

S-DECOMPOSABLE BANACH LATTICES, OPTIMAL SEQUENCE SPACES AND INTERPOLATION

SERGEY V. ASTASHKIN AND PER G. NILSSON

ABSTRACT. We investigate connections between upper/lower estimates for Banach lattices and the notion of relative s -decomposability, which has roots in interpolation theory. To get a characterization of relatively s -decomposable Banach lattices in terms of the above estimates, we assign to each Banach lattice X two sequence spaces X_U and X_L that are largely determined by the set of p , for which l_p is finitely lattice representable in X . As an application, we obtain an orbital factorization of relative K -functional estimates for Banach couples $\vec{X} = (X_0, X_1)$ and $\vec{Y} = (Y_0, Y_1)$ through some suitable couples of weighted L_p -spaces provided if X_i, Y_i are relatively s -decomposable for $i = 0, 1$.

Also, we undertake a detailed study of the properties of optimal upper and lower sequence spaces X_U and X_L , and, in particular, prove that these spaces are rearrangement invariant. In the Appendix, a description of the optimal upper sequence space for a separable Orlicz space as a certain intersection of some special Musielak-Orlicz sequence spaces is given.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper has roots in the classification problem of the interpolation theory of operators, see for instance Peetre [25], i.e., the problem of identification of equivalence classes of Banach couples with the "same" interpolation structure¹. Specifically, there are close connections of the topic of this paper with the so-called Calderón-Mityagin property of Banach couples, which often allows to describe effectively the class of all interpolation spaces with respect to them. Let us recall this notion.

Assuming that $\vec{X} = (X_0, X_1)$ and $\vec{Y} = (Y_0, Y_1)$ are Banach couples, we consider the following two properties of elements $x \in X_0 + X_1$ and $y \in Y_0 + Y_1$:

$$(1.1) \quad y = Tx \text{ for some bounded linear operator } T : X_i \rightarrow Y_i, \quad i = 0, 1,$$

Date: August 7, 2023.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 46B70; Secondary 46B42, 15A15.

Key words and phrases. Banach lattice, s -relative decomposable couples, relative decomposable couples, lower, upper estimates, interpolation, Calderón-Mityagin property.

The work of the first author was completed as a part of the implementation of the development program of the Volga Region Scientific and Educational Mathematical Center (agreement no. 075-02-2023-931).

¹For standard definitions and notation used in the interpolation theory, see e.g. [3],[4], [5], [25].

and

$$(1.2) \quad K(t, y; \vec{Y}) \leq C \cdot K(t, x; \vec{X}) \text{ for some constant } C \text{ and } t > 0.$$

Here, $K(t, x; \vec{X})$ is the Peetre K -functional defined for all $x \in X_0 + X_1$ and $t > 0$ by

$$K(t, x; \vec{X}) := \inf\{\|x_0\|_{X_0} + t\|x_1\|_{X_1} : x = x_0 + x_1, x_i \in X_i\}.$$

It is easy to check that condition (1.1) implies (1.2) with $C = \max_{i=0,1} \|T\|_{X_i \rightarrow Y_i}$. If the converse implication holds (for all $x \in X_0 + X_1$ and $y \in Y_0 + Y_1$), the couples \vec{X} and \vec{Y} are said to have the *relative Calderón-Mityagin property* (in brief, $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property). In this case all relative interpolation spaces with respect to these couples can be described by using K -functionals in a precise quantitative manner, see for instance [4, Theorem 4.1.11].

A result of this type related to the finite dimensional couples (l_1^n, l_∞^n) goes back to Hardy-Littlewood-Polya, see [27, Theorem 5.5]. As the name of the term suggests, the first example of a $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ couple in the non-discrete infinite dimensional setting was obtained independently by Calderón [6] and Mityagin [24]. Their result that the Banach couple (L_1, L_∞) over an arbitrary σ -finite measure space has the $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property marked the start of searching for other such Banach couples. Early examples are pairs of weighted L_∞ -spaces, Peetre [25], and L_1 -spaces, Sedaev-Semenov, [28]. Over time, this property has been verified for a large number of Banach couples (and also quasi-Banach couples, couples of normed abelian groups); cf. [4, Sec. 4.7.2], [11, p. 2 onwards], [2].

In the paper [9], Cwikel have found a general condition, which guarantees that two given couples of Banach lattices have the relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property. Let X and Y be Banach lattices of measurable functions (possibly having different underlying measure spaces). Then X, Y are called *relatively decomposable* if for any sequences $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset X$ and $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset Y$ of elements with pair-wise disjoint supports such that $\sum_{n=1}^\infty x_n \in X$ and $\|y_n\|_Y \leq \|x_n\|_X$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\sum_{n=1}^\infty y_n \in Y$ and

$$(1.3) \quad \left\| \sum_{n=1}^\infty y_n \right\|_Y \leq D \left\| \sum_{n=1}^\infty x_n \right\|_X,$$

for some constant D independent of $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$. As is proved in [9] (see also [4, Theorem 4.4.29]), couples of Banach lattices $\vec{X} = (X_0, X_1)$ and $\vec{Y} = (Y_0, Y_1)$ have the relative Calderón-Mityagin property whenever both pairs X_0, Y_0 and X_1, Y_1 are relatively decomposable.

Let us mention that the latter notion is closely connected with L_p -spaces. In particular, by an appropriate form of the Kakutani-Bohnenblust-Tzafriri representation theorem, any decomposable lattice X of measurable functions on Ω (i.e., when $X = Y$), which is also σ -order continuous and has the Fatou property, coincides, for some $p \in [1, \infty)$, with an L_p -space of functions supported on some

measurable subset Ω' of Ω for some suitable measure defined on Ω' (see Proposition 1.4 in [10, p. 58]). Observe also that there is a simple sufficient condition for couples of Banach lattices to be relatively decomposable. Namely, if Y satisfies an upper p -estimate and X a lower p -estimate, then the Banach lattices X and Y are relative decomposable.

The notion of relative decomposibility plays a central role in the paper [11], where it was proved that all weighted couples modelled on two given couples $\vec{X} = (X_0, X_1)$ and $\vec{Y} = (Y_0, Y_1)$ of Banach lattices of measurable functions over σ -finite measure spaces possess the relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property if and only if both pairs X_0, Y_0 and X_1, Y_1 are relatively decomposable. Therefore, in the case when $\vec{X} = \vec{Y}$ and X_0, X_1 are σ -order continuous and have the Fatou property, the latter property of a couple \vec{X} implies that both X_0 and X_1 are L_p -spaces, which is a strong converse to the well-known result of Sparr [30], asserting that each weighted L_p -couple has the relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property.

Of course, not all pairs of Banach couples possess the relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property and this motivated Cwikel to consider a weakened version of that. Specifically, already in the papers [7] and [8], condition (1.2) is replaced with the inequality

$$(1.4) \quad K(t, y; \vec{Y}) \leq w(t)K(t, x; \vec{X}), \quad t > 0, \quad \text{with} \quad \int_0^\infty w(u)^s du/u < \infty,$$

for some (fixed) function $w(u) \geq 0$ and $s \in [1, \infty]$ (if $s = \infty$, after the usual modification of the condition imposed on w , we come certainly to the definition of relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property). In turn, this led to the introduction of the following more general concept of relatively s -decomposable pairs of Banach lattices.

Let $1 \leq s \leq \infty$. A pair of Banach lattices X, Y is said to be *relatively s -decomposable* whenever for all sequences $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset X$, $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset Y$ of pair-wise disjoint elements such that $\sum_{n=1}^\infty x_n \in X$ and $\|y_n\|_Y \leq \|x_n\|_X$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\sum_{n=1}^\infty y_n \in Y$ and

$$(1.5) \quad \left\| \sum_{n=1}^\infty \lambda_n y_n \right\|_Y \leq D \left(\sum_{n=1}^\infty |\lambda_n|^s \right)^{1/s} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^\infty x_n \right\|_X,$$

for some constant D and every sequence $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in l_s$ (again with the usual modification in the case $s = \infty$ that gives (1.3), i.e., the relative decomposibility). According to [9] (see also [4, Remark 4.4.33]), if $\vec{X} = (X_0, X_1)$ and $\vec{Y} = (Y_0, Y_1)$ are two couples of Banach lattices such that the pairs X_0, Y_0 and X_1, Y_1 are relatively s -decomposable, for every $x \in X_0 + X_1$ and $y \in Y_0 + Y_1$ satisfying condition (1.4) we have $y = Tx$ for some linear operator $T : X_i \rightarrow Y_i$, $i = 0, 1$.

One of the main results of the paper [11] is a characterization of the relative decomposability in the setting of Banach lattices of measurable functions, implying that the above-mentioned trivial sufficient condition expressed in terms of upper and lower estimates is also necessary. In the case of relative s -decomposable pairs of Banach lattices X, Y there is also a simple sufficient condition, formulated in

terms of upper estimates for Y and lower estimates for X . The main aim of this paper is to prove that, in a more general setting of abstract Banach lattices, this trivial sufficient condition is also necessary (as in the case of relative decomposability, i.e., when $s = \infty$).

A pivotal role in the proof of our main result is played by the notions of optimal upper and lower sequence spaces, introduced in this paper. Specifically, we associate to every Banach lattice X two sequence spaces X_U and X_L , which rather precisely reflect lattice properties of X , in particular, encoding the optimal upper and lower estimate information, respectively. Section 3 is devoted to a detailed study of the properties of these spaces, which, as we believe, can be useful tools also when considering other issues related to Banach lattices. As a result, in Section 4 we present the proof of Theorem 2.8, which gives a solution of the above problem. On the way, we obtain also other results related to optimal sequence spaces. We show that if Banach lattices X and Y are relatively s -decomposable, then the space of multipliers from X_L into Y_U with respect to coordinate-wise multiplication includes the space l_s (see Proposition 4.1). Another important ingredient in the proof of Theorem 2.8 is the relationship between the construction of optimal sequence spaces X_U and X_L and the finite lattice representability of l_r -spaces in X .

Section 5 contains some applications of Theorem 2.8 to the interpolation theory. In particular, in Theorem 5.2 we prove that Banach lattices X and Y being relatively s -decomposable admit an orbital factorization of relative K -functional estimates through some suitable couples of weighted L_p -spaces. In the next section we present the full proof of rearrangement invariance of the optimal upper and lower sequence spaces (see Theorem 3.3).

Finally, in the Appendix we identify the optimal upper sequence space for a separable Orlicz space L_M on $[0, 1]$. Namely, in Theorem 6.14, we prove that the space $(L_M)_U$ can be described as a certain intersection of some special Musielak-Orlicz sequence spaces.

It is worth noting that, in contrast to [9] and [4], in this paper we use a weaker version of *finite* relative s -decomposibility, which involves estimates (1.5) only for finite sequences. In a certain sense, this approach seems to be more natural, since our main result reveals the relationship between this property and upper/lower estimates of Banach lattices involved, whose definition contains only finite sequences of elements of these lattices as well. Observe that the above versions of the definition of relative s -decomposibility coincide if X, Y are Banach lattices of measurable functions such that Y has the Fatou property² (in this case only, the concept of relative s -decomposibility is applied in [9] (see also [4]) to the study of interpolation properties of Banach couples).

²A Banach lattice X of measurable functions on a σ -finite measure space (T, Σ, μ) is said to have the *Fatou property* if the conditions $x_n \in X$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, $\sup_{n=1,2,\dots} \|x_n\|_X < \infty$ and $x_n \rightarrow x$ a.e. on T imply that $x \in X$ and $\|x\|_X \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n\|_X$.

Some remarks around the history of this paper. Already in [11, Theorem 1.3, p. 98] the classification of decomposable pairs of Banach lattices on measure spaces was addressed. In fact, the corresponding results for the general case were also announced there (see [11, p. 100]). This problem was presented to the second author by Michael Cwikel back in 2003. Some preliminary results were presented by the second author during Jaak Peetre's "Summer Seminar" in Lund, 2003. Time flies, and resulted the in the present paper 20 years later. The authors thank Michael Cwikel for his insight and contributions to this paper.

2. SOME PRELIMINARIES AND STATEMENTS OF THE MAIN RESULTS.

We will assume that the reader is familiar with the definition of Banach lattices, their basic properties and some basic terminology (see, for instance, [20],[22],[27]). In particular, two elements x, y from a Banach lattice X are said to be *disjoint* if they satisfy $|x| \wedge |y| = 0$. For a given Banach space (lattice), we set $B_X := \{x \in X : \|x\|_X \leq 1\}$ and $S_X := \{x \in X : \|x\|_X = 1\}$.

Recall that a lattice X is said to be σ -*order complete* if every order bounded sequence in X has a least upper bound (see e.g. [20, Definition 1.a.3]). A Banach lattice has a σ -*order continuous norm* if every positive, increasing, norm bounded sequence converges in norm (see e.g. [27, Definition 5.12], [20, Definition 1.a.6]).

Let $l_p(I)$ denote the Banach space of all sequences, indexed by the set I , which are absolutely p -summable if $1 \leq p < \infty$ (resp. bounded if $p = \infty$). In the case $I = \mathbb{N}$ we simply write l_p . As usual, by $c_0 = c_0(\mathbb{N})$ will be denoted the space of all sequences tending to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For definiteness, all Banach spaces and lattices considered in this paper are assumed to be real.

