^*$;
- there exist c_1, c_2 such that

$$0 < c_1 \leq \inf_n \{\|\mathbf{x}_n\|, \|\mathbf{x}_n^*\|\} \leq \sup_n \{\|\mathbf{x}_n\|, \|\mathbf{x}_n^*\|\} \leq c_2 < \infty.$$

Under these conditions, for every $f \in \mathbb{X}$, we have the series expansion

$$f \sim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{x}_n^*(f) \mathbf{x}_n,$$

where $(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in c_0$. We denote by \mathbb{X}_f the subspace of \mathbb{X} where the support of f is finite, that is $|\text{supp}(f)| < \infty$ with $\text{supp}(f) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \mathbf{x}_n^*(f) \neq 0\}$. Moreover, we will use the quantity $\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty = \sup_{n \in \text{supp}(f)} |\mathbf{x}_n^*(f)|$. Also, related to a Banach space, we can define the so called *indicator sums*: let A be a finite set and $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_n)_{n \in A}$ a collection of numbers of modulus one, that is, $|\varepsilon_n| = 1$ for all $n \in A$ ($|\varepsilon| = 1$ for short). We define the (signed) indicator sums as follows:

$$\mathbf{1}_A[\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{X}] = \mathbf{1}_A := \sum_{j \in A} \mathbf{x}_j, \quad \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}[\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{X}] = \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} := \sum_{j \in A} \varepsilon_j \mathbf{x}_j.$$

Of course, if $\varepsilon \equiv 1$, $\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} = \mathbf{1}_A$.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 41A65, 46B15.

Key words and phrases. Greedy bases, Greedy Algorithm, Unconditional bases.

In 1999, in [9], S. V. Konyagin and V. N. Temlyakov introduced the Thresholding Greedy Algorithm (TGA): consider \mathbb{X} a Banach space with a basis $\mathcal{B} = (\mathbf{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and take $f \in \mathbb{X}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We define the *natural greedy ordering* of $f \in \mathbb{X}$ as a map $\rho : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq \rho(\mathbb{N})$ and such that if $j < k$, then either $|\mathbf{x}_{\rho(j)}^*(f)| > |\mathbf{x}_{\rho(k)}^*(f)|$ or $|\mathbf{x}_{\rho(j)}^*(f)| = |\mathbf{x}_{\rho(k)}^*(f)|$ and $\rho(j) < \rho(k)$. Then, the *mth greedy sum of f* is

$$\mathcal{G}_m[\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{X}](f) = \mathcal{G}_m(f) := \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{x}_{\rho(j)}^*(f) \mathbf{x}_{\rho(j)}.$$

Alternatively, denoting by $A_m(f) = \{\rho(1), \dots, \rho(m)\} \subset \text{supp}(f)$, we can identify the *mth greedy sum* like the projection

$$\mathcal{G}_m(f) = \sum_{n \in A_m(f)} \mathbf{x}_n^*(f) \mathbf{x}_n,$$

where $A_m(f)$ is called the *mth greedy set of f* and verifies the condition

$$\min_{n \in A_m(f)} |\mathbf{x}_n^*(f)| \geq \max_{n \notin A_m(f)} |\mathbf{x}_n^*(f)|.$$

Once we have the algorithm, the first natural question is when the algorithm converges. For that, S. V. Konyagin and V. N. Temlyakov introduced the notion of quasi-greediness: we say that \mathcal{B} in a Banach space \mathbb{X} is **quasi-greedy** if there is $C > 0$ such that

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_m(f)\| \leq C\|f\|, \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall f \in \mathbb{X}.$$

The relation between this property and the convergence was given by P. Wojtaszczyk in [11], where he proved the following: a basis is quasi-greedy if and only if

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \|f - \mathcal{G}_m(f)\| = 0, \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{X}.$$

Another situation to study is when the algorithm produces, up to some constant, the best approximation. For that, we need to introduce the best *mth error* in the approximation: given $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \mathbb{X}$,

$$\sigma_m[\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{X}](f) = \sigma_m(f) := \left\{ \left\| f - \sum_{j \in B} a_j \mathbf{x}_j \right\| : |B| \leq m, a_j \in \mathbb{F} \right\}.$$

Hence, we want to know when $\|f - \mathcal{G}_m(f)\|$ is comparable to $\sigma_m(f)$ and for that, we have the concept of greedy bases.

