

# On collectively L-weakly compact sets of operators

Eduard Emelyanov<sup>1</sup>

1. Sobolev Institute of Mathematics, Novosibirsk, 630090, Russia

July 16, 2024

## Abstract

A set of bounded linear operators from a Banach space to a Banach lattice is collectively L-weakly compact whenever union of images of the unit ball is L-weakly compact. We extend the Meyer-Nieberg duality theorem to collectively L-weakly compact sets of operators, study relations between these sets and collectively almost limited sets, and discuss the domination problem for collectively compact sets and collectively L-weakly compact sets.

**Keywords:** L-weakly compact set, almost limited set, Banach lattice, domination problem

**MSC 2020:** 46B50, 47B01, 47B07, 47B65

## 1 Introduction

The theory of L-weakly compact sets and operators was developed by P. Meyer-Nieberg [8]. Several versions of this theory were studied recently by many authors (see [2, 6] and references therein). We extend the Meyer-Nieberg duality theorem [8, Satz 3] and Theorem 2.6 of [5] to collectively L-weakly compact sets of operators, and shortly discuss the domination problem for collectively compact and collectively L-weakly compact sets.

Throughout this paper vector spaces are real; operators are linear; letters  $X$  and  $Y$  stand for Banach spaces;  $E$  and  $F$  for Banach lattices;  $B_X$  for the closed unit

ball of  $X$ ;  $I_X$  for the identity operator on  $X$ ;  $L(X, Y)$  (resp.,  $K(X, Y)$ ,  $W(X, Y)$ ,  $\text{Lim}(X, Y)$ ,  $\text{aLim}(X, Y)$ ) for the space of bounded (resp., compact, weakly compact, limited, almost limited) operators from  $X$  to  $Y$ ;

$$\text{absco}(A) = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k a_k : \sum_{k=1}^m |\alpha_k| \leq 1 \text{ and } a_1, \dots, a_m \in A \right\}$$

for the absolute convex hull of  $A \subseteq X$ ; and  $\text{sol}(A) = \bigcup_{a \in A} [-|a|, |a|]$  for the solid hull of  $A \subseteq E$ . We denote the uniform convergence of a sequence of functions  $(g_n)$  to  $g$  on a set  $A$  by  $g_n \rightrightarrows g(A)$ .

A bounded subset  $A$  of  $Y$  is limited whenever  $f_n \rightrightarrows 0(A)$  for every  $w^*$ -null sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $Y'$ . J. Bourgain and J. Diestel initiated the study of operators carrying bounded sets to limited ones in [4], such operators are called limited. A decade ago J. X. Chen, Z. L. Chen, and G. X. Ji introduced an almost limited set in a Banach lattice [5, Definition 2.3], which is a disjoint version of the limited set, namely a bounded  $A \subseteq F$  is almost limited whenever  $f_n \rightrightarrows 0(A)$  for every disjoint  $w^*$ -null sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $F'$ .

The central notion of the present paper is due to P. Meyer-Nieberg [8, pp.146-147]: a bounded  $A \subseteq F$  is called L-weakly compact (briefly, is an Lwc-set) whenever each disjoint sequence in  $\text{sol}(A)$  is norm-null; an operator  $T \in L(X, F)$  is said to be L-weakly compact (briefly,  $T \in \text{Lwc}(X, F)$ ) whenever  $T(B_X)$  is L-weakly compact.

Following P. M. Anselone and T. W. Palmer [3], we call a subset  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $L(X, Y)$  collectively (weakly) compact (collectively (almost) limited, collectively Lwc) if the set  $\mathcal{T}B_X = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T(B_X)$  is relatively (weakly) compact (resp., (almost) limited, Lwc). For convenience, we use bold letters to denote classes of collectively  $\mathcal{P}$ -sets of operators acting from  $X$  to  $Y$ , e.g.,  $\mathbf{K}(X, Y)$ ,  $\mathbf{W}(X, Y)$ ,  $\mathbf{Lim}(X, Y)$ ,  $\mathbf{aLim}(X, F)$ . Note that the collectively bounded sets of operators of  $\mathbf{L}(X, Y)$  are exactly the uniformly bounded sets.