Let F_1 and F_2 be two positive functions (quasinorms). We write $F_1 \preceq F_2$ if we have $F_1 \leq CF_2$ for some positive constant C that does not depend on the arguments of F_1 and F_2 . In the case when both $F_1 \preceq F_2$ and $F_2 \preceq F_1$ we write $F_1 \asymp F_2$. For a finite set $E \subset \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $|E|$ cardinality of E . Finally, if $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function (resp. $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of real numbers), then $\text{supp } F := \{\omega \in \Omega : F(\omega) \neq 0\}$ (resp. $\text{supp } a := \{i \in \mathbb{N} : a_i \neq 0\}$).

2.1. Relative decomposability of Banach lattices. The following definition generalizes the first of two definitions in [9, p. 44] (see also [4, Definition 4.4.26, p. 597]) and has roots in the interpolation theory of operators (see e.g. [9, Theorem 2], [4, Theorem 4.4.29, p. 598] and Section 1). However, as was already mentioned in Section 1, in contrast to [9] (and also to [11], where the case $s = \infty$ is covered), we will use a weaker version of this notion, which involves only finite sums of elements of given lattices.

Definition 2.1. Let $1 \leq s \leq \infty$. Banach lattices X and Y are said to be (*finitely*) *relative s -decomposable* if there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all sequences of pair-wise disjoint non-zero elements $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset X$ and

$\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset Y$ it holds

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \right\|_Y \leq D \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\|y_i\|_Y / \|x_i\|_X)^s \right)^{1/s} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right\|_X$$

(with the usual modification in the case $s = \infty$). Let $D_s = D_s(X, Y)$ denote the infimum of constants D satisfying the above condition and we refer to D_s as the *relative s -decomposibility constant* of X and Y .

In what follows, we will suppress the word "finitely", although this is a change of terminology as compared to the previous use of this term, both in [9] and [4, Definition 2.2.16] (see also a related discussion in Section 1).

Definition 2.1 can be also stated equivalently as follows. Let $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq S_X$, $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq S_Y$ be two sequences of pair-wise disjoint elements. Then for all sequences $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of scalars it holds

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i y_i \right\|_Y \leq D \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^s \right)^{1/s} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i \right\|_X.$$

Note that in the case $s = \infty$ Definition 2.1 reduces to the following: if $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq X$, $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq Y$ are two sequences of pair-wise disjoint elements with $\|y_i\|_Y \leq \|x_i\|_X$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, then

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \right\|_Y \leq D \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right\|_X$$

Following [11], we will say in this case that Banach lattices X and Y are *relatively decomposable* (see Section 1).

In particular, by Hölder inequality, we have

Example 2.2. If $1 \leq p, q, s \leq \infty$ then

$$D_s(l_q, l_p) < \infty \iff \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{s}$$

and $D_s(l_q, l_p) = 1$ whenever this constant is finite.

2.2. Upper and lower estimates for disjoint elements in Banach lattices and the Grobler-Dodds indices. Let us start with recalling the notions of lower and upper estimates in Banach lattices; see [20, Definition 1.f.4]. A Banach lattice X is said to *satisfy an upper (resp. a lower) p -estimate*, where $p \in [1, \infty]$, if for some constant M and all finite sequences of pair-wise disjoint elements $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq X$ it holds

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right\|_X \leq M \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_X^p \right)^{1/p}$$

(resp.

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_X^p \right)^{1/p} \leq M \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right\|.$$

The infimum of all M , satisfying the above inequality, is denoted by $M^{[p]}(X)$ and $M_{[p]}(X)$, respectively. Note that every Banach lattice admits (trivially) an upper 1-estimate and a lower ∞ -estimate.

The fact that a Banach lattice satisfies an upper or a lower p -estimate can be equivalently expressed in terms of relative decomposability. More explicitly, since $M_{[p]}(l_p) = M^{[p]}(l_p) = 1$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, one can immediately check the following (see also [11]):

Proposition 2.3. *Let X be a Banach lattice and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. We have:*

(i) *X satisfies an upper p -estimate if and only if l_p and X are relatively decomposable;*

(ii) *X satisfies a lower p -estimate if and only if X and l_p are relatively decomposable.*

Moreover, we have

$$M^{[p]}(X) = D_\infty(l_p, X), M_{[p]}(X) = D_\infty(X, l_p).$$

A direct application of the above definitions (see also Example 2.2) gives the following useful result.

Proposition 2.4. *Assume that X and Y are Banach lattices such that X satisfies a lower q -estimate and Y satisfies an upper p -estimate, where $1 \leq q, p \leq \infty$. If $1/p \leq 1/q + 1/s$, then X, Y are relatively s -decomposable and the following estimate holds:*

$$D_s(X, Y) \leq M_{[q]}(X) M^{[p]}(Y).$$

From the latter proposition and the trivial fact that every Banach lattice satisfies an upper 1-estimate and a lower ∞ -estimate it follows that any pair of Banach lattices is relatively 1-decomposable. Hence, given a pair of Banach lattices X and Y , the set of all $s \in [1, \infty]$ such that they are s -decomposable is always non-empty and is of the form either $[1, s_{\max}]$ or $[1, s_{\max})$, where

$$s_{\max} = s_{\max}(X, Y) := \sup\{s \in [1, \infty] : X, Y \text{ are } s\text{-decomposable}\}.$$

Taking $X = l_p$, $Y = l_1$ and s_{\max} so that $1/s_{\max} + 1/p = 1$, we obtain an example of the first type because of X and Y are s -decomposable if and only if $s \in [1, s_{\max}]$ (see Example 2.2). To get an example of the second type, let Y be a Banach lattice that satisfies, for a given $p_{\max} \in [1, \infty]$, an upper p -estimate for all $p < p_{\max}$ but not for $p = p_{\max}$. Then, taking l_∞ for X , we see that X and Y are s -decomposable if and only if $s < p_{\max}$ (see Proposition 2.3(i)).

Recall that the Grobler-Dodds indices $\delta(X)$ and $\sigma(X)$ of a Banach lattice X are defined by

$$\delta(X) := \sup\{p \geq 1 : X \text{ satisfies an upper } p\text{-estimate}\}$$

and

$$\sigma(X) := \inf\{q \geq 1 : X \text{ satisfies a lower } q\text{-estimate}\}.$$

For every infinite-dimensional Banach lattice X we have $1 \leq \delta(X) \leq \sigma(X) \leq \infty$. Moreover, the following duality relations hold:

$$\frac{1}{\delta(X)} + \frac{1}{\sigma(X^*)} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\sigma(X)} + \frac{1}{\delta(X^*)} = 1.$$

Definition 2.5. Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. We say that l_p is *finitely lattice representable* in a Banach lattice X whenever for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist pair-wise disjoint elements $x_i \in X$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, such that for any sequence $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of scalars we have

$$(2.1) \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

Similarly, l_p is said to be *crudely finitely lattice representable* in X whenever instead of (2.1) it holds

$$C^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X \leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^p \right)^{1/p},$$

where C is a constant independent of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

For the following result see, for instance, [20, Theorem 1.f.12.ii].

Proposition 2.6. *Let X be a Banach lattice. Then X admits a lower p -estimate for some $p < \infty$ if and only if l_∞ fails to be finitely lattice representable in X .*

Moreover, in view of [20, Theorem 1.a.5, 1.a.7] and [13, p. 288], it follows

Proposition 2.7. *If a Banach lattice X is not σ -complete or has a not σ -order continuous norm, then l_∞ is finitely lattice representable in X .*

2.3. The main result and its consequences. Now we are ready to state the main result of this paper, which gives a characterization of relatively s -decomposable Banach lattices in terms of their upper and lower estimates. This is an extension of results of the paper [11], where the case $s = \infty$ was covered in a more restrictive setting of Banach lattices of measurable functions. Note that the case when $\delta(Y) \leq \sigma(X)$ is more interesting, because then the lattices X and Y potentially may be not relatively decomposable. As was mentioned in Section 1, a non-trivial part of the next theorem can be also treated as the converse to Proposition 2.4.

Theorem 2.8. *Suppose X and Y are infinite dimensional Banach lattices. If $\delta(Y) \leq \sigma(X)$ the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) X and Y are relatively s -decomposable;

(ii) There exist p, q , with $1/p = 1/q + 1/s$, such that X satisfies a lower q -estimate and Y an upper p -estimate;

(iii) There exist p, q with $1/p = 1/q + 1/s$ such that X, l_q and l_p, Y are relatively decomposable.

In addition, if

$$F_s(X, Y) := \inf \left\{ M_{[q]}(X) M^{[p]}(Y) : \frac{1}{s} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}, 1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty \right\},$$

it holds

$$D_s(X, Y) \leq F_s(X, Y) \leq D_s(X, Y)^2.$$

Moreover, $\sigma(X) \leq \delta(Y)$ if and only if $s_{\max}(X, Y) = \infty$.

The proof of this theorem is presented in Section 4 below.

Now, by using standard arguments (see e.g. [20, Proposition 1.f.6]), one can prove that Definition 2.1 is equivalent to the following assertion for general sequences of elements in Banach lattices.

Corollary 2.9. *Infinite dimensional Banach lattices X and Y are relatively s -decomposable if and only if there exists a constant $D_s > 0$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all sequences $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq S_X$, $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq S_Y$ and $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$\|\vee_{i=1}^n |a_i y_i|\|_Y \leq D_s \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^s \right)^{1/s} \|\vee_{i=1}^n |x_i|\|_X$$

Corollary 2.10. *Suppose infinite dimensional Banach lattices X and Y are relatively s -decomposable for some $s \in [1, \infty]$. Then, there exist equivalent norms on X and Y such that X and Y are relatively s -decomposable Banach lattices with constant one.*

Proof. By [22, Lemma 2.8.8], every Banach lattice which satisfies a lower p -estimate/an upper q -estimate admits an equivalent Banach lattice norm such that the corresponding lower/upper estimate constant is equal to one. Consequently, after a suitable renorming X and Y , in the notation of Theorem 2.8 we have $F_s(X, Y) = 1$, which implies that $D_s(X, Y) = 1$. \square

2.4. Rearrangement invariant spaces. For a detailed theory of rearrangement invariant spaces we refer to the monographs [20, 17].

Let $I = [0, 1]$ or $(0, \infty)$ and let m be the Lebesgue measure on I . Given a measurable function $x(t)$ on I we define its distribution function by

$$n_x(\tau) := m\{t \in I : |x(t)| > \tau\}, \quad \tau > 0.$$

Measurable functions $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ on I are called *equimeasurable* if $n_x(\tau) = n_y(\tau)$ for all $\tau > 0$. In particular, each function $x(t)$ on I is equimeasurable with its non-increasing left-continuous rearrangement $x^*(t)$ of $|x(t)|$, which defines by

$$x^*(t) := \inf\{\tau > 0 : n_x(\tau) < t\}, \quad t \in I.$$

Definition 2.11. A Banach function space X on I is said to be *rearrangement invariant* (in short, r.i.) (or *symmetric*) if the conditions $x \in X$ and $n_y(\tau) \leq n_x(\tau)$ for all $\tau > 0$ imply that $y \in X$ and $\|y\|_X \leq \|x\|_X$.

Let X be a r.i. space. If $I = [0, 1]$ (resp. $I = (0, \infty)$) we have $L_\infty \hookrightarrow X \hookrightarrow L_1$ (resp. $L_\infty \cap L_1 \hookrightarrow X \hookrightarrow L_\infty + L_1$).

The *Köthe dual space* X' consists of all measurable functions y such that

$$\|y\|_{X'} := \sup\left\{\int_I |x(t)y(t)| dt : x \in X, \|x\|_X \leq 1\right\} < \infty.$$

Then, X' equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{X'}$ is a r.i. space. Moreover, $X \subset X''$, and the isometric equality $X = X''$ holds if and only if the norm in X has the *Fatou property*, that is, if the conditions $0 \leq x_n \uparrow x$ a.e. on I and $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_n\| < \infty$ imply $x \in X$ and $\|x_n\| \uparrow \|x\|$.

The *fundamental function* ϕ_X of a r.i. space X is defined by $\phi_X(t) := \|\chi_A\|_X$, where χ_A is the characteristic function of a measurable set $A \subset I$ with $m(A) = t$. The function ϕ_X is *quasi-concave* (i.e., $\phi_X(0) = 0$, ϕ_X increases and $\phi_X(t)/t$ decreases).

Most important examples of r.i. spaces are the L_p -spaces, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, and their natural generalization, the Orlicz spaces (for their detailed theory we refer to the monographs [16, 26, 21]).

Let M be an Orlicz function, that is, an increasing convex continuous function on $[0, \infty)$ such that $M(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} M(t) = \infty$. In what follows, we will assume also that $M(1) = 1$. Denote by $L_M := L_M(I)$ the *Orlicz space* endowed with the Luxemburg norm

$$\|f\|_{L_M} := \inf\left\{\lambda > 0 : \int_I M\left(\frac{|f(t)|}{\lambda}\right) dt \leq 1\right\}.$$

In particular, if $M(u) = u^p$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, we obtain L_p .