Definition 1.1 ([9]). *We say that a basis \mathcal{B} in a Banach space \mathbb{X} is **greedy** if there is a positive constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_m(f)\| \leq C\sigma_m(f), \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall f \in \mathbb{X}. \quad (1.1)$$

The least constant verifying (1.1) is denoted by $C_g[\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{X}] = C_g$ and we say that \mathcal{B} is C_g -greedy.

There are several examples of these type of bases. Some of them are the following:

- Every orthonormal basis in a Hilbert space \mathbb{H} is 1-greedy, that is,

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_m(f)\| = \sigma_m(f), \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall f \in \mathbb{H}.$$

- The Haar system in $L_p(0, 1)$, $1 < p < \infty$, is C_g -greedy with

$$C_g \approx \max\{p, q\},$$

where q is the conjugate of p ([2]).

- The canonical basis in the space ℓ_p , $1 \leq p < \infty$, is 1-greedy.

In [9], the authors provide a nice characterization of these bases using two properties: democracy and unconditionality.

Definition 1.2. We say that a basis \mathcal{B} in a Banach space \mathbb{X} is **suppression unconditional** if there is $K \geq 1$ such that

$$\|f - P_A(f)\| \leq K\|f\|, \forall |A| < \infty, \forall f \in \mathbb{X}, \quad (1.2)$$

where P_A is the projection operator, that is, $P_A(f) = \sum_{j \in A} \mathbf{x}_j^*(f) \mathbf{x}_j$. The least constant verifying (1.2) is denoted by $K_s[\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{X}] = K_s$ and we say that \mathcal{B} is K_s -suppression unconditional.

Definition 1.3. We say that a basis \mathcal{B} in a Banach space \mathbb{X} is **super-democratic** if there is a positive constant C such that

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|, \forall |A| \leq |B| < \infty, \forall |\varepsilon| = |\eta| = 1. \quad (1.3)$$

The least constant verifying (1.3) is denoted by $\Delta_s[\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{X}] = \Delta_s$ and we say that \mathcal{B} is Δ_s -super-democratic. In addition, if (1.3) is satisfied for $\varepsilon \equiv \eta \equiv 1$, we say that \mathcal{B} is Δ_d -democratic.

With these definitions, the characterization proved by S. V. Konyagin and V. N. Temlyakov is the following one.

Theorem 1.4 ([9]). A basis \mathcal{B} in a Banach space \mathbb{X} is greedy if and only if the basis is suppression-unconditional and democratic. Quantitatively, we have

$$\max\{K_s, \Delta_d\} \leq C_g \leq K_s(1 + \Delta_d).$$

The same characterization works replacing democracy by super-democracy obtaining the estimates

$$\max\{K_s, \Delta_s\} \leq C_g \leq K_s(1 + \Delta_s), \quad (1.4)$$

as we can see in [6] or [3].

Another characterization of greedy bases was given in [5] where the authors proved that is possible to substitute the error $\sigma_m(f)$ by the best m th error in the approximation by subspaces of dimension one.

Theorem 1.5 ([5]). A basis in a Banach space is greedy if and only if there is $C > 0$ such that

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_m(f)\| \leq C\mathcal{D}_m(f), \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall f \in \mathbb{X},$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_m[\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{X}](f) = \mathcal{D}_m(f) := \inf \{\|f - \alpha \mathbf{1}_A\| : |A| \leq m, \alpha \in \mathbb{F}\}.$$

Hence, we have different equivalences for greedy bases, but here we analyze the case of 1-greedy bases. The constant was a case studied by F. Albiac and P. Wojtaszczyk

in [4], where they realized that there exists a basis that is 1-suppression unconditional, 1-(super)democratic and 2-greedy. This example has two consequences:

- The first one is that the upper estimate (1.4) is optimal.
- It is not possible to characterize 1-greedy bases in terms of 1-suppression unconditional and 1-democratic bases.

To get 1-greediness from a theoretical point of view, they introduced the Property (A) that in [8] was renamed and extended to the notion of symmetry for largest coefficients.

Definition 1.6. *We say that a basis \mathcal{B} in a Banach space \mathbb{X} is **symmetric for largest coefficients** if there is a positive constant C such that*

$$\|f + \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq C\|f + \mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|, \quad (1.5)$$

for all $f \in \mathbb{X}$, A, B, ε and η such that $\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty \leq 1$, $|A| \leq |B| < \infty$, $A \cap B = \emptyset$, $\text{supp}(f) \cap (A \cup B) = \emptyset$ and $|\varepsilon| = |\eta| = 1$. The least constant verifying (1.5) is denoted by $\Delta[\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{X}] = \Delta$ and we say that \mathcal{B} is Δ -symmetric for largest coefficients.

