

# ON THE THREE-SPACE PROPERTY FOR SUBPROJECTIVE AND SUPERPROJECTIVE BANACH SPACES

MANUEL GONZÁLEZ AND JAVIER PELLO

ABSTRACT. We introduce the notion of subprojective and superprojective operators and we use them to prove a variation of the three-space property for subprojective and superprojective spaces. As an application, we show that some spaces considered by Johnson and Lindenstrauss are both subprojective and superprojective.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A Banach space  $X$  is called *subprojective* if every closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $X$  contains an infinite-dimensional subspace complemented in  $X$ , and  $X$  is called *superprojective* if every closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $X$  is contained in an infinite-codimensional subspace complemented in  $X$ ; note that finite-dimensional spaces are trivially both subprojective and superprojective. These two classes of Banach spaces were introduced by Whitley [20] in order to find conditions for the conjugate of an operator to be strictly singular or strictly cosingular. More recently, they have been used to obtain some positive solutions to the perturbation classes problem for semi-Fredholm operators. This problem has a negative solution in general [9], but there are some positive answers when one of the spaces is subprojective or superprojective [11] [14].

Subprojectivity passes on to subspaces and superprojectivity passes on to quotients, and both are stable under direct sums [19] [13], but neither of them is a three-space property: for every  $1 < p < \infty$  there exists a non-subprojective, non-superprojective space  $X$  with a subspace  $M \subseteq X$  such that  $M \simeq X/M \simeq \ell_p$ , which is both subprojective and superprojective [19, Proposition 2.8] [13, Proposition 3.2]. However, slightly stronger hypotheses on  $M$  and  $X/M$  do imply the subprojectivity or superprojectivity of  $X$ , as seen below. For the subprojectivity, it is enough that  $X/M$  is subprojective and that every closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $M$  contains an infinite-dimensional subspace complemented in  $X$  (which is stronger than being complemented in  $M$ , as the definition of subprojectivity of  $M$  would require), and there is an equivalent condition for superprojectivity (see Theorem 2.7). We introduce two classes of operators, namely subprojective and superprojective operators, which allow to show that a Banach space  $X$  is

subprojective or superprojective when certain conditions such as these are met by a closed subspace  $M$  of  $X$  and its induced quotient  $X/M$ .

As an application, these sufficient conditions will be used to prove that two examples of Banach spaces introduced by Johnson and Lindenstrauss to study the properties of weakly compactly generated spaces are both subprojective and superprojective.

We will use standard notation.  $X$ ,  $Y$  and  $Z$  will be Banach spaces. Given a closed subspace  $M$  of  $X$ , we will denote the inclusion of  $M$  into  $X$  by  $J_M$ , and  $Q_M$  will be the quotient map of  $X$  onto  $X/M$ . A (bounded, linear) operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  is said to be strictly singular if there is no closed infinite-dimensional subspace  $M$  of  $X$  such that the restriction  $TJ_M$  is an isomorphism; it is said to be strictly cosingular if there is no closed infinite-codimensional subspace  $M$  of  $Y$  such that  $Q_M T$  is surjective.

## 2. SUBPROJECTIVE AND SUPERPROJECTIVE OPERATORS

**Definition.** *An operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  is subprojective if every closed infinite-dimensional subspace  $M$  of  $X$  such that  $TJ_M$  is an isomorphism contains a closed infinite-dimensional subspace  $N$  such that  $T(N)$  is complemented in  $Y$ .*

*An operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  is superprojective if every closed infinite-codimensional subspace  $M$  of  $Y$  such that  $Q_M T$  is surjective is contained in a closed infinite-codimensional subspace  $N$  such that  $T^{-1}(N)$  is complemented in  $X$ .*

Note that a Banach space  $X$  is subprojective (resp., superprojective) if and only if the identity  $I_X$  is subprojective (resp., superprojective). Also, strictly singular operators are trivially subprojective, and strictly cosingular operators are trivially superprojective.

The following result, which is a consequence of [2, Lemma 2.2], will be useful at several places.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Banach spaces and let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  be an operator.*

- (i) *If  $M$  is a closed subspace of  $X$  such that  $TJ_M$  is an isomorphism and  $T(M)$  is complemented in  $Y$ , then  $M$  is complemented in  $X$ .*
- (ii) *If  $N$  is a closed subspace of  $Y$  such that  $Q_N T$  is surjective and  $T^{-1}(N)$  is complemented in  $X$ , then  $N$  is complemented in  $Y$ .*

*Proof.* (i) Let  $N(T)$  be the kernel of  $T$ . If  $M \cap N(T) = 0$  and  $N$  is a closed subspace of  $Y$  such that  $Y = T(M) \oplus N$ , then  $X = M \oplus T^{-1}(N)$ .

