

ESSENTIAL NORMS OF POINTWISE MULTIPLIERS ACTING BETWEEN KÖTHE SPACES: NON-ALGEBRAIC CASE

TOMASZ KIWERSKI AND JAKUB TOMASZEWSKI

ABSTRACT. Motivated by some recent results, but also referring to classics, we compute the essential norm and the weak essential norm of the multiplication operators acting between two different Köthe spaces both defined over the same complete σ -finite measure space. A by-product of the technology we have developed here are some applications to the abstract Cesàro spaces, their duals, the abstract Tandori spaces, and Banach spaces of analytic functions on the unit disc. We will close our work with some specific examples illustrating the previously obtained results including Orlicz and Musielak–Orlicz sequence spaces (in particular, Nakano spaces) as well as Lorentz and Marcinkiewicz sequence spaces.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Toolbox: Preliminary definitions and prerequisite concepts	5
2. On essential norms of multiplication operators	11
3. Applications: Cesàro, Tandori and Hardy spaces	24
4. Examples: On compact multipliers between some concrete classes of Köthe spaces	31
Appendix A. Quite unusual counterexample to the factorization problem	42
References	45

INTRODUCTION

Problems focused around the issue of calculating the essential norm*, that is, the quotient norm modulo the compact operators, of multiplication and composition operators (or, a mix of both, the so-called weighted composition operators) has a long history and a well-established reputation (see, for example, the papers of Axler [Axl82], Axler, Jawell and Shields [AJS80], Bonet, Domański and Lindström [BDL99a], [BDL99b], Edmunds and Shargorodsky [ES05], Lin and Rochberg [LR93], Saksman and Tylli [ST94], Schep [Sch89], [Sch80] and Shapiro [Sha87]). Nevertheless, even more recently, this subject attracts the attention of many researchers and seems to be still an inexhaustible source of inspirations (to name just a few, let us mention the work of Albanese, Bonet and Ricker [ABR18], Bonet and Ricker [BR20], Contreras and Hernández-Díaz [CHD03], Čučković and Zhao [ČZ07], Douglas, Sun and Zheng [DSZ11], Goldstein, Jarchow

Date: December 14, 2022.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 46E30; Secondary 46B20, 46B42.

Key words and phrases. Köthe (Banach ideal) spaces; rearrangement invariant (symmetric) spaces; multiplication (diagonal) operators; pointwise multipliers; (weak) essential norm; quotient norm; distance to order ideals; (weak) Calkin algebra; (weakly) compact operators; positive Schur property; disjointly homogeneous spaces; Musielak–Orlicz spaces; Nakano spaces; Lorentz spaces; Marcinkiewicz spaces; (abstract) Cesàro and Tandori spaces; optimal domains for Hardy (Cesàro) operator; Banach space of analytic functions on the unit disc; abstract Hardy spaces; Fourier multipliers.

*We kindly refer the reader to the “Toolbox” section, that is, Section 1 below, for all unexplained terms we use in this introduction.

and Labuschagne [GJL06], Guo, Sun, Zheng and Zhong [GSZZ09], Hyvärinen, Kemppainen, Lindström, Rautio and Saukko [HKLRS12], Izuchi, Izuchi and Ohno [IIO11], De Jager and Labuschagne [DJL19], Lang and Maz'ya [LM08], Lefèvre [Lef09], Leśnik and Mleczko [LM21], Mleczko [Mle09] and Schep [Sch22]).

What sets the overwhelming majority of articles dealing with multiplication operators apart is the fact that they focus almost exclusively on the case where the operator acts from one to the same space (perhaps modified by different weights). For example, if $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, then it is part of the folklore that

$$(0.1) \quad \|M_\lambda: \ell_p \rightarrow \ell_p\|_{ess} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda_n|$$

and

$$\|M_\lambda: L_p(\Omega) \rightarrow L_p(\Omega)\|_{ess} = \|M_\lambda: L_p(\Omega) \rightarrow L_p(\Omega)\| = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} |\lambda(\omega)|.$$

Our object in studying essential norms of the pointwise multipliers acting between two Köthe spaces is basically twofold.

First, and this seems to be the main novelty here, we will consider the *non-algebraic case*^{*}, that is, a situation in which the multiplication operator M_λ acts between two “different” Köthe spaces (both, however, defined over the same complete and σ -finite measure space). In other words, we are interested in precise estimation of

$$\|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} := \inf \{ \|M_\lambda - K\|_{X \rightarrow Y} : K: X \rightarrow Y \text{ is compact} \},$$

where X and Y are two Köthe spaces. Observe that in this situation the symbol λ of the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y$ belongs to the vector space

$$M(X, Y) := \{g \in L_0(\Omega) : fg \in Y \text{ for all } f \in X\}$$

which, when equipped with the natural operator norm

$$\|g\|_{M(X, Y)} := \|M_g: f \mapsto fg\|_{X \rightarrow Y} = \sup_{\|f\|_X \leq 1} \|fg\|_Y,$$

becomes a Köthe sequence space itself commonly called the *space of pointwise multipliers* between X and Y . Now, in stark contrast to the algebraic case, when simply $M(X, X)$ coincide with $L_\infty(\Omega)$, the space $M(X, Y)$ can be significantly different than $L_\infty(\Omega)$; for example, if $1 \leq q < p \leq \infty$, then it is rather straightforward to see that

$$M(L_p(\Omega), L_q(\Omega)) = L_r(\Omega),$$

where $1/r = 1/q - 1/p$. Moreover, since bounded multiplication operators $M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y$ are in correspondence with the Köthe space $M(X, Y)$, so it is natural to expect[†] that compact multiplication operators $M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y$ somehow correspond to the separable part of the space $M(X, Y)$, that is, $M(X, Y)_o$. Ideologically, it is a bit reminiscent of Calkin's correspondence, which states, that there is a correspondence between the operator ideal of bounded (respectively, compact) operators on a separable Hilbert space and a Köthe sequence space ℓ_∞ (respectively, c_0).

^{*}The idea of considering non-algebraic case seems to be in the air for some time (see, e.g., [ABR18], [CHD03], [ČZ07], [ES05] and [LM21]), but in the context of Köthe spaces and essential norms of multiplication operators acting on them it seems to be a blank page. However, the reason for this, it seems, is not a lack of interest in this subject, but rather a lack of available techniques or a lack of discernment in the current results. In fact, our results answer an old Djakov and Ramanujan's question from [DR00], five of six questions posed recently by Ramos-Fernández in [RF16] and the question asked by Ramos-Fernández, Rivera-Sarmiento and Salas-Brown in [RFRSSB19].

[†]Directly from (0.1) it follows that $M_\lambda: \ell_p \rightarrow \ell_p$ is compact if, and only if, $\lambda = \{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in c_0$. On the other hand, the separable part of ℓ_∞ coincide with c_0 .

Secondly, and this seems to be the most pragmatic here, since the class of Köthe spaces often serve as a basic skeleton for building other spaces (for example, Bergman spaces, Cesàro spaces, Hardy spaces, Sobolev spaces and Tandori spaces can be build upon Orlicz, Lorentz, Marcinkiewicz, Calderón–Lozanovskiĭ, Musielak–Orlicz or, even more generally, rearrangement invariant and Köthe spaces), so it can be expected that the techniques developed by us will find some applications in certain classes of function spaces (sometimes not belonging to the family of Köthe spaces). We make here the first step in this direction by improving Mleczko’s [Mle09] result on compact Fourier multipliers acting on Banach spaces of analytic functions on the unit disc (in particular, acting on abstract Hardy spaces), and Albanese, Bonet and Ricker’s [ABR18] and Bennett’s [Ben96] (see also [BR20]) results on compact multipliers acting between classical Cesàro and Tandori spaces.

What also seems to be noteworthy is that the non-algebraic case is not a simple generalization of what is currently known. On the one hand, it requires a fresh approach avoiding, for example, the spectral theory techniques (after all, $M(X, X) = L_\infty(\Omega)$ is a Banach algebra, which cannot be said about $M(X, Y)$ in general). On the other, because the description of compact multipliers between X and Y is inextricably linked with the description of a separable part of the space $M(X, Y)$, some more advanced theory related to the so-called *arithmetic of Köthe spaces** and *local properties*† of Köthe spaces, comes into play.

After all this propaganda, let us only add that the proofs we propose seems to lie much closer to the methods of functional analysis, in particular, to the theory of function spaces and to the operator theory, than to rely on some *ad hoc* tricks. As usual, more sophisticated methods put certain phenomena in a more complete and interesting context and, we hope, that this is the case here.

Neverending story. We have one more, slightly less official, but short, story to tell. Initially, the reason for our work was Voigt’s preprint [Voi22] posted on [arXiv.org](https://arxiv.org) in late March, where the essential norm of the multiplication operators acting from L_p into itself is calculated. Already a superficial reading of this work, as well as the works of authors cited therein, almost immediately convinced us that everything should work in much more general framework. However, we also could not shake off the impression that the problem raised in [Voi22] is too classical not to have a solution in the existing literature. To our surprise, just a few weeks later, a commentary on Voigt’s article in the form of Schep’s preprint [Sch22] appeared. In introduction to his paper, Schep writes

“We refer to a recent preprint of J. Voigt [Voi22] for some references. It seems that these authors are not aware that these multiplication operators are examples of order bounded band preserving operators (or orthomorphisms). (...) The current paper was prompted by the preprint [Voi22], which didn’t use our results form [Sch80]. By using the term abstract multiplication operator in our title we hope that future duplication of our results by authors working on these questions for concrete function spaces will be avoided by a web search of MathSciNet search. (...) The current paper describes completely the essential spectrum and norm of an operator $T \in Z(E)$ for an arbitrary Banach lattice E .”

*Arithmetic of Köthe spaces, broadly speaking, can be described as a certain collection of techniques dealing with constructions such as the pointwise product, the pointwise multipliers and the symmetrization (we refer to [KLM19] and Section 4 for some illustrations of these ideas and examples; cf. also [CS14], [CDSP08], [KLM14], [KLM12] and [Sch10]).

†The *order continuity* property will play the main role here, because “globally” it is an analogue of the separability, but can also be “localized” at a single point, that is, it make perfect sense to ask if a function in a Köthe space is order continuous or not.

Although we don't want to breach open doors here, we feel that the last word has not yet been given, because as we have already tried to explain above an analogous questions for something, what we call here the *non-algebraic case*, seems to be almost completely untouched.

Outline. Now, we describe the organization of this work and mention some other results contained herein.

We begin in Section 1 with rather rapid recollection of required definitions and notation that will be used through this paper. As it seems to us, the only slightly unconventional approach is presented here in the context of Rademacher functions (Definition 1.1).

Section 2 is the main part of the paper. At the beginning we compute the essential norms of multiplication operators acting between two different Köthe function spaces (Theorem 2.1) or two different Köthe sequence spaces (Theorem 2.3) culminating in Theorem 2.5. We then explain how these results can be viewed through the prism of Pitt's theorem (Proposition 2.8) and, using this point of view, we answer Djakov and Ramanujan's question from [DR00] (Remark 2.7). In the following, we will focus our attention on the weak essential norms of multiplications operators acting between two different Köthe function spaces (Theorem 2.12). *En route* to the proof on this result, we will use Flores, Tradacete and Troitsky's notion of disjointly homogeneous spaces in tandem with some recent results from [LTM22] about the Dunford–Pettis criterion in Köthe function spaces. Closing this thread, we will give an example of a multiplication operator acting between two Marcinkiewicz spaces which is not weakly compact (Example 2.13), and of a weakly compact multiplication operator acting between Lorentz spaces with a symbol which is not order continuous (Example 2.14). Finally, the last theme that we will devote our attention is the interplay between multiplier and its symbol. More precisely, relying on certain ideas from [KKT22] we will show an elegant result (Proposition 2.15) which equates the (weak) essential norm of the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y$ with the distance from its symbol λ to the ideal of all order continuous functions in $M(X, Y)$. We also propose aesthetically pleasing expression of the weak essential norms of multipliers acting between two rearrangement invariant function spaces (Corollary 2.16).

Then, in Section 3, we will harness our techniques and results developed so far to work. To begin with, by calculating the essential norms of multiplication operators acting between two different abstract Cesàro sequence spaces or two different abstract Tandori sequence spaces (Theorem 3.5), we answer Ramos-Fernández, Rivera-Sarmiento and Salas-Brown's question from [RFRSSB19]. To illustrate our, as nomenclature itself suggests, “abstract” approach, we will consider (in Remark 3.4) pointwise multipliers acting between the classical Cesàro sequence ces_p spaces, and, their duals, the so-called Tandori sequence spaces $\tilde{\ell}_p$. This way we will recreate Albanese, Bonet and Ricker's result from [ABR18] and some of Bennett's results from [Ben96]. Next, we do more or less the same in the case of abstract Cesàro and Tandori function spaces (Theorem 3.5), but we also explain why our results on weak essential norms cannot be easily transferred to the ground of operators acting between Cesàro function spaces. We will close this section by computing the essential norms of Fourier multipliers acting from a Banach space of analytic functions on the unit disc \mathbb{D} , in particular, from an abstract Hardy space built upon a Köthe function space defined the unit circle \mathbb{T} , into some Köthe sequence space (Theorem 3.9). This improves Mleczko's main result from [Mle09].

Last Section 4 is devoted to examples. Here, we calculate the space $M(X, Y)$ for the different configurations of spaces X and Y , coming from some more concrete classes of Köthe sequence spaces, like Musielak–Orlicz spaces (including Nakano spaces and, most importantly, Orlicz spaces; see Proposition 4.1) or Lorentz and Marcinkiewicz spaces (Proposition 4.2). This can be thought of as a tutorial to the arithmetic of Köthe spaces having their roots in [KLM12], [KLM14] and [KLM19] (Lemma 4.3), and as a reincarnation of some Kolwicz's ideas about symmetrization construction from [Kol16] (Lemma 4.4).

All sections are sprinkled with examples and open problems.

Finally, in Appendix A we present an example (Proposition A.1) of a certain Orlicz space $\ell_{\widetilde{M}}$ with the property that

$$\ell_{\widetilde{M}} \odot M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2) \neq \ell_2,$$

that is, $\ell_{\widetilde{M}}$ does not factorize through a Hilbert space ℓ_2 , but $M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2) \neq \ell_\infty$. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first example of such a space.

Acknowledgements. We are very grateful to Lech Maligranda for careful reading of an early draft for our work and all his helpful advise, and to Paweł Kolwicz for all the hints that led us back on the right track. Moreover, both authors would like to express their thanks to Damian Kubiak for sharing his paper with them. We also thank Karol Leśnik for some useful discussions. Last but not least, we also feel obligated to our dear friends Przemysław Trela and Mariusz Żyłuk for some, as usual, interesting comments about our work.

Our research was carried out at the Poznań University of Technology as a part of the Rector's grant.

1. TOOLBOX: PRELIMINARY DEFINITIONS AND PREREQUISITE CONCEPTS

Our notation is rather standard and is, more or less, a mix of notations used in Bennett–Sharpley [BS88], Kreĭn–Petunin–Semenov [KPS82], Lindenstrauss–Tzafriri [LT79] and Pietsch [Pie80]. Below, for the reader's convenience, we provide in detail the most important definitions and the necessary facts. However, the seasoned reader may skip this part without any harm (probably a glance should be given to the Section 1.5 devoted to Rademacher functions). Other more specific terminology will be introduced in context when needed.

1.1. Function spaces. Let (Ω, Σ, μ) be a complete* and σ -finite measure space. Let, moreover, $L_0(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ (briefly, $L_0(\Omega)$ or even L_0) be the set consisting of all equivalence classes, modulo equality almost everywhere, of locally integrable† real or complex valued functions on Σ . A Banach space X is called a *Köthe space* (also a *Banach ideal space* or a *Banach function space*) if the following two conditions hold:

- ▶ X is a linear subspace of $L_0(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$,
- ▶ if $|f(\omega)| \leq |g(\omega)|$ almost everywhere on Ω , with f measurable and $g \in X$, then $f \in X$ and $\|f\|_X \leq \|g\|_X$;

cf. [BS88, pp. 1–3], [KPS82, Definition 1.1, p. 40], [LT79, Definition 1.b.17, p. 28] or [Mal89, p. 161]. However, unless we write otherwise, we will also assume that

- ▶ for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$ with $\mu(\sigma) < \infty$ the characteristic function χ_σ belongs to X ;

Hereafter, whenever we use the term *Köthe sequence space* we mean a Köthe space over a purely atomic measure space, while, the name *Köthe function space* is reserved for a Köthe space over a non-atomic measure space (the choice of vocabulary seems, perhaps, a bit misplaced here, because formally every sequence is also a function, but this nomenclature seems to be well-rooted in the literature). It follows from Maharam's theorem that every Köthe space is, roughly speaking, a mixture of a certain Köthe sequence and Köthe function space. Moreover, since we only consider σ -finite measure spaces, so without losing generality we can, and we will, always assume that Köthe sequence spaces are defined over $(\mathbb{N}, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu)$.

Due to the closed graph theorem, an inclusion of two Köthe spaces, say X and Y , is bounded and to emphasize this fact we will write $X \hookrightarrow Y$ instead of just $X \subset Y$ (in some situations we will also use the symbol $X \xrightarrow{C} Y$ to indicate that the norm of the inclusion $X \subset Y$ is not greater

*This means that any subset of a set of measure zero is measurable.

†We will say, that a function f is *locally integrable* if it is measurable and for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$ with $\mu(\sigma) < \infty$ we have that $\int_\sigma |f(\omega)| d\mu(\omega) < \infty$

than $C > 0$). Moreover, $X = Y$ ($X \equiv Y$) means that the spaces X and Y are the same as sets and their norms are equivalent (respectively, equal).

Given a Köthe space X on (Ω, Σ, μ) the *Köthe dual space* X^\times (or the *associated space*) of the space X is defined as a vector space

$$X^\times = \left\{ f \in L_0(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} |f(\omega)g(\omega)| d\mu(\omega) < \infty \text{ for all } g \in X \right\}$$

with the norm $\|f\|_{X^\times} = \sup_{\|g\|_X=1} \|fg\|_{L_1}$. Recall that $X \xrightarrow{1} X^{\times\times}$ and we have the equality $X \equiv X^{\times\times}$ if, and only if, the norm in X has the so-called *Fatou property*, that is, the closed unit ball in X is also closed in L_0 with respect to the topology of local convergence in measure. Sometimes it will be convenient to use the symbol $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for the natural pairing between the Köthe space X and its topological dual X^* or its Köthe dual X^\times .

Moreover, for a Köthe space X on (Ω, Σ, μ) and a positive and locally integrable function $w: \Omega \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ (briefly, a *weight* on Ω) by a *weighted Köthe space* $X(w)$ we will understand a vector space

$$X(w) := \{f \in L_0(\Omega) : fw \in X\}$$

together with the norm $\|f\|_{X(w)} := \|fw\|_X$. There should be no doubt that the space $X(w)$ is a Köthe space itself. It is also clear that

$$[X(w)]^\times \equiv X^\times \left(\frac{1}{w} \right).$$

We will say that a function, say f , in a Köthe space X is *order continuous* (or it has an *order continuous norm*) if for any sequence $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in X with $0 \leq f_n \leq |f|$ and $f_n \downarrow 0$ point-wise we have that $\|f_n\|_X \downarrow 0$. By X_o we denote the subspace of all order continuous elements of X . It turns out that X_o is an *order ideal* in X , that is to say, X_o is a closed linear subspace of X with the ideal property* (see [BS88, Theorem 3.8, p. 16]). Whenever $X = X_o$, that is, every element of X is order continuous, the space X is said to be *order continuous* (pedantically, *σ -order continuous*) In this situation, we will occasionally write $X \in (OC)$. Notice that this is in fact equivalent to the separability of X (see [BS88, Theorem 5.5, p. 27]; in general, we refer to [Wnu99] for much more information about order continuity property). Moreover, we have two useful characterizations:

- The dual space X^* of a Köthe space X can be naturally identified with the Köthe dual space X^\times if, and only if, the space X is order continuous (see, e.g., [BS88, Corollary 4.3, p. 23]);
- A Köthe space X with the Fatou property is reflexive if, and only if, the space X itself and its Köthe dual X^\times are both order continuous (see [BS88, Corollary 4.4, p. 23]).

In practice, it is also useful to observe that a function f in a Köthe space X is order continuous if, and only if, $\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \|f\chi_{\sigma_n}\|_X = 0$ for every decreasing sequence $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of measurable sets with the intersection of measure zero (cf. [BS88, Proposition 3.5, p. 15]).

Now, let (Ω, Σ, μ) be a *resonant measure space*, that is, non-atomic or purely atomic with all atoms having equal measure, complete σ -finite measure space (see, e.g., [BS88, Theorem 2.7, p. 51]). A Köthe space X of measurable functions on Ω is called *rearrangement invariant* (or *symmetric*; sometimes we will also write briefly *r.i.*) if it satisfies the following condition:

- if f and g are equi-measurable and $g \in X$, then $f \in X$ and $\|f\|_X = \|g\|_X$;

cf. [BS88, Definition 4.1, p. 59], [LT79, Definition 2.a.1, pp. 117–118] or [KPS82, p. 90]. Equivalently,

- if $f^*(t) \leq g^*(t)$ for almost all $t > 0$ and $g \in X$, then $f \in X$ and $\|f\|_X \leq \|g\|_X$,

*This means that if $f \in X_o$, $g \in X$ and $|g(\omega)| \leq |f(\omega)|$, then also $g \in X_o$.

where f^* denote the *non-decreasing rearrangement* of f (see [KPS82, p. 90]; cf. [BS88, Definition 1.5, p. 39] and [LT79, p. 117]). Every Köthe space is a Banach lattice in a sense of Meyer-Nieberg [MN91]. Moreover, every order continuous Banach lattice with the weak unit is order isometric to a Köthe space (see [LT79, Theorem 1.b.14, p. 25] and references given there). It follows from the *Luxemburg representation theorem* (see [BS88, Theorem 4.10, p. 62]) that when considering rearrangement invariant spaces it is enough to limit oneself to the case of one of the three separable measure spaces:

- the natural numbers $\{1, 2, \dots\}$ with the counting measure $\#$,
- the unit interval $(0, 1)$ with the usual Lebesgue measure m ,
- the semi-axis $(0, \infty)$ with the usual Lebesgue measure m ;

cf. [LT79, pp. 114–115] (note, however, that in [KPS82] one consider only r.i. spaces defined on the semi-axis and in [BS88] the Fatou property is essentially included in their definition; see [KPS82, p. 90] and [BS88, Definition 1.1, p. 2]). Again, we take here the convention that whenever a rearrangement space X is defined over $(\mathbb{N}, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, \#)$ we will call it a *rearrangement invariant sequence space*, but in the other two cases, we will use the name *rearrangement invariant function space*.