With that definition, the corresponding characterization of greedy bases can be found in [8].

Theorem 1.7 ([4, 8]). *A basis in a Banach space is greedy if and only if the basis is suppression unconditional and symmetric for largest coefficients. Quantitatively,*

$$\max\{K_s, \Delta\} \leq C_g \leq K_s \Delta.$$

Then, with this new characterization, we can recover the case of 1-greedy bases using bases that are 1-suppression unconditional and 1-symmetric for largest coefficients. The main goal of this paper is to analyze the main characterization of 1-greedy bases in terms of the best 1th error in the approximation and using the so called Property (Q^*).

Definition 1.8 ([5]). *We say that a basis \mathcal{B} in a Banach space \mathbb{X} has the Property (Q^*) if there is $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|f + \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq C\|f + y\|, \quad (1.6)$$

for any $f \in \mathbb{X}$, $y \in \mathbb{X}_f$, A and ε such that $\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty \leq 1$, $|A| \leq |B| < \infty$ where the set B is defined as $B = \{n \in \text{supp}(y) : |\mathbf{x}_n^*(y)| = 1\}$, $\text{supp}(f) \cap \text{supp}(y) = \emptyset$, $\text{supp}(f + y) \cap A = \emptyset$ and $|\varepsilon| = 1$. The least constant verifying (1.6) is denoted by $\mathcal{Q}[\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{X}]$ and we say that \mathcal{B} has the Property (Q^*) with constant \mathcal{Q} .

With that property, one of the results proved in [5] is the following one.

Theorem 1.9. *Let \mathcal{B} be a basis in a Banach space. \mathcal{B} is greedy if and only if the basis has the Property (Q^*). Quantitatively,*

$$\mathcal{Q} \leq C_g \leq \mathcal{Q}^2.$$

As we can observe, using the Property (Q^*) with constant 1, it is possible to recover 1-greediness. Here, the main result that we show is the following one.

Theorem 1.10. *Let \mathcal{B} be a basis in a Banach space \mathbb{X} . The following are equivalent:*

- a) *The basis is 1-greedy.*

b) For any $f \in \mathbb{X}$,

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\| = \sigma_1(f). \quad (1.7)$$

c) The basis is 1-symmetric for largest coefficients and 1-suppression unconditional.

d) The basis has the Property (Q^*) with constant $\mathcal{Q} = 1$.

To show the proof, we will establish new characterizations of 1-unconditionality and the Property (Q^*) with $\mathcal{Q} = 1$. The structure of the paper is as follows: in Section 2, we give new and known equivalences of 1-suppression unconditional bases and the so called symmetry for largest coefficients. In Section 3, we talk about one equivalence of the Property (Q^*) with constant 1 based on sets of one element. Finally, in Section 4 we show the proof of Theorem 1.10 and Section 5 contains a remark about one consequence of Theorem 1.10.

2. TECHNICAL RESULTS

First of all, we study one characterization of 1-suppression unconditional bases.

Proposition 2.1. *Let \mathcal{B} be a basis in a Banach space \mathbb{X} . Then, \mathcal{B} is 1-suppression unconditional if and only if*

$$\|f - \mathbf{x}_n^*(f)\mathbf{x}_n\| \leq \|f\|, \forall f \in \mathbb{X}, \forall n \in \text{supp}(f). \quad (2.1)$$

Proof. Of course, if \mathcal{B} is 1-suppression unconditional, then we have (2.1). Assume now (2.1) and take $f \in \mathbb{X}$ with finite support, $A \subseteq \text{supp}(f)$ finite with $A = \{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_m\}$. Then, if we define $g = f - \mathbf{x}_{n_1}^*(f)\mathbf{x}_{n_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| f - \sum_{j=1}^2 \mathbf{x}_{n_j}^*(f)\mathbf{x}_{n_j} \right\| &= \|g - \mathbf{x}_{n_2}^*(g)\| \stackrel{(2.1)}{\leq} \|g\| \\ &= \|f - \mathbf{x}_{n_1}^*(f)\mathbf{x}_{n_1}\| \stackrel{(2.1)}{\leq} \|f\|. \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that

$$\left\| f - \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{x}_{n_j}^*(f)\mathbf{x}_{n_j} \right\| \leq \|f\|. \quad (2.2)$$