Note that the definition of an Orlicz function space $L_M[0, 1]$ depends (up to equivalence of norms) only on the behaviour of the function $M(t)$ for large values of argument t . An easy calculation (see also formula (9.23) in [16] on page 79 of the English version) shows that

$$(2.2) \quad \varphi_{L_M}(t) = \frac{1}{M^{-1}(1/t)}, \quad 0 < t \leq 1,$$

where M^{-1} is the inverse for M .

If M is an Orlicz function, then the *Young conjugate function* \tilde{M} is defined by

$$\tilde{M}(u) := \sup_{t>0} (ut - M(t)), \quad u \geq 0.$$

Moreover, \tilde{M} is also an Orlicz function and the Young conjugate for \tilde{M} is M .

Every Orlicz space $L_M(I)$ has the Fatou property; $L_M[0, 1]$ (resp. $L_M(0, \infty)$) is separable if and only if the function M satisfies the Δ_2^∞ -condition (resp. Δ_2 -condition), i.e., $\sup_{u \geq 1} M(2u)/M(u) < \infty$ (resp. $\sup_{u > 0} M(2u)/M(u) < \infty$). In this case we have $L_M(I)^* = L_M(I)' = L_{\tilde{M}}(I)$.

Let $1 < q < \infty$, $1 \leq r < \infty$. The Lorentz space $L_{q,r} = L_{q,r}(I)$ consists of all measurable functions x such that

$$\|x\|_{q,r} := \left(\frac{r}{q} \int_I (t^{1/q} x^*(t))^r \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{1/r} < \infty.$$

The functional $x \mapsto \|x\|_{q,r}$ is not subadditive, but it is equivalent to the norm $x \mapsto \|x^{**}\|_{q,r}$, where $x^{**}(t) := \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t x^*(s) ds$, $t > 0$. Moreover, $L_{q,r_1} \hookrightarrow L_{q,r_2}$, $1 \leq r_1 \leq r_2 < \infty$ and $L_{q,q} = L_q$ isometrically.

Rearrangement invariant (r.i.) sequence spaces are defined quite similarly. In particular, the *fundamental function* of a r.i. sequence space X is defined by $\phi_X(n) := \|\sum_{k=1}^n e_k\|_X$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. In what follows, e_k are the canonical unit vectors, i.e., $e_k = (e_k^i)_{i=1}^\infty$, $e_k^i = 0$ for $i \neq k$ and $e_k^k = 1$, $k, i = 1, 2, \dots$.

Recall that an *Orlicz sequence space* ℓ_ψ , where ψ is an Orlicz function, consists of all sequences $(a_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ such that

$$\|(a_k)\|_{\ell_\psi} := \inf \left\{ u > 0 : \sum_{k=1}^\infty \psi\left(\frac{|a_k|}{u}\right) \leq 1 \right\} < \infty.$$

Clearly, if $\psi(t) = t^p$, $p \geq 1$, then $\ell_\psi = \ell^p$ isometrically.

The fundamental function of an Orlicz sequence space ℓ_ψ can be calculated by the formula: $\phi_{\ell_\psi}(n) = \frac{1}{\psi^{-1}(1/n)}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Furthermore, an Orlicz sequence space ℓ_ψ is separable if and only if ψ satisfies the Δ_2^0 -condition ($\psi \in \Delta_2^0$), that is,

$$\sup_{0 < u \leq 1} \psi(2u)/\psi(u) < \infty.$$

In this case we have $\ell_\psi^* = \ell'_\psi = \ell_{\tilde{\psi}}$, with the Young conjugate function $\tilde{\psi}$ for ψ .

Observe that the definition of an Orlicz sequence space ℓ_ψ depends (up to equivalence of norms) only on the behaviour of ψ near zero.

3. OPTIMAL UPPER AND LOWER SEQUENCE LATTICES

In this section we introduce and study some specialized notions which will play an important role in the proof of our main Theorem 2.8. They are a special kind of sequence spaces which are generated via some appropriate sequences of norms, defined on \mathbb{R}^n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

3.1. Definitions and general properties.

Definition 3.1. Let X be a Banach lattice. For each integer n , let $\mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ denote the set of all sequences $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq S_X$ of elements with pair-wise disjoint support.

Lemma 3.2. *If X is a Banach lattice of dimension at least n , then the set $\mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ is non-empty.*

The proof of this lemma will be provided in Section 6.

Let now X be an infinite dimensional Banach lattice. Based on X we associate two auxiliary constructions, which yield two sequence spaces X_U and X_L that satisfy the following norm one continuous embeddings:

$$(3.1) \quad l_1 \xhookrightarrow{1} X_U \xhookrightarrow{1} X_L \xhookrightarrow{1} l_\infty.$$

We will call X_U and X_L the *optimal upper* and respectively *optimal lower sequence spaces* generated by X . Note that the construction, which leads to the space X_L , is close to the one developed in the paper [14] and related to the optimal cotype and summing properties of a Banach space.

To construct X_U we define first, for each fixed integer n , the following norm on \mathbb{R}^n by

$$\|\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n\|_{X_U(n)} := \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X : \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X) \right\}.$$

Let X_U be the space of all real-valued sequences $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, for which

$$\|a\|_{X_U} := \sup_n \|\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n\|_{X_U(n)} < \infty.$$

Since

$$\|\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n\|_{X_U(n)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

it follows the left-hand side embedding in (3.1).

The first step in the definition of the space X_L is the introduction of the functionals Φ_n , defined for $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by

$$\Phi_n(a) := \inf \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X : \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X) \right\}.$$

Next, we set

$$\|a\|_{X_L(n)} := \inf \left\{ \sum_{k \in F} \Phi_n(a^k) : F \subseteq \mathbb{N}, |F| < \infty, a^k \in \mathbb{R}^n, a = \sum_{k \in F} a^k \right\}.$$

Note that $\sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} |a_i| \leq \Phi_n(a)$ and hence $\|a\|_{l_\infty^n} \leq \|a\|_{X_L(n)}$, which implies that the mapping $a \mapsto \|a\|_{X_L(n)}$ defines a norm on \mathbb{R}^n . Finally, we define X_L to be the space of all real-valued sequences $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, for which

$$\|a\|_{X_L} := \sup_n \|\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n\|_{X_L(n)} < \infty.$$

Clearly, these definitions imply the second and third embeddings in (3.1).

The proof of the following important properties of the spaces X_U and X_L we provide in Section 6 below.

Theorem 3.3. *Let X be an infinite dimensional Banach lattice. Then X_L is a r.i. sequence space and X_U is a Banach sequence lattice. Moreover, if l_∞ is not finitely representable in X , X_U is a r.i. sequence space as well.*

Denote by X_L^0 (resp. X_U^0) the closed linear span of all finitely supported sequences in X_L (resp. X_U). Recall that $e_m, m = 1, 2, \dots$, are the unit basis vectors in spaces of real-valued sequences.

Corollary 3.4. *If X is an infinite dimensional Banach lattice, then X_L^0 is a Banach space in which the vectors $e_m, m = 1, 2, \dots$, form a symmetric normed basis. If l_∞ is not finitely representable in X , the same conclusion applies also to X_U^0 .*

In particular, if $\text{supp } a \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\|a\|_{X_L} = \|a\|_{X_L(n)}$ and $\|a\|_{X_U} = \|a\|_{X_U(n)}$.

Example 3.5. We claim that $(c_0)_U = (c_0)_L = l_\infty$ and hence $(c_0)_U^0 = (c_0)_L^0 = c_0$.

Indeed, first by (3.1), we have $(c_0)_U \xrightarrow{1} (c_0)_L \xrightarrow{1} l_\infty$. For the converse, fix an integer n and let $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq c_0$ be a positive unit norm sequence with pair-wise disjoint support. Clearly, for all $a_i \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$,

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right| \leq \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} |a_i|,$$

and hence $l_\infty \xrightarrow{1} (c_0)_U(n)$. In consequence, $l_\infty \xrightarrow{1} (c_0)_U$. Thus, in view of (3.1), everything is done.

The above example shows that the spaces X_U and X_L do not need to have σ -order continuous norm even if X has so. At the same time, the construction of the optimal upper and lower sequence spaces ensures that they *always* have the following somewhat weaker property.

Recall that a Banach function lattice X on a measure space (T, μ) is called *order semi-continuous* if the conditions $x_n \in X, n = 1, 2, \dots, x \in X$ and $x_n \chi_B \rightarrow x \chi_B$ μ -a.e. for each set $B \subset T$ such that $\mu(B) < \infty$ imply that $\|x\|_X \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n\|_X$.

In particular, Banach sequence lattice E (in this case $T = \mathbb{N}$ with the counting measure μ) is order semi-continuous if $\|a\|_E \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|_E$ whenever a sequence $\{a^n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset E$ converges coordinate-wise to $a \in E$.

Lemma 3.6. *X_U and X_L are order semi-continuous Banach sequence lattices for each Banach lattice X .*

Proof. We prove this result only for X_U , because for X_L this can be done in the same way.

Assume that a sequence $\{a^n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset X_U$ converges coordinate-wise to an element $a \in X_U$. Let $a^n = \{a_i^n\}_{i=1}^\infty, a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$. For arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ select $m \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$\|a\|_{X_U} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|\{a_i\}_{i=1}^m\|_{X_U(m)}.$$

Then, for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$|a_i^n| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|a_i|, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

whence

$$\|\{a_i^n\}_{i=1}^m\|_{X_U(m)} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \|\{a_i\}_{i=1}^m\|_{X_U(m)}.$$

Combining the above inequalities, we get

$$\|a\|_{X_U} \leq \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} \|\{a_i^n\}_{i=1}^m\|_{X_U(m)}$$

if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is sufficiently large. This implies that

$$\|a\|_{X_U} \leq \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a^n\|_{X_U}.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, the desired result for X_U is proved. \square

For any sequence $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ we have $a_i = \langle a, e_i \rangle$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the usual inner product. In what follows, the properties of the optimal sequence spaces from the next proposition, will play a crucial role.

Proposition 3.7. *Let X be a Banach lattice.*

(i). *For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and every pairwise disjoint sequences $u_k \in X_U$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^m u_k \right\|_{X_U} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_U} e_k \right\|_{X_U};$$

(ii). *For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and every pairwise disjoint sequences $u_k \in X_L$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$,*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m u_k \right\|_{X_L}.$$

Proof. First, we prove (i) assuming additionally that the elements u_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, have finite support. Then, denoting $u := \sum_{k=1}^m u_k$ and $n := |\text{supp } u|$, we get

$$u_k = \sum_{i \in \text{supp } u_k} \langle u_k, e_i \rangle e_i, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

Take $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ and put

$$z_k := \sum_{i \in \text{supp } u_k} \langle u_k, e_i \rangle x_i, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

Without any loss of generality, we may assume that $u_k \geq 0$ and $u_k \neq 0$ for all k . Hence, $z_k \neq 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$ and

$$(3.2) \quad \|z_k\|_X \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle u_k, e_i \rangle e_i \right\|_{X_U(n)} = \|u_k\|_{X_U}.$$

Moreover, since u_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, are pairwise disjoint sequences and x_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, are pairwise disjoint elements from X , we infer that $z_i \wedge z_j = 0$ if $i \neq j$. Thus, $\{z_k / \|z_k\|_X : 1 \leq k \leq m\} \in \mathfrak{B}_m(X)$. Consequently, from (3.2) it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle u, e_i \rangle x_i \right\|_X &= \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^n \langle u_k, e_i \rangle x_i \right\|_X = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{i \in \text{supp } u_k} \langle u_k, e_i \rangle x_i \right\|_X \\ &= \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m z_k \right\|_X = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|z_k\|_X \frac{z_k}{\|z_k\|_X} \right\|_X \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|z_k\|_X e_k \right\|_{X_U(m)} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_U} e_k \right\|_{X_U}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, as a sequence $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ is arbitrary, we conclude that

$$\|u\|_{X_U} = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle u, e_i \rangle e_i \right\|_{X_U(n)} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_U} e_k \right\|_{X_U},$$

and for finitely supported sequences assertion (i) is proved.

Let now $u_k \in X_U$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, be arbitrary pairwise disjoint non-negative elements. Denote by $u_k^{(n)}$ the truncations of u_k to the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$, that is,

$$(3.3) \quad u_k^{(n)} := \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n, j \in \text{supp } u_k} a_j e_j, \quad k = 1, \dots, m,$$

Since $u_k^{(n)}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, are pairwise disjoint sequences with finite support, by the first part of the proof, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^m u_k^{(n)} \right\|_{X_U} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k^{(n)}\|_{X_U} e_k \right\|_{X_U} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_U} e_k \right\|_{X_U}.$$

Therefore, taking into account that the sequence $\sum_{k=1}^m u_k^{(n)}$ tends coordinate-wise to $\sum_{k=1}^m u_k$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, by Lemma 3.6, we obtain

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^m u_k \right\|_{X_U} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m u_k^{(n)} \right\|_{X_U} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_U} e_k \right\|_{X_U},$$

which implies (i) in the general case.