The class of rearrangement invariant spaces includes many important and classical examples of spaces, like

- Orlicz spaces L_M (see [BS88, §4.8], [Mal83, §3]),
- Lorentz spaces Λ_φ (see [BS88, Definition 5.12, pp. 71–72], [KPS82, p. 107]),
- Lorentz spaces $L_{p,q}$ (see [LT79, Definition 2.b.8, p. 142]; cf. also Section 2),
- Marcinkiewicz spaces M_φ (see [BS88, Definition 5.7, p. 69], [KPS82, p. 114]),
- Lorentz–Zygmund spaces $L_{p,q}(\log L)^\alpha$ (see [BS88, Definition 6.13, p. 253]).

For general properties of Köthe and rearrangement invariant spaces we refer to Bennett–Sharpley [BS88], Kreĭn–Petunin–Semenov [KPS82], Lindenstrauss–Tzafriri [LT77] and [LT79], Luxemburg [Lux67], Maligranda [Mal89] and Zaanen [Zaa67, Chapter 15]. For some information on rearrangement invariant spaces defined *not* necessary on a σ -finite measure space see Fremlin [Fre02]. For much more information about Banach lattices and, even more generally, Riesz spaces, see, e.g., Aliprantis–Burkinshaw [AB85], Kantorovich–Akilov [KA82], Meyer-Nieberg [MN91] and Zaanen [Zaa83].

1.2. Essential norms and operator ideals. Denote by \mathcal{L} the class of all operators, which we *always* assumed to be linear and bounded, between all Banach spaces. For two Banach spaces, say X and Y , let $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ be the set of all operators from X into Y . More generally, for $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{L}$ any two Banach spaces X and Y we set $\mathcal{I}(X, Y) := \mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$. If the need arises, we will shorten the symbols $\mathcal{L}(X, X)$ and $\mathcal{I}(X, X)$ to $\mathcal{L}(X)$ and $\mathcal{I}(X)$, respectively. Following Pietsch [Pie80] we recall that a class \mathcal{I} is called a *operator ideal* if the following conditions are satisfied:

- for any one-dimensional Banach space X the identity operator $\text{id}: X \rightarrow X$ belongs to \mathcal{I} ,
- for all Banach spaces, say X and Y , the set $\mathcal{I}(X, Y)$ is a vector subspace of $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$,
- for any Banach spaces, say W , X , Y and Z , the composite operator UTS belongs to $\mathcal{I}(W, Z)$ whenever S belongs to $\mathcal{L}(Y, Z)$, T to $\mathcal{I}(X, Y)$ and U to $\mathcal{L}(W, X)$.

An operator ideal is said to be a *closed operator ideal* provided $\mathcal{I}(X, Y)$ is closed in $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ for any two Banach spaces X and Y . Some very well-known classes of operator ideals, like compact operators, weakly compact operators, strictly singular operators or completely continuous operators are closed operator ideals.

For any closed operator ideal \mathcal{I} and any operator, say T , acting between two Banach spaces X and Y by the *essential norm of $T: X \rightarrow Y$ with respect to an operator ideal \mathcal{I}* we mean

$$(1.1) \quad \|T: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess, \mathcal{I}} := \|T: X \rightarrow Y\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)/\mathcal{I}(X, Y)} = \inf\{\|T - J\|_{X \rightarrow Y} : J \in \mathcal{I}(X, Y)\};$$

cf. with the definitions given in [Tyl95, p. 96] and [Lef09, Definition 0.3]. The last expression on the right in (1.1) is, of course, nothing else but a natural norm on the space $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)/\mathcal{I}(X, Y)$, that is to say,

$$\|T: X \rightarrow Y\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)/\mathcal{I}(X, Y)} = \text{dist}_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)}(T: X \rightarrow Y, \mathcal{I}(X, Y)).$$

The above definition, in its two most common versions, looks like this:

- the quotient algebra $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)/\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$, where $\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ denote the ideal of compact operators from X to Y , is called the *Calkin algebra* and the corresponding quotient norm $\|T: X \rightarrow Y\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)/\mathcal{K}(X, Y)}$ (or, a bit more concisely, $\|T: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess}$) is called the *essential norm of T* ;
- alike, the quotient algebra $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)/\mathcal{W}(X, Y)$, where $\mathcal{W}(X, Y)$ denote the ideal of weakly compact operators acting between X and Y , is called the *weak Calkin algebra* and the corresponding quotient norm $\|T: X \rightarrow Y\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)/\mathcal{W}(X, Y)}$ (briefly $\|T: X \rightarrow Y\|_w$) is called the *weak essential norm of T* .

An operator T acting between X and Y belongs to the closed operator ideal $\mathcal{I}(X, Y)$ if, and only if,

$$\|T\|_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)/\mathcal{I}(X, Y)} = 0.$$

However, the concept of the essential norm has in general much more to offer (see, e.g., [Tyl95] and references given there).

1.3. Pointwise multipliers. Let X and Y be two Köthe spaces defined on the same complete and σ -finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) . The space of *pointwise multipliers* $M(X, Y)$ is defined as a vector space

$$M(X, Y) := \{f \in L_0(\Omega) : fg \in Y \text{ for all } g \in X\}$$

equipped with the natural operator norm $\|f\|_{M(X, Y)} := \sup_{\|g\|_X=1} \|fg\|_Y$.

Note that the space $M(X, L_1)$ is nothing else but the Köthe dual space X^\times of the space X , so we can naturally think of the construction $M(X, Y)$ as a generalized Köthe dual of X (cf. [CDSP08] and [MP89]). Moreover, looking from a different perspective, the space $M(X, Y)$ can naturally be understood as a “pointwise quotient” of the space Y by X .

Some properties and examples of this construction can be found in [CS14], [CDSP08], [KLM19], [KLM14], [KLM12], [LT21], [LTM22], [MP89] and [Sch10] (see also Bennett’s memoir [Ben96, §14] and Grosse-Erdmann’s book [GE98]). We will collect here only a few of the most important from the point of view of our future needs (hereinafter, unless stated otherwise, X, Y and Z will denote three Köthe spaces defined over the same measure space):

- if $X \hookrightarrow Y$, then $M(Y, Z) \hookrightarrow M(X, Z)$. Moreover, if $Y \hookrightarrow Z$, then $M(X, Y) \hookrightarrow M(X, Z)$;
- $L_\infty \hookrightarrow M(X, Y)$ if, and only if, $X \hookrightarrow Y$. In particular, $M(X, X) \equiv L_\infty$;
- $M(X, Y) \hookrightarrow M(Y^\times, X^\times) = M(X^{\times\times}, Y^{\times\times})$. Moreover, if Y has the Fatou property, then $M(X, Y) = M(Y^\times, X^\times)$;
- if Y has the Fatou property, then $M(X, Y)$ share this property too;
- if X and Y are two rearrangement invariant function spaces, then $M(X, Y)$ is also a rearrangement invariant function space.

Note that for $1 \leq q < p < \infty$ we have the following identifications, namely, $M(L_p, L_q) = L_r$ and $M(\ell_p, \ell_q) = \ell_r$, where $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}$. However, if $1 \leq p < q < \infty$, then $M(L_p, L_q) = \{0\}$, but $M(\ell_p, \ell_q) = \ell_\infty$.

The space of pointwise multipliers $M(X, Y)$ and the space of all *multiplication operators* (or *diagonal operators*; cf. [OT72]) M_λ acting between X and Y are isometrically isomorphic via the mapping

$$\Upsilon: \lambda \mapsto (M_\lambda: f \mapsto \lambda f),$$

where $\lambda \in M(X, Y)$ and $f \in X$. Function λ defining the multiplication operator M_λ will be called its *symbol*.

1.4. Symmetrizations of Köthe spaces. Let X be a Köthe space defined on complete and σ -finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) . By the *symmetrization* $X^{(*)}$ of X we will understand the set

$$X^{(*)} := \{x \in L_0(\Omega): x^* \in X\}$$

together with the functional $\|x\|_{X^{(*)}} := \|x^*\|_X$.

Many classical rearrangement invariant spaces, like Lorentz spaces Λ_φ , Marcinkiewicz spaces M_φ or Orlicz–Lorentz spaces $\Lambda_{M,w}$ are particular cases of this construction; more precisely, $\Lambda_\varphi = [L_1(\varphi')]^{(*)}$, $M_\varphi = [L_\infty(\varphi)]^{(*)}$, and $\Lambda_{M,w} = (L_\Phi)^{(*)}$, where L_Φ is a Musielak–Orlicz space generated by the Musielak–Orlicz function $\Phi(u, t) = M(u)w(t)$ and M is a Young function.

However, in general, even the fact that the symmetrization $X^{(*)}$ of a Köthe space X is a linear space is not so obvious (see [CKMP04, Example 3.1] for a counter-example). In fact, it was proved by Kamińska and Raynaud [KR09, Lemma 1.4] (and later supplemented by Kolwicz, Leśnik and Maligranda in [KLM19, Corollary 1]) that the symmetrization $X^{(*)}$ of a Köthe space X is a linear spaces if, and only if, the dilation operator D_2 is bounded on the cone of non-negative and non-increasing functions from X . Even then the functional $\|\cdot\|_{X^{(*)}}$ is only a quasi-norm.

This construction enjoys some interest nowadays (see [Kol16], [KLM19], [KR09] and references given there). For us, as we will see later, its usefulness stems primarily from the fact that it often allows us to reduce some rather difficult questions about the structure of rearrangement invariant spaces to simpler questions about the structure of weighted L_p -spaces; for example, it takes little skill to notice that

$$M(L_\infty(w), F) = F\left(\frac{1}{w}\right),$$

where F is a rearrangement invariant space. At the same time, it is not entirely clear how to identify the space $M(M_\varphi, F)$, until we notice that the following equalities should be true

$$M(M_\varphi, F) = M\left([L_\infty(\varphi)]^{(*)}, F^{(*)}\right) \stackrel{\diamond}{=} [M(L_\infty(\varphi), F)]^{(*)} = \left[F\left(\frac{1}{w}\right)\right]^{(*)}.$$

The point is, that we can make the second step somehow rigorous (see Section 4; cf. [KLM14]).

1.5. Rademachers on general measure spaces. Usually, without unnecessary confusion, the *Rademacher system* $\{r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is understood as the Bernoulli sequence of independent identically and symmetrically distributed random variables on the unit interval taking the values ± 1 . In more familiar form the n^{th} *standard Rademacher* r_n is just a function

$$(1.2) \quad r_n(t) = \text{sign}(\sin 2^n \pi t) \text{ for } 0 < t < 1,$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (cf. [AK06, Definition 6.2.1, p. 132] and [LT77, p. 24]; Astashkin's book [Ast20] seems to be an inexhaustible source of information about Rademacher's functions).

However, for some reasons, which will become clear later, the object we really want to construct here is a family of functions that shares the most important properties of Rademacher system, but can be defined on *any* σ -finite measure space. Since on a finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) Rademachers are nothing else but a sequence of independent random variables each of which takes values ± 1 with probability $\mu(\Omega)/2$, so the construction of Rademachers on any finite and non-atomic measure space should present no difficulties (cf. [JL06, p. 224]). With a little patience while gluing the appropriate fragments together we can do the same for every σ -finite measure

space. Unfortunately, handling with such a construction turned out to be quite difficult to us. Therefore, we propose the following, easier-to-work, one.

Definition 1.1 (Abstract Rademachers $\{r_n^\Omega\}_{n=1}^\infty$). Let (Ω, Σ, μ) be a non-atomic and complete σ -finite measure space and let $\Omega = \{\Omega_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ be a decomposition of Ω into countable family of pairwise disjoint sets of measure not exceeding one. Further, for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\varpi_N: \Omega_N \rightarrow (0, \mu(\Omega_N))$ be a measure-preserving transformation the existence of which is guaranteed by Ryff's theorem (see [BS88, Theorem 7.5, p. 82]). Put

$$r_n^{\Omega_N}(\omega) := (r_n \circ \varpi_N^{-1})(\omega) \text{ for } \omega \in \Omega_N,$$

where, as usual, the symbol r_n stands for the n^{th} standard Rademacher (like in (1.2) above). Then, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by the n^{th} abstract Rademacher on Ω we understand a function $r_n^\Omega: \Omega \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ defined as

$$r_n^\Omega(\omega) = \sum_{N=1}^\infty r_n^{\Omega_N}(\omega) \text{ for } \omega \in \Omega.$$

With such a definition at hand, it is not difficult to prove the following, essentially technical, lemma which seems to be well-known in its basic version (that is, when Ω is just a unit interval or a half-line with the Lebesgue measure; see, for example, [Kub14, Lemma 3.2]). However, this lemma will prove its usefulness in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Lemma \mathcal{R} . *Let (Ω, Σ, μ) be a non-atomic and complete σ -finite measure space. Then, for any function, say f , from $L_1(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ we have that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) r_n^\Omega(\omega) d\mu(\omega) = 0.$$

Proof. Take $f \in L_1(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ and put $\Omega = \{\Omega_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$, where Ω_N are like in the Definition 1.1. First, we claim that for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(1.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) r_n^{\Omega_N}(\omega) d\mu(\omega) = 0.$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) r_n^{\Omega_N}(\omega) d\mu(\omega) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega_N} f(\omega) (r_n \circ \varpi_N^{-1})(\omega) d\mu(\omega) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\mu(\Omega_N)} (f \circ \varpi_N)(t) r_n(t) dm(t) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from, for example, [Kub14, Lemma 3.2]. This proves the claim. Next, fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Since the space $L_1(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ is order continuous (see [BS88, Theorem 5.5, p. 27]), so there is a finite sequence of natural numbers, say $\{N_j\}_{j=1}^M$, such that

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^M \Omega_{N_j}} |f(\omega)| d\mu(\omega) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Next, using (1.3), for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, M$ we can find $n_j \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) r_n^{\Omega_{N_j}}(\omega) d\mu(\omega) \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2M} \text{ for } n \geq n_j.$$

Finally, for all $n \geq \max\{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_M\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) r_n^{\Omega}(\omega) d\mu(\omega) \right| &= \left| \sum_{j=0}^M \int_{\Omega_{N_j}} f(\omega) r_n^{\Omega}(\omega) d\mu(\omega) + \int_{\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^M \Omega_{N_j}} f(\omega) r_n^{\Omega}(\omega) d\mu(\omega) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^M \left| \int_{\Omega_{N_j}} f(\omega) r_n^{\Omega_{N_j}}(\omega) d\mu(\omega) \right| + \int_{\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^M \Omega_{N_j}} |f(\omega)| d\mu(\omega) < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

In view of ε 's arbitrariness this finishes the proof. \square

We end this section with one more remark about notation. Given two quantities, say A and B , depending (maybe) on certain parameters, we will write $A \approx B$ understanding that there exist absolute constants (that is, independent of all involved parameters), say $c, C > 0$, such that $cA \leq B \leq CA$.

2. ON ESSENTIAL NORMS OF MULTIPLICATION OPERATORS

This section is a main part of our work. Since the title of this paragraph is basically self-explanatory, so let's stop at the following remark, which we will use repeatedly without making any explicit reference to it: Since

$$M_{\lambda} = M_{e^{i\varphi}|\lambda|} = M_{e^{i\varphi}} M_{|\lambda|},$$

so the multiplication operator M_{λ} belongs to some operator ideal, say \mathcal{I} , if, and only if, the same can be said about the multiplication operator $M_{|\lambda|}$.

2.1. Compact multiplication operators. For the sake of completeness, let us remind that an operator acting from one Banach space to another is called *compact* provided it carries bounded sets to relatively compact one.

Intuition tells us that there should be no non-trivial compact multiplication operators between Köthe function spaces. In fact, the point is that "locally" the multiplication operator behaves similarly to the identity. More precisely, let $M_{\lambda}: X \rightarrow Y$ be the multiplication operator between two Köthe function spaces both defined on the same complete and σ -finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) . Since the symbol $\lambda \in M(X, Y)$ is not identically zero (otherwise it's all trivial), so there is a set $A \in \Sigma$ with $\mu(A) > 0$ such that

$$\lambda \chi_A \approx \chi_A.$$

However, since the operator $\chi_A: X|_A \rightarrow Y|_A$ defined as

$$\chi_A(x) = x \chi_A,$$

where $X|_A = \{f \in X: \text{supp}(f) \in A\}$ and, similarly, $Y|_A = \{f \in Y: \text{supp}(f) \in A\}$, is an isomorphism, so know from Riesz that it cannot be compact. Therefore, $M_{\lambda}: X \rightarrow Y$ is not compact as well.

What we want to do now is to calculate the essential norm of the multiplication operator. Roughly speaking, we will show that the multiplication operator between two Köthe function spaces is as far from being compact as it can be.

Theorem 2.1 (Essential norm of multiplication operators between Köthe function spaces). *Let X and Y be two Köthe function spaces with the Fatou property both defined on the same complete σ -finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) . Suppose that either the space X is order continuous or the space Y is reflexive. Then*

$$\|M_{\lambda}: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} = \|\lambda\|_{M(X, Y)} = \|M_{\lambda}\|_{X \rightarrow Y}.$$

In particular, there are no non-trivial compact multiplication operators between X and Y .

Proof. Of course, we can immediately assume that the space $M(X, Y)$ is non-trivial, because otherwise there is nothing to prove. What's more, the inequality

$$\|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} \leq \|M_\lambda\|_{X \rightarrow Y} = \|\lambda\|_{M(X, Y)}$$

is true for obvious reasons, so there is nothing else but to turn to the proof of a more interesting inequality.

Let's start with the case when the space X is order continuous. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and take $\lambda \in M(X, Y)$. It follows from the definition of the norm in the space $M(X, Y)$ that there exists $f \in \text{Ball}(X)$ with $\|\lambda f\|_Y \geq \|\lambda\|_{M(X, Y)} - \varepsilon$. Moreover, it is also clear that

$$\|\lambda f r_n^\Omega\|_Y = \|\lambda f\|_Y \geq \|\lambda\|_{M(X, Y)} - \varepsilon,$$

where r_n^Ω denote the n^{th} -abstract Rademachers on Ω (cf. Definition 1.1). Now, for any compact operator, say K , acting from X to Y we have that

$$\|M_\lambda - K\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \geq \|(M_\lambda - K)(f r_n^\Omega)\|_Y \geq \|\|\lambda f r_n^\Omega\|_Y - \|K(f r_n^\Omega)\|_Y\|,$$

We claim that the sequence $\{f r_n^\Omega\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is weakly null. To see this, take $g \in X^\times$ (due to our assumptions the space X is order continuous, thus we have the equality $X^* = X^\times$; see, e.g., [BS88, Theorem 4.1, p. 20]). Since $f g \in L_1(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$, so it is enough to apply Lemma \mathcal{R} from Section 1.5 to conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle f r_n^\Omega, g \rangle| = \left| \int_\Omega (f g) r_n^\Omega d\mu \right| = 0$$

and this proves our claim. Consequently, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|K(f r_n^\Omega)\|_Y = 0$, because every compact operator K is *a fortiori* completely continuous. But now, using the above inequalities, we get that

$$\|M_\lambda - K\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \geq \|\lambda\|_{M(X, Y)} - \varepsilon.$$

This concludes the proof in the first case.

Now, let us move on to the second case when the space Y is reflexive. It follows from Schauder's theorem that an operator, say T , acting between Banach spaces is compact if, and only if, its adjoint T^* is compact too (see., e.g., [AK06, A.4, p. 329]). Hence, we can conclude* that

$$(2.1) \quad \|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} \geq \|M_\lambda^*: Y^* \rightarrow X^*\|_{ess},$$

where M_λ^* is the adjoint of the multiplication operator M_λ . Next, we will need the following observation.

Claim ♠. *Let W and Z be two Köthe function space both defined on the same complete σ -finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) . Let, moreover, $M_\lambda: W \rightarrow Z$ be the multiplication operator with the symbol $\lambda \in M(W, Z)$. Suppose the space Z is order continuous. Then the following diagram commutes*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z^* & \xrightarrow{M_\lambda^*} & W^* \\ L \uparrow & & \uparrow \text{id} \\ Z^\times & \xrightarrow{M_\lambda^\times} & W^\times \end{array}$$

where $L: Z^\times \rightarrow Z^*$ is the natural isometric isomorphism between the Köthe dual Z^\times and the topological dual Z^* , and $M_\lambda^\times: Z^\times \rightarrow W^\times$ is the Köthe adjoint[†] of $M_\lambda: W \rightarrow Z$.

*Note, however, that in general there is no hope for an equality in (2.1) (see [AJS80, Example 1]; cf. [AJS80, p. 160]).

[†]Recall that for a bounded operator T acting between two Köthe spaces, say X and Y , defined on possibly different measure spaces its *Köthe adjoint* (or *Köthe dual*) operator $T^\times: Y^\times \rightarrow X^\times$ is defined by

$$\langle x, T^\times(y^*) \rangle = \langle T(x), y^* \rangle \text{ for all } x \in X \text{ and } y^* \in Y^\times.$$

Proof of Claim ♠. It is clear that each function $g \in Z^\times$ induces a bounded linear functional

$$L_g: f \mapsto L_g(f) := \int_{\Omega} fgd\mu$$

on Z and we can think of L_g as a member of the space Z^* . Moreover, since the space Z is order continuous, it turns out that the mapping $L: Z^\times \rightarrow Z^*$ given by

$$L: g \mapsto (f \mapsto L_g(f)) \text{ for } f \in Z$$

is an isometric isomorphism (see, e.g., [BS88, Theorem 4.1, p. 20]). Therefore, for $f \in W$ and $g \in Z^\times$, we have

$$\langle f, M_\lambda^*(L(g)) \rangle = \langle M_\lambda(f), L(g) \rangle = \int_{\Omega} M_\lambda(f)gd\mu = \int_{\Omega} fM_\lambda^\times(g)d\mu = \langle f, M_\lambda^\times(g) \rangle.$$

This ends the proof of Claim ♠.