Then, if we take $h = f - \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{x}_{n_j}^*(f)\mathbf{x}_{n_j}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| f - \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{x}_{n_j}^*(f)\mathbf{x}_{n_j} \right\| &= \|h - \mathbf{x}_{n_m}^*(h)\| \stackrel{(2.1)}{\leq} \|h\| \\ &= \left\| f - \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{x}_{n_j}^*(f)\mathbf{x}_{n_j} \right\| \stackrel{(2.2)}{\leq} \|f\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the basis is 1-suppression-unconditional for elements with finite support. Now, applying density, we can show that basis is 1-suppression-unconditional: take $f \in \mathbb{X}$ and $g \in \mathbb{X}$ with finite support such that $\|f - g\| < \varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon > 0$. Hence,

$$\|f - P_A(f)\| = \|f - g + g - P_A(g) + P_A(g) - P_A(f)\|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \|f - g\| + \|g - P_A(g)\| + \|P_A(f - g)\| \\
&\leq (1 + \|P_A\|)\|f - g\| + \|g\| \\
&\leq (2 + \|P_A\|)\|f - g\| + \|f\| \\
&< (2 + \|P_A\|)\varepsilon + \|f\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking now $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the result. \square

The same idea works to prove the following result for quasi-greedy bases.

Proposition 2.2. *Let \mathcal{B} be a basis in a Banach space \mathbb{X} . Then, \mathcal{B} is 1-quasi-greedy if and only if*

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\| \leq \|f\|, \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{X}, \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. It is only necessary to show that (2.3) implies quasi-greediness. For that, taking $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A_m(f)$ a greedy set of cardinality m , if $f_1 = f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)$,

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_2(f)\| = \|f_1 - \mathcal{G}_1(f_1)\| \stackrel{(2.3)}{\leq} \|f_1\| = \|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\| \stackrel{(2.3)}{\leq} \|f\|.$$

Now, assume that

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_{m-1}(f)\| \leq \|f\|. \quad (2.4)$$

Taking $f_2 = f - \mathcal{G}_{m-1}(f)$,

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_m(f)\| = \|f_2 - \mathcal{G}_1(f_2)\| \stackrel{(2.3)}{\leq} \|f_2\| \stackrel{(2.4)}{\leq} \|f\|,$$

so the basis is 1-quasi-greedy. \square

Also, respect to unconditionality, we can found the following result in [5].

Proposition 2.3. *Let \mathcal{B} be a K_s -suppression unconditional basis of a Banach space \mathbb{X} . Let $f \in \mathbb{X}$, $A \subseteq \text{supp}(f)$ and $\varepsilon_n = \frac{\mathbf{x}_n^*(f)}{|\mathbf{x}_n^*(f)|}$ for $n \in A$. Then,*

$$\left\| \sum_{j \in B} \mathbf{x}_j^*(f) \mathbf{x}_j + t \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} \right\| \leq K_s \|f\|,$$

for each $B \subset \text{supp}(f) \setminus A$ and $t \leq \min\{|\mathbf{x}_n^*(f)| : n \in A\}$.

Corollary 2.4. *Let \mathcal{B} be a 1-suppression unconditional basis in a Banach space \mathbb{X} . Then, if $\varepsilon_m = \frac{\mathbf{x}_m^*(f)}{|\mathbf{x}_m^*(f)|}$ with $\{m\} \in \text{supp}(f)$, we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{j \in B} \mathbf{x}_j^*(f) \mathbf{x}_j + t \varepsilon_m \mathbf{x}_m \right\| \leq \|f\|,$$

for each $B \subset \text{supp}(f) \setminus \{m\}$ and $t \leq |\mathbf{x}_m^*(f)|$.

Proof. Just apply the last proposition with $A = \{m\}$ and $K_s = 1$. \square

Considering now the symmetry for largest coefficients, the following result is well known.

Proposition 2.5 ([1]). *A basis is 1-symmetric for largest coefficients if and only if*

$$\|f + \varepsilon_n \mathbf{x}_n\| = \|f + \eta_j \mathbf{x}_j\|,$$

for every $f \in \mathbb{X}$ with $\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty \leq 1$, $|\varepsilon_n| = |\eta_j| = 1$ with $n, j \notin \text{supp}(f)$.