(ii) Let  $R(T)$  be the range of  $T$ . If  $R(T) + N = Y$  and  $M$  is a closed subspace of  $X$  such that  $X = M \oplus T^{-1}(N)$ , then  $T(M)$  is closed and  $Y = T(M) \oplus N$ .  $\square$

Subprojective (resp., superprojective) operators are stable under left (resp., right) composition.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $X$ ,  $Y$  and  $Z$  be Banach spaces and let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  and  $S \in \mathcal{L}(Y, Z)$  be operators.*

- (i) *If  $S$  is subprojective, then  $ST$  is subprojective.*
- (ii) *If  $T$  is superprojective, then  $ST$  is superprojective.*

*Proof.* (i) Let  $M$  be a closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $X$  such that  $STJ_M$  is an isomorphism. Then  $T(M)$  is a closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $Y$  and  $SJ_{T(M)}$  is an isomorphism. Since  $S$  is subprojective, there exists a closed infinite-dimensional subspace  $N$  of  $T(M)$  such that  $S(N)$  is complemented in  $Z$ , and then  $(TJ_M)^{-1}(N)$  is a closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $M$  whose image  $(ST)((TJ_M)^{-1}(N)) = S(N)$  is complemented in  $Z$ .

(ii) Let  $M$  be a closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $Z$  such that  $Q_MST$  is surjective. Then  $S^{-1}(M)$  is a closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $Y$  and  $Q_{S^{-1}(M)}T$  is surjective. Since  $T$  is superprojective, there exists a closed infinite-codimensional subspace  $N$  of  $Y$  containing  $S^{-1}(M)$  such that  $T^{-1}(N)$  is complemented in  $X$ , and then  $S(N)$  is a closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $Z$  containing  $M$  where  $(ST)^{-1}(S(N)) = T^{-1}(N)$  is complemented in  $X$ .  $\square$

Applying this result to the identity of a subprojective or superprojective space yields the following.

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Banach spaces and let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  be an operator.*

- (i) *If  $Y$  is subprojective, then  $T$  is subprojective.*
- (ii) *If  $X$  is superprojective, then  $T$  is superprojective.*

**Question.** *Let  $S, T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ .*

- (1) *If  $S$  and  $T$  are subprojective, is  $S + T$  subprojective?*
- (2) *If  $S$  and  $T$  are superprojective, is  $S + T$  superprojective?*

The subprojectivity of an embedding and the superprojectivity of a quotient map appear often enough that it is worth noting the following characterisation for them.

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $X$  be a Banach space and let  $Z$  be a closed subspace of  $X$ .*

- (i)  *$J_Z$  is subprojective if and only if every closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $Z$  contains an infinite-dimensional subspace complemented in  $X$ , in which case  $Z$  is subprojective.*
- (ii)  *$Q_Z$  is superprojective if and only if every closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $X$  containing  $Z$  is contained in an infinite-codimensional subspace complemented in  $X$ , in which case  $X/Z$  is superprojective.*

*Proof.* (i) This is a direct consequence of the definition of subprojective operator and Lemma 2.1(i).

(ii) Assume that  $Q_Z$  is superprojective and let  $M$  be a closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $X$  containing  $Z$ . Then  $Q_Z(M)$  is a closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $X/Z$  and, by hypothesis, there exists an infinite-codimensional subspace  $N$  of  $X/Z$  containing  $Q_Z(M)$  and such that  $Q_Z^{-1}(N)$  is complemented in  $X$ , where  $Q_Z^{-1}(N)$  contains  $M$  and is still infinite-codimensional.

Conversely, let  $M$  be a closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $X/Z$ . Then  $Q_Z^{-1}(M)$  is a closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $X$  containing  $Z$ , so there exists an infinite-codimensional subspace  $N$  containing  $Q_Z^{-1}(M)$  and complemented in  $X$ , and then  $Q_Z(N)$  is infinite-codimensional in  $X/Z$  and contains  $M$ , and  $Q_Z^{-1}(Q_Z(N)) = N$  is complemented in  $X$ .