Proceeding with the proof of (ii), we again consider first the case when the elements u_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, have finite support. Let u , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and z_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, be defined in the same way as in the beginning of the proof of (i). Assuming as above that $u_k \geq 0$ and $u_k \neq 0$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, we get $z_k \neq 0$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, and $n \geq m$. Consequently, $\{z_k / \|z_k\|_X\}_{k=1}^m \in \mathfrak{B}_m(X)$. Moreover, by the definition of the norm in X_L , we have

$$\|u_k\|_{X_L} \leq \Phi_n(u_k) \leq \|z_k\|_X, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

Hence, by Theorem 3.3, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L(m)} &\leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|z_k\|_X e_k \right\|_{X_L(m)} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|z_k\|_X \frac{z_k}{\|z_k\|_X} \right\|_X \\ &= \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m z_k \right\|_X = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{j \in \sigma_k} \langle u_k, e_j \rangle x_j \right\|_X = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \langle u, e_j \rangle x_j \right\|_X. \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the infimum over all $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$, we obtain

$$(3.4) \quad \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L(m)} \leq \Phi_n(u).$$

Next, let $u = \sum_{l \in F} v_l$ for some finite set F of positive integers. Clearly, we may assume that the supports of v_l are contained in that of u and hence in the set $\cup_{k=1}^m \text{supp } u_k$. Then, if

$$v_{l,k} := \sum_{i \in \text{supp } u_k} \langle v_l, e_i \rangle e_i, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

we have $v_l = \sum_{k=1}^m v_{l,k}$, $l \in F$, and $u_k = \sum_{l \in F} v_{l,k}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Furthermore, since u_k^l , $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, are pairwise disjoint and have finite support, applying (3.4) for v_l , we infer

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|v_{l,k}\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L(m)} \leq \Phi_n(v_l), \quad l \in F.$$

Hence, by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L(m)} &\leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{l \in F} \|v_{l,k}\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L(m)} \\ &\leq \sum_{l \in F} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|v_{l,k}\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L(m)} \\ &\leq \sum_{l \in F} \Phi_n(v_l). \end{aligned}$$

Since the above representation of u is arbitrary, from Theorem 3.3 it follows

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L} = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L(m)} \leq \|u\|_{X_L(n)} = \|u\|_{X_L}.$$

Thus, for sequences with finite support (ii) is proved.

To extend the assertion (ii) to the general case, assume that $u_k \in X_L$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, are pairwise disjoint and non-negative. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary and $u_k^{(n)}$

be the truncations defined by formula (3.3). Since $u_k^{(n)}$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, are finitely supported, as was already proved, it holds

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^m u_k \right\|_{X_L} \geq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m u_k^{(n)} \right\|_{X_L} \geq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k^{(n)}\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L}.$$

Observe that from Lemma 3.6 it follows $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k^{(n)}\|_{X_L} = \|u_k\|_{X_L}$ for each $k = 1, \dots, m$. In consequence, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k^{(n)}\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L} = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L}.$$

Combining this together with the preceding estimate, we infer that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^m u_k \right\|_{X_L} \geq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \|u_k\|_{X_L} e_k \right\|_{X_L},$$

and so the proof is completed. \square

By Theorem 3.3, both spaces X_U and X_L are Banach lattices and hence X_U - and X_L -constructions can be applied also to them. However, this process terminates already on the second step, because of the following result.

Proposition 3.8. (a) *For every Banach sequence lattice E we have $E \xrightarrow{1} E_L$. If additionally E is order semi-continuous, then $E_U \xrightarrow{1} E$.*

(b) *For every Banach lattice X we have $(X_L)_L = X_L$ and $(X_U)_U = X_U$ isometrically.*

Proof. (a) We show first that $E \xrightarrow{1} E_L$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. Since $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(E)$, for every $a = (a_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in E$, we can write

$$\|a\|_E \geq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i \right\|_E \geq \Phi_n((a_i)_{i=1}^n) \geq \|(a_i)_{i=1}^n\|_{E_L(n)}.$$

Consequently, $\|a\|_E \geq \|a\|_{E_L}$, i.e., $E \xrightarrow{1} E_L$.

Assume now that E is order semi-continuous. Then, for every $a = (a_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in E_U$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\|(a_i)_{i=1}^n\|_{E_U(n)} \geq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i \right\|_E,$$

whence

$$\|a\|_{E_U} \geq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i \right\|_E, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore, since E is order semi-continuous, we get $\|a\|_{E_U} \geq \|a\|_E$ for each $a \in E_U$. Thus, the proof of (a) is completed.

(b) If X is an arbitrary Banach lattice, then by Lemma 3.6, X_L is an order semi-continuous Banach sequence lattice. Hence, from the already proved part (a) it follows that $X_L \xrightarrow{1} (X_L)_L$. It remains to check that $(X_L)_L \xrightarrow{1} X_L$.

Suppose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b = (b_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}$ is arbitrary. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a sequence $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X_L)$ such that

$$\Phi_n(b) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i u_i \right\|_{X_L}.$$

Hence, by Proposition 3.7(ii), we obtain

$$\Phi_n(b) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \|u_i\|_{X_L} e_i \right\|_{X_L} = (1 - \varepsilon) \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i e_i \right\|_{X_L}.$$

Now, let $a = (a_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in (X_L)_L$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i = \sum_{k \in F} b^k$, where $F \subset \mathbb{N}$ is a finite set and $b^k = (b_i^k)_{i=1}^n$, $k \in F$. Then, from the preceding estimate and the triangle inequality it follows that

$$\sum_{k \in F} \Phi_n((b_i^k)_{i=1}^n) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{k \in F} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^k e_i \right\|_{X_L} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i \right\|_{X_L},$$

Hence, taking the infimum over all the above representations of $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$, implies

$$\|a\|_{(X_L)_L} \geq \|(a_i)_{i=1}^n\|_{(X_L)_L(n)} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \|(a_i)_{i=1}^n\|_{X_L(n)}.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary and X_L is order semi-continuous, one can easily get now that $\|a\|_{(X_L)_L} \geq \|a\|_{X_L}$, and so the proof of the equality $(X_L)_L = X_L$ is completed.

The proof of the fact that $(X_U)_U = X_U$ is very similar and simpler. Again, in view of Lemma 3.6 and the part (a) of this proposition, it suffices to show that $X_U \xrightarrow{1} (X_U)_U$. Indeed, if $a = (a_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in X_U$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then for each sequence $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X_U)$, by Proposition 3.7(i), we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i u_i \right\|_{X_U} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \|u_i\|_{X_U} e_i \right\|_{X_U} = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i \right\|_{X_U} \leq \|a\|_{X_U}.$$

Therefore,

$$\|(a_i)_{i=1}^n\|_{(X_U)_U(n)} \leq \|a\|_{X_U} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

whence $\|a\|_{(X_U)_U} \leq \|a\|_{X_U}$. Thus, the proof of the proposition is completed. \square

3.2. Optimal sequence spaces and upper/lower estimates of Banach lattices. As we will see in this section, properties of the spaces X_U and X_L are largely determined by the optimal upper and lower estimate information related to the given Banach lattice X . The connections, revealed in the next proposition, will play an important role in the proof of our main Theorem 2.8. Recall that $\delta(X)$ and $\sigma(X)$ are the Grobler-Dodds indices of a Banach lattice X (see Section 2.2).

Proposition 3.9. *Let X be a Banach lattice. Then,*

- (i) $X_U \xrightarrow{1} l_{\delta(X)}$ and $l_p \hookrightarrow X_U$ for every $p < \delta(X)$;
- (ii) $l_{\sigma(X)} \xrightarrow{1} X_L$ and $X_L \hookrightarrow l_q$ for every $q > \sigma(X)$;
- (iii) $X_U = l_p$ if and only if $p = \delta(X)$ and X admits an upper $\delta(X)$ -estimate;
- (iv) $X_L = l_q$ if and only if $q = \sigma(X)$ and X admits a lower $\sigma(X)$ -estimate.

Proof. (i) Let $p < \delta(X)$ and $a = (a_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in l_p$. Since X admits an upper p -estimate, then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ we have

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k x_k \right\|_X \leq C_p \left(\sum_{k=1}^n |a_k|^p \right)^{1/p},$$

where C_p depends only on p . Consequently, by the definition of X_U , we get

$$\|a\|_{X_U} = \sup_{n=1,2,\dots} \|(a_k)_{k=1}^n\|_{X_U(n)} \leq C_p \|a\|_{l_p}.$$

Next, suppose $a = (a_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in X_U$. By Schep's result (see [29]), $l_{\delta(X)}$ is finitely lattice representable in X , which implies that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a sequence $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ such that for any $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k \right\|_X \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \|(a_k)_{k=1}^n\|_{l_{\delta(X)}}.$$

Hence,

$$\|(a_k)_{k=1}^n\|_{l_{\delta(X)}} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k \right\|_X \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \|(a_k)_{k=1}^n\|_{X_U(n)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \|a\|_{X_U}.$$

Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ are arbitrary, we have $\|a\|_{l_{\delta(X)}} \leq \|a\|_{X_U}$, which completes the proof of (i).

(ii) Let $q > \sigma(X)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a = (a_k)_{k=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since X admits a lower q -estimate, then for every $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ we have

$$\|a\|_{l_q^n} = \left(\sum_{k=1}^n |a_k|^q \right)^{1/q} \leq C_q \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k x_k \right\|_X,$$

where C_q depends only on q . Passing to the infimum over all sequences $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$, we come to the inequality

$$\|a\|_{l_q^n} \leq C_q \Phi_n(a).$$

Next, if $a = \sum_{l \in F} b^l$, where $F \subset \mathbb{N}$ is finite and $b^l \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\|a\|_{l_q^n} \leq \sum_{l \in F} \|b^l\|_{l_q^n} \leq C_q \sum_{l \in F} \Phi_n(b^l).$$

Passing to the infimum over all above representations of a , we obtain

$$\|a\|_{l_q^n} \leq C_q \|a\|_{X_L(n)}.$$

Since this holds for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a = (a_k)_{k=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, by using Lemma 3.6, we conclude that $X_L \hookrightarrow l_q$.

Further, again appealing to [29], we have that $l_{\sigma(X)}$ is finitely lattice representable in X . Therefore, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a sequence

$\{y_k\}_{k=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ such that for any $a = (a_k)_{k=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ it holds

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k \right\|_X \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|a\|_{l_{\sigma(X)}}.$$

In consequence, by the definition of the $X_L(n)$ -norm,

$$\|a\|_{X_L(n)} \leq \Phi_n(a) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|a\|_{l_{\sigma(X)}},$$

and hence again for each $a \in l_{\sigma(X)}$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ it follows that

$$\|a\|_{X_L} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|a\|_{l_{\sigma(X)}}.$$

Application of Lemma 3.6 again completes the proof.

(iii) If X admits an upper $\delta(X)$ -estimate, the same argument as in the proof of (i) implies that $l_{\delta(X)} \hookrightarrow X_U$. Combining this with the first embedding in (i), we get that $X_U = l_{\delta(X)}$.

Conversely, let $X_U = l_p$ for some $p \geq 1$. Then, from (i) it follows immediately that p should be equal to $\delta(X)$. It remains to show that X admits an upper $\delta(X)$ -estimate.

Suppose that $x_k \in X$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, are arbitrary pair-wise disjoint elements. Then, by the definition of the $X_U(n)$ -norm and the fact that $X_U = l_{\delta(X)}$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n x_k \right\|_X \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \|x_k\|_X e_k \right\|_{X_U(n)} \leq C \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \|x_k\|_X^{\delta(X)} \right)^{1/\delta(X)},$$

where C does not depend on n and x_k . This means that X admits an upper $\delta(X)$ -estimate.

(iv) If X admits a lower $\sigma(X)$ -estimate, then from (ii) it follows immediately then $X_L = l_{\sigma(X)}$.

Conversely, if $X_L = l_q$, then, by (ii), $q = \sigma(X)$. Consequently, for every pair-wise disjoint $x_k \in X$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, by the definition of the $X_L(n)$ -norm, it follows

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \|x_k\|_X^{\sigma(X)} \right)^{1/\sigma(X)} \leq C \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \|x_k\|_X e_k \right\|_{X_L(n)} \leq C \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n x_k \right\|_X.$$

Therefore, X admits a lower $\sigma(X)$ -estimate, and the proof is complete. \square

In some cases, an application of the last proposition allows to find immediately the optimal sequence spaces.

Example 3.10. Let $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q < \infty$ and let $L_{p,q} = L_{p,q}(I)$ be the Lorentz space, where $I = [0, 1]$ or $(0, \infty)$ (see Section 2.4). It is well known that $\delta(L_{p,q}) = \min(p, q)$, $\sigma(L_{p,q}) = \max(p, q)$, and moreover, that $L_{p,q}$ admits an upper $\delta(L_{p,q})$ -estimate and a lower $\sigma(L_{p,q})$ -estimate (see e.g. [12, Theorem 3]). Consequently, by Proposition 3.9, $(L_{p,q})_U = l_{\min(p,q)}$ and $(L_{p,q})_L = l_{\max(p,q)}$.