More generally, collectively  $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{P}$  sets of operators are defined for a property  $\mathcal{C}$  of subsets of  $X$  and a property  $\mathcal{P}$  of subsets of  $Y$  by saying that a subset  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\mathbf{L}(X, Y)$  is collectively  $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{P}$  whenever  $\mathcal{T}(C) = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T(C)$  has the property  $\mathcal{P}$  for each set  $C$  with the property  $\mathcal{C}$ . For example: collectively Gelfand – Phillips (resp., Bourgain – Diestel, collectively limitedly L-weakly compact) sets  $\mathbf{GP}(X, Y)$  (resp.,  $\mathbf{BD}(X, Y)$ ,  $\mathbf{l-Lwc}(X, F)$ ) correspond to the property  $\mathcal{C}$  to be limited and the property  $\mathcal{P}$  to be relatively compact (resp., relatively weakly compact, Lwc);

collectively order bounded sets  $\mathbf{L}_{\text{ob}}(E, F)$  correspond to the properties  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  to be order bounded; etc., (cf. [6, 2]). Clearly, each collectively  $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{P}$  set consists of  $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{P}$  operators, for example,  $T \in \mathcal{T} \in \mathbf{l}\text{-Lwc}(X, F) \implies T \in l\text{-Lwc}(X, F)$ .

For further unexplained notation and terminology, we refer to [1, 4, 5, 7, 9].

## 2 Main results

We need several technical lemmas, some of them might be already known. Since we did not find appropriate references for them, we include their proofs.

**Lemma 1.** The strong closure of the absolute convex hull of a collectively limited (collectively almost limited, collectively weakly compact) set is collectively limited (resp., collectively almost limited, collectively weakly compact).

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbf{Lim}(X, Y)$ . Since  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}^s B_X \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{T}B_X}$ , the strong closure  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}^s$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  is collectively limited by [4, Proposition]. The collectively almost limited case is similar, and the proof for collectively weakly compact sets is a straightforward modification of the proof of [3, Proposition 2.1].  $\square$

The next lemma is a minor extension of [9, Corollary 3.6.4 ii)].

**Lemma 2.** The absolute convex hull of every Lwc set is an Lwc set.

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be an Lwc set in  $E$ . By [1, Theorem 5.63], for proving that  $\text{absco}(A)$  is an Lwc set it suffices to show that each disjoint sequence in  $B_{E'}$  is uniformly null on  $\text{absco}(A)$ . So, let  $(f_n)$  be disjoint in  $B_{E'}$ , and let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Applying [1, Theorem 5.63], we have an  $n_\varepsilon$  such that  $\sup_{a \in A} |f_n(a)| \leq \varepsilon$  for all  $n \geq n_\varepsilon$ . Take an arbitrary

$x \in \text{absco}(A)$ , say  $x = \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k a_k$ , where  $\sum_{k=1}^m |\alpha_k| \leq 1$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in A$ . Then

$$|f_n(a)| = \left| \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k f_n(a_k) \right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^m |\alpha_k| |f_n(a_k)| \leq \varepsilon \quad (n \geq n_\varepsilon),$$

and hence  $f_n \rightrightarrows 0(\text{absco}(A))$  as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** The norm closure of every Lwc set is likewise an Lwc set.