Finally, let  $M$  be a closed infinite-codimensional subspace  $M$  of  $X/Z$ . Then  $Q_Z^{-1}(M)$  is contained in an infinite-codimensional subspace  $N$  complemented in  $X$ , so  $M$  is contained in  $Q_Z(N)$ , which is closed, hence complemented in  $X/Z$  by Lemma 2.1(ii).  $\square$

The following lemmata will be used in Theorem 2.7 to handle subspaces of a space depending on its relative position with respect to another subspace.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $X$  be a Banach space, let  $M$  and  $N$  be closed subspaces of  $X$  such that  $M \cap N = 0$  and  $M + N$  is not closed. Then there exists an automorphism  $U: X \rightarrow X$  such that  $U(M) \cap N$  is infinite-dimensional.*

*Proof.* Take normalised sequences  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $M$  and  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $N$  such that  $\|x_n - y_n\| < 2^{-n}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since any weak cluster point of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  must be in  $M \cap N = 0$ , by passing to a subsequence [3, Theorem 1.5.6] we can assume that  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a basic sequence and that there exists a sequence  $(x_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $X^*$  such that  $\langle x_i^*, x_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$  for every  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|x_n^*\| \|x_n - y_n\| < 1$ . Then  $K(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle x_n^*, x \rangle (x_n - y_n)$  defines an operator  $K: X \rightarrow X$  with  $\|K\| < 1$  and  $U = I - K$  is an automorphism on  $X$  that maps  $U(x_n) = y_n$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so  $U(M) \cap N$  is infinite-dimensional.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $X$  be a Banach space, let  $M$  and  $N$  be closed subspaces of  $X$  such that  $M + N$  is dense in  $X$  but not closed. Then there exists an automorphism  $U: X \rightarrow X$  such that  $\overline{U^{-1}(M) + N}$  is infinite-codimensional in  $X$ .*

*Proof.*  $M + N$  is dense in  $X$  but not closed, so  $M^\perp \cap N^\perp = 0$  and  $M^\perp + N^\perp$  is not closed either [18, Theorem IV.4.8]. Take a normalised sequence  $(x_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $M^\perp$  and another sequence  $(y_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $N^\perp$  such that  $\|x_n^* - y_n^*\| < 2^{-n}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since any weak\* cluster point

of  $(x_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  must be in  $M^\perp \cap N^\perp = 0$ , by passing to a subsequence [10, Lemma 3.1.19] we can assume that  $(x_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a basic sequence and find a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $X$  such that  $\langle x_i^*, x_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$  for every  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|x_n\| \|x_n^* - y_n^*\| < 1$ . Then  $K(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle x_n^* - y_n^*, x \rangle x_n$  defines an operator  $K: X \rightarrow X$  with  $\|K\| < 1$  and  $U = I - K$  is an automorphism on  $X$  whose conjugate maps  $U(x_n^*) = y_n^*$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so  $\overline{U^*(M^\perp)} \cap N^\perp = (U^{-1}(M) + N)^\perp$  is infinite-dimensional and  $\overline{U^{-1}(M) + N}$  is infinite-codimensional.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let  $X$  be a Banach space and let  $Z$  be a closed subspace of  $X$ .*

- (i) *If  $J_Z$  and  $Q_Z$  are both subprojective, then  $X$  is subprojective.*
- (ii) *If  $J_Z$  and  $Q_Z$  are both superprojective, then  $X$  is superprojective.*

*Proof.* (i) Let  $M$  be a closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $X$ . If  $M \cap Z$  is infinite-dimensional, then it contains another infinite-dimensional subspace complemented in  $X$  by the hypothesis on  $J_Z$  and Proposition 2.4(i).

Otherwise, if  $M \cap Z$  is finite-dimensional, we can assume that  $M \cap Z = 0$  by passing to a further subspace if necessary. If  $M + Z$  is closed, then  $Q_Z J_M$  is an isomorphism and  $M$  contains an infinite-dimensional subspace complemented in  $X$  by the hypothesis on  $Q_Z$ .