Now, it follows from the preceding Claim ♠ that the adjoint operator $M_\lambda^*: Y^* \rightarrow X^*$ can be naturally identified with the multiplication operator $M_\lambda^\times: Y^\times \rightarrow X^\times$ and, in consequence, we have that

$$\|M_\lambda\|_{ess} \geq \|M_\lambda^\times\|_{ess} = \|\lambda\|_{M(Y^\times, X^\times)} = \|\lambda\|_{M(X^{\times\times}, Y^{\times\times})} = \|\lambda\|_{M(X, Y)},$$

where the above inequality is a consequence of (2.1), the first equality results from the fact that under our assumption that the space Y is reflexive, the space Y^\times is order continuous (see [BS88, Corollary 4.4, p. 23]) and the first part of this proof, while, finally, the last equality follows from the fact that $X^{\times\times}$ (resp. $Y^{\times\times}$) and X (resp. Y) are isometrically isomorphic whenever the space X (resp. Y) has the Fatou property (see [BS88, Theorem 2.7, p. 10]). We are done. \square

We immediately get the following

Corollary 2.2 (Compact multiplication operators from a Köthe function space to itself). *Let X be an order continuous Köthe function space with the Fatou property. Then*

$$\|M_\lambda: X \circlearrowleft\|_{ess} = \|\lambda\|_{L_\infty}.$$

In particular, there are no non-trivial compact multiplication operators on X .

Proof. Just observe that $M(X, X) \equiv L_\infty$ and use Theorem 2.1. \square

Let us now turn to the case of Köthe spaces defined over purely atomic measure spaces. Now the situation is completely different, because, for example, any sequence from c_{00} (that is, a sequence which is eventually zero) induces a compact multiplication operator. Precisely, we have the following

Theorem 2.3 (Essential norm of multiplication operators between Köthe sequence spaces). *Let X and Y be two Köthe sequence spaces with the Fatou property. Suppose that either the space X is reflexive or the space Y is order continuous. Then*

$$\|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{M(X, Y)}.$$

In particular, the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y$ is compact if, and only if, $\lambda \in M(X, Y)_o$.

Note that, as the first part of the proof presented below shows, the inequality

$$\|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{M(X, Y)}$$

holds without any additional assumptions on X and Y .

Proof. In order to show the first of the two inequalities, take $\lambda = \{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in M(X, Y)$ and notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} &= \inf \{ \|M_\lambda - K\|_{X \rightarrow Y} : K \in \mathcal{K}(X, Y) \} \\ &\leq \left\| M_\lambda - M_{\lambda\chi_{\{1, \dots, n-1\}}} \right\|_{X \rightarrow Y} = \left\| \lambda\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_{M(X, Y)}, \end{aligned}$$

where to get the inequality we have used the plain fact that finite rank operators acting between Banach spaces are always compact. In consequence, we conclude that

$$\|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \lambda\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_{M(X, Y)}.$$

Now, let us turn to the proof of the second inequality. We will consider both situations mentioned in the formulation of the theorem separately.

1st. Let's start with the case when the space X is reflexive. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. It is clear from the definition of the norm in the space $M(X, Y)$ that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find $x^{(n)} \in \text{Ball}(X)$ with

$$\left\| \lambda\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} x^{(n)} \right\|_Y \geq \left\| \lambda\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_{M(X, Y)} - \varepsilon.$$

It should be also clear that without losing generality we can assume that $\text{supp}(x^{(n)}) \subset \{n, n+1, \dots\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This, however, gives us that

$$(2.2) \quad \left\| \lambda x^{(n)} \right\|_Y \geq \left\| \lambda\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_{M(X, Y)} - \varepsilon \text{ for every } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Next, observe that the sequence $\{x^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \text{Ball}(X)$ is weakly null. Indeed, since the space X is reflexive, so the space X^\times is order continuous and $X^* = X^\times$ (keeping in mind that the space X has the Fatou property we refer to [BS88, Corollaries 4.3 and 4.4, p. 23]). Therefore, for any $x^* \in X^\times$, we have that

$$\left| \langle x^{(n)}, x^* \rangle \right| = \left| \sum_{j=1}^\infty x^{(n)}(j) x^*(j) \right| = \left| \sum_{j=n}^\infty x^{(n)}(j) x^*(j) \right| \leq \left\| x^{(n)} \right\|_X \left\| x^* \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_{X^\times} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Now, for any compact operator K between X and Y , we have

$$\|M_\lambda - K\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \geq \left\| (M_\lambda - K) \left(x^{(n)} \right) \right\|_Y \geq \left\| \lambda x^{(n)} \right\|_Y - \left\| K \left(x^{(n)} \right) \right\|_Y,$$

where the last inequality follows from the reverse Δ -inequality. Moreover, remembering about inequality (2.2), we get that actually

$$\|M_\lambda - K\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \geq \left\| \lambda\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_{M(X, Y)} - \left\| K \left(x^{(n)} \right) \right\|_Y - \varepsilon.$$

Going further, since every compact operator is *a fortiori* completely continuous and, as we have shown above, the sequence $\{x^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \text{Ball}(X)$ is weakly null, so $\|K(x^{(n)})\|_Y \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently,

$$\|M_\lambda - K\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \lambda\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_{M(X, Y)} - \varepsilon$$

and this, due to ε 's arbitrariness, ends the proof in the first case.

2nd. Next, suppose the space Y is order continuous. Again, fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\{x^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \text{Ball}(X)$ be the sequence constructed above. Moreover, let $K: X \rightarrow Y$ be a compact operator. Since the set $\{K(x^{(n)})\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is relatively compact in Y , so it has an accumulation point, say $y_a \in Y$. This means that there is a subsequence $\{x^{(n_k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of the sequence $\{x^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ with

$$(2.3) \quad \left\| K \left(x^{(n_k)} \right) - \tilde{y} \right\|_Y < \varepsilon \text{ for all } k \text{ big enough.}$$

Therefore, using the reverse Δ -inequality,

$$\|M_\lambda - K\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \geq \left\| (M_\lambda - K) \left(x^{(n_k)} \right) \right\|_Y \geq \left\| M_\lambda \left(x^{(n_k)} \right) - y_a \right\|_Y - \left\| K \left(x^{(n_k)} \right) - y_a \right\|_Y.$$

But, the above inequality in tandem with (2.3) implies that for sufficiently big k we have

$$(2.4) \quad \|M_\lambda - K\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \geq \|M_\lambda(x^{(n_k)}) - y_a\|_Y - \varepsilon$$

On the other hand, recalling that $\text{supp}(x^{(n)}) \subset \{n, n+1, \dots\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_\lambda(x^{(n_k)}) - \tilde{y}\|_Y &= \|\lambda x^{(n_k)} - y_a\|_Y \\ &\geq \|(\lambda x^{(n_k)} - y_a) \chi_{\text{supp}(x^{(n_k)})}\|_Y \\ &\geq \|\lambda x^{(n_k)}\|_Y - \|y_a \chi_{\text{supp}(x^{(n_k)})}\|_Y \\ &\geq \|\lambda \chi_{\{n_k, n_{k+1}, \dots\}}\|_{M(X, Y)} - 2\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from inequality (2.2) together with our assumption that the space Y is order continuous. Finally, by combining the just obtained inequality with (2.4), we get immediately that

$$\|M_\lambda - K\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \geq \|\lambda \chi_{\{n_k, n_{k+1}, \dots\}}\|_{M(X, Y)} - 3\varepsilon,$$

which due to the arbitrariness of K and the ideal property of the space $M(X, Y)$ gives

$$\|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{M(X, Y)} - 3\varepsilon.$$

This proves what we wanted. \square

The results consisting in the estimation of the quantity $\|M_\lambda: X \circlearrowleft\|_{ess}$ in various concrete classes of Köthe sequence spaces, like Musielak–Orlicz spaces, Lorentz spaces, Marcinkiewicz spaces or Cesàro spaces, are scattered throughout the existing literature (we refer to [RF16] and [RFRSSB19] and also to references given there). Below, we propose the following consequence of Theorem 2.3, which is a general supplement to the results of this type. Later, in Section 4, we will pick up this thread again with much more due attention.

Corollary 2.4 (Compact multiplication operators from a Köthe sequence space to itself). *Let X be an order continuous Köthe sequence space with the Fatou property. Then*

$$\|M_\lambda: X \circlearrowleft\|_{ess} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda_n|.$$

In particular, the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: X \circlearrowleft$ is compact if, and only if, $\lambda \in c_0$.

Proof. Since $M(X, X) \equiv \ell_\infty$, so using Theorem 2.3 we immediately obtain that

$$\|M_\lambda: X \circlearrowleft\|_{ess} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{\ell_\infty} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{m \geq n} |\lambda_m| \right) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda_n|.$$

\square

Let us admit, however, that very recently Schep in [Sch22] obtained a better result avoiding* the assumption about order continuity of the space X . On the other hand, his argument is based on the spectral theory and does not work in the non-algebraic case.

Finally, we can combine an atomic case (Theorem 2.3) together with a non-atomic case (Theorem 2.1) to describe the essential norm of multiplication operators acting between two general Köthe spaces.

*He was also able to avoid the assumption about σ -finiteness of the involved measure space and he considered a more general class of operators, namely, the *band preserving operators*.

Theorem 2.5 (Essential norm of multiplication operators between Köthe spaces). *Let X and Y be two Köthe spaces with the Fatou property both defined over the same complete σ -finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) . Let, moreover, Ω_c and Ω_a denote the non-atomic and the purely atomic part of (Ω, Σ, μ) , respectively. Suppose that one of the spaces X or Y is reflexive. Then*

$$\|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} \approx \max \{ \|M_\lambda: X|_{\Omega_c} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_c}\|_{ess}, \|M_\lambda: X|_{\Omega_a} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_a}\|_{ess} \}$$

with an equivalence involving universal constants only.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that the space $M(X, Y)$ is non-trivial. Take $\lambda \in M(X, Y)$.

To show the first inequality let $\{K_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of compact operators from X into Y defined as

$$K_n(x) = \lambda x \chi_{\{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}}$$

for $x \in X$ and $n = 2, 3, \dots$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} &\leq \|M_\lambda - K_n\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \\ &\leq \|M_\lambda - K_n\|_{X|_{\Omega_c} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_c}} + \|M_\lambda - K_n\|_{X|_{\Omega_a} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_a}} \\ &= \|M_\lambda\|_{X|_{\Omega_c} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_c}} + \left\| M_{\lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}} \right\|_{X|_{\Omega_a} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_a}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, it follows from Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 that

$$\|M_\lambda: X|_{\Omega_c} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_c}\|_{ess} = \|M_\lambda\|_{X|_{\Omega_c} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_c}},$$

and, respectively,

$$\|M_\lambda: X|_{\Omega_a} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_a}\|_{ess} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_{M(X|_{\Omega_a}, Y|_{\Omega_a})} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| M_{\lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}} \right\|_{X|_{\Omega_a} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_a}}.$$

In consequence, we have

$$\|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} \leq 2 \max \{ \|M_\lambda: X|_{\Omega_c} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_c}\|_{ess}, \|M_\lambda: X|_{\Omega_a} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_a}\|_{ess} \}$$

To prove the second inequality, let's first define the operators $P_\square: X \rightarrow X|_{\Omega_\square}$ and $R_\square: Y \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_\square}$ as follows

$$P_\square(x) = x \chi_{\Omega_\square} \text{ for } x \in X$$

and

$$R_\square(y) = y \chi_{\Omega_\square} \text{ for } y \in Y.$$

where $\square \in \{a, c\}$. Clearly, P_\square and R_\square are norm one projections onto $X|_{\Omega_\square}$ and, respectively, $Y|_{\Omega_\square}$. For $\square \in \{a, c\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_\lambda: X|_{\Omega_\square} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_\square}\|_{ess} &= \inf \left\{ \|M_\lambda - K\|_{X|_{\Omega_\square} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_\square}} : K \in \mathcal{K}(X|_{\Omega_\square}, Y|_{\Omega_\square}) \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \|R_\square(M_\lambda - K)P_\square\|_{X \rightarrow Y} : K \in \mathcal{K}(X, Y) \right\} \\ &\leq \inf \left\{ \|M_\lambda - K\|_{X \rightarrow Y} : K \in \mathcal{K}(X, Y) \right\} \\ &= \|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\max \{ \|M_\lambda: X|_{\Omega_c} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_c}\|_{ess}, \|M_\lambda: X|_{\Omega_a} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_a}\|_{ess} \} \leq \|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess},$$

and this ends the proof. \square

Although Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 are isometric in nature, the above result unfortunately loses this value. Therefore, in this context, it is natural to ask the following question.

Question 2.6. Let X and Y be two Köthe spaces with the Fatou property both defined over the same complete and σ -finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) . Suppose they can be isometrically represented as a direct sums of their atomic and non-atomic parts, that is to say,

$$X \equiv X|_{\Omega_a} \oplus_E X|_{\Omega_c} \text{ and } Y \equiv Y|_{\Omega_a} \oplus_F Y|_{\Omega_c},$$

where E and F are two-dimensional Köthe spaces. Do we then have the equality

$$\|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} = \left\| \left\{ \|M_\lambda: X|_{\Omega_\square} \rightarrow Y|_{\Omega_\square}\|_{ess} \right\}_{\square \in \{a,c\}} \right\|_{M(E,F)} ?$$

We will close this subsection by taking a closer look to the landscape surrounding results presented so far. This will show our results in a slightly richer light.

Remark 2.7 (On Pitt's theorem and Djakov–Ramanujan's question). We know from Pitt [Pit79] (cf. also [LT77, Proposition 2.c.3, p. 76] or [AK06, Theorem 2.1.4, p. 32]) that every operator from ℓ_p into ℓ_q is compact if, and only if, $1 \leq q < p \leq \infty$ (with the convention that whenever $p = \infty$, then we are working with c_0 instead of ℓ_∞), or, pictographically, $\mathcal{L}(\ell_p, \ell_q) = \mathcal{K}(\ell_p, \ell_q)$ (have a look at [Ros69, Theorem A2] for even more general result). On the other hand, the natural inclusion $\ell_q \hookrightarrow \ell_p$, where again $1 \leq q < p \leq \infty$, is not compact (but it is “nearly” compact, because it is *strictly singular*).

Many natural generalizations of this classical result are also available, for example, let M and N be two Orlicz functions both satisfying the Δ_2 -condition at zero. Then every operator from ℓ_M into ℓ_N is compact if, and only if, $\alpha_M > \beta_N$, where α_M and β_N are the so-called Matuszewska–Orlicz indices (see [LT77, p. 149]; cf. [LT77, Theorem 4.a.9, p. 143] and [Mal89, Chapter 11]).

For the multiplication operators Pitt's theorem corresponds - via Theorem 2.3 - with the fact that the space $M(\ell_p, \ell_q) = \ell_r$, where $1/r = 1/q - 1/p$, is order continuous. In general, we can prove the following result (cf. [Cro69, Proposition 3.1]).

Proposition 2.8 (Multiplier analogue of Pitt's theorem). *Let X and Y be two Köthe sequence spaces with the Fatou property. Then the multiplication operator acting from X into Y is compact if, and only if, the space $M(X, Y)$ is order continuous.*

Proof. One way, this is a direct consequence of the first part of the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Next, suppose the space $M(X, Y)$ is not order continuous. Take $\lambda_0 \in M(X, Y) \setminus M(X, Y)_o$. Then, due to [HN04, Lemma 5], there exists $\delta > 0$ and a strictly increasing sequence, say $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, of natural numbers such that

$$(2.5) \quad \left\| \lambda_0 \chi_{\{n_k, n_k+1, \dots, n_{k+1}\}} \right\|_{M(X, Y)} > \delta \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Moreover, it follows from the definition of the norm in the space $M(X, Y)$, there exists a sequence $\{x^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \text{Ball}(X)$ with $\text{supp}(x^{(k)}) \subset \{n_k, n_k + 1, \dots, n_{k+1}\}$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad \left\| \lambda_0 \chi_{\{n_k, n_k+1, \dots, n_{k+1}\}} x^{(k)} \right\|_Y \geq \left\| \lambda_0 \chi_{\{n_k, n_k+1, \dots, n_{k+1}\}} \right\|_{M(X, Y)} - \frac{\delta}{2} \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now, combining (2.5) together with (2.6) we get

$$\left\| \lambda_0 x^{(k)} \right\|_Y = \left\| \lambda_0 \chi_{\{n_k, n_k+1, \dots, n_{k+1}\}} x^{(k)} \right\|_Y > \frac{\delta}{2} \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

However, since $M_{\lambda_0} \left(\{x^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty \right) = \{\lambda_0 x^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$, so this means that the image of a bounded sequence $\{x^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ through the multiplication operator M_{λ_0} , is not relatively compact in Y . In consequence, the operator $M_{\lambda_0}: X \rightarrow Y$ is not compact and this completes the proof. \square

Again, if $X \hookrightarrow Y$ (in particular, if $\ell_q \hookrightarrow \ell_p$, that is, $q \leq p$), then $M(X, Y) = \ell_\infty$ and, consequently, there are some non-compact multiplication operators acting from X into Y . Nevertheless, even if $Y \hookrightarrow X$, but the spaces X and Y are too “close”, the space $M(X, Y)$ can be

not order continuous and then there will be some non-compact multiplication operators from X into Y . An example illustrating this situation is given in Appendix A.

Let us mention one more thing here. In [DR00] Djakov and Ramanujan ask the following question

“Is it true that every compact multiplier between the spaces ℓ_M and ℓ_N is a limit of finitely-supported multipliers?”

(see [DR00, p. 318]). Thanks to our Proposition 2.8 we can answer this question in the affirmative (to see this, just note that the ideal $M(X, Y)_o$ is contained in the closure of finitely-supported functions living in $M(X, Y)$; see [BS88, Theorem 3.11, p. 18]). Even more is true, because - as it follows from Proposition 2.8 - actually *every* compact multiplication operator acting between two Köthe sequence spaces is a limit of finitely-supported multipliers.

Remark 2.9 (On the approximation numbers). Let us recall, at the beginning, that the n^{th} approximation number $a_n(T: X \rightarrow Y)$ of an operator T acting between two Banach spaces X and Y is defined in the following way

$$a_n(T: X \rightarrow Y) := \inf \{ \|T - T_n\|_{X \rightarrow Y} : \text{rank}(T_n) < n \},$$

where $n = 1, 2, \dots$. It was proved by Pietsch that the operator T is compact if, and only if, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n(T: X \rightarrow Y) = 0$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n(T: X \rightarrow Y) = \|T: X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess}.$$

Now, it is not very hard to prove that for $1 < p < q < \infty$ we have the following formula

$$a_n(M_\lambda: \ell_q \rightarrow \ell_p) = \left(\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} (\lambda_k^*)^r \right)^{1/r} = \|\lambda^* \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{\ell_r},$$

where $1/r = 1/q - 1/p$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, we don't even know how to express $a_n(M_\lambda: \ell_p \rightarrow \ell_q)$ (the most obvious guess that $a_n(M_\lambda: \ell_p \rightarrow \ell_q) = \lambda_{n+1}^*$ doesn't seem to work). Hence, in connection with this, we would like to ask the following question.

Question 2.10. *For which pairs of Köthe sequence spaces X and Y we have the following equality*

$$a_n(M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y) = \|\lambda^* \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{M(X, Y)}?$$

What can then be said about $a_n(M_\lambda: Y \rightarrow X)$?

The assumptions that appear in Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 seem to be only technical artifacts for us. We believe (highly motivated by [Sch22]) that all major results from this section should work in full generality. Let us express our expectations in the following question.

Question 2.11. *How to get rid of the additional assumptions in Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3?*

2.2. Weakly compact multiplication operators. Recall that an operator acting between two Banach spaces is *weakly compact* if it takes bounded subset to relatively weakly compact one. Equivalently, thanks to the Eberlein-Šmulian theorem, an operator is weakly compact if and only if every bounded sequence admits a subsequence whose image is weakly convergent.

As we saw earlier (cf. Theorem 2.1), there are basically no compact multiplication operators between Köthe function spaces. It is natural, then, to weaken this notion and ask, for example, about weakly compact multipliers.

But, before we proceed to the formulation of the next result, let us remind of a concept that, in a sense, will play one of the main roles there. Precisely, a Köthe space (in general, nothing prevents considering Banach lattices) has the *positive Schur property* if every weakly null sequence* with positive terms is norm convergent. This property was investigated by Wnuk

*As it turns out, it is enough to consider disjoint sequences only (see [MN91, Corollary 2.3.5]).

(see [Wnu93] and [Wnu89]). Due to Rosenthal's ℓ_1 -theorem, Köthe spaces having the positive Schur property are exactly those spaces which are *1-disjointly homogeneous* (briefly, 1-DH), that is to say, in which every normalized disjoint sequence has a subsequence equivalent to unit vector basis of ℓ_1 (see [Wnu93, Theorem 7]; cf. [FHSTT14, Proposition 4.9]). This class of spaces was introduced by Flores, Tradacete and Troitsky in [FTT09] and attracted much attention in recent times (see, e.g., [FHSTT14] and [LTM22] and references therein). The class of 1-disjointly homogeneous spaces significantly exceeds the family L_1 -spaces, because, for example,

- the Orlicz spaces L_M such that $M \in \Delta_2(\infty)$, $M^* \in \Delta_0$ and M is equivalent to the linear function for small arguments are 1-DH (clearly, if we narrow our considerations only to Orlicz spaces defined on $(0, 1)$, then the last condition may be ignored; see [LTM22]);
- the Lorentz spaces $\Lambda_\varphi(0, 1)$ are 1-DH provided the following three conditions are satisfied: 1°. $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi(t) = 0$; 2°. $\varphi(1) > 0$; 3°. $\int_0^1 \varphi(t) dt = 1$ (in particular, Lorentz spaces $L_{p,1}(0, 1)$ are 1-DH for all $1 \leq p < \infty$);
- for each $1 < p < \infty$ the space $L_{p,1}(0, \infty) \cap L_1(0, \infty)$ is 1-DH (see [LTM22, Theorem 8]).

Note, however, that spaces with the positive Schur property, or, which is one thing, 1-DH spaces, are in general not stable under isomorphism.

We are finally ready to present the main result here.

Theorem 2.12 (Weak essential norm of multiplication operators acting between Köthe function spaces). *Let X and Y be two Köthe function spaces with the Fatou property both defined on the same complete and σ -finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) . Suppose that the space Y is 1-DH and that every simple function* in the space $M(X, Y)$ has an absolutely continuous norm. Then*

$$\|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_w = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda \chi_{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)}\|_{M(X, Y)}.$$

where[†]

$$\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda) := \bigcup_{N \geq n} \Omega_N \cup \{\omega \in \text{supp}(\lambda) : |\lambda(\omega)| > n\} \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and $\{\Omega_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ is a decomposition of Ω into a pairwise disjoint family of sets of finite measure. In particular, the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly compact if, and only if, $\lambda \in M(X, Y)_o$.