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be an Lwc set in  $E$ , and let  $(\bar{x}_n)$  be a disjoint sequence in the solid hull  $\text{sol}(\bar{A})$  of the norm closure  $\bar{A}$  of  $A$ . Suppose, in contrary,  $(\bar{x}_n)$  is not norm null. WLOG,  $\|\bar{x}_n\| \geq \varepsilon$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and all  $n$ . For every  $n$ , pick  $\bar{a}_n \in \bar{A}$  such that  $|\bar{x}_n| \in [0, |\bar{a}_n|]$  and choose  $a_n \in A$  satisfying  $\|\bar{a}_n - a_n\| \leq 2^{-n}$ . Then, for all  $n$ ,

$$\| |\bar{x}_n| \wedge |\bar{a}_n| \| - \| |\bar{x}_n| \wedge |a_n| \| \leq \| |\bar{x}_n| \wedge |\bar{a}_n| - |\bar{x}_n| \wedge |a_n| \| \leq \| |\bar{a}_n| - |a_n| \| \leq \|\bar{a}_n - a_n\| \leq 2^{-n}.$$

Since  $(|\bar{x}_n| \wedge |a_n|)$  is disjoint in  $\text{sol}(A)$  then  $\| |\bar{x}_n| \wedge |a_n| \| \rightarrow 0$  which is absurd as

$$\| |\bar{x}_n| \wedge |a_n| \| + 2^{-n} \geq \| |\bar{x}_n| \wedge |\bar{a}_n| \| = \| |\bar{x}_n| \| = \|\bar{x}_n\| \geq \varepsilon$$

for all  $n$ . The obtained contradiction completes the proof.  $\square$

Now, we are in the position to prove an Lwc-version of [3, Proposition 2.1].

**Proposition 1.** The strong closure of absolute convex hull of a collectively Lwc set is likewise collectively Lwc.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbf{Lwc}(X, F)$ . Since  $\overline{\text{absco}(\mathcal{T})}^s B_X \subseteq \overline{\text{absco}(\mathcal{T})} B_X$ ,  $\overline{\text{absco}(\mathcal{T})}^s$  is collectively Lwc by Lemmas 2 and 3.  $\square$

The following result provides collectively (almost) limited, weakly compact, and Lwc versions of [3, Propositions 2.2]. It involves integrals of operator valued functions. Suppose  $K_\xi(t) \in L(X, F)$  for  $t \in [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$  and  $\xi$  in an index set  $\Xi$ . Below, under the integral  $\int_a^b K_\xi(t) dt$  we understand the strong or norm limit of the approximating sums  $\sum_{k=1}^m K_\xi(t'_k)(t_k - t_{k-1})$ .

**Proposition 2.** The following statements hold:

- (i) If  $\{K_\xi(t) : \xi \in \Xi, a \leq t \leq b\}$  is collectively (almost) limited (collectively weakly compact) in  $L(X, Y)$  then  $\left\{ \int_a^b K_\xi(t) dt : \xi \in \Xi \right\}$  is likewise collectively (almost) limited (resp., collectively weakly compact).
- (ii) If  $\{K_\xi(t) : \xi \in \Xi, a \leq t \leq b\}$  is a collectively Lwc subset of  $L(X, F)$  then  $\left\{ \int_a^b K_\xi(t) dt : \xi \in \Xi \right\}$  is collectively Lwc.

*Proof.* (i) follows from Lemma 1, whereas (ii) is a consequence of Proposition 1.  $\square$

Each element of a collectively (almost) limited (collectively weakly compact, collectively Lwc) set is an (almost) limited (resp., weakly compact, Lwc) operator. The converse fails as can be seen by considering the set of all normalized rank one operators in  $\ell^1$ . However, similarly to [3, Theorem 2.5] we have:

**Theorem 1.** Every totally bounded set of (almost) limited (weakly compact, Lwc) operators is collectively (almost) limited (resp., collectively weakly compact, collectively Lwc).

*Proof.* We include the proof only for Lwc operators. Remaining cases are left for the reader. So, let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{Lwc}(X, F)$  be totally bounded. By the equivalence  $i) \iff iii)$  of [9, Corollary 3.6.4], we obtain that  $\mathcal{T}B_X$  is an Lwc set. Now, the applying of Proposition 1 completes the proof.  $\square$

The converse of Theorem 1 is false. The following two examples are motivated by [3, Example 2.6].