We are left with the case where  $M \cap Z = 0$  and  $M + Z$  is not closed. By Lemma 2.5, there exists an automorphism  $U: X \rightarrow X$  such that  $U(M) \cap Z$  is infinite-dimensional. Let  $N$  be an infinite-dimensional subspace of  $U(M) \cap Z$  complemented in  $X$ , again by Proposition 2.4(i); then  $U^{-1}(N) \subseteq M$  and is still complemented in  $X$ .

(ii) Let  $M$  be a closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $X$ . If  $\overline{M + Z}$  is infinite-codimensional, then it is contained in another infinite-codimensional subspace complemented in  $X$  by the hypothesis on  $Q_Z$  and Proposition 2.4(ii).

Otherwise, if  $\overline{M + Z}$  is finite-codimensional, we can assume that  $\overline{M + Z} = X$  by enlarging  $M$  with a finite-dimensional subspace if necessary. If  $M + Z$  is closed, so  $M + Z = X$ , then  $Q_M J_Z$  is surjective and  $M$  is contained in an infinite-codimensional subspace complemented in  $X$  by the hypothesis on  $J_Z$ .

We are left with the case where  $M + Z$  is dense in  $X$  but not closed. By Lemma 2.6, there exists an automorphism  $U: X \rightarrow X$  such that  $\overline{U^{-1}(M) + Z}$  is infinite-codimensional in  $X$ . Let  $N$  be an infinite-codimensional subspace complemented in  $X$  such that  $\overline{U^{-1}(M) + Z} \subseteq N$ , again by Proposition 2.4(ii); then  $M \subseteq U(N)$ , which is still infinite-codimensional and complemented in  $X$ .  $\square$

Theorem 2.7 implies a variation of the 3-space property for subprojectivity and superprojectivity. Given a Banach space  $X$  and a closed subspace  $Z$  of  $X$ , the inclusion  $J_Z$  is subprojective if and only if every

closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $Z$  contains an infinite-dimensional subspace complemented in  $X$  by Proposition 2.4(i), and this is stronger than being subprojective; on the other hand, for  $Q_Z$  to be subprojective, it is sufficient (but not necessary) that  $X/Z$  be subprojective, by Corollary 2.3. So, if  $X/Z$  is subprojective and  $J_Z$  is subprojective, then  $X$  is subprojective. Similarly, if  $Z$  is superprojective and  $Q_Z$  is superprojective, then  $X$  is superprojective.

Also, Theorem 2.7 is not a characterisation. While  $J_Z$  must be subprojective if  $X$  is subprojective by Corollary 2.3,  $Q_Z$  need not be. For instance, take any surjection  $T: \ell_1 \rightarrow C([0, 1])$  and define the operator  $Q: \ell_1 \oplus \ell_1 \rightarrow C([0, 1])$  as  $Q(x, y) = x + Ty$ . Then  $Q$  is also clearly surjective and an isomorphism on its first component, but  $\ell_1$  cannot contain any subspace whose image by  $Q$  is complemented in  $C([0, 1])$ .

Related to Theorem 2.7, as mentioned in the introduction, there exists a non-subprojective, non-superprojective space  $X$  with a subspace  $M \subseteq X$  such that  $M \simeq X/M \simeq \ell_p$ , which is both subprojective and superprojective [19, Proposition 2.8] [13, Proposition 3.2], where  $Q_M$  is strictly singular [17, Theorem 6.4], hence subprojective, while  $X$  is not, and  $J_M$  is strictly cosingular [17, Theorem 6.4], hence superprojective, while  $X$  is not. Thus,  $J_M$  cannot be subprojective although  $M$  is, and  $Q_M$  cannot be superprojective although  $X/M$  is.

$$\begin{aligned} J_Z, Q_Z \text{ subprojective} &\Rightarrow X \text{ subprojective} \Rightarrow \\ &\Rightarrow J_Z \text{ subprojective} \Rightarrow Z \text{ subprojective} \end{aligned}$$

A similar situation holds for superprojectivity.

$$\begin{aligned} J_Z, Q_Z \text{ superprojective} &\Rightarrow X \text{ superprojective} \Rightarrow \\ &\Rightarrow Q_Z \text{ superprojective} \Rightarrow X/Z \text{ superprojective} \end{aligned}$$

As a particular case of Theorem 2.7, we have the following.