Proof. Take $\lambda \in M(X, Y)$ and note that $\{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a decreasing family of measurable sets with $\mu(\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)) = 0$.

To demonstrate the first inequality, let us first observe that all sets

$$\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)^c := \text{supp}(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)$$

have a finite measure and that the symbol λ is a bounded function when restricted to the set $\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)^c$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, thanks to our assumptions imposed on the space $M(X, Y)$, we immediately see that $\lambda \chi_{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)^c} \in M(X, Y)_o$. To make our life easier, put $\tilde{\lambda}_n := \lambda \chi_{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)^c}$. Now, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\{\sigma_k^n\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \Sigma$ be a decreasing family of measurable subsets with $\mu(\bigcap_{k=1}^\infty \sigma_k^n) = 0$. Since $\tilde{\lambda}_n \in M(X, Y)_o$, so it follows that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k > K$ we have

$$\sup_{g \in M_{\tilde{\lambda}_n}(\text{Ball}(X))} \|g \chi_{\sigma_k^n}\|_Y = \sup_{h \in \text{Ball}(X)} \|\tilde{\lambda}_n h \chi_{\sigma_k^n}\|_Y = \|\tilde{\lambda}_n \chi_{\sigma_k^n}\|_{M(X, Y)} < \varepsilon.$$

However, this exactly means that the set $M_{\tilde{\lambda}_n}(B(X))$ is Y -equicontinuous (or L -weakly compact; see [MN91, Definition 3.6.1, p. 212]), so using [MN91, Proposition 3.6.5, p. 212], also

*By a *simple function* we understand here any function defined on Ω which is a finite linear combination of characteristic functions of sets of finite measure.

†It is clear that if the measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) is finite, then it is enough to put $\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda) := \{\omega \in \text{supp}(\lambda) : |\lambda(\omega)| > n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

relatively weakly compact. Consequently, all operators $M_{\tilde{\lambda}_n}$ are weakly compact, and we have the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_\lambda : X \rightarrow Y\|_w &\leq \inf\{\|M_\lambda - W\|_{X \rightarrow Y} : W \in \mathscr{W}(X, Y)\} \\ &\leq \|M_\lambda - M_{\tilde{\lambda}_n}\|_{X \rightarrow Y} = \|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}_n\|_{M(X, Y)} = \|\lambda \chi_{\mathcal{U}_n}\|_{M(X, Y)}. \end{aligned}$$

But this clearly implies that

$$\|M_\lambda : X \rightarrow Y\|_w \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda \chi_{\mathcal{U}_n}\|_{M(X, Y)}$$

and we are done.

Let us pass to the proof of the second inequality. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and take $\lambda \in M(X, Y)$. Still, let $\{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be as in the formulation of the theorem. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find $f_n \in \text{Ball}(X)$ with $\text{supp}(f_n) \subset \mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)$ such that

$$(2.7) \quad \|\lambda f_n\|_Y = \|\lambda \chi_{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)} f_n\|_Y \geq \|\lambda \chi_{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)}\|_{M(X, Y)} - \varepsilon.$$

Take any weakly compact operator, say W , acting between X and Y . Since the space Y is 1-disjointly homogeneous, so it follows from [LTM22, Theorem 3.6] that the space Y satisfies* the Dunford–Pettis criterion, that is, every bounded and relatively weakly compact subset of Y is Y -equicontinuous. However, this means that the set $\{W(f_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is actually Y -equicontinuous and

$$(2.8) \quad \|W(f_n) \chi_{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)}\|_Y < \varepsilon$$

for all sufficiently large n . Therefore,

$$\|M_\lambda - W\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \geq \|(M_\lambda - W)(f_n)\|_Y = \|(\lambda f_n - W(f_n)) \chi_{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)}\|_Y \geq \|\lambda f_n\|_Y - \|W(f_n) \chi_{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)}\|_Y,$$

and, using (2.7) along with (2.8), we get that for all sufficiently big n we have

$$\|M_\lambda - W\|_{X \rightarrow Y} \geq \|\lambda \chi_{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)}\|_{M(X, Y)} - 2\varepsilon.$$

This is enough to conclude the proof. \square

Next two examples explain the role of the assumption imposed on the space Y in the above result. Roughly speaking, there is a chance for an analogue of Theorem 2.12, but only replacing the 1-DH property with “something” else. But, before we dive deeper into details, we first need to define the objects of our considerations.

Let φ be an increasing concave function on $(0, 1)$ with $\varphi(0^+) = 0$. Recall that the *Lorentz space* $\Lambda_{\varphi, q}(0, 1)$, where $1 \leq q < \infty$, (resp. *Marcinkiewicz space* $M_\varphi(0, 1)$) consists of all equivalence classes, modulo equality almost everywhere, of real valued Lebesgue measurable functions defined on the unit interval $(0, 1)$ with

$$(2.9) \quad \|f\|_{\Lambda_{\varphi, q}} := \left(\int_0^1 (\varphi(t) f^*(t))^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{1/q} < \infty,$$

respectively,

$$(2.10) \quad \|f\|_{M_\varphi} := \sup_{0 < t < 1} \frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \int_0^t f^*(s) ds < \infty.$$

In particular, if the Lorentz space $\Lambda_{\varphi, q}$ (resp. Marcinkiewicz space M_φ) is generated by the power function $\varphi(t) = t^{1/p}$, where $1 < p < \infty$, then it is denoted by $L_{p, q}$ (respectively, $L_{p, \infty}$). Moreover, the spaces $L_{p, \infty}$ are sometimes also called the *weak L_p -spaces*.

*In fact, in the class of Köthe function spaces, both conditions are equivalent.

Example 2.13 (Multipliers between weak L_p -spaces). Let $1 \leq p < q < \infty$. Recall that

$$M(L_{p,\infty}(0,1), L_{q,\infty}(0,1)) = L_{r,\infty}(0,1),$$

where $1/r = 1/p - 1/q$ (see, e.g., [KLM19, Theorem 4] and references given there). Note also that the space $L_{q,\infty}$ is not* 1-DH.

Take the function $\lambda_0(t) = t^{-1/r}$ from $M(L_{p,\infty}(0,1), L_{q,\infty}(0,1))$. Since for all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have that

$$\|\lambda_0 \chi_{(0,\varepsilon)}\|_{L_{r,\infty}} = 1,$$

so λ_0 is not order continuous.

Next, we will show that the multiplication operator $M_{\lambda_0}: L_{p,\infty}(0,1) \rightarrow L_{q,\infty}(0,1)$ is not weakly compact. For this, take $g(t) = t^{-1/p} \in L_{p,\infty}(0,1)$. Observe that to achieve the intended goal it is enough to show that

$$(2.11) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \lambda_0 g r_n, \varphi \rangle = 0 \text{ for every } \varphi \in (L_{q,\infty}(0,1))^\times$$

and to construct a linear functional, say ψ , in $(L_{q,\infty}(0,1))^*$ such that

$$(2.12) \quad \langle \lambda_0 g r_n, \psi \rangle = \frac{q}{q-1} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\{r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is the sequence of Rademacher functions. In fact, if it can be done, then the image of the sequence $\{g r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset L_{p,\infty}$ through the operator M_{λ_0} , that is, the sequence $\{\lambda_0 g r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset L_{q,\infty}$, does not possess a weakly convergent subsequence (if it did, then because the intersection of kernels of all functionals from $(L_{q,\infty}(0,1))^\times$ is zero, this hypothetical subsequence would have to converge weakly to zero, which in view of (2.12) is just impossible). But that would exactly mean that the operator $M_{\lambda_0}: L_{p,\infty}(0,1) \rightarrow L_{q,\infty}(0,1)$ is not weakly compact.

First, take $h \in (L_{q,\infty}(0,1))^\times$ and put

$$\langle f, \varphi \rangle := \int_0^1 f(t)h(t)dt \text{ for } f \in L_{q,\infty}(0,1).$$

Because of Lemma \mathcal{R} (from Section 1.5) and the fact that $\lambda_0(t)g(t) = t^{-1/q} \in L_{q,\infty}(0,1)$ we infer that

$$\langle \lambda_0 g r_n, \varphi \rangle = \int_0^1 \underbrace{\lambda_0(t)g(t)}_{\in L_{q,\infty}} r_n(t) \underbrace{h(t)}_{\in (L_{q,\infty})^\times} dt \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

This proves our first claim (2.11).

Second, let \mathcal{U} be a free ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} . For $f \in L_{q,\infty}(0,1)$ put

$$\langle f, \psi \rangle := \lim_{\mathcal{U}} \left[2^{n(1-\frac{1}{q})} \int_0^{2^{-n}} f(t)dt \right].$$

It is not hard to see that ψ is bounded linear functional on $L_{q,\infty}(0,1)$. In fact, it follows from Hardy–Littlewood’s inequality (see, e.g., [BS88, Theorem 2.2, p. 44]) that

$$\left| 2^{n(1-\frac{1}{q})} \int_0^{2^{-n}} f(t)dt \right| \leq 2^{n(1-\frac{1}{q})} \int_0^{2^{-n}} f^*(t)dt \leq \|f\|_{L_{q,\infty}} 2^{n(1-\frac{1}{q})} \int_0^{2^{-n}} \frac{dt}{t^{\frac{1}{q}}} \leq \frac{\|f\|_{L_{q,\infty}}}{1-\frac{1}{q}},$$

*This space is not even *disjointly homogeneous* (in particular, it is not p -DH for any $1 \leq p \leq \infty$), because inside $L_{q,\infty}$ we can find a disjoint sequence with a subsequence equivalent to unit vector basis of c_0 , as well as another disjoint sequence spanning ℓ_q (see, e.g., [FTT09, Example, p. 659] for more details). On the other hand, the space $(L_{q,\infty})_o$ is ∞ -DH.

where the second inequality is due to the fact that $f^*(t) \leq \|f\|_{L_{q,\infty}} t^{-1/q}$ for all $f \in L_{q,\infty}(0,1)$. Now, it remains only to note that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a big enough $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$2^{N(1-\frac{1}{q})} \int_0^{2^{-N}} \lambda_0(t)g(t)r_n(t)dt = 2^{N(1-\frac{1}{q})} \int_0^{2^{-N}} t^{-\frac{1}{q}}r_n(t)dt = 2^{N(1-\frac{1}{q})} \int_0^{2^{-N}} t^{-\frac{1}{q}}dt = \frac{q}{q-1}.$$

Hence, as a consequence of the definition of functional ψ ,

$$\langle \lambda_0 g r_n, \psi \rangle = \frac{q}{q-1} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

That's all we needed.

Example 2.14 (Multipliers between Lorentz spaces). Let $1 < p < q < \infty$. Again, in view of [KLM19, Theorem 4], we have

$$M(L_p(0,1), L_{p,q}(0,1)) = L_\infty(0,1).$$

Moreover, it follows from [FJT75, Proposition 5.1] that Lorentz function spaces $L_{p,q}$ are q -DH, but since $q > 1$, they are not 1-DH. Of course, the ideal $M(L_p(0,1), L_{p,q}(0,1))_o$ is trivial. On the other hand, due to the reflexivity of the space $L_p(0,1)$, each multiplication operator $M_\lambda: L_p(0,1) \rightarrow L_{p,q}(0,1)$ is weakly compact (see, e.g., [AK06, p. 348]). Therefore, in general, the multiplication operator can be weakly compact even though its symbol is not order continuous.

It should also be added that the class of disjointly homogeneous Köthe sequence spaces is not particularly rich, because, for example (and in opposition to the function case presented above), Orlicz sequence spaces ℓ_M and Lorentz sequence spaces $\ell_{p,q}$ are, excluding trivial cases, not disjointly homogeneous at all. This is because basic sequences in Köthe sequence spaces are usually equivalent to disjoint sequences. The culprit for this are the echoes of the Bessaga–Pełczyński selection principle (cf. [AK06, Proposition 3.1.10, p. 14]).

2.3. Interplay between the multiplication operator and its symbol. Typically, (some) operator theoretic aspects of the multiplication operator M_λ (that is, treating M_λ as an element of $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$) are reflected in function theoretic properties of its symbol λ (which, of course, live a fully-fledged life in $M(X, Y)$). Here, we aim to study this symmetry in the context specified by the next result.

Proposition 2.15. *Let X and Y be two Köthe spaces with the Fatou property both defined on the same complete and σ -finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) .*

- (i) *Suppose that the measure μ is purely atomic. Assume further that either the space X is reflexive or the space Y is order continuous. Then*

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{L}(X,Y)}(M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y, \mathcal{K}(X, Y)) = \text{dist}_{M(X,Y)}(\lambda, M(X, Y)_o).$$

- (ii) *Suppose that the measure μ is non-atomic. Assume further that the space Y is 1-DH and every simple function in the space $M(X, Y)$ has an absolutely continuous norm. Then*

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{L}(X,Y)}(M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y, \mathcal{W}(X, Y)) = \text{dist}_{M(X,Y)}(\lambda, M(X, Y)_o).$$

Proof. (i) First of all, there is no doubt in assuming that $M(X, Y)_o \neq M(X, Y)$, because if both spaces $M(X, Y)_o$ and $M(X, Y)$ are equal, then it follows from Theorem 2.3 that every multiplication operator between X and Y is compact and, consequently,

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{L}(X,Y)}(M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y, \mathcal{K}(X, Y)) = 0 = \text{dist}_{M(X,Y)}(\lambda, M(X, Y)_o).$$

Now, let us begin the proof with the following observation* which seems quite interesting in itself.

*This result can be seen as a spin-off from Theorem 3.2 in [KKT22]. However, in the mentioned article we were more interested in the rearrangement invariant structure. Morally speaking, it may be instructive to compare our Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.12 with Theorem 3.4 from [KKT22].

Claim ♣. *Let Z be a Köthe sequence space. Suppose that the ideal Z_o is non-trivial. Then*

$$(2.13) \quad \text{dist}_Z(z, Z_o) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| z\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_Z.$$

Proof of Claim ♣. Using the ideal property of the space Z it is straightforward to see that

$$\|z - y\|_Z \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| (z - y)\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_Z \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left\| z\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_Z - \left\| y\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_Z \right|,$$

where the second inequality follows from the reverse Δ -inequality. Consequently, for $y \in Z_o$, we have that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| y\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_Z = 0$, which means that

$$\text{dist}_Z(z, Z_o) = \inf \{ \|z - y\|_Z : y \in Z_o \} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| z\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_Z.$$

To prove the opposite inequality just note that

$$\text{dist}_Z(z, Z_o) = \inf \{ \|z - y\|_Z : y \in Z_o \} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|z - z\chi_{\{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}}\|_Z = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| z\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_Z,$$

where the first inequality is due to the fact* that $x\chi_{\{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}} \in Z_o$. Thus we have completed the proof of Claim ♣. \square

Let's go back to the proof of the theorem. Using Theorem 2.3 once again together with the above Claim ♣, but for the space $M(X, Y)$ instead of Z , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)}(M_\lambda : X \rightarrow Y, \mathcal{K}(X, Y)) &= \|M_\lambda : X \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \lambda\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_{M(X, Y)} \\ &= \text{dist}_{M(X, Y)}(\lambda, (M(X, Y))_o). \end{aligned}$$

That's all.

(ii) The proof of the second part is very similar. It requires two ingredients. First, if $M(X, Y)_o = M(X, Y)$, then, as Theorem 2.12 teaches us, every multiplication operator between X and Y is weakly compact, so we have the equality

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)}(M_\lambda : X \rightarrow Y, \mathcal{W}(X, Y)) = 0 = \text{dist}_{M(X, Y)}(\lambda, M(X, Y)_o).$$

Therefore, without loss of the generality we can assume that $M(X, Y)_o \neq M(X, Y)$. Next, we need an analogue of Claim ♣ in the following form

Claim ♡. *Let Z be a Köthe function space defined on a complete and σ -finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) . Suppose that every simple function in Z has an absolutely continuous norm. Then*

$$(2.14) \quad \text{dist}_Z(z, Z_o) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| z\chi_{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)} \right\|_Z,$$

where, as in Theorem 2.12,

$$\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda) := \bigcup_{N \geq n} \Omega_N \cup \{\omega \in \text{supp}(\lambda) : |\lambda(\omega)| > n\} \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and $\{\Omega_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ is a decomposition of Ω into a pairwise disjoint family of sets of finite measure.

We will omit the proof of this fact, as it does not differ significantly from that of Claim ♣. Finally, using Theorem 2.12 in combination with Claim ♡ we complete the proof. \square

With the help of the above result we can express the quantity $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \lambda\chi_{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)} \right\|_{M(X, Y)}$ from Theorem 2.12 which, due to the quite ephemeral character of the family $\{\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)\}_{n=1}^\infty$, seems not suitable for calculations, in a fairly reasonable way. The price we have to pay for this is to confine our consideration to rearrangement invariant spaces.

*Even a slightly more general statement is true, namely, if Z is a Köthe space on purely atomic and σ -finite measure space, say (Ω, Σ, μ) , and $F \in \Sigma$ has finite measure, then $z\chi_F \in Z_o$ for every $z \in Z$.

Corollary 2.16 (Weak essential norm of multiplication operator between rearrangement invariant function spaces). *Let X and Y be two rearrangement invariant function spaces with the Fatou property. Suppose that the space Y is 1-DH and that the ideal $M(X, Y)_o$ is non-trivial. Then*

$$(2.15) \quad \|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_w = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \lambda^* \chi_{(0, \frac{1}{n}) \cup (n, \infty)} \right\|_{M(X, Y)}.$$

It is clear that this result is only a special case of Theorem 2.12, so, somehow, the set $\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)$ has to be hidden in (2.15). Intuitively, the first part of the set $\mathcal{U}_n(\lambda)$, that is, $\bigcup_{N \geq n} \Omega_N$ corresponds to the set (n, ∞) , and the second part, that is, $\{\omega \in \text{supp}(\lambda): |\lambda(\omega)| > n\}$, corresponds to the set $(0, \frac{1}{n})$. However, what is completely not obvious here, is the fact that instead of the symbol λ we can consider its non-increasing rearrangement λ^* . Fortunately, such questions were the subject of our considerations in [KKT22].

Proof. First of all, in the class of rearrangement invariant spaces we essentially have only two possibilities, namely, either the ideal of order continuous functions is trivial or it is equal to the closure of simple functions (see [BS88, Theorem 5.5, pp. 67–68]; cf. [KT17, Theorem B]). Hence, since the space $M(X, Y)$ is also rearrangement invariant (see [KLM12, Theorem 2.2(i)]) and we assumed that the ideal $M(X, Y)_o$ is non-trivial, so every simple function in $M(X, Y)$ has an absolutely continuous norm. Consequently, the use of Proposition 2.15 (ii) is justified, and we have the following identifications

$$\|M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y\|_w = \text{dist}_{\mathcal{L}(X, Y)}(M_\lambda: X \rightarrow Y, \mathcal{W}(X, Y)) = \text{dist}_{M(X, Y)}(\lambda, M(X, Y)_o).$$

On the other hand, it follows from [KKT22, Corollary 3.7] that

$$\text{dist}_{M(X, Y)}(\lambda, M(X, Y)_o) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \lambda^* \chi_{(0, \frac{1}{n}) \cup (n, \infty)} \right\|_{M(X, Y)}$$

and this ends the proof. \square

3. APPLICATIONS: CESÁRO, TANDORI AND HARDY SPACES

Because both Cesáro spaces CX and Tandori spaces \tilde{X} are usually defined as certain spaces of real valued functions, so in order not to complicate things unnecessarily, let's agree that whenever we allow these spaces into our considerations, then we will tacitly assume that the underlying Köthe spaces X are defined over the field of real numbers. If the need arose, we can always consider the complexifications of these spaces.

3.1. Abstract Cesáro and Tandori sequence spaces. For a Köthe sequence space X we define the *abstract Cesáro sequence space* CX as a set

$$CX := \{x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in \omega: \mathcal{H}(|x|) \in X\} \text{ with the norm } \|x\|_{CX} = \|\mathcal{H}(|x|)\|_X,$$

where the symbol \mathcal{H} will stand for the *discrete Hardy operator* (or the *discrete Cesáro operator*) which is defined as

$$\mathcal{H}: \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \mapsto \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n x_k \right\}_{n=1}^\infty.$$

These spaces can be viewed as, on the one hand, a generalization of the *classical Cesáro sequence spaces* $ces_p := C\ell_p$ (see [AM14] and references given there; see also Bennett's memoir [Ben96] and Grosse-Erdmann book [GE98]) and, on the other hand, as the so-called *optimal domains* of Hardy's operator \mathcal{H} for the space X , because from the very definition the operator $\mathcal{H}: CX \rightarrow X$ is bounded and the space CX is the largest Köthe sequence space with this property (see [DS07], [CR16] and [NP10]; cf. Okada, Ricker and Sánchez Pérez book [ORS08] and references therein). Furthermore, the Cesáro spaces are also closely related to Sinnamon's *down spaces* (see [KMS07], [MS06] and [Sin94]). They owe the nickname "abstract" to Lešnik and Maligranda, who proposed

this nomenclature in [LM15]. Nowadays, the structure of these spaces, especially in its most general form, enjoys unflagging interest (see [ALM19] and [KKT22] and their references).

In a sense, a dual construction to the Cesàro spaces the so-called Tandori spaces. Precisely, for a Köthe sequence space X by the corresponding *abstract Tandori sequence space* \tilde{X} we understand a set

$$\tilde{X} := \{x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in \omega : \tilde{x} \in X\} \text{ with the norm } \|x\|_{\tilde{X}} = \|\tilde{x}\|_X,$$

where \tilde{x} is the *non-increasing majorant* of a given sequence $x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ defined as

$$\tilde{x} = \{\tilde{x}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty := \left\{ \sup_{m \geq n} |x_m| \right\}_{n=1}^\infty.$$

The name of these spaces was proposed in [LM16, p. 767], where the authors refer to Tandori's paper [Tan54] from 1954. However, despite being nameless, these spaces were investigated even earlier (see [LM15] and [AM14]). Their significance stems mostly from the fact that they are Köthe duals of Cesàro spaces (see [LM15]; cf. [Ben96] and [GE98]), but some questions about their isomorphic structure or interpolation properties are interesting in themselves (see, for example, [ALM19] and [LM16]).

In [RFRSSB19] Ramos-Fernández, Rivera-Sarmiento and Salas-Brown computed the essential norm of the multiplication operator acting from the classical Cesàro sequence spaces ces_p to itself, namely, they showed that

$$\|M_\lambda : ces_p \rightarrow ces_p\|_{ess} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda_n|,$$

where $\lambda = \{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in \ell_\infty$. In addition, they write the following

“Thus, it is natural to ask if the result obtained in this article is also valid for multiplication operator acting on any Köthe sequence space X .”