**Example 1.** Let  $T_n \in L(\ell^1)$  be defined by  $T_n x = x_n e_1$ , where  $x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x_k e_k \in \ell^1$  and  $e_k$  is the  $k$ -th standard unit vector in  $\ell^1$ . Clearly, the set  $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is collectively Lwc (compact, weakly compact, and limited). But  $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is not totally bounded, for  $\|T_n - T_m\| = 2$  with  $n \neq m$ .

The adjoint set  $\{T'_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset L(\ell^{\infty})$  is collectively limited, yet not collectively compact. Indeed,

$$(T'_n f)x = f(T_n x) = f(x_n e_1) = x_n f(e_1) = x_n f_1 \quad (f \in \ell^{\infty}, x \in \ell^1),$$

and hence  $T'_n f = f_1 e_n$ . Thus,  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T'_n(B_{\ell^{\infty}}) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [-e_n, e_n] \subset c_0$ . Therefore,  $\{T'_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is collectively limited due to Phillip's lemma (cf. [1, Theorem 4.67]). Since  $e_n \in T'_n B_{\ell^{\infty}}$  for every  $n$ , the set  $\{T'_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is not collectively compact.

Note that, since the set  $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is collectively Lwc then  $\{T'_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is collectively Mwc by Theorem 2. Thus,  $\{T'_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is collectively weakly compact by Corollary 1.

Now, let  $S_n \in L(c_0)$  be defined similarly by  $S_n x = x_n e_1$ . Again,  $\{S_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is collectively compact. However, in this case  $\{S'_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset L(\ell^1)$  is not collectively weakly compact, since  $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [-e_n, e_n] = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S'_n(B_{\ell^1})$  and the subset  $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  of  $\ell^1$  is not relatively weakly compact.

**Example 2.** Let  $\dim(F^a) = \infty$ , where  $F^a$  is the order continuous part of  $F$ . Take a disjoint normalized sequence  $(u_n)$  in  $F_+^a$  and define rank one operators  $T_n : \ell^\infty \rightarrow F$  by  $T_n x = x_n u_n$ . Every  $T_n$  is an Lwc operator since  $T_n(\ell^\infty) \subseteq F^a$ . However,  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \notin \mathbf{Lwc}(\ell^\infty, F)$ . Indeed, for the bounded set  $A = \{e_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \ell^\infty$ , the set  $\mathcal{T}A = \{0\} \cup \{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is not Lwc.

By the Meyer-Nieberg result [8, Satz 3], the L- and M-weakly compact operators are in duality to each other (cf. [9, Proposition 3.6.11], [1, Theorem 5.64]). We need the following collective analogue of the notion of Mwc operators.

**Definition 1.** A subset  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $L(E, Y)$  is said to be collectively M-weakly compact (briefly, collectively Mwc) if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \|Tx_n\| = 0$  holds for every norm bounded disjoint sequence  $(x_n)$  of  $E$ .

The following result is a generalization of the Meyer-Nieberg duality theorem to collectively L(M)-weakly compact sets.

**Theorem 2.** The following statements hold:

- (i) A subset  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $L(X, F)$  is collectively Lwc iff its adjoint  $\mathcal{T}' = \{T' : T \in \mathcal{T}\}$  is collectively Mwc.
- (ii) A subset  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $L(E, Y)$  is collectively Mwc iff its adjoint is collectively Lwc.

*Proof.* (i) Let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq L(X, F)$ . Then  $\mathcal{T}$  is collectively Lwc iff every disjoint sequence of  $\text{sol}\left(\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T(B_X)\right)$  is uniformly null on  $B_{F'}$  iff  $f_n \rightrightarrows 0\left(\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T(B_X)\right)$  for every disjoint  $(f_n)$  in  $B_{F'}$  by [1, Theorem 5.63] iff  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \|T'f_n\| = 0$  (or, equivalently,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{S \in \mathcal{T}'} \|Sf_n\| = 0$ ) holds for every disjoint  $(f_n)$  of  $B_{F'}$  iff  $\mathcal{T}'$  is collectively Mwc.