**Corollary 2.8.** *Let  $X$  be a Banach space such that*

- (i) *every closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $X$  contains an infinite-dimensional subspace complemented in  $X^{**}$ ; and*
- (ii)  *$X^{**}/X$  is subprojective.*

*Then  $X^{**}$  is subprojective.*

In [12], it is proved that, under certain conditions, the  $J$ -sum  $J(\Phi)$  of Banach spaces, as defined by Bellenot [6], and its bidual  $J(\Phi)^{**}$  are subprojective. As a particular case, for every separable subprojective space  $X$  there exists a separable Banach space  $J(\Phi)$  such that  $J(\Phi)^{**}$  is subprojective and  $J(\Phi)^{**}/J(\Phi)$  is isomorphic to  $X$ . An essential part of the proof is to show that any closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $J(\Phi)$  contains a further infinite-dimensional subspace complemented in  $J(\Phi)^{**}$ , which is to say that the inclusion of  $J(\Phi)$  in  $J(\Phi)^{**}$  is subprojective [12, Theorem 5.2(i)]. That result is, in fact, a particular case of Corollary 2.8.

A related result was proved by Argyros and Raikoftsalis [4]. Let  $Y$  be a separable reflexive space. Then:

- For every  $1 < p < \infty$ , there is a separable reflexive space  $X_p(Y)$  that is hereditarily complemented  $\ell_p$ , hence subprojective, and  $Y$  is a quotient of  $X_p(Y)$ .
- $Y$  is a quotient of a separable hereditarily- $c_0$  space  $X_0(Y)$ .

Of course, in both cases the kernel of the quotient map is subprojective.

**Remark.** In Corollary 2.8, condition (i) can be replaced by

- (i') *every closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $X$  contains an infinite-dimensional reflexive subspace complemented in  $X$ .*

### 3. SUBPROJECTIVITY AND SUPERPROJECTIVITY OF THE JOHNSON-LINDENSTRAUSS SPACE

Here we apply the results in the previous section to study the Banach spaces introduced by Johnson and Lindenstrauss in [16, Examples 1 and 2].

Let  $\Gamma$  be a set with the cardinality of the continuum and let  $\{N_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$  be a family of infinite subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$  such that  $N_\gamma \cap N_{\gamma'}$  is finite if  $\gamma \neq \gamma'$ . For each  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , let  $\phi_\gamma \in \ell_\infty$  be the characteristic function of  $N_\gamma$ .

Let  $V = c_0 \subset \ell_\infty$  and let  $JL_0$  be the linear span of  $V \cup \{\phi_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$  in  $\ell_\infty$  endowed with the norm

$$\left\| y + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \phi_{\gamma_i} \right\|_{JL} = \max \left\{ \left\| y + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \phi_{\gamma_i} \right\|_\infty, \left\| (a_i)_{i=1}^k \right\|_2 \right\}$$

for every  $y \in V$  and  $(\gamma_i)_{i=1}^k$  with  $\gamma_i \neq \gamma_j$  if  $i \neq j$ .

The space  $JL$  is defined as the completion of  $(JL_0, \|\cdot\|_{JL})$ . These are some of its properties.

**Theorem 3.1.** [16, Example 1]

- (i)  $V$  is a subspace of  $JL$  isometric to  $c_0$  and  $JL/V$  is isometric to  $\ell_2(\Gamma)$ .
- (ii) Weakly compact subsets of  $JL$  are separable. Hence every reflexive subspace of  $JL$  is separable and  $V$  is not complemented.
- (iii)  $JL^*$  is isomorphic to  $\ell_1 \oplus \ell_2(\Gamma)$ .

A Banach space  $X$  is weakly compactly generated (WCG, in short) if there exists a weakly compact subset of  $X$  that generates a subspace that is dense in  $X$ . Clearly, separable spaces and reflexive spaces are WCG, but  $JL$  is not by property (ii), as it is not separable. Hence being WCG is not a three-space property [16].

Note that, while we treat  $JL$  as a unique space, there are different  $JL$  spaces depending on the choice of the family  $\{N_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ , and that the resulting spaces may not be isomorphic [5]. However, the properties

in Theorem 3.1, and those proved below, are common to all possible  $JL$  spaces obtained this way.