Corollary 3.11. *Let X be a Banach lattice. Then, $\delta(X_U) = \delta(X)$ and $\sigma(X_L) = \sigma(X)$.*

Proof. First, we claim that X_U admits an upper p -estimate for every $p < \delta(X)$. Indeed, if $p < \delta(X)$ and $u_i \in X_U$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are disjoint, by Propositions 3.7 and 3.9(i), we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \right\|_{X_U} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{X_U} e_i \right\|_{X_U} \leq C_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|_{X_U}^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

Since $p < \delta(X)$ is arbitrary, this inequality implies that $\delta(X) \leq \delta(X_U)$. It remains to prove the opposite inequality.

Suppose that X_U admits an upper p -estimate with $p > \delta(X)$. Then, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k e_k \right\|_{X_U} \leq C \|(a_k)_{k=1}^n\|_{l_p}.$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 3.9(i),

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k e_k \right\|_{X_U} \geq \|(a_k)_{k=1}^n\|_{l_{\delta(X)}}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Since $p > \delta(X)$, combining these inequalities, we come to a contradiction. Thus, $\delta(X_U) = \delta(X)$, as required.

Similarly, by using Propositions 3.7 and 3.9(ii), one can easily check that the space X_L has a lower p -estimate for every $p > \sigma(X)$. Therefore, $\sigma(X_L) \leq \sigma(X)$, and the equality $\sigma(X_L) = \sigma(X)$ will be proved, once we check that X_L does not admit a lower p -estimate with any $p < \sigma(X)$. To the contrary, assume that for some $p < \sigma(X)$ there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$,

$$\|(a_k)_{k=1}^n\|_{l_p} \leq C \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k e_k \right\|_{X_L}.$$

On the other hand, from Proposition 3.9(ii) it follows that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k e_k \right\|_{X_L} \leq \|(a_k)_{k=1}^n\|_{l_{\sigma(X)}}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Since the latter estimates imply a contradiction, everything is done. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.8

We start with some auxiliary assertions.

Our first result shows that relative s -decomposability of Banach lattices X and Y implies that each sequence from the space l_s can be treated as a multiplier, bounded from X_L into Y_U .

Proposition 4.1. *Let X and Y be relatively s -decomposable Banach lattices. Then, we have*

$$X_L \cdot l_s \hookrightarrow Y_U,$$

i.e., the conditions $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in X_L$, $b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in l_s$ imply $ab := \{a_i b_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in Y_U$ and

$$\|ab\|_{Y_U} \leq D_s(X, Y) \|b\|_{l_s} \|a\|_{X_L}.$$

Proof. Let n be any positive integer and $D > D_s(X, Y)$. For arbitrary $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in X_L$, $b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in l_s$ we put $a^{(n)} := \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i$, $b^{(n)} := \sum_{i=1}^n b_i e_i$. Since X and Y are relatively s -decomposable, for any $\{x_i\} \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(Y)$ it holds

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i y_i \right\|_Y \leq D \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |b_i|^s \right)^{1/s} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X.$$

By taking the supremum over all sequences $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and the infimum over all sequences $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ we infer

$$\|a^{(n)} b^{(n)}\|_{Y_U(n)} \leq D \|b\|_{l_s} \Phi_n(a^{(n)})$$

Next, write $a^{(n)} = \sum_{k \in F} a^k$ for some finite set $F \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $a^k = \{a_i^k\}_{i=1}^n$, $k \in F$. Then $a^{(n)} b^{(n)} = \sum_{k \in F} b^{(n)} a^k$ and the preceding estimate implies

$$\|a^{(n)} b^{(n)}\|_{Y_U(n)} \leq \sum_{k \in F} \|b^{(n)} a^k\|_{Y_U(n)} \leq D \|b\|_{l_s} \left(\sum_{k \in F} \Phi_n(a^k) \right).$$

After taking the infimum over all such decompositions of $a^{(n)}$ we obtain

$$\|a^{(n)} b^{(n)}\|_{Y_U(n)} \leq D \|b\|_{l_s} \|a^{(n)}\|_{X_L(n)}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

which implies the claimed result (see also Lemma 3.6). \square

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose that X and Y are relatively s -decomposable Banach lattices for some $1 \leq s \leq \infty$, l_p is finitely lattice representable in Y_U , where $p \leq s$.*

Then, X satisfies a lower q -estimate for every q such that $1/p \geq 1/q + 1/s$, and $M_{[q]}(X) \leq D_s(X, Y)$.

Proof. Let n be any positive integer and $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. By the assumption, we can find pair-wise disjoint elements $u_i \in Y_U$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, satisfying

$$(4.1) \quad \|b\|_{l_p^n} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i u_i \right\|_{Y_U} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|b\|_{l_p^n}$$

for all sequences $b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of scalars.

Let $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ and $D > D_s(X, Y)$. Then for any sequence $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of scalars, by using (4.1), Proposition 3.7(i) and relative s -decomposability of X

and Y , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i b_i|^p \right)^{1/p} &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i u_i \right\|_{Y_U} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i \|u_i\|_{Y_U} e_i \right\|_{Y_U} \\
&= \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i \|u_i\|_{Y_U} y_i \right\|_Y : \{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(Y) \right\} \\
&\leq D \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |b_i|^s \right)^{1/s} \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|u_i\|_{Y_U} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, since from (4.1) it follows $\|u_i\|_{Y_U} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$, we get

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i b_i|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) D \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |b_i|^s \right)^{1/s} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X.$$

Hence, by the reverse Hölder inequality,

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^q \right)^{1/q} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) D \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X$$

whenever $1/q \leq 1/p - 1/s$. Thus, X satisfies a lower q -estimate and $M_{[q]}(X) \leq D_s(X, Y)$. \square

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that X and Y are relatively s -decomposable Banach lattices for some $1 \leq s \leq \infty$, l_q is finitely lattice representable in X_L and $1/q + 1/s \leq 1$.*

Then, Y satisfies an upper p -estimate for every p such that $1/p \geq 1/q + 1/s$, and $M^{[p]}(Y) \leq D_s(X, Y)$.

Proof. Let n be a positive integer and $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. By the assumption, we can select pair-wise disjoint elements $u_i \in X_L$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, such that

$$(4.2) \quad \|b\|_{l_q^n} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i u_i \right\|_{X_L} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|b\|_{l_q^n}$$

for all sequences $b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of scalars.

Suppose $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(Y)$ and $D > D_s(X, Y)$. For each $b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$ we write $b = \sum_{k \in F} b^k$, where $F \subset \mathbb{N}$ is a finite set and $b^k = \{b_i^k\}_{i=1}^n$ are arbitrary. Then, for every sequences $\{x_i^k\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$, $k \in F$, and any sequence $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of scalars, by the triangle inequality and relative s -decomposability of X and Y , we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i y_i \right\|_Y \leq \sum_{k \in F} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i^k y_i \right\|_Y \leq D \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^s \right)^{1/s} \sum_{k \in F} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^k x_i^k \right\|_X.$$

Therefore, taking the infimum over all sequences $\{x_i^k\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ for each $k \in F$ implies that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i y_i \right\|_Y \leq D \|a\|_{l_s^n} \sum_{k \in F} \Phi_n(b^k),$$

and hence

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i y_i \right\|_Y \leq D \|a\|_{l_s^n} \|b\|_{X_L}.$$

Thus, applying Proposition 3.7(ii) and inequalities (4.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i y_i \right\|_Y &\leq D \|a\|_{l_s^n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i e_i \right\|_{X_L} \leq D \|a\|_{l_s^n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \frac{u_i}{\|u_i\|_{X_L}} \right\|_{X_L} \\ &\leq D \|a\|_{l_s^n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i u_i \right\|_{X_L} \leq D(1 + \varepsilon) \|a\|_{l_s^n} \|b\|_{l_q^n}. \end{aligned}$$

By the reverse Hölder inequality, this implies that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n c_i y_i \right\|_Y \leq D(1 + \varepsilon) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |c_i|^p \right)^{1/p},$$

whenever $\frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{s}$. As a result, Y satisfies an upper p -estimate and $M^{[p]}(Y) \leq D_s(X, Y)$. \square

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose Banach lattices X and Y satisfy the following conditions:*

- (a) X, Y are relatively s -decomposable for some $1 \leq s \leq \infty$;
- (b) l_p is finitely lattice representable in Y_U ;
- (c) l_q is finitely lattice representable in X_L .

Then, it holds

$$\frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{s}$$

Proof. Let n be a positive integer and $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. By assumption (b), there exist pair-wise disjoint elements $y_i \in Y_U$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, such that for all scalar sequences $b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$

$$\|b\|_{l_p^n} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i y_i \right\|_{Y_U(n)} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|b\|_{l_p^n}.$$

In the same manner, using (c), we can select pair-wise disjoint $x_i \in X_L$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, such that for all scalar sequences $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$

$$\|a\|_{l_q^n} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_{X_L(n)} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|a\|_{l_q^n}.$$

Applying these inequalities and Propositions 3.7(i), 4.1 and 3.7(ii), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|ab\|_{l_p^n} &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i y_i \right\|_{Y_U(n)} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i \|y_i\|_{Y_U} e_i \right\|_{Y_U(n)} \\
&\leq (1 + \varepsilon) D_s(X, Y) \|b\|_{l_s^n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i \right\|_{X_L(n)} \\
&\leq (1 + \varepsilon) D_s(X, Y) \|b\|_{l_s^n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_{X_L(n)} \\
&\leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2 D_s(X, Y) \|b\|_{l_s^n} \|a\|_{l_q^n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are arbitrary, the claim follows (see also Example 2.2). \square

Recall that

$$s_{\max} = s_{\max}(X, Y) := \sup\{s \in [1, \infty) : X, Y \text{ are } s\text{-decomposable}\}.$$

Proposition 4.5. *Let X and Y be Banach lattices such that $\delta(Y) \leq \sigma(X)$. Then, we have*

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{1}{\delta(Y)} = \frac{1}{\sigma(X)} + \frac{1}{s_{\max}}.$$

Proof. Assume first that $s_{\max} > 1$. Then, if $1 \leq s < s_{\max}$, X and Y are relatively s -decomposable. Moreover, by Schep's result [29], $l_{s(Y_U)}$ and $l_{\sigma(X_L)}$ are finitely representable in Y_U and X_L , respectively. Hence, all the conditions of Proposition 4.4 are fulfilled and we conclude

$$\frac{1}{\delta(Y_U)} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma(X_L)} + \frac{1}{s}.$$

On the other hand, by Corollary 3.11, $s(Y_U) = s(Y)$ and $\sigma(X_L) = \sigma(X)$. Consequently, we have

$$\frac{1}{\delta(Y)} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma(X)} + \frac{1}{s}.$$

Since this holds for all $s < s_{\max}$, it follows

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{1}{\delta(Y)} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma(X)} + \frac{1}{s_{\max}}.$$

Observe that the same arguments work also in the case when $s_{\max} = 1$, because every Banach couples X and Y are relatively 1-decomposable. Therefore, we again get inequality (4.4).

For the opposite inequality, assume first that $s_{\max} = \infty$. Then, (4.4) implies that $\sigma(X) \leq \delta(Y)$. Combining this inequality with the assumption, we conclude that $\sigma(X) = \delta(Y)$, and hence (4.4) becomes (4.3).

Let now $s_{\max} < \infty$. Assume that (4.3) fails, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{\delta(Y)} < \frac{1}{\sigma(X)} + \frac{1}{s_{\max}}.$$

If $\delta(Y) > 1$ and $\sigma(X) < \infty$, we can find $1 \leq p < \delta(Y)$, $q > \sigma(X)$ and $s > s_{\max}$ such that $1/p = 1/q + 1/s$. Since X satisfies a lower q -estimate and Y an upper p -estimate, from Proposition 2.4 it follows that X and Y are relatively s -decomposable, which is impossible, since $s > s_{\max}$. Thus, in this case (4.3) is proved.

If $\delta(Y) = 1$ or $\sigma(X) = \infty$, the proof follows by the same lines in view of the fact that each Banach lattice admits an upper 1-estimate and a lower ∞ -estimate. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.8. We start with the case when $\delta(Y) \leq \sigma(X)$.

(i) \implies (ii). Assume first that $s_{\max} > 1$, $\delta(Y) > 1$ and $\sigma(X) < \infty$.