Here, we are interested not only in answering the above question, but exactly as we have so far, we want to consider non-algebraic case, that is to say, our goal is to evaluate

$$\|M_\lambda : CX \rightarrow CY\|_{ess} \text{ and also } \|M_\lambda : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{Y}\|_{ess}.$$

To do this, let's start with the following preparatory result.

Lemma 3.1. *Let X be a Köthe sequence space. Then*

$$\left(\tilde{X}\right)_o = \tilde{X}_o.$$

Proof. Let us start by recalling the well-known fact: *Let Z be a Köthe sequence space. Then*

$$(\spadesuit) \quad z = \{z_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in Z \text{ belongs to the ideal } Z_o \text{ if, and only if, } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|z\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_Z = 0.$$

If we keep in mind (\spadesuit) , the rest of the proof basically follows from the following simple-to-see inequality, namely,

$$(3.1) \quad \widetilde{x\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}} = \tilde{x}\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In fact, after imposing the norm $\|\cdot\|_X$ on both sides of (3.1) we get

$$(3.2) \quad \|x\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{\tilde{X}} = \left\| \widetilde{x\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}} \right\|_X = \|\tilde{x}\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_X \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now, if $x \in \left(\tilde{X}\right)_o$, then it follows from (\spadesuit) that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{\tilde{X}} = 0$. Therefore, in view of (3.2), also $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{x}\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_X = 0$. But this exactly means that $\tilde{x} \in X_o$. Consequently, $x \in \tilde{X}_o$ and we have the inclusion $\left(\tilde{X}\right)_o \subset \tilde{X}_o$. On the other hand, take $x \in \tilde{X}_o$. Then $\tilde{x} \in X_o$, so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{x}\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_X = 0$. However, using again (3.2), we see that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x\chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{\tilde{X}} =$

0 as well. This gives us that $x \in (\tilde{X})_o$ and, in consequence, $(\tilde{X})_o \supset \widetilde{X}_o$. The proof is complete. \square

Now we are ready to present and also prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.2 (Essential norm of multipliers acting between abstract Cesáro and Tandori sequence spaces). *Let X and Y be two rearrangement invariant sequence spaces with the Fatou property. Suppose that either the space X is order continuous or the space Y is reflexive. Further, suppose that Y factorizes* through X , that is to say, $X \odot M(X, Y) = Y$. Then*

$$\|M_\lambda: \tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{Y}\|_{ess} \approx \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \tilde{\lambda} \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_{M(X, Y)}.$$

Moreover, if the Hardy operator \mathcal{H} is bounded on both spaces X and Y , then also

$$\|M_\lambda: CX \rightarrow CY\|_{ess} \approx \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \tilde{\lambda} \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}} \right\|_{M(X, Y)}.$$

Both of the above estimates depend on X and Y only. In particular, the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: \begin{matrix} CX & \rightarrow & CY \\ \tilde{X} & \rightarrow & \tilde{Y} \end{matrix}$ is compact if, and only if, the function $\tilde{\lambda} = \{\tilde{\lambda}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ belongs to the ideal $M(X, Y)_o$.

Proof. As a warm-up, let's explain the following, not very difficult issues, that will be useful later.

(a) Due to our assumption about the boundedness of Hardy's operator H on X and Y , both spaces CX and CY are non-trivial (this easily follows from the definition of the Cesáro space construction, however, this statement is also a form of Hardy's inequality, which in its qualitative version can be written as an inclusion; cf. [Ben96]).

(b) If a Köthe sequence space, say Z , has the Fatou property then the Cesáro space CZ as well as the Tandori space \tilde{Z} have the Fatou property (see, e.g., [LM15, Theorem 1(d)]; although, formally, the proof given in [LM15] covers only Köthe function spaces, it works just as well for their sequence counterparts).

(c) Both spaces \tilde{Z} and CZ are order continuous provided Z is an order continuous Köthe sequence space (this is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.1 and a nearly direct consequence of Lemma 11 in [KT17]; cf. the proof of Proposition 5.1 in [KKT22]).

(d) Lastly, we claim that

Claim \diamond . *Let Z be a reflexive rearrangement invariant sequence space with the Fatou property such that the Hardy's operator H is bounded on Z . Then both spaces \tilde{Z} and CZ are reflexive.*

Proof of Claim \diamond . Both spaces are related to each other through duality, so let's stop at the proof for the Cesáro space construction.

Since the space Z is reflexive and has the Fatou property, so it follows from [BS88, Corollary 4.4, p. 23] that both spaces Z and Z^\times are order continuous. Because of (b) and, one more time, [BS88, Corollary 4.4, p. 23], to complete the proof it is enough to show that the spaces CZ and $(CZ)^\times$ are order continuous. Now, in the first case, that is, when we consider CZ , it results immediately from (c), while in the second case, that is, when we consider $(CZ)^\times$, things are a bit more complicated. Namely, using the Leśnik and Maligranda duality results from [LM15] we get the equality

$$(CX)^\times = \widetilde{X^\times}$$

*More precisely, for two Köthe spaces, say E and F , both defined over the same complete σ -finite measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) by the *pointwise product space* $E \odot F$ we understand the set $\{gh: g \in E \text{ and } h \in F\}$ equipped with the quasi-norm $\|f\|_{E \odot F} = \inf\{\|g\|_E \|h\|_F: f = gh, g \in E, h \in F\}$. Now, we will say that E factorizes through F provided $E \odot M(E, F) = F$. For much more information about pointwise products and factorization we refer to [CS14], [KLM14], [KLM19] and [Sch10].

(see [LM15, Theorem 6]). But, with Lemma 3.1 in mind, we get

$$((CX)^\times)_o = \left(\widetilde{X^\times}\right)_o = \widetilde{(X^\times)_o} = \widetilde{X^\times} = (CX)^\times.$$

This means that also the space $(CX)^\times$ is order continuous. And that is all we needed to finish the proof of Claim \diamond . \square

Now, the essential part of the proof is based on the following three steps:

1st. In view of (a), (b), (c) and (d), there is nothing to prevent us from using Theorem 2.3. Consequently, we get the formula

$$\left\| M_\lambda: \begin{array}{c} CX \rightarrow CY \\ \widetilde{X} \rightarrow \widetilde{Y} \end{array} \right\|_{ess} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{M(CX, CY)}.$$

Moreover, it follows that the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: \begin{array}{c} CX \rightarrow CY \\ \widetilde{X} \rightarrow \widetilde{Y} \end{array}$ is compact if, and only if, $\lambda \in \left(M(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})\right)_o$. However, as shown in Lemma 3.1, $\left(M(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})\right)_o = M(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})_o$. Therefore, the condition “ $\lambda \in \left(M(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})\right)_o$ ” can be equivalently replaced by the condition “ $\lambda \in M(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})_o$ ”. But the latter means that $\widetilde{\lambda} \in M(X, Y)_o$.

2nd. Next, due to our factorization assumption that $X \odot M(X, Y) = Y$, we get

$$(3.3) \quad M(CX, CY) = M(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y}) \text{ and } M\left(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y}\right) = M(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y}),$$

so we actually have that

$$\left\| M_\lambda: \begin{array}{c} CX \rightarrow CY \\ \widetilde{X} \rightarrow \widetilde{Y} \end{array} \right\|_{ess} \approx \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{M(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})}.$$

The only thing that remains to be clarified is (3.3). But this is a consequence of [KLM19, Theorem 6] and duality results contained in [LM15] (see also [Ben96, pp. 67–77]).

3rd. Finally, using (3.2) from the proof of Lemma 3.1, we see that

$$\|\lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{M(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})} = \|\widetilde{\lambda} \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{M(X, Y)} = \|\widetilde{\lambda} \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{M(X, Y)}.$$

Putting it all together ends the proof. \square

Algebraic situation is much simpler.

Corollary 3.3 (Compact multipliers form the abstract Cesáro or Tandori sequence space to itself). *Let X be an order continuous rearrangement invariant sequence space with the Fatou property. Then*

$$\left\| M_\lambda: \begin{array}{c} CX \odot \\ \widetilde{X} \odot \end{array} \right\|_{ess} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda_n|.$$

In particular, the multiplication operators $M_\lambda: \begin{array}{c} CX \odot \\ \widetilde{X} \odot \end{array}$ are compact if, and only if, $\lambda \in c_0$.

Proof. This result is an easy consequence of Theorem 2.3 and remark (c) from the proof of Theorem 3.2. Indeed, since $M(CX, CX) \equiv \ell_\infty$ and the space CX is order continuous, so

$$\left\| M_\lambda: \begin{array}{c} CX \odot \\ \widetilde{X} \odot \end{array} \right\|_{ess} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{\ell_\infty} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{m \geq n} |\lambda_m| \right) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda_n|.$$

\square

Let us close this section with the touch of classics.

Remark 3.4 (Compact multipliers between classical Cesàro and Tandori sequence spaces). Assume that $1 < p < q < \infty$. With the help of technology we have developed, let us now try to answer the following question: *When are the multiplication operators*

$$M_\lambda: \begin{array}{l} ces_q \rightarrow ces_p \\ ces_p \rightarrow ces_q \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad M_\lambda: \begin{array}{l} \widetilde{\ell}_q \rightarrow \widetilde{\ell}_p \\ \ell_p \rightarrow \ell_q \end{array}$$

compact?

It was proved by Bennett [Ben96] (cf. Grosse-Erdmann [GE98]) that

$$(A) \quad M(ces_q, ces_p) = M(\widetilde{\ell}_q, \widetilde{\ell}_p) = \widetilde{\ell}_r,$$

where $1/r = 1/p - 1/q$, and

$$(B) \quad M(ces_p, ces_q) = \ell_\infty \left(n^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}} \right) = \left\{ x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty : \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(n^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}} |x_n| \right) < \infty \right\}.$$

The first situation (A) is not particularly complicated as it fits exactly Theorem 3.2. Indeed, since we have the factorization

$$\ell_q \odot M(\ell_q, \ell_p) = \ell_q \odot \ell_r = \ell_p$$

and both spaces ces_p and ces_q are even reflexive, so the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: ces_q \rightarrow ces_p$ is compact if, and only if, $\lambda \in (\widetilde{\ell}_r)_o = \widetilde{\ell}_r$.

The second situation (B) is much more interesting, because now

$$\ell_p \odot M(\ell_p, \ell_q) = \ell_p \odot \ell_\infty = \ell_p \neq \ell_q$$

and we *can't* use Theorem 3.2 directly. Fortunately, Theorem 2.3 remains at our disposal all the time, so the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: ces_p \rightarrow ces_q$ is compact if, and only if, the symbol $\lambda = \{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ belongs to the space

$$(M(ces_p, ces_q))_o = \left(\ell_\infty \left(n^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}} \right) \right)_o = c_0 \left(n^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}} \right),$$

that is to say, $\{\lambda_n n^{1/q - 1/p}\}_{n=1}^\infty \in c_0$. The above equality is probably interesting in its own way, because $M(\ell_p, \ell_q) = \ell_\infty$, so the fact that the space $M(ces_p, ces_q)$ is not just ℓ_∞ may come as a bit of surprise. Anyhow, in this way, we recreated the Albanese, Bonet and Ricker result from [ABR18] (precisely, see [ABR18, Proposition 2.2]).

The analogous answer in the case of Tandori spaces coincides with what is contained in Table 6 on page 69 and Table 22 on page 70 in Bennett memoir [Ben96] (see also [BR20]).

3.2. Abstract Cesàro and Tandori function spaces: Open ends. In the function case, the *continuous Hardy operator* (or the *continuous Cesàro operator*) \mathcal{H} is defined by $\mathcal{H}(f)(x) := \frac{1}{x} \int_0^x f(t) dt$ for $x > 0$ and the corresponding *abstract Cesàro function space* CX , where X is a Köthe function space defined on the unit interval $(0, 1)$ or the semi-axis $(0, \infty)$ (both equipped with the usual Lebesgue measure m), is defined - similarly to the sequence case considered in the previous subsection - as the set of all real valued measurable functions, say f , such that $\mathcal{H}(|f|) \in X$, equipped with the norm $\|f\|_{CX} = \|\mathcal{H}(|f|)\|_X$.

Without any surprises, for a Köthe function space X exactly as above, by the *abstract Tandori function space* \widetilde{X} we mean a set of all measurable functions, say f , with $\widetilde{f} \in X$, where \widetilde{f} is the *decreasing majorant* of a given function f , i.e., $\widetilde{f}(x) := \text{esssup}_{t \geq x} |f(t)|$, with the norm $\|f\|_{\widetilde{X}} = \|\widetilde{f}\|_X$.

Here, we don't really need more than the above two definitions, but the isomorphic and isometric structure of the Cesàro and Tandori function spaces has been the subject of extensive research and has many non-trivial results to offer (we refer to [ALM19], [CR16], [DS07], [KKM21], [KKT22], [KT17], [Kub14], [LM16], [LM15] and [MS06]; cf. [AM14] and references therein).

Now, by mimicking the proof of Theorem 3.2 and using our Theorem 2.1 together with [LM15, Theorem 3] and [KLM19, Theorem 6] (see also Remark 9 in [KLM19]) it is not very difficult to prove the main result of this subsection.

Theorem 3.5 (Essential norm of multiplication operators between abstract Cesàro and Tandori function spaces). *Let X and Y be two Köthe function spaces with the Fatou property both defined over the semi-axis $(0, \infty)$ with the Lebesgue measure. Suppose that both operators* \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}^\times as well as the dilation operator D_τ are bounded on X and on Y , for some $0 < \tau < 1$. Suppose further that either the space X is reflexive or the space Y is order continuous. Assume also that Y factorizes through X , that is to say, $X \odot M(X, Y) = Y$. Then*

$$\left\| M_\lambda: \tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{Y} \right\|_{ess} \approx \|\lambda\|_{\widetilde{M(X, Y)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|M_\lambda: CX \rightarrow CY\|_{ess} \approx \|\lambda\|_{\widetilde{M(X, Y)}},$$

where both of the above estimates depend on X and Y only. In particular, there is a lack of compact multiplication operators acting between abstract Cesàro and Tandori function spaces.

However, when we try to imitate Theorem 2.12 to calculate the weak essential norm, things cease to be easy, because we don't really have a clue what Cesàro function spaces are 1-disjointly homogeneous. It seems like the best we can do is to ask the following

Question 3.6. *What properties of a Köthe function space, say X , imply that the corresponding abstract Cesàro function space CX is 1-DH?*

In our experience, this should happen sporadically, for example, if X is the weighted L_∞ -space, where the weight is defined as $w(t) = t$ for $t > 0$, then the space CX is 1-DH, because $CX \equiv L_1$. We will even risk the hypothesis that for X being a rearrangement invariant space this situation will never occurs. However, if we are right about this, then we should ask another question.

Question 3.7. *What is an analogue of Theorem 2.12 for Cesàro function spaces?*

Where did the Cesàro function spaces defined on $(0, 1)$ get lost in all this? Unfortunately, due to some technicalities (see the paragraph after Problem 2 in [KLM19] for more details), we do not have a satisfactory description of the space $M(CX, CY)$ in the case when both spaces X and Y are rearrangement invariant spaces defined over $(0, 1)$. For this reason, let us ask one more question.

Question 3.8. *Let X and Y be two rearrangement invariant spaces (or, maybe, just Köthe spaces) over $(0, 1)$. How to describe the space $M(CX, CY)$? Moreover, what are the analogs of Theorem 2.12 and Theorem 3.5 in this case?*

3.3. Banach spaces of analytic functions. In this subsection, we will improve and complete the main result from Mleczko's paper [Mle09] (precisely, see [Mle09, Theorem 2.5]). However, before we do that, we need short preliminaries to clarify our notation.

Let $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$ be the space of all analytic functions on the unit disc $\mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$. Further, let Y be a Köthe sequence space. With a linear subspace, say $H(\mathbb{D})$, of $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$ we can associate the space

$$\widehat{H}(\mathbb{D}) = \left\{ \left\{ \widehat{f}(n) \right\}_{n=0}^{\infty} : \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \widehat{f}(n) \chi_n \in H(\mathbb{D}) \right\}$$

*Here, the symbol \mathcal{H}^\times stands for the Köthe adjoint operator to the Hardy operator \mathcal{H} , the so-called *continuous Copson operator*, which can be explicitly defined via

$$\mathcal{H}^\times : f \mapsto \mathcal{H}^\times(f)(x) := \int_x^\infty \frac{f(t)}{t} dt \quad \text{for } x > 0.$$

of Taylor's coefficients of functions from $H(\mathbb{D})$, where $\chi_n(z) = z^n$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Then with any sequence $\lambda = \{\lambda_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ from $M(\widehat{H}(\mathbb{D}), Y)$ we can associate its *Fourier multiplier operator* $\mathcal{M}_\lambda: H(\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow Y$ defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_\lambda: f \mapsto \left\{ \lambda_n \widehat{f}(n) \right\}_{n=0}^\infty,$$

where $f = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \widehat{f}(n) \chi_n \in H(\mathbb{D})$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

Moreover, let X be a Köthe space on the unit circle $\mathbb{T} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}: |z| = 1\}$ equipped with the normalized Lebesgue measure $dm(t) = |dt|/2\pi$. Then the *abstract Hardy space* $H[X]$ is defined as a set

$$H[X] = \left\{ f \in X: \widehat{f}(n) = 0 \text{ for all } n < 0 \right\}$$

equipped with the norm inherited from X (cf. [Mle09]). Equivalently, via convolution with the Poisson kernel, we can treat the Hardy space $H[X]$ as a space of analytic functions on the unit disc \mathbb{D} . Of course, $H[L_p]$, where $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, is nothing else, but a classical Hardy space H_p (for more information we refer to [LM21], [Mle09] and references given there).

Now we are ready to prove the promised result.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $H(\mathbb{D})$ be a Banach space of analytic function on the unit disc \mathbb{D} intermediate between $H_\infty(\mathbb{D})$ and $H_2(\mathbb{D})$. Moreover, let Y be an order continuous Köthe sequence space with the Fatou property, Then*

$$\|\mathcal{M}_\lambda: H(\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow Y\|_{ess} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{M(\ell_2, Y)}.$$

In particular, the Fourier multiplier $\mathcal{M}_\lambda: H(\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow Y$ is compact if, and only if, $\lambda \in M(\ell_2, Y)_o$.

Clearly, if X is a Köthe space on \mathbb{T} such that $L_\infty(\mathbb{T}) \hookrightarrow X \hookrightarrow L_2(\mathbb{T})$, then $H_\infty(\mathbb{D}) \hookrightarrow H[X] \hookrightarrow H_2(\mathbb{D})$ and, consequently, the corresponding Hardy space $H[X]$ may serve here as a main illustration for this result.

Sketch of the proof. The proof basically consists of two steps.

1st. First, we need to transfer the situation to our ‘‘ideal’’ word. This can be done using the so-called solid envelopes. Precisely, thanks to our assumption that $H_\infty(\mathbb{D}) \hookrightarrow H(\mathbb{D}) \hookrightarrow H_2(\mathbb{D})$ and knowing that the solid envelope of $H_\infty(\mathbb{D})$ and $H_2(\mathbb{D})$ is ℓ_2 , it is not hard to see that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H(\mathbb{D}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}_\lambda} & Y \\ \text{id} \downarrow & & \uparrow M_\lambda \\ H_2 & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} & \ell_2 \end{array}$$

where $\lambda \in \widehat{H}(\mathbb{D})$ and $\mathcal{F}(f) = \left\{ \widehat{f}(n) \right\}_{n=0}^\infty$ for $f \in H(\mathbb{D})$ (cf. Proposition 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 in [Mle09]). But this means that

$$\mathcal{M}(H(\mathbb{D}), Y) = M(\ell_2, Y).$$

2nd. Now, because the space Y is order continuous, so it is enough to apply our Theorem 2.3. That is all. \square

How to get back to Mleczko's result from here? Well, with the extra assumption that $\ell_2 \hookrightarrow Y$, we get that $M(\ell_2, Y) = \ell_\infty$ and, consequently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{M(\ell_2, Y)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\lambda \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{\ell_\infty} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{m \geq n} |\lambda_m| \right) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda_n|.$$

This gives us Theorem 2.5 from [Mle09].

Corollary 3.10 (Mleczko, 2009). *Let $H(\mathbb{D})$ be a Banach space of analytic function on the unit disc \mathbb{D} intermediate between $H_\infty(\mathbb{D})$ and $H_2(\mathbb{D})$. Moreover, let Y be an order continuous Köthe sequence space with the Fatou property intermediate between ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ . Then the Fourier multiplier $\mathcal{M}_\lambda: H(\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow Y$ is compact if, and only if,*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda_n| = 0.$$

4. EXAMPLES: ON COMPACT MULTIPLIERS BETWEEN SOME CONCRETE CLASSES OF KÖTHE SPACES

The space $M(X, Y)_o$, that is, a separable part of the space of pointwise multipliers between X and Y plays a fundamental role in virtually all of our results regarding the problem of description of compact multipliers acting between two Köthe spaces (see Section 2; especially Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.12). In many specific situations the space $M(X, Y)$ can be explicitly* calculated and, on the other hand, the points of order continuity of certain classes of Köthe spaces can be characterized in a fairly satisfactory manner. In fact, these two problems have been the leitmotif of many articles (to mention a few, see [CS14], [CDSP08], [DR00], [Kol16], [KLM12], [KLM14], [KLM19], [KP12], [LT21] and [MP89]; cf. [Ben96] and [GE98]). Unfortunately, there seems to be no overall satisfactory† and general description of the points of order continuity in the space of pointwise multipliers $M(X, Y)$, where X and Y are two Köthe sequence spaces (this fact should be compared with [LTM22, Corollary 6.3]). That is why we have chosen to focus here on specific pairs of Köthe spaces for which we can calculate the space $M(X, Y)$ and describe the ideal $M(X, Y)_o$ in some sensible way. To this end, we will sometimes use existing results, but anyway, [KLM12], [KLM14], [KLM19], [Kol16] and [KP12] will be the main sources of inspiration.