**Corollary 3.2.** *Every infinite-dimensional reflexive subspace of  $JL$  is a complemented copy of  $\ell_2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be an infinite-dimensional reflexive subspace of  $JL$ . Then  $M \cap V$  is finite-dimensional and, by Lemma 2.5,  $M + V$  is closed. Passing to a finite-codimensional subspace  $N$  of  $M$ , the restriction  $Q_V J_N$  is an isomorphism. Since  $Q_V(N)$  is complemented in  $\ell_2(\Gamma)$ ,  $N$  is complemented in  $JL$  by Lemma 2.1(i), and then so is  $M$ .  $\square$

Using subprojective and superprojective operators, it is possible to prove that the space  $JL$  is both subprojective and superprojective.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\{\gamma_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  be a finite subset of  $\Gamma$  and let  $M_k = N_{\gamma_k} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} N_{\gamma_i}$  for every  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Then  $(\chi_{M_k})_{k=1}^n$  is equivalent to the unit vector basis of  $\ell_2^n$ .*

*Proof.* For every  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , define  $F_k = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} (N_{\gamma_k} \cap N_{\gamma_i})$ , which is a finite set, and note that  $N_{\gamma_k}$  is the disjoint union of  $M_k$  and  $F_k$ , so  $\chi_{M_k} = \chi_{N_{\gamma_k}} - \chi_{F_k}$ , which is well defined in  $JL$ . Since the sets  $(M_k)_{k=1}^n$  are pairwise disjoint,  $\|\sum_{k=1}^n a_k \chi_{M_k}\|_\infty = \|(a_k)_{k=1}^n\|_\infty$  and  $\|\sum_{k=1}^n a_k \chi_{M_k}\|_{JL} = \|(a_k)_{k=1}^n\|_2$  for every  $(a_k)_{k=1}^n$ .  $\square$

As a consequence, the same applies to any countable subset of  $\Gamma$  with respect to  $\ell_2$ .

We will need the following result, which was essentially proved in [8, Theorem 2.2]. We include a proof here because our statement is different and also encompasses complex spaces.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $X$  be a Banach space that does not contain any copies of  $\ell_1$ . Then every copy of  $c_0$  in  $X$  contains another copy of  $c_0$  complemented in  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $X$  equivalent to the unit vector basis of  $c_0$  and take a bounded sequence  $(x_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $X^*$  such that  $\langle x_i^*, x_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$  for every  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . It is easy to check that  $(x_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is equivalent to the unit vector basis of  $\ell_1$ .

Since  $X$  does not contain any copies of  $\ell_1$ , there exists a normalised weak\* null block sequence of  $(x_n^*)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  ([15, Theorem 1(a)] for the real case, [1, Appendix A] for the complex case). Write  $y_k^* = \sum_{i=m_k}^{m_{k+1}-1} a_i x_i^*$  for such a sequence and let  $\varepsilon_i = a_i/|a_i|$ , or  $\varepsilon_i = 1$  if  $a_i = 0$ , for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $y_k = \sum_{i=m_k}^{m_{k+1}-1} \varepsilon_i x_i$  defines a sequence  $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $[x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}]$  equivalent to the unit vector basis of  $c_0$  such that  $P(x) = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \langle y_k^*, x \rangle y_k$  is a projection in  $X$  onto  $[y_k : k \in \mathbb{N}]$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.5.**

- (i)  $J_V$  is subprojective.



- (ii)  $Q_V$  is superprojective.
- (iii)  $JL$  is both subprojective and superprojective.
- (iv)  $JL^*$  is subprojective but not superprojective.
- (v)  $JL^{**}$  is neither subprojective nor superprojective.

*Proof.* (i)  $JL$  does not contain any copies of  $\ell_1$ , as neither  $c_0$  nor  $\ell_2(\Gamma)$  contain copies of  $\ell_1$ , and not containing any copies of  $\ell_1$  is a three-space property [7, Theorem 3.2.d]. Then every closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $V \simeq c_0$  contains another copy of  $c_0$  that is complemented in  $JL$  by Proposition 3.4 and  $J_V$  is subprojective by Proposition 2.4.

(ii) Let  $M$  be a closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $JL$  containing  $V$ . Then  $JL/M$  is a quotient of  $JL/V \equiv \ell_2(\Gamma)$ , so, taking a bigger  $M$  if necessary, we can assume that  $JL/M$  is separable. Since  $Q_V(M)$  is closed, we can consider the decomposition  $\ell_2(\Gamma) = Q_V(M) \oplus Q_V(M)^\perp$ .