Corollary 2.6. *Let \mathcal{B} be a 1-symmetric for largest coefficients basis in a Banach space \mathbb{X} . Then,*

$$\|f\| \leq \|f - P_{\{n\}}(f) + t\eta_k \mathbf{x}_k\|,$$

for every $f \in \mathbb{X}$, $t \geq \|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty$, $n \in \text{supp}(f)$, $k \notin \text{supp}(f)$ and $|\eta_k| = 1$.

Proof. Take $f \in \mathbb{X}$ and $j, k \notin \text{supp}(f)$ and $|\varepsilon_j| = |\eta_k| = 1$. Now, if we define $f' = \frac{f}{t}$ where $t \geq \|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty$, $\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f'))_n\|_\infty \leq 1$, so if we apply Proposition 2.5, we obtain

$$\|f' + \varepsilon_j \mathbf{x}_j\| = \|f' + \eta_k \mathbf{x}_k\|. \quad (2.5)$$

Multiplying now by t in (2.5), we have

$$\|f + t\varepsilon_j \mathbf{x}_j\| = \|f + t\eta_k \mathbf{x}_k\|. \quad (2.6)$$

Consider now $n \in \text{supp}(f)$ and define $g := f - P_{\{n\}}(f)$. Applying n as j in (2.6) we obtain

$$\|g + t\varepsilon_n \mathbf{x}_n\| = \|g + t\eta_k \mathbf{x}_k\|, \quad (2.7)$$

where applying convexity,

$$\|f\| = \|f - P_{\{n\}}(f) + P_{\{n\}}(f)\| \leq \sup_{|\varepsilon_n|=1} \|f - P_n(f) + t\varepsilon_n \mathbf{x}_n\| \stackrel{(2.7)}{\leq} \|f - P_{\{n\}}(f) + t\eta_k \mathbf{x}_k\|.$$

□

3. PROPERTY (Q*)

We analyze in this section an equivalence of the Property (Q*) for the constant 1. Remember that a basis has the Property (Q*) with constant \mathcal{Q} if

$$\|f + \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \mathcal{Q}\|f + y\|,$$

for any $f \in \mathbb{X}$, $y \in \mathbb{X}_f$, $\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty \leq 1$, $|A| \leq |B| < \infty$ with $B = \{n \in \text{supp}(y) : |\mathbf{x}_n^*(y)| = 1\}$, $\text{supp}(f) \cap \text{supp}(y) = \emptyset$, $\text{supp}(f + y) \cap A = \emptyset$ and $|\varepsilon| = 1$.

We note that thanks to [7, Lemma 3.2], we can replace $f \in \mathbb{X}$ by $f \in \mathbb{X}_f$ thanks to a density argument in the last definition.

The main result here is the following equivalence.

Theorem 3.1. *Let \mathcal{B} a basis in a Banach space \mathbb{X} . \mathcal{B} has the Property (Q*) with $\mathcal{Q} = 1$ if and only if*

$$\|f + \varepsilon_n \mathbf{x}_n\| \leq \|f + \eta_k \mathbf{x}_k + y\|, \quad (3.1)$$

for any $f \in \mathbb{X}$, $y \in \mathbb{X}_f$, $\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty \leq 1$, n, k different indices such that $\text{supp}(f) \cap \text{supp}(y) = \emptyset$, $\text{supp}(f + y) \cap \{n, k\} = \emptyset$ and $|\varepsilon_n| = |\eta_k| = 1$.

Proof. Assume that we have the Property (Q*) with $\mathcal{Q} = 1$ and take now f, ε_n, η_k and y as in (3.1). Taking in (1.6) $A = \{n\}$ and $y' = y + \eta_k \mathbf{x}_k$ with $B = \{k\}$,

$$\|f + \varepsilon_n \mathbf{x}_n\| \stackrel{(1.6)}{\leq} \|f + y'\| = \|f + \eta_k \mathbf{x}_k + y\|,$$

so we obtain (3.1).

Assume now that we have (3.1) and take f, y, A, B, ε and η as in the definition of the Property (Q*), that is, as in (1.6). First of all, we do the following decomposition of A and B : $A = \{n_1, \dots, n_k\}$ and $B = \{m_1, \dots, m_p\}$ with $p \geq k$ and $y = y_r + \sum_{j \in B} \eta_j \mathbf{x}_j$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f + \varepsilon_{n_1} \mathbf{x}_{n_1} + \varepsilon_{n_2} \mathbf{x}_{n_2}\| &= \|(f + \varepsilon_{n_1} \mathbf{x}_{n_1}) + \varepsilon_{n_2} \mathbf{x}_{n_2}\| \\ &\leq \|(f + \varepsilon_{n_1} \mathbf{x}_{n_1}) + \eta_{m_1} \mathbf{x}_{m_1}\| \\ &\stackrel{(3.1), y=0}{=} \|(f + \eta_{m_1} \mathbf{x}_{m_1}) + \varepsilon_{n_1} \mathbf{x}_{n_1}\| \\ &\leq \|f + \eta_{m_1} \mathbf{x}_{m_1} + \eta_{m_2} \mathbf{x}_{m_2}\|. \\ &\stackrel{(3.1), y=0}{=} \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that