Let $1 \leq s < s_{\max}$. Then, by Proposition 4.5, we have

$$\frac{1}{\delta(Y)} < \frac{1}{\sigma(X)} + \frac{1}{s}.$$

Consequently, for some $1 \leq p_1 < \delta(Y)$ and $q_1 > \sigma(X)$ we obtain

$$\frac{1}{p_1} = \frac{1}{\sigma(X)} + \frac{1}{s} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\delta(Y)} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{s}.$$

Since $\delta(Y_U) = \delta(Y)$ and $\sigma(X_L) = \sigma(X)$ (see Corollary 3.11), by [29], $l_{\delta(Y)}$ (resp. $l_{\sigma(X)}$) is finitely lattice representable in Y_U (resp. in X_L). Therefore, according to Propositions 4.2 and 4.3, X satisfies a lower q_1 -estimate, Y satisfies an upper p_1 -estimate and $M_{[q_1]}(X) \leq D_s(X, Y)$, $M^{[p_1]}(Y) \leq D_s(X, Y)$. Next, if $1/p = 1/q + 1/s$, where $p < \delta(Y)$ and $q > \sigma(X)$, we have $p < p_1$ and $q > q_1$. Hence, X satisfies a lower q -estimate, Y satisfies an upper p -estimate and

$$M_{[q]}(X) M^{[p]}(Y) \leq M_{[q_1]}(X) M^{[p_1]}(Y) \leq D_s(X, Y)^2.$$

Suppose now that X and Y are relatively s_{\max} -decomposable. Since $l_{\delta(Y)}$ is finitely lattice representable in Y_U , by Propositions 4.2 and 4.5, X satisfies a lower $\sigma(X)$ -estimate and $M_{[\sigma(X)]}(X) \leq D_s(X, Y)$. In the same manner, applying this time Proposition 4.3, we infer that Y satisfies an upper $\delta(Y)$ -estimate and $M^{[\delta(Y)]}(Y) \leq D_s(X, Y)$. Combining this together with equality (4.3), we come to the desired result.

If $s_{\max} = 1$, or $\delta(Y) = 1$, or $\sigma(X) = \infty$, we can use the same arguments, taking into account that every Banach lattices X and Y are relatively 1-decomposable and each Banach couple satisfies an upper 1-estimate and a lower ∞ -estimate.

(ii) \implies (i). This implication together with the inequality

$$D_s(X, Y) \leq M_{[q]}(X) M^{[p]}(Y)$$

is an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.4.

To complete the proof of the equivalence of (i), (ii) and (iii) it remains now to refer to Proposition 2.3.

Finally, let us prove the equivalence of the conditions $\sigma(X) \leq \delta(Y)$ and $s_{\max} = \infty$.

If $\sigma(X) < \delta(Y)$, then X satisfies a lower p -estimate and Y an upper p -estimate for $p \in (\sigma(X), \delta(Y))$. Therefore, by Proposition 2.4, X, Y are relatively decomposable. Hence, $s_{max} = \infty$. If $\sigma(X) = \delta(Y)$, the same result follows from Proposition 4.5.

On the contrary, assume that $s_{max} = \infty$. Then, X and Y are relatively s -decomposable for each $s < \infty$. Therefore, since $\delta(Y_U) = \delta(Y)$ and $\sigma(X_L) = \sigma(X)$, by Proposition 4.4, we infer

$$\frac{1}{\delta(Y)} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma(X)} + \frac{1}{s}.$$

Tending $s \rightarrow \infty$, we get the required inequality, and so the proof is completed. \square

Recall that the main result of the paper [11] (see Theorem 1.3) reads that Banach function lattices X, Y are relatively decomposable (or ∞ -decomposable) if and only if there exists $p \geq 1$ such that X satisfies a lower p -estimate and Y an upper p -estimate. As an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.8 and its proof we obtain the following extension of this result to general Banach lattices.

Corollary 4.6. *Banach lattices X, Y are relatively decomposable if and only if there exists $p \geq 1$ such that X satisfies a lower p -estimate and Y an upper p -estimate.*

Remark 4.7. In contrast to [11], our definition of relative decomposability (see Definition 2.1) deals only with finite sums. Thanks to that, we need not to impose on lattices X and Y any extra condition. In particular, if X and Y are Banach lattices of measurable functions on a σ -finite measure space we omit the assumption from [11, Theorem 1.3] that Y has the Fatou property.

From Proposition 3.9 and the proof of Theorem 2.8 we also deduce the following result.

Corollary 4.8. *If Banach lattices X, Y are relatively s_{max} -decomposable, then X admits a lower $\sigma(X)$ -estimate and Y admits an upper $\delta(Y)$ -estimate (equivalently, $X_L = l_{\sigma(X)}$ and $Y_U = l_{\delta(Y)}$).*

5. APPLICATIONS TO INTERPOLATION THEORY: CALDERÓN-MITYAGIN COUPLES OF TYPE s .

In this section, we freely use notation and results from interpolation theory as in [4], [3], [5].

Let (X, Σ, μ) be a σ -finite measure space. A Σ -measurable function ω is called a *weight* if ω is non-negative μ -a.e. on X . Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and let $L_p(\omega, \mu)$ be the Banach space of all (equivalence classes of) Σ -measurable functions f with $f\omega \in L_p(\mu)$. Given $1 \leq p_0, p_1 \leq \infty$ put $\vec{p} = (p_0, p_1)$. A Banach couple $\vec{U} = (U_0, U_1)$ of Banach lattices is called a $L_{\vec{p}}$ -couple if $U_i = L_{p_i}(\omega_i, \mu)$, $i = 0, 1$, for some measure space (X, Σ, μ) and some weights ω_0, ω_1 with respect to this measure space.

Let $1 \leq s_0, s_1 \leq \infty$ and \vec{X}, \vec{Y} be two Banach couples of Banach lattices such that X_i, Y_i are relatively s_i -decomposable for $i = 0, 1$. Then, by Theorem 2.8, there exist $1 \leq p_0, p_1, q_0, q_1 \leq \infty$ with $1/p_i = 1/q_i + 1/s_i$, $i = 0, 1$, such that for every $L_{\vec{q}}$ -couple $\vec{U} = (U_0, U_1)$ and $L_{\vec{p}}$ -couple $\vec{V} = (V_0, V_1)$ both X_i, U_i and V_i, Y_i are relative decomposable for $i = 0, 1$.

Combining the last observation with the results of [11], we see that each of the pairs of the couples \vec{X}, \vec{U} and \vec{V}, \vec{Y} have the relative Calderón-Mityagin property ($\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property). Hence, the s -decomposability relation of couples of Banach lattices has some transitivity property, which is manifested in factorization of this relation through the canonical s -decomposability of suitable $L_{\vec{q}}$ - and $L_{\vec{p}}$ -couples. More precisely, we get the following result.

Theorem 5.1. *Let \vec{X}, \vec{Y} be two couples of Banach lattices over a σ -finite measure space. If the spaces X_i, Y_i are relative s_i -decomposable for $i = 0, 1$, where $1 \leq s_i \leq \infty$, then there exist pairs \vec{p}, \vec{q} of parameters such that, for every $L_{\vec{q}}$ -couple $\vec{U} = (U_0, U_1)$ and every $L_{\vec{p}}$ -couple $\vec{V} = (V_0, V_1)$, pairs of the couples \vec{X}, \vec{U} and \vec{V}, \vec{Y} have the relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property and the spaces U_i, V_i are relatively s_i -decomposable, $i = 0, 1$.*

There are many pairs of Banach couples \vec{X} and \vec{Y} , which fail to have relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property. In [9], Cwikel introduced the following weaker condition that may be satisfied by such a pair of Banach couples.

Let $\vec{X} = (X_0, X_1)$ and $\vec{Y} = (Y_0, Y_1)$ be two Banach couples. Given $1 \leq s \leq \infty$, define the relation R_s for $(x, y) \in (X_0 + X_1) \times (Y_0 + Y_1)$ by

$$xR_s y \iff \exists w \in L_s((0, \infty), dt/t) \text{ with } K(t, y; \vec{Y}) \leq w(t) \cdot K(t, x; \vec{X}), \quad t > 0.$$

We say that the Banach couples \vec{X}, \vec{Y} are of *relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ type s* whenever the relation $xR_s y$ implies that $y = Tx$ for some linear operator $T : \vec{X} \rightarrow \vec{Y}$ (i.e., $T : X_0 + X_1 \rightarrow Y_0 + Y_1$, and T is bounded from X_i into Y_i , $i = 0, 1$).

Since each K -functional is a concave nondecreasing function in t , we can assume that the function w in this definition is continuous or constant on each dyadic interval. From this observation it follows easily that if \vec{X}, \vec{Y} are of relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ type s_1 and $1 \leq s_2 \leq s_1$, then these couples are also of relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ type s_2 . Furthermore, it is known [7, Theorem 1] that arbitrary couples \vec{X}, \vec{Y} are of relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ type 1. Hence, the set of real numbers s in $[1, \infty]$ such that \vec{X}, \vec{Y} are of relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ type s is an interval which includes 1. In [7] and [9] one can find examples of Banach couples, for which this interval is $[1, q]$, $1 \leq q < \infty$, or $[1, \infty)$ (of course, it is $[1, \infty]$ iff \vec{X}, \vec{Y} have the relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property).

Further, in [9], Cwikel proved that, if the couples \vec{X}, \vec{Y} are mutually closed and X_i, Y_i , $i = 0, 1$, are relatively s -decomposable for some $1 \leq s \leq \infty$, then

these couples are of relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ type s (see also [4, p. 606]). Let us show that, under some conditions, this implies the orbital factorization of relative K -functional estimates for such couples through suitable $L_{\vec{p}}$ - and $L_{\vec{q}}$ -couples.

Given Banach couples \vec{X}, \vec{Y} the couple \vec{Y} is called \vec{X} -abundant, if for each element $x \in X_0 + X_1$ there exists $y \in Y_0 + Y_1$ such that

$$K(t, x; \vec{X}) \asymp K(t, y; \vec{Y})$$

with constants independent of $x \in X_0 + X_1$ and $t > 0$ (see e.g. [4, Definition 4.4.8]). For instance, if a couple \vec{X} is regular (i.e., $X_0 \cap X_1$ is dense in X_0 and X_1), then the $L_{\vec{p}}$ -couples $(l_{p_0}(\mathbb{Z}, (1)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}), l_{p_1}(\mathbb{Z}, (2^{-n})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}))$ and $(L_{p_0}(\mathbb{R}_+, dt/t), L_{p_1}(\mathbb{R}_+, dt/t))$ are \vec{X} -abundant for each pair $\vec{p} = (p_0, p_1)$ [4, Theorem 4.5.7]. With this notation, we have the following version of Theorem 5.1.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $\vec{X} = (X_0, X_1)$ and $\vec{Y} = (Y_0, Y_1)$ be two Banach lattice couples over a σ -finite measure space such that $X_i, Y_i, i = 0, 1$, are relatively s -decomposable for some $1 \leq s \leq \infty$. Then, there are pairs $\vec{p} = (p_0, p_1)$ and $\vec{q} = (q_0, q_1)$ of parameters such that for every $L_{\vec{q}}$ -couple \vec{U} , which is \vec{X} -abundant, and every $L_{\vec{p}}$ -couple \vec{V} , which is \vec{Y} -abundant, we have the following: If $x \in X_0 + X_1, y \in Y_0 + Y_1$ satisfy the relation $xR_s y$, then there exist linear operators $T_0 : \vec{X} \rightarrow \vec{U}, T_1 : \vec{U} \rightarrow \vec{V}, T_2 : \vec{V} \rightarrow \vec{Y}$ such that $y = T_2 T_1 T_0 x$.*

Proof. Applying first Theorem 5.1, we find parameters $1 \leq p_i, q_i \leq \infty, 1/p_i = 1/q_i + 1/s, i = 0, 1$, such that, if $\vec{p} = (p_0, p_1), \vec{q} = (q_0, q_1)$, then for every $L_{\vec{q}}$ -couple $\vec{U} = (U_0, U_1)$ and every $L_{\vec{p}}$ -couple $\vec{V} = (V_0, V_1)$, pairs of the couples \vec{X}, \vec{U} and \vec{V}, \vec{Y} have relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property and the spaces $U_i, V_i, i = 0, 1$, are relatively s -decomposable. Next, assuming that $x \in X_0 + X_1, y \in Y_0 + Y_1$ satisfy $xR_s y$, by using the abundance assumption, we can select $u \in U_0 + U_1$ and $v \in V_0 + V_1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} K(t, x; \vec{X}) &\asymp K(t, u; \vec{U}) \\ K(t, y; \vec{Y}) &\asymp K(t, v; \vec{V}) \end{aligned}$$

with constants independent of $x \in X_0 + X_1, y \in Y_0 + Y_1$ and $t > 0$. Since the couples \vec{X}, \vec{U} and \vec{V}, \vec{Y} have relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property, we can find linear operators $T_0 : \vec{X} \rightarrow \vec{U}$ and $T_2 : \vec{V} \rightarrow \vec{Y}$ satisfying $u = T_0 x$ and $y = T_2 v$. Moreover, as was above-mentioned (see [9]), the couples \vec{U} and \vec{V} are of relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ type s . Hence, from the relation $xR_s y$ it follows the existence of a linear operator $T_1 : \vec{U} \rightarrow \vec{V}$ such that $v = T_1 u$. \square

Assume now that $\vec{X} = (X_0, X_1)$ and $\vec{Y} = (Y_0, Y_1)$ are two Banach lattice couples such that X_i, Y_i are relatively ∞ -decomposable for $i = 0, 1$. Then, the results of [11] imply that the couples \vec{X} and \vec{Y} have relative $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{M}$ property. Arguing in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 5.2, one can easily deduce the following factorization result.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\vec{X} = (X_0, X_1)$ and $\vec{Y} = (Y_0, Y_1)$ be two Banach lattice couples over a σ -finite measure space such that X_0, Y_0 and X_1, Y_1 are relatively decomposable. Then, there is a pair $\vec{p} = (p_0, p_1)$ of parameters such that for every $L_{\vec{p}}$ couples \vec{U} and \vec{V} such that \vec{U} is \vec{X} -abundant and \vec{V} is \vec{Y} -abundant we have the following: If $x \in X_0 + X_1, y \in Y_0 + Y_1$ satisfy*

$$(5.1) \quad K(t, y; \vec{Y}) \leq K(t, x; \vec{X}), \quad t > 0,$$

then there exist linear operators $T_0 : \vec{X} \rightarrow \vec{U}$, $T_1 : \vec{U} \rightarrow \vec{V}$, $T_2 : \vec{V} \rightarrow \vec{Y}$ with $y = T_2 T_1 T_0 x$.

6. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 3.3.

This proof will be broken down into a number of lemmas and propositions. The main step is Proposition 6.1 showing under which conditions a scale of norms on \mathbb{R}^n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, generates a rearrangement invariant Banach sequence lattice. The rest of this section is to secure that these conditions are valid for both X_L - and X_U -constructions.

Recall that a functional Ψ (in particular, a norm $\|\cdot\|$) defined on \mathbb{R}^n is called *lattice monotone* or *lattice norm* if for any elements $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n, b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|a_i| \leq |b_i|, 1 \leq i \leq n$, it holds $\Psi(a) \leq \Psi(b)$. This functional is said to be *symmetric* if for any permutation σ of the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ we have $\Psi(\sigma a) = \Psi(a)$ where $\sigma a = \{a_{\sigma(i)}\}_{i=1}^n$. We introduce also the operators

$$\begin{aligned} I_n &: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n \mapsto \{a_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1} \\ Tr_n &: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n \mapsto \begin{cases} a_i : i \neq n \\ 0 : i = n \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

As above, for any sequence $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of real numbers and each integer k , by $a^{(k)}$ we will denote the truncated sequence $a^{(k)}$ defined by $a^{(k)} = \{a_i^{(k)}\}_{i=1}^\infty$, with $a_i^{(k)} = a_i$ if $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $a_i^{(k)} = 0$ if $i > k$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\|\cdot\|_n$ be symmetric lattice norms on $\mathbb{R}^n, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that the restrictions I_n are contractive with respect to these norms. Denote by Y the space of all sequences $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, for which the norm*

$$\|a\|_Y := \sup_{n \geq 1} \|\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n\|_n$$

is finite. If the space Y is embedded into c_0 , then Y is a r.i. Banach sequence lattice.

Proof. First, one can easily check that the conditions $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in Y$ and $|a_i| \leq |b_i|, i = 1, 2, \dots$, imply that $b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in Y$ and $\|b\|_Y \leq \|a\|_Y$. Consequently, $a \mapsto \|a\|_Y$ is a lattice norm on Y .

To prove the rearrangement invariance of Y , assume that $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in Y$ and a sequence $b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is equi-measurable with a . This means that the sets $\{i : |a_i| > t\}$ and $\{i : |b_i| > t\}$ have the same cardinality for every $t > 0$. Since Y

is embedded into c_0 these sets are finite and hence the sets $A_t := \{i : |a_i| = t\}$ and $B_t := \{i : |b_i| = t\}$ also have the same cardinality for each $t > 0$. Put $t_k := |b_k|$, $B_k := B_{t_k}$, $A_k := A_{t_k}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. Take $u_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\cup_{k=1}^n A_k \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, u_n\}$. Then, we have $\{|b_k|\}_{k=1}^n \subseteq \{|a_k|\}_{k=1}^{u_n}$. Indeed, if $1 \leq k \leq n$, then by construction $|b_k| = t_k \in B_k$ and hence there exists $j \in A_k$ with $|a_j| = |b_k|$. Since $A_k \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, u_n\}$, the conclusion follows.

Next, there is a permutation σ of the set $\{1, 2, \dots, u_n\}$ with $(\sigma|a|)_k = |b_k|$, $1 \leq k \leq n$. By the assumptions of the lemma, this implies the estimate

$$\|\{b_k\}_{k=1}^n\|_n = \|\{|b_k|\}_{k=1}^n\|_n = \|\{\sigma|a|\}_{k=1}^n\|_n \leq \|\{\sigma|a|\}_{k=1}^{u_n}\|_{u_n}.$$

Hence,

$$\|\{b_k\}_{k=1}^n\|_n \leq \|a\|_Y, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and so $b \in Y$ and $\|b\|_Y \leq \|a\|_Y$. Similarly, $\|a\|_Y \leq \|b\|_Y$, and thus $\|a\|_Y = \|b\|_Y$.

By construction, Y is a normed linear space of sequences. To prove completeness of Y , take $\{a^n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq Y$, $a^n = \{a_i^n\}_{i=1}^\infty$, with $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \|a^n\|_Y = C < \infty$. Since Y is embedded in c_0 , there exists $a \in c_0$ with $a = \sum_{n=1}^\infty a^n$. Also, for each integer k we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty \|\{a_i^n\}_{i=1}^k\|_k \leq C.$$

Hence, by completeness of the space \mathbb{R}^k with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_k$ and uniqueness of a representation of vectors by using the canonical unit basis, we get $a^{(k)} = \sum_{n=1}^\infty (a^n)^{(k)}$ and $\|a^{(k)}\|_k \leq C$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, $a \in Y$ and $\|a\|_Y \leq C$. The proposition is proved. \square

Next, we proceed with the postponed proof of Lemma 3.2 on the nonemptiness of the sets $\mathfrak{B}_n(X)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We will use the notation X_+ for the positive cone $\{x \in X : x \geq 0\}$ of a Banach lattice X .

Proof of Lemma 3.2. If l_∞ is finite lattice representable in X , then the desired result follows immediately from Definition 2.5. Therefore, we can assume that l_∞ fails to be finite lattice representable in X , and hence, by Proposition 2.7, X is both σ -complete and σ -order continuous. This implies that for each $x \in X_+$ we can define the contractive projection $P_x : X \rightarrow X$ by $P_x(y) = \vee_{n \geq 1} (nx \wedge y)$, $y \in X_+$, and then extend it by linearity to the whole of X (see e.g. [20]).

Suppose that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$, where $m \in \mathbb{N}$, is a maximal sequence of normalized positive pair-wise disjoint elements in a Banach lattice X . We claim that X has dimension not bigger than m . We will divide the proof of this fact into several parts.

(i) Each element $x \in \{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is an atom.

Assume that $x = y + z$ for some y, z with $|y| \wedge |z| = 0$. Since $x > 0$, we have $x = |y| + |z|$, and thus $0 \leq |y|, |z| \leq x$. Hence, by maximality, $|y| = x$ or $|z| = x$, i.e., x is an atom.

(ii) For every $x \in \{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ the projection P_x has one dimensional range.

Recall that (see [20, p. 10])

$$(6.1) \quad \text{Im}P_x = \{z \in X : x \wedge y = 0 \text{ for some } y \in X_+ \implies |z| \wedge y = 0\}.$$

Putting $z = P_x(y)$, where $y \in Y_+$, we have $z \geq 0$. Without loss of generality, assume that $z > 0$. From (6.1) it follows that $z \wedge x_i = 0$ whenever $x_i \neq x$. If $z \wedge x = 0$ we get a contradiction, because the set $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ was selected to be maximal. Hence, $0 < z \wedge x \leq x$ and, since x is an atom, we conclude that $z \wedge x = \lambda x$ for some $\lambda > 0$. Observe that the set $(\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{z/\|z\|_X\}$ is also a maximal set of normalized positive pair-wise disjoint elements in X . Consequently, from (i) it follows that z is an atom. Since $\lambda x = x \wedge z \leq z$, this implies that $\lambda x = \mu z$ for some scalar $\mu > 0$. Hence, P_x has one dimensional range, generated by the vector x .

(iii) X is the linear span of the sequence $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$.

Put $x = \bigvee_{i=1}^m x_i$ and take $y \in X_+$. Then, if $z := P_x(y)$, we have $x \wedge (y - z) = 0$. From the inequalities $0 \leq x_i \leq x$ and $0 \leq z \leq y$ it follows that $x_i \wedge (y - z) = 0$ and hence, by maximality, we have $y = z = P_x(y)$. Since $x \wedge y = \bigvee_{i=1}^m (x_i \wedge y)$, we have for each integer n

$$nx \wedge y = \bigvee_{i=1}^m (nx_i \wedge y) = \sum_{i=1}^m nx_i \wedge y \leq \sum_{i=1}^m P_{x_i}(y),$$

which implies that

$$y = P_x(y) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m P_{x_i}(y).$$

By the decomposition property, we may write $y = \sum_{i=1}^m y_i$, where $0 \leq y_i \leq P_{x_i}(y)$, and hence $y_i \in \text{Im}P_{x_i}$. Therefore, by (ii), $y_i = \lambda_i x_i$ for some scalars λ_i and thus $y = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i x_i$. As a result, the claim is proven and so the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 6.2. *Let X be an infinite dimensional Banach lattice such that l_∞ is not finitely lattice representable in X . Then, for every sequence $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a sequence $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1} \in \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}(X)$ such that either*

$$(i) : u_i = x_i, i = 1, \dots, n,$$

or

(ii) : *there exists k with $1 \leq k \leq n$ and a bijection $\psi : \{1, \dots, n-1\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k\}$ such that $u_i = x_{\psi(i)}, 1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $\alpha u_n + \beta u_{n+1} = x_k$ for some positive scalars α and β . Moreover, we have*

$$\|u_n - x_k\|_X \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Given $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ we put $x = \bigvee_{i=1}^n x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$. Take $y \in X_+$ and set $z = P_x(y)$. Then $x \wedge (y - z) = 0$. If there exists y such that $y \neq P_x(y)$, we define $u_{n+1} := \lambda(y - P_x(y))$, where λ is selected so that $\|u_{n+1}\| = 1$. Then, setting $u_i = x_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, we see that the case (i) holds.

Therefore, we may assume that $P_x(y) = y$ for each $y \in X_+$. Hence, as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, it follows that X is the direct sum of the bands $P_{x_i}(X), i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and hence at least one of them, say, $P_{x_k}(X)$, is infinite dimensional.

Since x_k can not be an atom, we may write $x_k = u + v$, where $u, v \in X_+$ and $u \wedge v = 0$. Further, at least one of the subspaces $P_u(X)$ or $P_v(X)$ is again infinite dimensional. Arguing in the same way, we conclude that, for any positive integer m , x_k is a sum of m pair-wise disjoint elements w_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Without loss of generality, assume that $\|w_1\|_X \geq \|w_2\|_X \geq \dots \geq \|w_m\|_X$. By the assumption (see also Proposition 2.6), X satisfies a lower p -estimate for some $p < \infty$. Consequently, we can estimate

$$m^{1/p} \|w_m\|_X \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \|w_i\|_X^p \right)^{1/p} \leq M_{[p]}(x) \|x_k\|_X = M_{[p]}(X),$$

whence $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|w_m\|_X = 0$.

Put

$$u_n = (x_k - w_m^{(m)}) / \|x_k - w_m^{(m)}\|_X, \quad u_{n+1} = w_m^{(m)} / \|w_m^{(m)}\|_X.$$

Since $u_n \wedge u_{n+1} = 0$, we have $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1} \in \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}(X)$. Moreover, by construction, $x_k = \alpha u_n + \beta u_{n+1}$, with $\alpha = \|x_k - w_m^{(m)}\|_X$, $\beta = \|w_m^{(m)}\|_X$. Finally, since

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_k - u_n\|_X &= \left\| \frac{(\alpha - 1)x_k + w_m^{(m)}}{\alpha} \right\|_X \\ &\leq \frac{|\|x_k - w_m^{(m)}\|_X - \|x_k\|_X|}{\alpha} \|x_k\|_X + \frac{\|w_m^{(m)}\|_X}{\alpha} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\alpha} \|w_m^{(m)}\|_X, \end{aligned}$$

we may select m so that $\|x_k - u_n\|_X < \varepsilon$. Thus, all the conditions in (ii) are fulfilled. \square

Remark 6.3. In the above proof we required that l_∞ fails to be finitely lattice representable in X . But, in fact, we need only a weaker property that if $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is an infinite sequence of pair-wise disjoint elements with decreasing norms in X , then $\|x_n\|_X \downarrow 0$. According the terminology from the book [1], such a Banach lattice X is said to have the Lebesgue property (see [1, Theorem 3.22]).

Lemma 6.4. *Each of the functionals $\|\cdot\|_{X_U(n)}$, $\Phi_n(\cdot)$ and $\|\cdot\|_{X_L(n)}$ defined on \mathbb{R}^n is lattice monotone and symmetric.*

Proof. Let $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be two sequences of scalars with $|b_i| \leq |a_i|$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then, for every sequence $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ we have

$$(6.2) \quad \left| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i \right| = \sum_{i=1}^n |b_i| |x_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i| |x_i| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right|.$$

Also, let σ be a permutation of the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and the sequence c be defined by $c = \sigma a := \{a_{\sigma(i)}\}_{i=1}^n$. Further, we prove the desired claims for each functional separately.