Let  $\{e_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$  be the basis of  $\ell_2(\Gamma)$ . Since  $Q_V(M)^\perp$  is separable, there exists a sequence of different points  $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\Gamma$  such that  $Q_V(M)^\perp \subseteq [e_{\gamma_n} : n \in \mathbb{N}]$ . Consider an orthonormal basis of  $Q_V(M)^\perp$ ; then that basis is a normalised weakly null sequence, so it has a subsequence  $(f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  that is equivalent to a block basis of  $(e_{\gamma_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , i.e., there exist  $1 = m_1 < m_2 < m_3 < \dots$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  and a sequence of scalars  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $y_k = \sum_{i=m_k}^{m_{k+1}-1} b_i e_{\gamma_i}$  satisfies  $\|y_k - f_k\| < 2^{-2k}$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Now, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define  $F_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} (N_{\gamma_n} \cap N_{\gamma_i})$  and  $M_n = N_{\gamma_n} \setminus F_n$ , so that  $(\chi_{M_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is equivalent to the unit vector basis of  $\ell_2$  by Lemma 3.3 and  $Q_V(\chi_{M_n}) = Q_V(\chi_{N_{\gamma_n}}) = e_{\gamma_n}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , which means that the restriction of  $Q_V$  to  $[\chi_{M_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}]$  is an isomorphism onto  $[e_{\gamma_n} : n \in \mathbb{N}]$ . Define  $x_k = \sum_{i=m_k}^{m_{k+1}-1} b_i \chi_{M_i} \in JL$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , so that  $Q_V(x_k) = y_k$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then the restriction of  $Q_V$  to  $[x_k : k \in \mathbb{N}]$  is an isomorphism onto  $[y_k : k \in \mathbb{N}]$  and  $\ell_2(\Gamma) = [y_k : k \in \mathbb{N}] \oplus N$  with  $N$  a closed subspace containing  $Q_V(M)$ , and  $JL = [x_k : k \in \mathbb{N}] \oplus Q_V^{-1}(N)$ . Hence  $Q_V^{-1}(N)$  is a complemented infinite-codimensional subspace containing  $M$ .

(iii)  $Q_V$  is subprojective and  $J_V$  is superprojective by Corollary 2.3, as  $JL/V \equiv \ell_2(\Gamma)$  is subprojective and  $V = c_0$  is superprojective, so  $JL$  is both subprojective and superprojective by (i), (ii) and Theorem 2.7.

(iv) This follows from  $JL^* \simeq \ell_1 \oplus \ell_2(\Gamma)$  [19, Proposition 2.2] [13, Proposition 4.1], as  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2(\Gamma)$  are subprojective, but  $\ell_1$  is not superprojective.

(v)  $JL^{**}$  contains a (complemented) copy of  $\ell_\infty$ . □

There is a second example in [16], which is the closed subspace  $X_{JL}$  generated by  $V \cup \{\phi_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma\} \cup \{\chi_N\}$  in  $\ell_\infty$ . Since  $X_{JL}$  is a commutative Banach algebra with the pointwise multiplication, it is isometric to some  $C(K)$  space by Gelfand's representation theorem [16, Example 2]. It is easy to check that  $X_{JL}/V$  is isometric to  $c_0(\Gamma)$ , which is WCG because the natural inclusion  $\ell_2(\Gamma) \rightarrow c_0(\Gamma)$  has dense range.

However, since weakly compact subsets of  $\ell_\infty$  are separable,  $X_{JL}$  is not WCG, so  $V$  is not complemented in  $X_{JL}$ .

Recall that a Banach space  $X$  is said to have property (V) if every non-weakly compact operator  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  is an isomorphism on a subspace of  $X$  isomorphic to  $c_0$ . It is well known that  $C(K)$  spaces have property (V), so  $X_{JL}$  has property (V).

**Proposition 3.6.**  *$X_{JL}$  is subprojective and superprojective.*

*Proof.*  $X_{JL}$  is hereditarily  $c_0$  because being hereditarily  $c_0$  is a three-space property [7, Theorem 3.2.e]. As such, any closed infinite-dimensional subspace of  $V = c_0$  contains a further subspace isomorphic to  $c_0$  and complemented in  $X_{JL}$  by Proposition 3.4, which means that  $J_V$  is subprojective. As in the case of  $JL$ ,  $Q_V$  is subprojective by Corollary 2.3, as  $X_{JL}/V \cong c_0(\Gamma)$  is subprojective, so  $X_{JL}$  is subprojective by Theorem 2.7.