$$\left\| f + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \varepsilon_{n_j} \mathbf{x}_{n_j} \right\| \leq \left\| f + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \eta_{m_j} \mathbf{x}_{m_j} \right\|. \quad (3.2)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f + \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| &= \left\| (f + \varepsilon_{n_k} \mathbf{x}_{n_k}) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \varepsilon_{n_j} \mathbf{x}_{n_j} \right\| \\ &\stackrel{(3.2)}{\leq} \left\| (f + \varepsilon_{n_k} \mathbf{x}_{n_k}) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \eta_{m_j} \mathbf{x}_{m_j} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \left(f + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \eta_{m_j} \mathbf{x}_{m_j} \right) + \varepsilon_{n_k} \mathbf{x}_{n_k} \right\| \\ &\stackrel{(3.1), y_1=y_r + \sum_{j=k+1}^p \eta_{m_j} \mathbf{x}_{m_j}}{\leq} \left\| \left(f + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \eta_{m_j} \mathbf{x}_{m_j} \right) + \eta_{m_k} \mathbf{x}_{n_k} + y_1 \right\| \\ &= \left\| \left(f + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \eta_{m_j} \mathbf{x}_{m_j} \right) + \eta_k \mathbf{x}_k + y_r + \sum_{j=k+1}^p \eta_{m_j} \mathbf{x}_{m_j} \right\| \\ &= \|f + y\|. \end{aligned}$$

□

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.10

To study the proof of Theorem 1.10, we will use the following results proving the equivalence between the Property (Q*) with $\mathcal{Q} = 1$ with the 1-symmetry of largest coefficients and 1-suppression unconditionality.

Proposition 4.1. *Let \mathcal{B} be a basis of a Banach space \mathbb{X} . The following are equivalent:*

- a) \mathcal{B} has the Property (Q*) with $\mathcal{Q} = 1$.
- b) \mathcal{B} is 1-suppression unconditional and 1-symmetric for largest coefficients.

Proof. Assume a). By Proposition 2.1, we only have to show that

$$\|f - \mathbf{x}_j^*(f)\mathbf{x}_j\| \leq \|f\|, \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{X},$$

with $\{j\} \subset \text{supp}(f)$. Take then $f \in \mathbb{X}$ and $j \in \text{supp}(f)$ and define $f_1 = \frac{f}{\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty}$ and $g = f_1 - \mathbf{x}_j^*(f_1)$. Hence, taking in (1.6) $A = \emptyset$ and $y = \mathbf{x}_j^*(f_1)$,

$$\|g\| = \|f_1 - \mathbf{x}_j^*(f_1)\| \leq \|g + \mathbf{x}_j^*(f_1)\| = \|f_1\|.$$

Then, we have that

$$\left\| \frac{f}{\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty} - \mathbf{x}_j^* \left(\frac{f}{\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty} \right) \right\| \leq \left\| \frac{f}{\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty} \right\|.$$

Now, since \mathbf{x}_j^* are linear for any j ,

$$\left\| \frac{f}{\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty} - \frac{1}{\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty} \mathbf{x}_j^*(f) \right\| \leq \left\| \frac{f}{\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty} \right\|,$$

and this implies that

$$\|f - \mathbf{x}_j^*(f)\mathbf{x}_j\| \leq \|f\|, \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{X},$$

so the basis is 1-suppression unconditional.

Now, we need to show that the basis is 1-symmetric for largest coefficients. For that, invoking Proposition 2.5, so we only have to show that

$$\|f + \varepsilon_n \mathbf{x}_n\| = \|f + \eta_j \mathbf{x}_j\|,$$

for every $f \in \mathbb{X}$, $|\varepsilon_n| = |\eta_j| = 1$ with $n, j \notin \text{supp}(f)$, but this equality is trivial taking in (3.1) $y = 0$. Thus, a) is done.