4.1. Musielak–Orlicz sequence spaces. Let $\{M_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of Orlicz functions‡. The *Musielak–Orlicz sequence space* $\ell_{\{M_n\}}$ is a Banach space of all sequences $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of real numbers with $\sum_{n=1}^\infty M_n(|x_n|/\varrho) < \infty$ for some $\varrho > 0$, equipped with the so-called Luxemburg–Nakano norm

$$\|\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty\|_{\ell_{\{M_n\}}} := \inf \left\{ \varrho > 0: \sum_{n=1}^\infty M_n \left(\frac{x_n}{\varrho} \right) \leq 1 \right\}.$$

This general construction includes two very important types of spaces: On the one hand, *Nakano sequence spaces* $\ell_{\{p_n\}}$ (or *variable exponent Riesz–Lebesgue spaces*) which are nothing else but Musielak–Orlicz sequence spaces $\ell_{\{M_n\}}$ with all generating functions M_n being just power functions, that is, $M_n(t) = t^{p_n}$ for some $p_n \geq 1$; On the other, classical *Orlicz sequence spaces* ℓ_M which are Musielak–Orlicz sequence spaces $\ell_{\{M_n\}}$ with “constant” sequence of Orlicz functions $\{M_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, that is, with $M_n = M$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (see [LT77, Chapter 4] and [Mal89] for much more information about Musielak–Orlicz spaces and, respectively, Orlicz spaces).

Recently, Lešnik and the second named author in [LT21] proved that the space of pointwise multipliers between two Musielak–Orlicz sequence spaces, say $\ell_{\{M_n\}}$ and $\ell_{\{N_n\}}$, is another

*Almost always up to the *equivalence*, but not equality, of norms.

†In some sense, an exact description of the ideal $M(X, Y)_o$ in the language of the properties of X and Y should not be possible in general, because the properties of the space $M(X, Y)$ also depend on the relative position of the spaces X and Y on the scale of Köthe spaces.

‡By an *Orlicz function* $M: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ we understand a convex and strictly increasing function vanishing at zero. We decided to use only the Orlicz functions here instead of the more general Young functions (which can “jump” to infinity) to avoid some unnecessary complications. However, formally, all the results presented here work in full generality (actually, everything work in even more general setting of the so-called *generalized Calderón–Lozanovskii sequence spaces* $E_{\{M_n\}}$, where E is a Köthe sequence space and $\{M_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of Young functions; however, we will not elaborate on this topic here, because we feel that such a generality would disturb the very shaky balance between applicability and technicality, to the detriment of the first).

Musielak–Orlicz sequence space. More precisely, it follows from Theorem 9 in [LT21] that

$$M(\ell_{\{M_n\}}, \ell_{\{N_n\}}) = \ell_{\{N_n \ominus M_n\}},$$

where

$$(N_n \ominus M_n)(t) := \sup_{0 \leq u \leq 1} [N_n(tu) - M_n(u)] \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

is the so-called *generalized Young conjugate* of M_n with respect to N_n .

Moreover, Kolwicz and Panfil in [KP12] gave complete criteria describing the points of order continuity in Musielak–Orlicz spaces. Precisely, it can be deduced from Theorem 11 in [KP12] that a function, say x , is an order continuous element of the Musielak–Orlicz sequence space $\ell_{\{M_n\}}$ if, and only if, the sequence of Orlicz functions $\{M_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfies the so-called *local δ_2 -condition with respect to x* (see [KP12, Definition 1]).

Without going into technical details, the aforementioned results in tandem with our Theorem 2.3 make it possible to describe the compact multipliers between two Musielak–Orlicz sequence spaces. However, sacrificing a little generality for the sake of clarity, we will now describe the compact multipliers between two Nakano sequence spaces.

Proposition 4.1 (Compact multipliers between Nakano sequence spaces). *Let $\{p_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{q_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be two sequences of real numbers with $1 \leq p_n \leq q_n < \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that either*

$$1 < \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} p_n \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} p_n < \infty$$

or

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} q_n < \infty.$$

Then the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: \ell_{\{p_n\}} \rightarrow \ell_{\{q_n\}}$ is compact if, and only if,

$$\forall \ell > 1: \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\left\{n \in \text{supp}(\lambda): r_n > \frac{\log k}{\log \ell}\right\}} (|\lambda_n| \ell)^{r_n} = 0,$$

where $1/r_n = 1/q_n - 1/p_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We will prove this result in four steps.

1st. It is part of folklore that the Nakano space $\ell_{\{s_n\}}$, where $\{s_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is from $[1, \infty)$, is order continuous if, and only if, $p_n < \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In consequence, using duality and [BS88, Corollary 4.4, p. 23], the space $\ell_{\{s_n\}}$ is reflexive if, and only if, $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} s_n > 1$ and $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} s_n < \infty$.

2nd. Suppose $1 \leq p_n \leq q_n < \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then it follows from [LT21, Theorem 9] that

$$M(\ell_{\{p_n\}}, \ell_{\{q_n\}}) = \ell_{\{q_n \ominus p_n\}} = \ell_{\{r_n\}}, \text{ where } \frac{1}{r_n} = \frac{1}{q_n} - \frac{1}{p_n} \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

3rd. Next, it follows from [KP12, Theorem 11] that $x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ belongs to the separable part of the Musielak–Orlicz space $(\ell_{\{M_n\}})_o$, where $\{M_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of Orlicz functions, if and only if for each $\ell > 1$ we have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left\{ M_n \left(\ell x_n \chi_{A_k^\ell} \right) \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \right\|_{\ell_1} = 0,$$

where $A_k^\ell = \{n \in \text{supp}(x): M_n(\ell x_n) > k M_n(x_n)\}$. However, in our situation, we need to apply the above criterion to the Nakano space $\ell_{\{r_n\}}$. After some simple calculations it is easy to see that $x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ belongs to $(\ell_{r_n})_o$ if, and only if,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left\{ (\ell x_n)^{r_n} \chi_{A_k^\ell} \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \right\|_{\ell_1} = 0,$$

where

$$A_k^\ell = \left\{ n \in \text{supp}(x): r_n > \frac{\log k}{\log \ell} \right\}.$$

4th. Now, to complete the proof, it is enough to use the previous steps and Theorem 2.3. \square

4.2. Lorentz and Marcinkiewicz sequence spaces. Let φ be a positive, increasing and concave function on $(0, \infty)$. By the *Lorentz sequence space* λ_φ , respectively, the *Marcinkiewicz sequence space* m_φ , we understand the space of all sequences $x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ for which the following norm

$$\|x\|_{\lambda_\varphi} := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n^*(\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)),$$

respectively,

$$\|x\|_{m_\varphi} := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n x_k^*,$$

is finite. Here, $x^* = \{x_n^*\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is the non-increasing rearrangement of the sequence $|x| = \{|x_n|\}_{n=1}^\infty$. In the case when $\varphi(n) = n^{1/p}$ for $1 < p < \infty$, the corresponding Marcinkiewicz sequence space m_φ is denoted by $\ell_{p,\infty}$ and is sometimes called the *weak ℓ_p -space*.

Let us now collect some important facts about Lorentz and Marcinkiewicz spaces.

- For any rearrangement invariant sequence space X with the fundamental function* φ_X we have the following inclusions

$$\ell_1 \hookrightarrow \lambda_{\varphi_X} \hookrightarrow X \hookrightarrow m_{\varphi_X} \hookrightarrow \ell_\infty,$$

that is to say, Lorentz spaces λ_{φ_X} are the “smallest” and Marcinkiewicz spaces m_{φ_X} are the “largest” spaces among all rearrangement invariant spaces with a given fundamental function φ_X (see [BS88, Theorem 5.13, p. 72], [KPS82, Theorem 5.5, p. 118 and Theorem 5.7, p. 119]).

- It is well-known that Lorentz space λ_φ is separable if, and only, if $\varphi(\infty) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(t) = \infty$ (see [KPS82, Lemma 5.1, p. 110]; cf. also [Kol16, Corollary 4.20] together with the note on p. 820 about the “sequence case”). Note also that if $\varphi(\infty) < \infty$, then $\lambda_\varphi = \ell_\infty$ and, in consequence, $(\lambda_\varphi)_o = c_0$. On the other hand, Marcinkiewicz spaces m_φ are never separable (see, e.g., [Kol16, Remark 4.4(ii)]). However, the separable part $(m_\varphi)_o$ of m_φ can be described precisely in the following way

$$(m_\varphi)_o = \left\{ x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in m_\varphi : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n x_k^* = 0 \right\}$$

(see [KPS82, pp. 115–116]).

- It follows from the very definition that Lorentz spaces λ_φ are (up to the equality of norms) symmetrizations of weighted ℓ_1 -spaces; more precisely,

$$\lambda_\varphi \equiv [\ell_1(\Delta\varphi)]^{(*)},$$

where $\Delta\varphi(n) = \varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

- Dually, down to one technical detail, Marcinkiewicz spaces m_φ are (but only up to the equivalence of norms) symmetrizations of weighted ℓ_∞ -spaces, namely,

$$m_\varphi = [\ell_\infty(\varphi)]^{(*)}.$$

*Recall, that the *fundamental function* φ_X of a rearrangement invariant sequence space X is the function $\varphi_X(n) := \|\sum_{k=1}^n e_k\|_X$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is the canonical basic sequence of X . Note that every such a function is equivalent to a concave function (see [BS88, Proposition 5.11, p. 71]).

The detail is the assumption that the so-called lower index* p_φ^∞ of the function φ is strictly greater than one.

After this short reminder we are in the position to show the following result describing the compact multipliers acting either from the Marcinkiewicz sequence space into a rearrangement invariant sequence space or from a rearrangement invariant sequence space into the Lorentz sequence spaces.

Proposition 4.2 (Compact multipliers between Lorentz and Marcinkiewicz sequence spaces). *Let φ and ψ be two positive, increasing and concave functions defined on $(0, \infty)$. Let, moreover, X, Y and Z be three rearrangement invariant sequence spaces with the Fatou property.*

- (i) *Suppose X is reflexive and $q_\varphi^\infty < \infty$. Then the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: X \rightarrow \lambda_\varphi$ is compact if, and only if, either $\left\{\frac{\varphi(n)}{n}\lambda_n^*\right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in X^\times$, provided $\left\{\frac{\varphi(n)}{n}\right\}_{n=1}^\infty \notin X^\times$, or $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in c_0$, provided $\left\{\frac{\varphi(n)}{n}\lambda_n^*\right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in X^\times$.*
- (ii) *Suppose Y is order continuous and $1 < p_\varphi^\infty$. Then the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: m_\varphi \rightarrow Y$ is compact if, and only if, either $\left\{\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}\lambda_n^*\right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in Y$, provided $\left\{\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^\infty \notin Y$, or $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in c_0$, provided $\left\{\frac{\varphi(n)}{n}\lambda_n^*\right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in Y$.*
- (iii) *Suppose $q_\varphi^\infty < \infty$. Then the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: Z \rightarrow \lambda_\varphi$ is compact if, and only if, either $\left\{\frac{\varphi(n)}{n}\lambda_n^*\right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in (Z^\times)_o$, provided $\left\{\frac{\varphi(n)}{n}\right\}_{n=1}^\infty \notin Z^\times$, or $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in c_0$, provided $\left\{\frac{\varphi(n)}{n}\right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in Z^\times$.*

In particular,

- (iv) *if $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(n)}{\varphi(n)} = \infty$ and $1 < p_\varphi^\infty$, then the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: m_\varphi \rightarrow \lambda_\psi$ is compact if, and only if, $\left\{\frac{\psi(n+1)-\psi(n)}{\varphi(n)}\lambda_n^*\right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in \ell_1$.*
- (v) *if $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(n)}{\psi(n)} = \infty$ and $q_\varphi^\infty < \infty$, then the multiplication operator $M_\lambda: \lambda_\psi \rightarrow \lambda_\varphi$ is compact if, and only if, $\left\{\frac{\varphi(n)}{\psi(n)}\lambda_n^*\right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in c_0$.*

Note that (i) and (ii) means exactly that the operators $M_\lambda: X \rightarrow \lambda_\varphi$ and $M_\lambda: m_\varphi \rightarrow Y$ are compact if and only if they are bounded.

The proof of Proposition 4.2 will essentially consists of two parts: we compute the space of pointwise multipliers first, and then we try to characterize the points of order continuity in this space. However, since the whole argument seems quite long, we decided to include its most important parts in two auxiliary lemmas.

We start with the following one, which can be viewed as a discrete version of some of the Lešnik, Kolwicz and Maligranda results from [KLM14].

Lemma 4.3. *Let X and Y be two rearrangement invariant sequence spaces with the Fatou property. Let, moreover, φ be an increasing concave function on $[1, \infty)$.*

- (i) *Suppose $1 < p_\varphi^\infty$. Then $M(m_\varphi, Y) = \left[Y\left(\frac{1}{\varphi}\right)\right]^{(*)}$.*
- (ii) *Suppose $q_\varphi^\infty < \infty$. Then $M(X, \lambda_\varphi) = \left[X^\times\left(\frac{\varphi(t)}{t}\right)\right]^{(*)}$.*

*For an increasing concave function φ defined on $[1, \infty)$ the corresponding lower index p_φ^∞ and upper index q_φ^∞ are the numbers defined as

$$p_\varphi^\infty = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log s}{\log \bar{\varphi}^\infty(s)}, \quad q_\varphi^\infty = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log s}{\log \bar{\varphi}^\infty(s)}, \quad \text{where } \bar{\varphi}^\infty(s) = \sup_{t \geq \max(1, 1/s)} \frac{\varphi(st)}{\varphi(t)}.$$

It is known that $1 \leq p_\varphi^\infty \leq q_\varphi^\infty \leq \infty$.

Proof. The proof presented here will abound in many small technical details and facts that are either certainly known to some specialists or are based on earlier results scattered over at least a few papers (mainly [KLM12] and [KLM14]). However, in order to relieve the reader from the tedious and time-consuming task of checking and converting all arguments by himself, and, because we feel that by simplifying some of the proofs we are able to present the material in a clearer and a bit more complete manner, we decided to present all the details. Simultaneously, the proofs given here can serve as a tutorial to the arithmetic of Köthe spaces.

Let's start with explanation that spaces $M(m_\varphi, Y)$ and $M(X, \lambda_\varphi)$ are actually rearrangement invariant spaces. We only need to show that the space $M(E, F)$, where E and F are two rearrangement invariant sequence spaces, is rearrangement invariant as well (for a pair of rearrangement invariant function spaces this fact is known; see [KLM12, Theorem 2.2]). To see this, take $x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in M(E, F)$ and let's consider two cases.

Firstly, suppose that $x^*(\infty) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n^* > 0$. This implies that $\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow M(E, F)$. Moreover, if $F \hookrightarrow G$, then it is straightforward to see that $M(E, F) \hookrightarrow M(E, G)$. Note also that $M(E, \ell_\infty) \hookrightarrow \ell_\infty$; indeed, if an unbounded function, say $z = \{z_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, belonged to $M(E, \ell_\infty)$, then $z_n = e_n z \in \ell_\infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which is impossible. Thus, combining all these three facts together and remembering that $F \hookrightarrow \ell_\infty$ (see [BS88, Corollary 6.7, p. 78]), we get

$$\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow M(E, F) \hookrightarrow M(E, \ell_\infty) \hookrightarrow \ell_\infty.$$

In consequence, $M(E, F) = \ell_\infty$.

Secondly, suppose that $x^*(\infty) = 0$. Here we will, more or less, follow the argument given in [KLM12, Theorem 2.2]. Let $y = \{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be any function that is equi-measurable with x . Then it follows from [KPS82, Lemma 2.1, p. 60] that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a measure-preserving transformation, say ϖ_ε , such that

$$\|x - y(\varpi_\varepsilon)\|_{\ell_1} < \varepsilon.$$

Consequently, since $\ell_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi_F(1)} F$ and $E \xrightarrow{1/\varphi_E(1)} \ell_\infty$ (see [BS88, pp. 77–78]), so for all $z = \{z_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in E$ with $\|z\|_E \leq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|yz\|_F &= \|y(\varpi_\varepsilon)z(\varpi_\varepsilon)\|_F \\ &\leq \|xz(\varpi_\varepsilon)\|_F + \|[y(\varpi_\varepsilon) - x]z(\varpi_\varepsilon)\|_F \\ &\leq \|x\|_{M(E, F)} + \|[y(\varpi_\varepsilon) - x]z(\varpi_\varepsilon)\|_F \\ &\leq \|x\|_{M(E, F)} + \|z(\varpi_\varepsilon)\|_{\ell_\infty} \|y(\varpi_\varepsilon) - x\|_F \\ &\leq \|x\|_{M(E, F)} + \frac{\varphi_F(1)}{\varphi_E(1)} \|z\|_E \|y(\varpi_\varepsilon) - x\|_{\ell_1} < \|x\|_{M(E, F)} + \frac{\varphi_F(1)}{\varphi_E(1)} \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Due to ε 's arbitrariness we conclude that

$$\|y\|_{M(E, F)} \leq \|x\|_{M(E, F)}.$$

To prove the reverse inequality, it is enough to swap the roles of x and y .

(i) First of all, without loss of generality, we can assume that $m_\varphi \neq \ell_\infty$ (or, which is the same thing, that the function φ is unbounded), because otherwise the sequence $\{\varphi(n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is equivalent to a constant sequence and, almost trivially, we have the following identifications

$$M(m_\varphi, Y) = M(\ell_\infty, Y) = Y = Y \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) = \left[Y \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)}.$$

Continuing the proof, we will now consider two cases.

1st. Assume that $\left\{\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in Y$. Then it is clear that $\ell_{\infty} \hookrightarrow Y\left(\frac{1}{\varphi}\right)$. Moreover, since for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\frac{\varphi_Y(n)}{\varphi(n)} x_n^* = \varphi_Y(n) \left[\frac{x_n^*}{\varphi(n)} \right]^* \leq \frac{\varphi_Y(n)}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{x_k^*}{\varphi(k)},$$

where the first equality follows from a simple fact that the product of two non-increasing functions is non-increasing, and the second inequality is due to [BS88, Proposition 3.2, p. 52], so in view of the embedding $Y \hookrightarrow m_{\varphi_Y}$ (see [BS88, Proposition 5.1, p. 70]) we infer that

$$\ell_{\infty} \equiv (\ell_{\infty})^{(*)} \hookrightarrow \left[Y \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} \hookrightarrow \left[m_{\varphi_Y} \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} \hookrightarrow \left[\ell_{\infty} \left(\frac{\varphi_Y}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)}.$$

Now, because $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\varphi_Y(n)}{\varphi(n)} < \infty$ (otherwise, the sequence $\left\{\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ does not belong to $[\ell_{\infty}(\varphi_Y)]^{(*)}$, which is impossible!), so

$$\left[\ell_{\infty} \left(\frac{\varphi_Y}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} \hookrightarrow (\ell_{\infty})^{(*)} \equiv \ell_{\infty}.$$

This gives us that

$$(4.1) \quad \left[Y \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} = \ell_{\infty}.$$

On the other hand, if $\left\{\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in Y$, then $\ell_{\infty}(\varphi) \hookrightarrow Y$ and

$$m_{\varphi} = [\ell_{\infty}(\varphi)]^{(*)} \hookrightarrow Y^{(*)} \equiv Y,$$

where the first equality follows from our assumption that $p_{\varphi}^{\infty} > 1$. This implies, however, that $\ell_{\infty} \hookrightarrow M(m_{\varphi}, Y)$ and, because the space $M(m_{\varphi}, Y)$ is rearrangement invariant (see the argument given at the beginning of the proof), so also $M(m_{\varphi}, Y) \hookrightarrow \ell_{\infty}$. In conclusion

$$M(m_{\varphi}, Y) = \ell_{\infty}$$

and, not forgetting about (4.1), we finally get the equality

$$M(m_{\varphi}, Y) = \ell_{\infty} = \left[Y \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)}.$$

2nd. Next, assume that $\left\{\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \notin Y$. Our plan is to show that

$$(*) \quad \left[Y \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} \stackrel{2}{\hookrightarrow} M(m_{\varphi}, Y) \stackrel{1}{\hookrightarrow} \left[Y \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)}.$$

To do that, we will need the following preparatory result whose proof we borrow from [KLM14, p. 653].

Claim Δ . *Let Y be a rearrangement invariant sequence space. Further, let φ be an increasing concave function on $[1, \infty)$ with $1 < p_{\varphi}^{\infty}$. Then for any $x \in M(m_{\varphi}, Y)$ we have the following equality*

$$\|x\|_{M(m_{\varphi}, Y)} = \sup_{\varpi} \left\| \frac{x}{\varphi(\varpi)} \right\|_Y,$$

where the supremum is taken over all measure-preserving transformations.

Proof of Claim Δ . Take $x \in M(m_\varphi, Y)$. Let ϖ be a measure preserving transformation. Since $m_\varphi = [\ell_\infty(\varphi)]^{(*)}$ and $\left(\frac{1}{\varphi(\varpi)}\right)^* = \frac{1}{\varphi} \in \ell_\infty(\varphi)$, so $\frac{1}{\varphi(\varpi)} \in m_\varphi$. In consequence, $\frac{x}{\varphi(\varpi)} \in Y$ and $\left\|\frac{x}{\varphi(\varpi)}\right\|_Y \leq \|x\|_{M(m_\varphi, Y)}$. Taking the supremum over all measure-preserving transformations, we immediately see that

$$\sup_{\varpi} \left\|\frac{x}{\varphi(\varpi)}\right\|_Y \leq \|x\|_{M(m_\varphi, Y)}.$$

To prove the reverse inequality, suppose that for any measure-preserving transformation ϖ the function $\frac{x}{\varphi(\varpi)}$ belongs to Y . Take $z \in m_\varphi$ with $\|z\|_{m_\varphi} \leq 1$. As we explained above, we can always assume that $m_\varphi \neq \ell_\infty$. Therefore, $m_\varphi \hookrightarrow c_0$ and, consequently, $z^*(\infty) = 0$. Moreover, Ryff's theorem guarantee the existence of a measure-preserving transformation, say ϖ_0 , with $|z| = z^*(\varpi_0)$. Putting these facts together, we get

$$|xz| = |x|z^*(\varpi_0) \leq \frac{|x|}{\varphi(\varpi_0)} \in Y.$$

But this means that $x \in M(m_\varphi, Y)$ and

$$\|x\|_{M(m_\varphi, Y)} \leq \sup_{\varpi} \left\|\frac{x}{\varphi(\varpi)}\right\|_Y.$$

The proof is finished. \square

Now we are ready to show (\star) . Let's first focus on the embedding $M(m_\varphi, Y) \hookrightarrow \left[Y\left(\frac{1}{\varphi}\right)\right]^{(*)}$. Take $x \in M(m_\varphi, Y)$. In view of Claim Δ , it is enough to prove that

$$\left\|\frac{x^*}{\varphi}\right\|_Y = \left\|\frac{x^*(\varpi)}{\varphi(\varpi)}\right\|_Y \leq \sup_{\varpi} \left\|\frac{x}{\varphi(\varpi)}\right\|_Y.$$

However, if it is true that there is a measure-preserving transformation, say ϖ_0 , with $|x| = x^*(\varpi_0)$, then the above inequality is basically obvious. This, however, will be an immediate consequence of Ryff's theorem once we know that $x^*(\infty) = 0$. Let us show the latter. To do this recall that it follows from our assumptions that

$$\ell_\infty(\varphi) \not\hookrightarrow Y.$$

Then it is clear that

$$m_\varphi = (\ell_\infty(\varphi))^{(*)} \not\hookrightarrow Y^{(*)} = Y.$$

But this means that $\ell_\infty \not\hookrightarrow M(m_\varphi, Y)$. Indeed, otherwise, due to the fact that the space $M(m_\varphi, Y)$ is rearrangement invariant, we would have that $M(m_\varphi, Y) = \ell_\infty$. However, this in turn would mean that $m_\varphi \hookrightarrow Y$. Clearly, this is impossible, so using once again the fact that the space $M(m_\varphi, Y)$ is rearrangement invariant, we get

$$M(m_\varphi, Y) \hookrightarrow c_0.$$

This is exactly what we needed.