For the superprojectivity, we will prove that  $Q_V$  is superprojective. First of all,  $\ell_1(\Gamma)$  does not have any reflexive subspaces, so  $X_{JL}/V \cong c_0(\Gamma)$  does not have any reflexive quotients. Let  $W$  be a closed infinite-codimensional subspace of  $X_{JL}$  containing  $V$ ; then  $Q_W$  is not weakly compact, and  $X_{JL}$  has property (V), so there exists a subspace  $M$  of  $X_{JL}$  isomorphic to  $c_0$  such that  $Q_W$  is an isomorphism on  $M$ . Now again  $X_{JL}/W$  does not have any reflexive quotients, so it does not contain  $\ell_1$  and we can assume that  $Q_W(M)$  is complemented by Proposition 3.4. Write  $X_{JL}/W = Q_W(M) \oplus N$ ; then  $X_{JL} = M \oplus Q_W^{-1}(N)$ , where  $Q_W^{-1}(N)$  contains  $W$ .

Finally, again  $J_V$  is superprojective by Corollary 2.3, so  $X_{JL}$  is superprojective by Theorem 2.7.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Acuaviva. *Factorizations and minimality of the Calkin algebra norm for  $C(K)$ -spaces*. arXiv:2408.11132v1, 2024.
- [2] P. Aiena, M. González. *On inessential and improper operators*. Studia Math. 131 (1998) 271–287.
- [3] F. Albiac, N. J. Kalton. *Topics in Banach Space Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 233. Springer, 2006.
- [4] S. A. Argyros, T. Raikoftsalis. *The cofinal problem property of the reflexive indecomposable Banach spaces*. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 62 (2012), 1–45.
- [5] A. Avilés, G. Martínez-Cervantes, J. Rodríguez. *Weak\*-sequential properties of Johnson-Lindenstrauss spaces*. J. Funct. Anal. 276 (10) (2019), 3051–3066.
- [6] S. F. Bellenot. *The  $J$ -sum of Banach spaces*. J. Funct. Anal. 48 (1) (1982) 95–106.
- [7] J. M. F. Castillo, M. González. *Three-space problems in Banach space theory*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1667. Springer-Verlag, 1997.
- [8] S. Díaz and A. Fernández. *Reflexivity in Banach lattices*. Arch. Math. 63 (6) (1994), 549–552.
- [9] M. González. *The perturbation classes problem in Fredholm theory*. J. Funct. Anal. 200 (2003) 65–70.

- [10] M. González, A. Martínez-Abejón. *Tauberian Operators*. Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, 194. Birkäuser, 2010.
- [11] M. González, A. Martínez-Abejón, M. Salas-Brown. *Perturbation classes for semi-Fredholm operators on subprojective and superprojective Banach spaces*. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 36 (2011) 481–491.
- [12] M. González, J. Pello. *Projections in the  $J$ -sums of Banach spaces*. Rev. Real Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fís. Nat. Ser. A-Mat. 118 (4) (2024), 162.
- [13] M. González, J. Pello. *Superprojective Banach spaces*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 437 (2) (2016) 1140–1151.
- [14] M. González, J. Pello, M. Salas-Brown. *The perturbation classes problem for subprojective and superprojective Banach spaces*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 489 (2) (2020) 124191, 5 pp.
- [15] J. Hagler, W. B. Johnson. *On Banach spaces whose dual balls are not weak\* sequentially compact*. Israel J. Math. 28 (4) (1977), 325–330.
- [16] W. B. Johnson, J. Lindenstrauss. *Some remarks on weakly compactly generated Banach spaces*. Israel J. Math. 17 (2) (1974) 219–230.
- [17] N. J. Kalton, N. T. Peck. *Twisted sums of sequence spaces and the three space problem*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 255 (1979) 1–30.
- [18] T. Kato. *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*. Springer, 1966.
- [19] T. Oikhberg, E. Spinu. *Subprojective Banach spaces*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 424 (2015) 613–635.
- [20] R. J. Whitley. *Strictly singular operators and their conjugates*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 113 (1964) 252–261.

FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE CANTABRIA, 39071 SANTANDER, SPAIN

ESCUELA SUPERIOR DE CIENCIAS EXPERIMENTALES Y TECNOLOGÍA, UNIVERSIDAD REY JUAN CARLOS, 28933 MÓSTOLES, SPAIN