Prove now b). Assume that \mathcal{B} is 1-suppression unconditional and 1-symmetric for largest coefficients. We have to show that

$$\|f + \varepsilon_n \mathbf{x}_n\| \leq \|f + \eta_k \mathbf{x}_k + y\|,$$

for any $f \in \mathbb{X}$, $y \in \mathbb{X}_f$, $\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty \leq 1$, n, k different indices such that $\text{supp}(f) \cap \text{supp}(y) = \emptyset$, $\text{supp}(f + y) \cap \{n, k\} = \emptyset$ and $|\varepsilon_n| = |\eta_k| = 1$.

First of all, using the 1-symmetry for largest coefficients (Proposition 2.5), we have

$$\|f + \varepsilon_n \mathbf{x}_n\| \leq \|f + \eta_k \mathbf{x}_k\|.$$

Now, if we define $f' := f + \eta_k \mathbf{x}_k + y$, if $A = \text{supp}(y)$, applying 1-suppression unconditionality, we obtain

$$\|f + \eta_k \mathbf{x}_k\| = \|f' - P_A(f')\| \leq \|f'\| = \|f + \eta_k \mathbf{x}_k + y\|,$$

so the basis has the Property (Q*) with $Q = 1$. \square

Proposition 4.2. *Let \mathcal{B} be a basis in a Banach space \mathbb{X} . If \mathcal{B} is 1-suppression unconditional and 1-symmetric for largest coefficients, then*

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\| = \sigma_1(f), \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{X}.$$

Proof. Take $f \in \mathbb{X}$, n_g the index such that $P_{n_g}(f) = \mathcal{G}_1(f)$ and $y \in \mathbb{X}_f$ such that $\sigma_1(f) = \|f - y\|$ with $n_a = \text{supp}(y)$. Taking now $\varepsilon \equiv \{\text{sign}(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))\}$,

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\| \leq \|f - P_{n_g}(f) - P_{n_a}(f) + t\varepsilon_{n_g} \mathbf{x}_{n_g}\| \quad (4.1)$$

Corollary 2.6

$$= \|P_{(n_g \cup n_a)^c}(f - y) + t\varepsilon_{n_g} \mathbf{x}_{n_g}\|, \quad (4.2)$$

where $t = |\mathbf{x}_{n_g}^*(f)|$. Now, since $(n_g \cup n_a)^c \subset \text{supp}(f - y) \setminus n_g$,

$$\|P_{(n_g \cup n_a)^c}(f - y) + t\varepsilon_{n_g} \mathbf{x}_{n_g}\| \stackrel{\text{Corrolary 2.4}}{\leq} \|f - y\|. \quad (4.3)$$

Hence, by (4.1) and (4.3), we obtain

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\| \leq \sigma_1(f),$$

and then, since $\sigma_1(f) \leq \|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\|$, we obtain that

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\| = \sigma_1(f), \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{X}.$$

Now, assume that

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\| = \sigma_1(f), \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{X}.$$

We need to show that \mathcal{B} is 1-suppression unconditional and 1-symmetric for largest coefficients. We start with the symmetry. Take f, ε and η as in the Proposition 2.5 and define the element $h := f + \varepsilon_n \mathbf{x}_n + (1 + \gamma)\eta_k \mathbf{x}_k$ with $\gamma > 0$. Hence, the set $\{k\}$ is a greedy set with cardinality 1. Then

$$\|f + \varepsilon_n \mathbf{x}_n\| = \|h - \mathcal{G}_1(h)\| \stackrel{(1.7)}{\leq} \sigma_1(h) \leq \|h - \varepsilon_n \mathbf{x}_n\| = \|f + (1 + \gamma)\eta_k \mathbf{x}_k\|.$$

Taking the limit when $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, the basis is 1-symmetric for largest coefficients. Now, is the turn of 1-suppression unconditionality. For that, take any $\{j\} \in \text{supp}(f)$ with $f \in \mathbb{X}$ and α big enough such that $(\alpha + \mathbf{x}_j^*(f))$ is bigger than $\|(\mathbf{x}_n^*(f))_n\|_\infty$. Then, define now

$$g := (f - \mathbf{x}_j^*(f)) + (\alpha + \mathbf{x}_j^*(f))\mathbf{x}_j.$$

It is clear that $\{j\}$ is now the 1-greedy set of g . Hence,

$$\|f - \mathbf{x}_j^*(f)\| = \|g - \mathcal{G}_1(g)\| \stackrel{(1.7)}{\leq} \sigma_1(g) \leq \|g - \alpha \mathbf{x}_j\| = \|f\|,$$

so the basis is 1-suppression unconditional. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Of course, a) implies b) since if \mathcal{B} is 1-greedy, then we have (1.7), that is,