To complete the proof, we only need to show the second embedding. Take $x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in \left[Y\left(\frac{1}{\varphi}\right)\right]^{(*)}$. Let ϖ be a measure-preserving transformation. Applying [KPS82, Property 10°, p. 67] and remembering that the function $t \mapsto \frac{1}{\varphi(t)}$ is non-increasing, we get

$$\left(\frac{x}{\varphi(\varpi)}\right)^* \leq D_2(x^*)D_2\left(\left(\frac{1}{\varphi(\varpi)}\right)^*\right) = D_2(x^*)D_2\left(\frac{1}{\varphi}\right) = D_2\left(\frac{x^*}{\varphi}\right).$$

Moreover, since the space Y is rearrangement invariant, so

$$\left\| \frac{x}{\varphi(\varpi)} \right\|_Y = \left\| \left(\frac{x}{\varphi(\varpi)} \right)^* \right\|_Y \leq \|D_2: Y \rightarrow Y\| \left\| \frac{x^*}{\varphi} \right\|_Y \leq 2 \|x\|_{\left[Y \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)}},$$

where the last inequality is essentially due to the Calderón–Mityagin interpolation theorem (see [LT79, p. 130]; cf. [KPS82, pp. 96–98]). Taking the supremum over all measure-preserving mappings ends the proof of (\star) .

(ii) Remembering about our assumptions we have that

$$\begin{aligned} M(X, \lambda_\varphi) &= M((\lambda_\varphi)^\times, X^\times) \quad (\text{using [KLM12, Property (vii), p. 879]}) \\ &= M(m_{t/\varphi(t)}, X^\times) \quad (\text{using [KPS82, Theorem 5.2, p. 112]}) \\ &= \left[X^\times \left(\frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \right) \right]^{(*)} \quad (\text{by (i) proved above}). \end{aligned}$$

That's all. \square

Next, we need a lemma in the spirit of Kolwicz's results from [Kol16] (precisely, see Theorem 3.9 ibidem).

Lemma 4.4. *Let X be a rearrangement invariant sequence space with the Fatou property. Let, moreover, w be a positive and non-increasing function on $(0, \infty)$ such that $w \notin X$. Suppose that $[X(w)]^{(*)}$ is a Banach space up an equivalent norm. Then*

$$\left[X(w)^{(*)} \right]_o = [X_o(w)]^{(*)}.$$

Proof. First, in order not to overload the notation, we will omit some parentheses here and there. This should not lead to misunderstandings. Secondly, it is more or less obvious that $X(w)_o = X_o(w)$, so we only need to show that

$$[X(w)_o]^{(*)} = [X(w)^{(*)}]_o.$$

We will justify both inclusions separately.

To show that

$$(4.2) \quad [X(w)_o]^{(*)} \subset [X(w)^{(*)}]_o,$$

take $x \in [X(w)_o]^{(*)}$. This means that $x^* \in X(w)_o$. Since the space $X(w)^{(*)}$ is rearrangement invariant, so in order to prove the inclusion (4.2) it is enough to show that $x^* \in [X(w)^{(*)}]_o$ (see [KKT22, Theorem 3.6]). From the order continuity of x in $X(w)$ it follows that

$$\|x^* \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{X(w)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Consequently, for a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\|x^* \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{X(w)} < \varepsilon \text{ for } n \geq N.$$

Next, because we assumed that $w \notin X$, so $x^*(\infty) = 0$ (otherwise, $\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow X(w)$ and this imply that $w \in X$, which is impossible!). Therefore, we can find $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$x_M^* \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\|\chi_{\{1, \dots, N\}}\|_{X(w)}}.$$

For $n \geq \max\{M, N\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^* \chi_{\{n, n+1, \dots\}}\|_{X(w)^{(*)}} &\leq \|(x^* \chi_{\{M, \dots\}})^* w\|_X \\ &\leq \|x_M^* \chi_{\{1, \dots, N\}} w\|_X + \|x^* \chi_{\{N, \dots\}}\|_{X(w)} < 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $x^* \in [X(w)^{(*)}]_o$ and completes the proof of (4.2).

Now we can turn our attention to the second inclusion, that is, we will show that

$$(4.3) \quad [X(w)^{(*)}]_o \subset [X(w)_o]^{(*)}.$$

Take $x \in [X(w)^{(*)}]_o$. Once again, since the space $X(w)^{(*)}$ is rearrangement invariant, so in view of [KKT22, Theorem 3.6] the fact that $x \in [X(w)^{(*)}]_o$ is equivalent to $x^* \in [X(w)^{(*)}]_o$. In order to prove (4.3) we need to show that $x^* \in X(w)_o$, that is, that for any sequence $\{x^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset X(w)$ with

$$0 \leq x^{(n)} \leq x^* \text{ and } x^{(n)} \downarrow 0,$$

we have $\|x^{(n)}\|_{X(w)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Take such a sequence $\{x^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$. Since $x^*(\infty) = 0$ (note that x^* is a point of order continuity in a rearrangement invariant space $X(w)^{(*)}$ and $[X(w)^{(*)}]_o \subset [\ell_\infty]_o = c_0$), so $(x^{(n)})^* \downarrow 0$ and, trivially, $0 \leq (x^{(n)})^* \leq x^*$. This means that $\|(x^{(n)})^*\|_{X(w)} \rightarrow 0$ (recall, that it follows from our assumption that $x^* \in [X(w)^{(*)}]_o$). In consequence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{(n)}\|_{X(w)} &= \|x^{(n)}w\|_X = \|(x^{(n)}w)^*\|_X \quad (\text{because } X \text{ is rearrangement invariant}) \\ &\leq \|D_2[(x^{(n)})^*]D_2[w^*]\|_X \quad (\text{using [KPS82, Property 10}^\circ, \text{ p. 67]}) \\ &= \|D_2[(x^{(n)})^*w^*]\|_X \\ &\leq \|D_2: X \rightarrow X\| \|(x^{(n)})^*w^*\|_X \quad (\text{because } D_2 \text{ is bounded on } X) \\ &= \|D_2: X \rightarrow X\| \|(x^{(n)})^*w\|_X \quad (\text{since the function } w \text{ is non-increasing}) \\ &= \|D_2: X \rightarrow X\| \|x^{(n)}\|_{X(w)^{(*)}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is finished. □

What seems quite surprising is that our proof is (almost) completely elementary, that is, it does not use the concept of an OC^* -point or the machinery developed in [Kol16]. Led us also add that the first author learned from Kolwicz another, slightly more general, proof which directly uses [Kol16]. But let's put it in the drawer for now.

Remark 4.5 (When is the symmetrization of a weighted rearrangement invariant sequence space a Banach space?). As we tried to explain earlier, the symmetrization of a Köthe space is in general only a quasi-Banach space (see [KR09, Lemma 1.4]; cf. [KLM19, Corollary 1]). However, there is a rather simple criterion to determine whether the space $[E(1/\phi)]^{(*)}$, where E is a rearrangement invariant sequence space and ϕ is a non-decreasing concave function on $(0, \infty)$, is a Banach space up to an equivalent norm. Indeed, suppose that

$$\frac{1}{\beta_E} < 1 - \frac{1}{p_\phi^\infty},$$

where β_E is the upper Boyd index of E and p_ϕ^∞ is the lower index of ϕ . Then the discrete Hardy operator \mathcal{H} is bounded on the space $E(1/\phi)$ (see [Mal83, Theorem 1]; cf. note on Pavlov's result on p. 127 in [KMP07]). In consequence, the functional

$$\|x\| := \left\| \frac{x^{**}}{\phi} \right\|_E \quad \text{for } x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in \left[E \left(\frac{1}{\phi} \right) \right]^{(*)},$$

where the symbol x^{**} denote the *maximal function* of x^* , that is, $x^{**} := \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n x_k^* \right\}_{n=1}^\infty$ (see [BS88, Definition 3.1, p. 52]), defines on the space $[E(1/\phi)]^{(*)}$ an equivalent norm. In fact, in view of [BS88, p. 54] the triangle inequality is clear. Moreover, for any $x \in [E(1/\phi)]^{(*)}$ we have the following inequalities

$$\left\| \frac{x^*}{\phi} \right\|_E \leq \left\| \frac{x^{**}}{\phi} \right\|_E = \|x\| \leq \left\| \mathcal{H} : E\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\right) \rightarrow E\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\right) \right\| \left\| \frac{x^*}{\phi} \right\|_E,$$

which means that

$$\|x\|_{[E(1/\phi)]^{(*)}} \approx \|x\|.$$

Proof of Proposition 4.2. (i) Under the assumption that $\left\{ \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} \right\}_{n=1}^\infty \notin X^\times$, we have the following sequence of equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} M_\lambda : X \rightarrow \lambda_\varphi \text{ is compact} &\iff \lambda \in M(X, \lambda_\varphi)_o \quad (\text{using Theorem 2.3}) \\ &\iff \lambda \in \left\{ \left[X^\times \left(\frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \right) \right]^{(*)} \right\}_o \quad (\text{by Lemma 4.3 (ii)}) \\ &\iff \lambda \in \left[(X^\times)_o \left(\frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \right) \right]^{(*)} \quad (\text{by Lemma 4.4}) \\ &\iff \left\{ \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} \lambda_n^* \right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in (X^\times)_o \quad (\text{because } X \text{ is reflexive}) \\ &\iff \left\{ \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} \lambda_n^* \right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in X^\times. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it follows from Theorem 2.3 that

$$M_\lambda : X \rightarrow \lambda_\varphi \text{ is compact if, and only, if } \left\{ \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} \lambda_n^* \right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in X^\times.$$

Next, assume that $\left\{ \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} \right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in X^\times$. Then the first part of the proof of Lemma 4.3 together with duality results teaches us that

$$M(X, \lambda_\varphi) = M((\lambda_\varphi)^\times, X^\times) = M(m_{t/\varphi(t)}, X^\times) = \ell_\infty.$$

Therefore, applying Theorem 2.3 one more time, we see immediately that

$$M_\lambda : X \rightarrow \lambda_\varphi \text{ is compact if, and only, if } \lambda \in (\ell_\infty)_o = c_0.$$

(ii) Similarly, assuming that $\left\{ \frac{1}{\varphi(n)} \right\}_{n=1}^\infty \notin Y$, we have the following equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} M_\lambda : m_\varphi \rightarrow Y \text{ is compact} &\iff \lambda \in M(m_\varphi, Y)_o \quad (\text{using Theorem 2.3}) \\ &\iff \lambda \in \left[\left[Y \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} \right]_o \quad (\text{by Lemma 4.3 (i)}) \\ &\iff \lambda \in \left[Y_o \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} \quad (\text{by Lemma 4.4}) \\ &\iff \left\{ \frac{1}{\varphi(n)} \lambda_n^* \right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in Y_o \quad (\text{because } X \text{ is order continuous}) \\ &\iff \left\{ \frac{1}{\varphi(n)} \lambda_n^* \right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in Y. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if we assume that $\left\{\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in Y$, then the following equality

$$M(m_{\varphi}, Y) = \ell_{\infty}$$

is a straightforward consequence of the first part of the proof of Lemma 4.3. Thus,

$$M_{\lambda}: m_{\varphi} \rightarrow Y \text{ is compact if, and only, if } \lambda \in (\ell_{\infty})_o = c_0.$$

(iii) After noticing that the space λ_{φ} is order continuous, this part can be proved in the same way as (i) (see [KPS82, Lemma 5.1, p. 110]; cf. also Lemma 4.4).

(iv) Assume that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(n)}{\varphi(n)} = \infty$. In view of the embedding

$$\lambda_{\psi} \hookrightarrow m_{\psi}$$

(see [BS88, Proposition 5.9, p. 70]), it is clear that

$$\text{if } \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(n)}{\varphi(n)} = \infty, \text{ then } \left\{\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \notin m_{\psi} \text{ and, in consequence, } \left\{\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \notin \lambda_{\psi}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} M(m_{\varphi}, \lambda_{\psi}) &= \left[\lambda_{\psi} \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} \quad (\text{by Lemma 4.3 (i)}) \\ &= \left[\ell_1(\Delta\psi)^{(*)} \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} \quad (\text{because } \lambda_{\phi} \equiv \ell_1(\Delta\phi)^{(*)}, \Delta\phi(n) := \phi(n+1) - \phi(n)) \\ &= \left[\ell_1(\Delta\psi) \left(\frac{1}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} \quad (\text{in view of the equality } \left(\frac{x^*}{\varphi} \right)^* = \frac{x^*}{\varphi}) \\ &= \left[\ell_1 \left(\frac{\Delta\psi}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta\psi(t) := \psi(n+1) - \psi(n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the sequence $\left\{\frac{\psi(n+1) - \psi(n)}{\varphi(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is non-increasing and ℓ_1 is separable, so applying Lemma 4.4 we get that

$$\left[\left[\ell_1 \left(\frac{\Delta\psi}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} \right]_o = \left[(\ell_1)_o \left(\frac{\Delta\psi}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)} = \left[\ell_1 \left(\frac{\Delta\psi}{\varphi} \right) \right]^{(*)}.$$

Let us make it clear that the use of Lemma 4.4 was completely justified in this situation, because $\left\{\frac{\Delta\psi(n)}{\varphi(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \notin \ell_1$. In fact, if this were not the case, then $\left\{\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \lambda_{\psi}$ which, due to our assumptions, is impossible. All this means is that the sequence $\lambda = \{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ belongs to $M(m_{\varphi}, \lambda_{\psi})_o$ if, and only, if the sequence $\left\{\frac{\psi(n+1) - \psi(n)}{\varphi(n)} \lambda_n^*\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ belongs to ℓ_1 . Since the space λ_{ψ} is order continuous, so the rest follows as before from Theorem 2.3.

(v) Assume that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(n)}{\psi(n)} = \infty$. Using the known equality between the fundamental functions of the space X and its Köthe dual X^{\times} (see [BS88, Theorem 5.2, p. 66]), that is,

$$\varphi_X(n) \varphi_{X^{\times}}(n) = n \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and arguing as at the beginning of the proof of (iv), it is straightforward to see that

$$\text{if } \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(n)}{\psi(n)} = \infty, \text{ then } \left\{\frac{\varphi(n)}{n}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \notin (\lambda_{\psi})^{\times} = m_{t/\psi(t)}.$$

In consequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
M(\lambda_\psi, \lambda_\varphi) &= \left[(\lambda_\psi)^\times \left(\frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \right) \right]^{(*)} && \text{(by Lemma 4.3 (ii))} \\
&= \left[m_{t/\psi(t)} \left(\frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \right) \right]^{(*)} && \text{(using [KPS82, Theorem 5.2, p. 112])} \\
&= \left[\left[\ell_\infty \left(\frac{t}{\psi(t)} \right) \right]^{(*)} \left(\frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \right) \right]^{(*)} && \text{(because } m_\phi = \ell_\infty(\phi)^{(*)} \text{ as long as } p_\phi > 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, keeping in mind that the function $t \mapsto \frac{\varphi(t)}{t}$ is non-increasing and using the obvious fact that the product of two non-increasing functions is still non-increasing, we see that

$$\left[\left[\ell_\infty \left(\frac{t}{\psi(t)} \right) \right]^{(*)} \left(\frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \right) \right]^{(*)} = \left[\ell_\infty \left(\frac{t}{\psi(t)} \right) \left(\frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \right) \right]^{(*)} = \left[\ell_\infty \left(\frac{\varphi}{\psi} \right) \right]^{(*)}.$$

Now, since $\left\{ \frac{\varphi(n)}{\psi(n)} \right\}_{n=1}^\infty \notin \ell_\infty$ (otherwise, $\left\{ \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} \right\}_{n=1}^\infty \in m_{t/\psi(t)}$ and this is contrary to our assumptions), so we can use Lemma 4.4 and, consequently, we get

$$\left[\left[\ell_\infty \left(\frac{\varphi}{\psi} \right) \right]^{(*)} \right]_o = \left[(\ell_\infty)_o \left(\frac{\varphi}{\psi} \right) \right]^{(*)} = \left[c_0 \left(\frac{\varphi}{\psi} \right) \right]^{(*)}.$$

Hence it is clear that the sequence $\lambda = \{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ belongs to $M(\lambda_\psi, \lambda_\varphi)_o$ if, and only if, the sequence $\left\{ \frac{\varphi(n)}{\psi(n)} \lambda_n^* \right\}_{n=1}^\infty$ belongs to c_0 . The use of Theorem 2.3 together with the information that the space λ_φ is order continuous completes the proof. \square

APPENDIX A. QUITE UNUSUAL COUNTEREXAMPLE TO THE FACTORIZATION PROBLEM

The famous Lozanovskii's theorem says that each function, say f , from L_1 can be written as a pointwise product of two functions, say g and h , where the first one belongs to a Köthe space X and the second one comes from its Köthe dual X^\times , in such a way that

$$\|f\|_{L_1} \approx \|g\|_X \|h\|_{X^\times}$$

(see [Loz69, Theorem 6]; cf. [Mal89, p. 185]). Using the language of the arithmetic of Köthe spaces we can express this result in 95e compact, but equivalent, form as

$$X \odot X^\times = X \odot M(X, L_1) = L_1.$$

From here, however, the short road leads to the much more general question if for a given pair of Köthe spaces, say X and Y , the following equality holds

$$X \odot M(X, Y) = Y?$$

We will refer to this kind of question as the *factorization problem*.

It is not particularly difficult to find a pair of Köthe sequence spaces for which the factorization problem has a negative solution. Exactly, let's take two Köthe sequence spaces X and Y such that $X \neq Y$. Suppose $M(X, Y) = \ell_\infty$. Then

$$X \odot M(X, Y) = X \odot \ell_\infty = X \neq Y,$$

that is, X does not factorize through Y . As an illustration, let's take $1 < p < \infty$ and notice that

$$\ell_p \odot M(\ell_p, \ell_{p,\infty}) = \ell_p \odot \ell_\infty = \ell_p \subsetneq \ell_{p,\infty}.$$

This clearly means that ℓ_p does not factorize through $\ell_{p,\infty}$. On the other hand, using duality argument, we can also show that

$$\ell_{p,1} \odot M(\ell_{p,1}, \ell_p) = \ell_{p,1} \odot M((\ell_p)^\times, (\ell_{p,1})^\times) = \ell_{p,1} \odot M(\ell_q, \ell_{q,\infty}) = \ell_{p,1} \odot \ell_\infty = \ell_{p,1} \subsetneq \ell_p,$$

where $p + q = pq$. Consequently, $\ell_{p,1}$ does not factorize through ℓ_p .

Based on this two* examples, it is not entirely unreasonable to suppose that if $M(X, Y) \neq \ell_\infty$ then the factorization problem does have the positive solution. We will show that this is far from the truth even in the class of rearrangement invariant spaces.

Proposition A.1. *There exists an Orlicz function, say \widetilde{M} , with the property that the corresponding Orlicz space $\ell_{\widetilde{M}}$ does not factorize through ℓ_2 , that is,*

$$\ell_{\widetilde{M}} \odot M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2) \neq \ell_2,$$

but at the same time $M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2) \neq \ell_\infty$.

Proof. First of all, let's define the Orlicz function \widetilde{M} in the following[†] way

$$\widetilde{M}(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{2}{n!}t - \frac{1}{(n!)^2} & \text{for } \frac{n+2}{2(n+1)!} \leq t < \frac{n+1}{2n!}, \quad n \geq 1 \\ t^2 & \text{for } 1 \leq t < \infty. \end{cases}$$

We divide the proof into three parts.

1st. We will start by calculating the space $M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2)$. Since the space ℓ_2 can obviously be treated as an Orlicz space, say ℓ_N , generated by the function $N(t) = t^2$, so our problem comes down to calculating the space of pointwise multipliers between two Orlicz sequence spaces. Luckily, Djakov and Ramanujan [DR00] come to our aid. Based on their results, we conclude that

$$M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2) = \ell_{N \ominus \widetilde{M}},$$

where

$$(N \ominus \widetilde{M})(t) := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} [N(st) - \widetilde{M}(s)] \quad \text{for } t \geq 0$$

is the so-called generalized Young conjugate of \widetilde{M} with respect to N (see [DR00, Theorem 3]; cf. [LT21]). Now, we have that

$$(N \ominus \widetilde{M})(t) = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} [N(st) - \widetilde{M}(s)] = \sup_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{N} \\ \frac{n+2}{2(n+1)!} \leq s < \frac{n+1}{2n!}}} \left[(st)^2 - \frac{2}{n!}s + \frac{1}{(n!)^2} \right].$$

However, it is not difficult to see that the functions that appear under the supremum do not attain their maximum values within the respective intervals, so the values at the ends of the intervals should be considered, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} (N \ominus \widetilde{M})(t) &= \max_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left[\left(\frac{n+2}{2(n+1)!} \right)^2 t^2 - \frac{2}{n!} \frac{n+2}{2(n+1)!} + \frac{1}{(n!)^2}, \left(\frac{n+1}{2n!} \right)^2 t^2 - \frac{2}{n!} \frac{n+1}{2n!} + \frac{1}{(n!)^2} \right] \\ &= \max_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left[\frac{(n+2)^2 t^2 - 8(n+2)(n+1) + 4(n+1)^2}{4((n+1)!)^2}, \frac{(n+1)^2 t^2 - 4n}{4(n!)^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

*To the best of our knowledge, all known counterexamples to the factorization problem are of this type (being precise, in the case of Köthe function spaces we have one more possibility, namely, the space $M(X, Y)$ can also be trivial, but this is really clichéd). For clear reasons we have not listed all of them here, but it is not difficult to find more of them, for example, among Orlicz spaces (cf. [KLM14], [KLM19] and [LT21]).