(ii) Let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq L(E, Y)$ .  $\mathcal{T}$  is collectively Mwc iff  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \|Tx_n\| = 0$  for every disjoint  $(x_n)$  in  $B_E$  iff  $x_n \rightrightarrows 0\left(\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T'(B_{Y'})\right)$  for every disjoint  $(x_n)$  in  $B_E$ , and by [1, Theorem 5.63], iff every disjoint sequence of  $\text{sol}\left(\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T'(B_{Y'})\right)$  is norm null, iff  $\mathcal{T}'$  is collectively Lwc.  $\square$

The following corollary generalizes another Meyer-Nieberg result (cf. [1, Theorem 5.61]) to collectively L(M)-weakly compact sets.

**Corollary 1.** Every collectively Lwc (Mwc) set is collectively weakly compact.

*Proof.* It is a consequence of [9, Proposition 3.6.5] for collectively Lwc sets. Now, for collectively Mwc sets, the result follows from Theorem 2.  $\square$

Next, we present a collective version of [5, Theorem 2.6].

**Theorem 3.** For every  $X$  and  $F$ ,  $\mathbf{Lwc}(X, F) \subseteq \mathbf{aLim}(X, F)$ . Furthermore, the following conditions are equivalent.

- (i)  $F$  has order continuous norm.
- (ii) For every  $X$ ,  $\mathbf{aLim}(X, F) \subseteq \mathbf{Lwc}(X, F)$ .
- (iii)  $\mathbf{aLim}(F) \subseteq \mathbf{Lwc}(F)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a collectively Lwc subset of  $L(X, F)$ . By Theorem 2,  $\mathcal{T}' \subseteq L(F', X')$  is collectively Mwc. Then, for every disjoint  $(f_n)$  in  $B_{F'}$ ,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{|f_n(Tx)| : x \in B_X, T \in \mathcal{T}\} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \|T'f_n\| = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{S \in \mathcal{T}'} \|Sf_n\| = 0,$$

and hence  $\mathcal{T}B_X = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T(B_X)$  is almost limited, i.e.  $\mathcal{T}$  is collectively almost limited.

(i) $\implies$ (ii) Let  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbf{aLim}(X, F)$ . Since the set  $\mathcal{T}B_X = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T(B_X)$  is almost limited, it is an Lwc set by [5, Theorem 2.6], and hence  $\mathcal{T}$  is collectively Lwc.

(ii) $\implies$ (iii) It is obvious.

(iii) $\implies$ (i) Now, assume that every collectively almost limited subset of  $L(F)$  is collectively Lwc. Then each almost limited operator is Lwc, and hence the norm in  $F$  is order continuous by [5, Theorem 2.6].  $\square$

We turn our discussion to the domination problem for collectively compact sets.

**Definition 2.** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  be two subsets of  $L_+(E, F)$ . Then  $\mathcal{S}$  is dominated by  $\mathcal{T}$  if, for each  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  there exists  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $S \leq T$ .

The proofs of the following two propositions are straightforward modifications of proofs of [1, Theorem 5.11] and [1, Lemma 5.12] respectively.

**Proposition 3.** Let  $\mathcal{S} \subset L_+(E, F)$  be dominated by  $\{T\}$  for some  $T \in L_+(E, F)$ . If  $T[0, x]$  is  $|\sigma|(F, F')$ -totally bounded for each  $x \in E_+$ , then  $\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S[0, x]$  is likewise  $|\sigma|(F, F')$ -totally bounded for each  $x \in E_+$ .

**Proposition 4.** Let  $\mathcal{S} \subset L_+(E, F)$  be dominated by  $\{T\}$  for some  $T \in L_+(E, F)$ . If  $T(A)$  is a norm totally bounded set, then for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists some  $u \in F_+$  such that  $\sup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \|(Sx - u)^+\| \leq \varepsilon$  holds for all  $x \in A$ .