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\| = \sigma_1(f), \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{X},$$

Now b) is equivalent to c) using Proposition 4.2. Also, using now Proposition 4.1, c) is equivalent to d). Finally, we have to show that d) implies a), but this is trivial invoking Theorem 1.9. \square

5. ANOTHER CONSEQUENCES OF THEOREM 1.10

Some years ago, T. Oikhberg introduced in [10] a variant of the Thresholding Greedy Algorithm for gaps, that is, selecting a sequence of positive integers $\mathbf{n} = (n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$, the **n-greedy bases** are as those bases where there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_n(f)\| \leq C\sigma_n(f), \quad \forall n \in \mathbf{n}, \forall f \in \mathbb{X}. \quad (5.1)$$

Of course, if \mathcal{B} is a greedy basis with constant C_g , then (5.1) is satisfied with constant $C \leq C_g$. The most surprise result proved in [10, Section 1] is that if (5.1) is satisfied with

constant C , then \mathcal{B} is greedy with constant $C_g \leq C$, that is, both notions are equivalent using the same constant!

Hence, applying our Theorem 1.10, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.1. *Let \mathcal{B} a basis in a Banach space \mathbb{X} . The following are equivalent:*

- \mathcal{B} is 1-greedy.
- For every $f \in \mathbb{X}$,

$$\|f - \mathcal{G}_1(f)\| = \sigma_1(f).$$

- The basis satisfied the condition (5.1) with constant $C = 1$, that is, the basis is \mathbf{n} -greedy with constant 1.

Funding : P. M. Berná was partially supported by the Grant PID2019-105599GB-I00 (Agencia Estatal de Investigación, Spain). D. González was partially supported by ESI International Chair@ CEU-UCH.

REFERENCES

- [1] Albiac F. and Ansorena J.L., *Characterization of 1-almost greedy bases*, Rev. Mat. Complut. **30** (2017), 13-24.
- [2] Albiac F., Ansorena J.L., and Berná P. M., *Asymptotic Greediness of the Haar System in the Spaces $L_p[0, 1]$, $1 < p < \infty$* , Constr. Approx. **51** (2020), 427-440.
- [3] Albiac F., Ansorena J.L., Berná P. M., and Wojtaszczyk P., *Greedy approximation for biorthogonal systems in quasi-Banach spaces*, Dissertationes Math. **560** (2021), 1-88.
- [4] Albiac F. and Wojtaszczyk P., *Characterization of 1-greedy bases*, J. Approx. Theory **138** (2006), 65-86.
- [5] Berná P.M. and Blasco Ó., *Characterization of greedy bases in Banach spaces*, J. Approx. Theory **215** (2017), 28-39.
- [6] Berná P.M., Blasco Ó., and Garrigós G., *Lebesgue inequalities for the greedy algorithm in general bases*, Rev. Mat. Complut. **30** (2017), 369-392.
- [7] Berná P.M., Dilworth S. J., Kutzarova D., Oikhberg T., and Wallis B., *The weighted property (A) and the greedy algorithm*, J. Approx. Theory **248** (2019), 105300.
- [8] Dilworth S. J., Kutzarova D., Odell E., Schlumprecht Th., and Zsák A., *Renorming spaces with greedy bases*, J. Approx. Theory **188** (2014), 39-56.
- [9] Konyagin S.V. and Temlyakov V. N., *A remark on greedy approximation in Banach spaces*, East. J. Approx. **5** (1999), 365-379.
- [10] Oikhberg T., *Greedy algorithm with gaps*, J. Approx. Theory **225** (2018), 176-190.
- [11] Wojtaszczyk P., *Greedy Algorithm for General Biorthogonal Systems*, J. Approx. Theory **107** (2000), 293-314.

PABLO M. BERNÁ, DEPARTAMENTO DE MÉTODOS CUANTITATIVOS, CUNEF UNIVERSIDAD, MADRID, 28040 SPAIN

Email address: pablo.berna@cunef.edu

DAVID GONZÁLEZ, UNIVERSIDAD CARDENAL HERRERA-CEU, CEU UNIVERSITIES, SAN BARTOLOMÉ 55, 46115, ALFARA DEL PATRIARCA, VALENCIA, SPAIN

Email address: dgonzalezmoro@gmail.com