[†]Roughly speaking the space $\ell_{\widetilde{M}}$ is “very close” to ℓ_2 , but the Orlicz function \widetilde{M} goes to zero “much faster” (in the sense of the δ_2 -condition) than the function $t \mapsto t^2$.

Since the function

$$t \mapsto \frac{(n+2)^2 t^2 - 8(n+2)(n+1) + 4(n+1)^2}{4((n+1)!)^2}$$

takes only negative values for $t \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so

$$(N \ominus \widetilde{M})(t) = \max_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left[\frac{(n+1)^2 t^2 - 4n}{4(n!)^2} \right].$$

Hence, it is not very hard to see that

$$(N \ominus \widetilde{M})(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } t = 0 \\ \frac{(n+1)^2 t^2 - 4n}{4(n!)^2} & \text{for } \frac{2\sqrt{n+\varepsilon_n}}{n+1} < t \leq \frac{2\sqrt{n-1+\varepsilon_{n-1}}}{n}, n > 1, \end{cases}$$

where $\varepsilon_n = O(n^{-2})$ (here, the letter “ O ” stands from the *big Oh notation* or the *Bachmann–Landau notation*; we don’t need to be more precise than that, as we pay attention only to “small” arguments and we consider all the equalities between spaces up to the equality of norms).

2nd. Next we will show that the space $M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2)$ is not separable, but $M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2) \neq \ell_\infty$. Indeed, since the function $N \ominus \widetilde{M}$ does not satisfy the δ_2 -condition (to see this put $u_n := \frac{2\sqrt{n+\varepsilon_n}}{n+1}$ and observe that $\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_n} \rightarrow 1$, while $\frac{\varphi(u_{n+1})}{\varphi(u_n)} \approx \frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0$), so

$$M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2)_o = (\ell_{N \ominus \widetilde{M}})_o \neq \ell_{N \ominus \widetilde{M}} = M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2)$$

(see [LT77, Proposition 4.a.4, p. 138] or [Mal89, Corollary, pp. 21–22]). On the other hand, it is straightforward to see that an Orlicz space, say ℓ_F , coincides with ℓ_∞ if and only if the Young function F vanishes in some neighborhood of zero. However,

$$\inf \left\{ t > 0 : (N \ominus \widetilde{M})(t) > 0 \right\} = 0,$$

so this is not the case and $M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2) = \ell_{N \ominus \widetilde{M}} \neq \ell_\infty$.

3rd. Finally, we will prove that $\ell_{\widetilde{M}}$ does not factorize ℓ_2 . To show this we will use the characterization from [LT21, Theorem 2] which states that for a pair of Orlicz functions, say M_0 and M_1 , the factorization $\ell_{M_0} \odot M(\ell_{M_0}, \ell_{M_1}) = \ell_{M_1}$ holds if and only if there exist constants $C, D > 0$ with

$$CM_1^{-1}(t) \leq M_0^{-1}(t)(M_1 \ominus M_0)^{-1}(t) \leq DM_1^{-1}(t) \text{ for all } 0 < t < 1.$$

Consequently, it is enough to show that there is no constant $C > 0$ such that for all $0 < t < 1$ we have the inequality

$$CN^{-1}(t) \leq (\widetilde{M})^{-1}(t) (N \ominus \widetilde{M})^{-1}(t).$$

Suppose otherwise. Then, for some constant $C > 0$ and all $n > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C &\leq \frac{(\widetilde{M})^{-1}\left(\frac{n}{(n!)^2}\right) (N \ominus \widetilde{M})^{-1}\left(\frac{n}{(n!)^2}\right)}{N^{-1}\left(\frac{n}{(n!)^2}\right)} = \frac{\frac{\sqrt{n}}{n!}}{\frac{n+1}{2n!}} (N \ominus \widetilde{M})^{-1}\left(\frac{n}{(n!)^2}\right) \\ &= 2 \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n+1} (N \ominus \widetilde{M})^{-1}\left(\frac{n}{(n!)^2}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{2 (N \ominus \widetilde{M})^{-1}\left(\frac{n}{(n!)^2}\right)}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

But this means that

$$(N \ominus \widetilde{M})^{-1}\left(\frac{n}{(n!)^2}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} C \sqrt{n} \text{ for all } n > 1.$$

Here we get a contradiction, because this is clearly impossible. \square

Note also that since the space ℓ_2 is reflexive and, as the second part of the proof of Proposition A.1 shows, the space $M(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2)$ is not separable, so we can use our Theorem 2.3 and easily get the following

Corollary A.2. $\mathcal{L}(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2) \neq \mathcal{K}(\ell_{\widetilde{M}}, \ell_2)$.

Remembering that $\ell_2 \hookrightarrow \ell_{\widetilde{M}}$ it is instructive to compare Corollary A.2 with our discussion of Pitt's theorem in Remark 2.7. This result, however, should not be considered particularly spectacular, because the same conclusion can be drawn for the pair ℓ_p and $\ell_{p,\infty}$ or $\ell_{p,1}$ and ℓ_p , where $1 < p < \infty$. The only difference is that $M(\ell_p, \ell_{p,\infty}) = M(\ell_{p,1}, \ell_p) = \ell_\infty$.

REFERENCES

- [AGHLM18] I. Al Alam, L. Gaillard, G. Habib, P. Lefèvre and F. Maalouf, *Essential norm of Cesàro operators on L^p and Cesàro spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. (2018), 1–28.
- [AK06] F. Albiac and N. J. Kalton, *Topics in Banach Space Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York 2006.
- [ABR18] A. A. Albanese, J. Bonet and W. J. Ricker, *Multiplier and averaging operators in the Banach spaces $ces(p)$* , $1 < p < \infty$, Positivity 23 (2018), no. 1, 177–193.
- [AB85] C. D. Aliprantis and O. Burkinshaw, *Positive Operators*, Academic Press, Orlando, 1985.
- [Ast20] S. V. Astashkin, *The Rademacher System in Function Spaces*, Birkhäuser, 2020.
- [AK06] F. Albiac and N. J. Kalton, *Topics in Banach Space Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York 2006.
- [AB85] C. D. Aliprantis and O. Burkinshaw, *Positive Operators*, Academic Press, New York, London 1985.
- [ALM19] S. V. Astashkin, K. Lešnik and M. Maligranda, *Isomorphic structure of Cesàro and Tandori spaces*, Canad. J. Math. 71 (2019), no. 3, 501–532.
- [AM14] S. V. Astashkin and L. Maligranda, *Structure of Cesàro function spaces: a survey*, Banach Center Publ. 102 (2014), 13–40.
- [Axl82] S. Axler, *Multiplication operators on Bergmann spaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 336 (1982), 26–44.
- [AJS80] S. Axler, N. Jawell and A. Shields, *The essential norm of an operator and its adjoint*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 261 (1980), no. 1, pp. 159–167.
- [Ben96] G. Bennett, *Factorizing Classical Inequalities*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 120 (1996), no. 576, 138 pp.
- [BS88] C. Bennett and R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of Operators*, Pure and Applied Mathematics 129, Academic Press Inc., Boston, MA, 1988.
- [BV99] E. A. Biberdorf and M. Väth, *On the spectrum of orthomorphisms and Barbashin operators*, Z. Anal. Anwend. 18 (1999), no. 4, 859–873.
- [BDL99a] J. Bonet, P. Domański and M. Lindström, *Essential norm and weak compactness of composition operators on weighted Banach spaces of analytic functions*, Canad. Math. Bull. 42 (1999), 139–148.
- [BDL99b] J. Bonet, P. Domański and M. Lindström, *Pointwise multiplication operators on weighted Banach spaces of analytic functions*, Studia Math. 137 (1999), no. 2, 177–194.
- [BR20] J. Bonet and W. J. Ricker, *Operators acting in the dual spaces of discrete Cesàro spaces*, Monatsh. Math. 191 (2020), 487–512.
- [CS14] F. Cabello Sánchez, *Pointwise tensor products of function spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 418 (2014), 317–335.
- [CDSP08] J. M. Calabuig, O. Delgado and E. A. Sánchez Pérez, *Generalized perfect spaces*, Indag. Math. (N.S.) 19 (2008), no. 3, 359–378.
- [Cal41] J. Calkin, *Two-sided ideals and congruences in the ring of bounded operators in Hilbert spaces*, Ann. of Math. 42 (1941), no. 2, 839–873.
- [CHD03] M. D. Contreras and A. G. Hernández-Díaz, *Weighted composition operators between different Hardy spaces*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory 46 (2003), 165–188.
- [CR16] G. P. Curbera and W. J. Ricker, *Abstract Cesàro spaces: Integral representation*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 441 (2016), no. 1, 25–44.
- [Cro69] G. Crofts, *Concerning perfect Fréchet spaces and diagonal transformations*, Math. Ann. 182 (1969), no. 1, 67–76.
- [ČZ07] Ž. Čučković and R. Zhao, *Weighted composition operators between different weighted Bergman spaces and different Hardy spaces*, Illinois J. Math. 51 (2007), no. 2, 479–498.
- [CKMP04] M. Cwikel, A. Kamińska, L. Maligranda and L. Pick, *Are generalized Lorentz “spaces” really spaces?*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 132 (2004), no. 12, 3615–3625.
- [DS07] O. Delgado and J. Soria, *Optimal domain for the Hardy operator*, J. Funct. Anal. 244 (2007), no. 1, 119–133.

- [DJP01] J. Diestel, H. Jarchow and A. Pietsch, *Operator Ideals*, Handbook of the Geometry of Banach Spaces, North-Holland, Amsterdam 2001; vol. I, 437–496.
- [DR00] P. B. Djakov and M. S. Ramanujan, *Multipliers between Orlicz sequence spaces*, Turk. J. Math. 24 (2000), 313–319.
- [DSZ11] R. G. Douglas, S. Sun and D. Zheng, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman space via analytic continuation*, Adv. Math. 226 (2011), no. 1, 541–583.
- [ES05] D. E. Edmunds and E. Shargorodsky, *The inner variation of an operator and the essential norms of pointwise multipliers in function spaces*, Houston J. Math. 31 (2005), no. 3, 841–855.
- [FHSTT14] J. Flores, F. L. Hernández, E. Spinu, P. Tradacete and V. G. Troitsky, *Disjointly homogeneous Banach lattices: duality and complementation*, J. Funct. Anal. 266 (2014), no. 9, 5858–5885.
- [FJT75] T. Figiel, W. B. Johnson and L. Tzafriri, *On Banach lattices and spaces having local unconditional structure with applications to Lorentz function spaces*, J. Approx. Theory 13 (1975), 395–412.
- [FTT09] J. Flores, P. Tradacete and V. G. Troitsky, *Disjointly homogeneous Banach lattices and compact product of operators*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 354 (2009), 657–663.
- [Fre02] D. H. Fremlin, *Measure Theory. Volume 3: Measure Algebras*, Torres Fremlin, Colchester, 2002.
- [GJL06] S. Goldstein, H. Jarchow and E. Labuschagne, *Compactness properties for multiplication operators on von Neumann algebras and their preduals*, Banach Center Publ. 73 (2006), 177–185.
- [GE98] K.-G. Grosse-Erdmann, *The Blocking Technique, Weighted Mean Operators and Hardy’s Inequality*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1679, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1998.
- [GSZZ09] K. Guo, S. Sun, D. Zheng and C. Zhong, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman spaces via the Hardy spaces of the disc*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 628 (2009), 129–168.
- [HN04] H. Hudzik and A. Narloch, *Local monotonicity structure of Calderón–Lozanovskii spaces*, Indag. Mathem., N.S., 15 (2004), no. 2, 245–255.
- [HKLRS12] O. Hyvärinen, M. Kempainen, M. Lindström, A. Rautio and E. Saukko, *The essential norm of weighted composition operators on weighted Banach spaces of analytic functions*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory 72 (2012), 151–157.
- [IIO11] K. J. Izuchi, Y. Izuchi and S. Ohno, *Weighted composition operators on the space of bounded harmonic functions*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory 71 (2011), 91–111.
- [DJL19] P. De Jager and L. E. Labuschagne, *Multiplication operators on non-commutative spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 475 (2019), no. 1, 874–894.
- [JL06] H. Jarchow and E. Labuschagne, *Pointwise multipliers on L^1 and related spaces*, Note Mat. 25 (2006), no. 1, 221–229.
- [Kal74] N. Kalton, *Spaces of compact operators*, Math. Ann. 208 (1974), no. 4, 267–278.
- [KR09] A. Kamińska and Y. Raynaud, *Isomorphic copies in the lattice E and its symmetrization $E^{(*)}$ with applications to Orlicz–Lorentz spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. 257 (2009), no. 1, 271–331.
- [KA82] L. V. Kantorovich and G. P. Akilov, *Functional Analysis*, Nauka, Moscow 1977 (in Russian); English transl. in: Pergamon Press, Oxford-Elmsford, New York 1982.
- [KMS07] R. Kerman, M. Milman and G. Sinnamon, *On the Brudnyi–Krugljak duality theory of spaces formed by the K -method of interpolation*, Rev. Mat. Complut. 20 (2007), no. 2, 367–389.
- [KKM21] T. Kiwerski, P. Kolwicz and L. Maligranda, *Isomorphic and isometric structure of the optimal domains for Hardy-type operators*, Studia Math. 260 (2021), 45–89.
- [KKT22] T. Kiwerski, P. Kolwicz and J. Tomaszewski, *Quotients, ℓ_∞ and abstract Cesàro spaces*, Rev. Real Acad. Cienc. Exactas. Fís. Nat. Ser. A.-Mat. RACSAM 116 (2022), Article number: 131.
- [KT] T. Kiwerski and J. Tomaszewski, *Abstract Cesàro and Tandori spaces: Blocking technique and discretization via interpolation*, in preparation.
- [KT17] T. Kiwerski and J. Tomaszewski, *Local approach to order continuity in Cesàro function spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 455 (2017), no. 2, 1636–1654.
- [Kol16] P. Kolwicz, *Local structure of symmetrizations $E^{(*)}$ with applications*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 440 (2016), no. 2, 810–822.
- [KLM19] P. Kolwicz, K. Leśnik and L. Maligranda, *Symmetrization, factorization and arithmetic of quasi-Banach function spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 470 (2019), 1136–1166.
- [KLM14] P. Kolwicz, K. Leśnik and L. Maligranda, *Pointwise products of some Banach function spaces and factorization*, J. Funct. Anal. 266 (2014), no. 2, 616–659.
- [KLM12] P. Kolwicz, K. Leśnik and L. Maligranda, *Pointwise multipliers of Calderón–Lozanovskii spaces*, Math. Nachr. 286 (2012), no. 8–9, 876–907.
- [KP12] P. Kolwicz and A. Panfil, *Local Δ_2^E condition in generalized Calderón–Lozanovskii spaces*, Taiwanese J. Math. 16 (2012), no. 1, 259–282.
- [KPS82] S. G. Kreĭn, Yu. I. Petunin and E. M. Semenov, *Interpolation of Linear Operators*, Nauka, Moscow 1978 (in Russian); English transl.: AMS, Providence 1982.

- [Kub14] D. Kubiak, *Some geometric properties of the Cesàro function spaces*, J. Convex Analysis 21 (2014), no. 1, 189–200.
- [KMP07] A. Kufner, L. Maligranda and L. E. Persson, *The Hardy Inequality. About its History and Some Related Results*, Vydavatelský Servis, Plzeň 2007.
- [LM08] J. Lang and V. Maz'ya, *Essential norms and localization moduli of Sobolev embeddings for general domains*, J. London Math. Soc. 78 (2008), no. 2, 373–391.
- [Lef09] P. Lefèvre, *Generalized essential norm of weighted composition operators on some uniform algebras of analytic functions*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory 63 (2009), no. 4, 557–569.
- [LR93] P. Lin and R. Rochberg, *The essential norm of Hankel operator on the Bergman space*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory 17 (1993), no. 3, 361–372.
- [LT21] K. Leśnik and J. Tomaszewski, *Pointwise multipliers of Musielak–Orlicz spaces and factorization*, Rev. Math. Compl. 34 (2021), 489–509.
- [LTM22] K. Leśnik, J. Tomaszewski and L. Maligranda, *Weakly compact sets and weakly compact pointwise multipliers in Banach function lattices*, Math. Nachr. 295 (2022), no. 3, 574–592.
- [LM16] K. Leśnik and L. Maligranda, *Interpolation of abstract Cesàro, Copson and Tandori spaces*, Indag. Math. 27 (2016), no. 3, 764–785.
- [LM15] K. Leśnik and L. Maligranda, *On abstract Cesàro spaces. Duality*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 424 (2015), no. 2, 932–951.
- [LM21] K. Leśnik and P. Mleczko, *Compact Hankel operators between distinct Hardy spaces and commutators*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory 93 (2021), no. 5, 57–76.
- [LT79] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach Spaces II. Function Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York 1979.
- [LT77] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach Spaces I. Sequence Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York 1977.
- [Loz69] G. Ja. Lozanovskii, *On some Banach lattices*, Sibirsk. Math. Zh. 10 (1969), 584–599 (in Russian); English transl. in: Siberian Math. J. 10 (1969), no. 3, 419–431.
- [Lux67] W. A. J. Luxemburg, *Rearrangement invariant Banach function spaces*, Proc. Sympos. in Analysis, Queen's Papers in Pure and Appl. Math. 10 (1967), 83–114.
- [Mal89] L. Maligranda, *Orlicz Spaces and Interpolation*, Sem. Mat. 5, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Dep. Mat., Campinas 1989.
- [Mal83] L. Maligranda, *On Hardy's inequality in weighted rearrangement invariant spaces and applications. I, II*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 88 (1983), no. 1, 67–74, 75–80.
- [MP89] L. Maligranda and L. E. Persson, *Generalized duality of some Banach function spaces*, Indag. Math. 51 (1989), no. 3, 323–338.
- [MS06] M. Mastyło and G. Sinnamon, *A Calderón couple of down spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. 240 (2006), no. 1, 192–225.
- [MN91] P. Meyer-Nieberg, *Banach Lattices*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1991.
- [Mle09] P. Mleczko, *Compact multipliers on spaces of analytic functions*, Arch. Math. 92 (2009), no. 4, 325–334.
- [NP10] A. Nekvinda and L. Pick, *Optimal estimates for the Hardy averaging operator*, Math. Nachr. 283 (2010), no. 2, 262–271.
- [ORS08] S. Okada, W. J. Ricker and E. Sánchez Pérez, *Optimal Domain and Integral Extension of Operators Acting in Function Spaces*, Birkhäuser-Verlag, Basel 2008.
- [OT72] M. Orhon and T. Terzioğlu, *Diagonal operators on spaces of measurable functions*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 256 (1972), 138–152.
- [PS88] B. de Pagter and A. R. Schep, *Measures of non-compactness of operators in Banach lattices*, J. Funct. Anal. 78 (1988), 31–55.
- [Pie80] A. Pietsch, *Operator Ideals*, North Holland, Amsterdam, New York 1980.
- [Pit79] L. Pitt, *A compactness condition for linear operators on function spaces*, J. Operator Theory 1 (1979), 49–54.
- [RF16] J. C. Ramos-Fernández, *Some properties of multiplication operators acting on Banach spaces of measurable functions*, Boletín de Matemáticas 23 (2016), no. 2, 221–237.
- [RFRSSB19] J. C. Ramos-Fernández, M. A. Rivera-Sarmiento and M. Salas-Brown, *On the essential norm of multiplications operators acting on Cesàro sequence spaces*, J. Funct. Spaces 2019 (2019), p. 1–5.
- [Ros69] H. P. Rosenthal, *On quasi-complemented subspaces of Banach spaces with an appendix on compactness of operators from $L^p(\mu)$ to $L^r(\nu)$* , J. Funct. Anal. 4 (1969), 176–214.
- [ST94] E. Saksman and H.-O. Tylli, *Weak essential spectra of multiplication operators on spaces of bounded linear operators*, Math. Ann. 299 (1994), no. 1, 299–309.
- [Sch22] A. R. Schep, *The essential spectrum, norm, and spectral radius of abstract multiplication operators*, preprint available on arXiv:2204.03805 [math.FA], April 2022.

- [Sch10] A. R. Schep, *Products and factors of Banach function spaces*, Positivity 14 (2010), 301–319.
- [Sch89] A. R. Schep, *Measure of non-compactness of a disjointness preserving operator*, J. Operator Theory 21 (1989), 397–402.
- [Sch80] A. R. Schep, *Positive diagonal and triangular operators*, J. Operator Theory 3 (1980), no. 2, 165–178.
- [Sha87] J. H. Shapiro, *Essential norm of a composition operator*, Ann. Math. 125 (1987), no. 2, 375–404.
- [Sin94] G. Sinnamon, *Spaces defined by the level function and their duals*, Studia Math. 111 (1994), no. 1, 19–52.
- [Tan54] K. Tandori, *Über einen speziellen Banachschen Raum*, Publ. Math. Debrecen 3 (1954, 1955) 263–268.
- [Tyl95] H.-O. Tylli, *The essential norm of an operator is not self-dual*, Isr. J. Math. 91 (1995), 93–110.
- [Voi22] J. Voigt, *The essential norm of multiplication operators on $L_p(\mu)$* , preprint available on [arXiv:2203.13096](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.13096) [math.FA], March 2022.
- [Wnu99] W. Wnuk, *Banach Lattices with Order Continuous Norms*, Polish Scientific Publishers PWN, Warszawa 1999.
- [Wnu93] W. Wnuk, *Banach lattices with properties of the Schur type - survey*, Conf. Smin. Mat. Univ. Bari 249 (1993), 25 pp.
- [Wnu89] W. Wnuk, *A note on positive Schur property*, Glasg. Math. J. 31 (1989), 169–172.
- [Zaa83] A. C. Zaanen, *Riesz Spaces II*, North-Holland, Amsterdam 1983.
- [Zaa67] A. C. Zaanen, *Integration*, North-Holland, Amsterdam 1967.

(Tomasz Kiwerski) POZNAŃ UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF CONTROL, ROBOTICS AND ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING, PIOTROWO 3A, 60-965 POZNAŃ, POLAND
Email address: tomasz.kiwerski@gmail.com

(Jakub Tomaszewski) POZNAŃ UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF CONTROL, ROBOTICS AND ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING, PIOTROWO 3A, 60-965 POZNAŃ, POLAND
Email address: tomaszewskijakub@protonmail.com