The author does not know whether or not a single operator  $T$  in Proposition 3 (in Proposition 4) can be replaced by a set  $\mathcal{T} \subset L_+(E, F)$  dominating  $\mathcal{S}$  such that  $\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T[0, x]$  is  $|\sigma|(F, F')$ -totally bounded (resp.,  $\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T(A)$  is norm totally bounded). Replacing [1, Theorem 5.11] by Proposition 3 and [1, Lemma 5.12] by Proposition 4 in the proof of [1, Theorem 5.13] gives a collective extension of the Aliprantis–Burkinshaw theorem as follows.

**Theorem 4.** Let  $\mathcal{S} \subset L_+(E)$  be dominated by  $\{T\}$  for some  $T \in K_+(E)$ , then the set  $\{S^3 : S \in \mathcal{S}\}$  is collectively compact.

A similar modification of the proof of [1, Theorem 5.20] gives the following collective extension of the Dodds–Fremlin theorem.

**Theorem 5.** Let the norms in  $E'$  and in  $F$  be order continuous. If  $\mathcal{S} \subset L_+(E, F)$  is dominated by  $\{T\}$  for some  $T \in K_+(E, F)$ , then  $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbf{K}(E, F)$ .

The author does not know whether or not the operator  $T \in K_+(E, F)$  in Theorems 4 and 5 can be replaced by a collectively compact set  $\mathcal{T} \subset L_+(E, F)$  dominating  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Finally, we mention briefly the domination problem for collectively Lwc sets. Whereas collective extensions of the Aliprantis–Burkinshaw theorem [1, Theorem 5.11] and of the Dodds–Fremlin theorem [1, Theorem 5.20] are not sufficiently clear yet, the domination problem for collectively Lwc sets is much easier and has the complete solution, as follows.

**Theorem 6.** Let  $\mathcal{S} \subset L_+(E, F)$  be dominated by  $\mathcal{T} \subset L_+(E, F)$ .

- (i) If  $\mathcal{T}$  is collectively Lwc, then  $\mathcal{S}$  is collectively Lwc.
- (ii) If  $\mathcal{T}$  is collectively Mwc, then  $\mathcal{S}$  is collectively Mwc.



*Proof.* (i) Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a collectively Lwc set. Since  $\mathcal{S}$  is dominated by  $\mathcal{T}$ , then  $Sx \in \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T(B_E^+)$  for each  $x \in B_E^+$ . As  $\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S(B_E^+) \subseteq \text{sol} \left( \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T(B_E) \right)$ , and  $\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T(B_E)$  is an Lwc subset of  $F$ , therefore,  $\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S(B_E^+)$ , and hence  $\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S(B_E)$  is also Lwc by [9, Corollary 3.6.4].

(ii) Apply Theorem 2. □

## References

- [1] Aliprantis, C.D., Burkinshaw, O.: Positive operators. Springer, Berlin (2006)
- [2] Alpay, S., Emelyanov, E., Gorokhova, S.: Duality and norm completeness in the classes of limitedly Lwc and Dunford–Pettis Lwc operators. *Turk. J. Math.* 48(1), 267–278 (2024)
- [3] Anselone, P.M., Palmer, T.W.: Collectively compact sets of linear operators. *Pacific J. Math.* 25(3), 417–422 (1968)
- [4] Bourgain, J., Diestel, J.: Limited operators and strict cosingularity. *Math. Nachr.* 119, 55–58 (1984)
- [5] Chen, J.X., Chen, Z.L., Ji, G.X.: Almost limited sets in Banach lattices. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 412(1), 547–553 (2014)
- [6] Emelyanov, E., Gorokhova, S.: Operators affiliated to Banach lattice properties and their enveloping norms. *Turk. J. Math.* 47(6), 1659–1673 (2023)
- [7] Kusraev, A.G.: Dominated Operators. Kluwer, Dordrecht (2000)
- [8] Meyer-Nieberg, P.: Über klassen schwach kompakter Operatoren in Banachverbänden. *Math. Z.* 138, 145–159 (1974)
- [9] Meyer-Nieberg, P.: Banach lattices. Universitext. Springer, Berlin (1991)