(i) : $\|\cdot\|_{X_U(n)}$. From (6.2) it follows that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i \right\|_X \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X,$$

which implies $\|b\|_{X_U(n)} \leq \|a\|_{X_U(n)}$. Consequently, $\|\cdot\|_{X_U(n)}$ is a lattice norm.

Next, since for every $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ and any permutation π of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ we have $\{x_{\pi(i)}\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$, denoting by σ^{-1} the inverse permutation, we obtain

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n c_i x_i \right\|_X = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_{\sigma(i)} x_i \right\|_X = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_{\sigma^{-1}(i)} \right\|_X \leq \|a\|_{X_U(n)}.$$

Hence, $\|c\|_{X_U(n)} \leq \|a\|_{X_U(n)}$, and by symmetry we obtain that the norm $\|\cdot\|_{X_U(n)}$ is symmetric.

(ii) : $\Phi_n(\cdot)$. In the same way, as above, we have

$$\Phi_n(b) \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i \right\|_X \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X.$$

Thus, $\Phi_n(b) \leq \Phi_n(a)$, and so $\Phi_n(\cdot)$ is a lattice functional. Also, arguing precisely as in the case (i), we obtain $\Phi_n(c) \leq \Phi_n(a)$, and hence this functional is symmetric.

(iii) : $\|\cdot\|_{X_L(n)}$. Let $a = \sum_{k \in F} a^k$, where $F \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is finite and $a^k = (a_i^k)_{i=1}^n$, $k \in F$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have

$$|b_i| \leq |a_i| \leq \sum_{k \in F} |a_i^k|.$$

One can readily select b_i^k such that $b_i = \sum_{k \in F} b_i^k$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $|b_i^k| \leq |a_i^k|$ for all k and i . Then, setting $b^k = \{b_i^k\}_{i=1}^n$, $k \in F$, we have $b = \sum_{k \in F} b^k$ and $\Phi_n(b^k) \leq \Phi_n(a^k)$, which implies

$$\|b\|_{X_L(n)} \leq \sum_{k \in F} \Phi_n(b^k) \leq \sum_{k \in F} \Phi_n(a^k).$$

In consequence, $\|b\|_{X_L(n)} \leq \|a\|_{X_L(n)}$, that is, the norm $\|\cdot\|_{X_L(n)}$ is lattice.

Next, note that

$$\sigma a = \sum_{k \in F} \sigma a^k,$$

and hence, by (ii),

$$\|\sigma a\|_{X_L(n)} \leq \sum_{k \in F} \Phi_n(\sigma a^k) = \sum_{k \in F} \Phi_n(a^k).$$

Thus, $\|\sigma a\|_{X_L(n)} \leq \|a\|_{X_L(n)}$ and so $\|\cdot\|_{X_L(n)}$ is a symmetric norm. \square

An immediate consequence of this lemma is the following

Corollary 6.5. $\|\cdot\|_{X_L}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{X_U}$ are lattice norms.

Our next two propositions state that the operators $I_{n+1} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ are contractions with respect to each of the three functionals considered in the latter lemma.

Proposition 6.6. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each infinite dimensional Banach lattice X and all $a \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ we have*

$$\Phi_n(I_{n+1}a) \leq \Phi_{n+1}(a)$$

and

$$\|I_{n+1}a\|_{X_L(n)} \leq \|a\|_{X_L(n+1)}.$$

Proof. Put $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ and $b = I_{n+1}a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

By Lemma 6.4, Φ_n is lattice monotone. Consequently, it suffices to prove the result in the special case of $a_{n+1} = 0$. We set

$$\mathfrak{B}_n^*(X) := \left\{ \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n : \text{there is } x_{n+1} \in X \text{ such that } \{x_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1} \in \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}(X) \right\}.$$

Obviously, $\mathfrak{B}_n^*(X) \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$, which implies, since $a_{n+1} = 0$, the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_n(b) &= \inf \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X : \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X) \right\} \\ &\leq \inf \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X : \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n^*(X) \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i + a_{n+1} x_{n+1} \right\|_X : \{x_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1} \in \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}(X) \right\} \\ &= \Phi_{n+1}(a), \end{aligned}$$

and the first inequality is proved.

To prove similar inequality for the norm $\|\cdot\|_{X_L(n)}$, write $a = \sum_{k \in F} a^k$ for some finite subset $F \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and $a^k \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then, we have

$$b = I_{n+1}Tr_{n+1}a = \sum_{k \in F} I_{n+1}Tr_{n+1}a^k,$$

and, by the first part,

$$\|b\|_{X_L(n)} \leq \sum_{k \in F} \Phi_n(I_{n+1}Tr_{n+1}a^k) \leq \sum_{k \in F} \Phi_{n+1}(Tr_{n+1}a^k) \leq \sum_{k \in F} \Phi_{n+1}(a^k).$$

Hence,

$$\|b\|_{X_L(n)} \leq \|a\|_{X_L(n+1)},$$

and the proof is completed. \square

Proposition 6.7. *Let X be an infinite dimensional Banach lattice such that l_∞ is not finitely lattice representable in X . The following holds for every positive integer n and $a \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$*

$$\|I_{n+1}a\|_{X_U(n)} \leq \|a\|_{X_U(n+1)}.$$

Proof. We put again $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ and $b = I_{n+1}a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$. As in the proof of Proposition 6.6, we may assume that $a_{n+1} = 0$.

Let $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. By Lemma 6.2, we can select a sequence $\{u_n\}_{i=1}^{n+1} \in \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}(X)$ that satisfies one of the conditions (i) and (ii) of that lemma.

In the case when (i) is fulfilled, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} a_i u_i \right\|_X \leq \|a\|_{X_U(n+1)},$$

and the desired result follows.

Assume now that we have (ii) and let k, ψ be as in the statement of Lemma 6.2. Define the vector $c = \{c_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by

$$c_i = \begin{cases} a_{\psi(i)} & : i \neq k, 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \\ c_n = a_k \\ c_{n+1} = 0 \end{cases}$$

Then, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} c_i u_i \right\|_X + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} c_i u_i - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} c_i u_i - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_{\psi(i)} x_{\psi(i)} + a_k u_n + 0 \cdot u_{n+1} - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^n a_i x_i \right) + a_k u_n - a_k x_k - \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^n a_i x_i \\ &= a_k (u_n - x_k), \end{aligned}$$

$|a_k| \leq \|a\|_{X_U(n+1)}$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, and $\|\cdot\|_{X_U(n+1)}$ is a symmetric norm, we conclude

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} c_i u_i \right\|_X + \|u_n - x_k\|_X \leq \|c\|_{X_U(n+1)} + \varepsilon \|a\|_{X_U(n+1)} = (1+\varepsilon) \|a\|_{X_U(n+1)}.$$

Thus, since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, $\|b\|_{X_U(n)} \leq \|a\|_{X_U(n+1)}$, what is required. \square

Proposition 6.8. *Let X be an infinite dimensional Banach lattice such that X_L is not contained in c_0 . Then, l_∞ is finitely lattice representable in X .*

Proof. By the assumption, there exists a sequence $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in X_L$ with $\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} |a_i| > \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. By scaling we may assume that $\delta = 1$. Define the sequence $b = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ by

$$b_i = \begin{cases} 1 & : |a_i| > 1 \\ 0 & : |a_i| \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

Since $|b_i| \leq |a_i|$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$, by Corollary 6.5, $b \in X_L$ and $\|b\|_{X_L} \leq \|a\|_{X_L}$.

Further, for each positive integer m select k_m such that the set

$$U_m := \{i : 1 \leq i \leq k_m, b_i = 1\}$$

has cardinality m . Note that for any sequence $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^{k_m} \in \mathfrak{B}_{k_m}(X)$ it holds

$$\left\| \sum_{i \in U_m} y_i \right\|_X = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{k_m} b_i y_i \right\|_X \leq \Phi_{k_m}(b).$$

Hence, if $b = \sum_{j \in F} b^j$ for some finite set F and $b^j \in \mathbb{R}^{k_m}$, by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i \in U_m} y_i \right\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{k_m} \sum_{j \in F} \langle b^j, e_i \rangle y_i \right\|_X \leq \sum_{j \in F} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{k_m} \langle b^j, e_i \rangle y_i \right\|_X \leq \sum_{j \in F} \Phi_{k_m}(b^j).$$

Consequently, for any sequence $\{t_i\}_{i \in U_m}$ of scalars we obtain

$$\sup_{i \in U_m} |t_i| \leq \left\| \sum_{i \in U_m} t_i y_i \right\|_X \leq \sup_{i \in U_m} |t_i| \left\| \sum_{i \in U_m} y_i \right\|_X \leq \sup_{i \in U_m} |t_i| \|b\|_{X_L(k_m)} \leq \|a\|_{X_L} \sup_{i \in U_m} |t_i|.$$

Since the set U_m has cardinality m , which is arbitrary, and $\|a\|_{X_L}$ is a constant that does not depend on m , the latter inequality means that l_∞ is crudely finitely lattice representable in X (see Section 2.2). Since the latter is equivalent to the finite lattice representability of l_∞ in X [13, p. 288], the proof is completed. \square

Proposition 6.9. *Assume that l_∞ is finitely lattice representable in a Banach lattice X . Then X_L coincides with l_∞ isometrically.*

Proof. Fix a positive integer n and $\varepsilon > 0$. By the assumption, there exists a sequence $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of pair-wise disjoint elements in X such that

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} |a_i| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} |a_i|$$

for any scalar sequence $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Putting $z_i := x_i / \|x_i\|_X$, we get $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$. Hence, in view of embeddings (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|a\|_{l_\infty^n} &\leq \|a\|_{X_L(n)} \leq \Phi_n(a) \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i z_i \right\|_X = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{\|x_i\|_X} x_i \right\|_X \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{|a_i|}{\|x_i\|_X} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|a\|_{l_\infty^n} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $\|a\|_{l_\infty^n} = \|a\|_{X_L(n)}$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$, which implies that $X_L = l_\infty$ isometrically. \square

Prove now the dual result.

Proposition 6.10. *If l_1 is finitely lattice representable in a Banach lattice X , then X_U coincides isometrically with l_1 .*

Proof. For every positive integer n and $\varepsilon > 0$ we can select a sequence $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of pair-wise disjoint elements such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|$$

for any scalar sequence $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$. As in the preceding proof, we put $z_i = x_i / \|x_i\|_X$. Then $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$, and since $1 \leq \|x_i\|_X \leq 1 + \varepsilon$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|a\|_{l_1^n} &\geq \|a\|_{X_U(n)} \geq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i z_i \right\|_X = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{\|x_i\|_X} x_i \right\|_X \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|a_i|}{\|x_i\|_X} \geq (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i| = (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} \|a\|_{l_1^n} \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\|a\|_{l_1^n} = \|a\|_{X_U(n)}$ and thus the proof is complete. \square

As a result, all the pieces needed for the proof of Theorem 3.3 are in place.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Prove first the claim for X_L . By Lemmas 6.4 and 6.6, $\|\cdot\|_{X_L(n)}$ is a lattice, symmetric norm for each positive integer n and the operators I_n are contractions with respects to these norms. Hence, if X_L is embedded in c_0 , then Proposition 6.1 may be applied and we conclude that X_L is a r.i. Banach sequence lattice. In the case when X_L is not embedded in c_0 , from Propositions 6.8 and 6.9 it follows that X_L coincides isometrically with l_∞ , and hence it is a r.i. Banach sequence lattice as well.

Proceeding with the case of X_U , observe that, by the assumption, l_∞ fails to be finitely lattice representable in X , and so, using Proposition 6.7, we have that the maps I_n are contractive with respect to these norms. Moreover, by Lemma 6.4, $\|\cdot\|_{X_U(n)}$ is a lattice, symmetric norm for each positive integer n . Finally, from Proposition 2.6 it follows that X satisfies a lower p -estimate for some $p < \infty$. Hence, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any sequences $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathfrak{B}_n(X)$ and $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of scalars it follows

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq M_{[p]}(X) \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \right\|_X \leq M_{[p]}(X) \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i \right\|_{X_U},$$

i.e., X_U is embedded into l_p and thus also in c_0 . Thus, applying Proposition 6.1, we conclude that X_U is a r.i. sequence Banach lattice. \square

APPENDIX: A DESCRIPTION OF THE OPTIMAL UPPER SEQUENCE LATTICES FOR ORLICZ SPACES.

Recall that, according to Example 3.10, optimal upper and lower sequence lattices for the $L_{p,q}$ -spaces are just some l_r -spaces. As well known (see e.g. [18,

19]), comparing with the Lorentz spaces, the structure of disjoint sequences in Orlicz spaces is much more complicated. In particular, in general, an Orlicz space L_M need not to admit an upper $\delta(L_M)$ -estimate or a lower $\sigma(L_M)$ -estimate (as above, $\delta(X)$ and $\sigma(X)$ are the Grobler-Dodds indices of a Banach lattice X). Therefore, we come to the problem of identification of optimal sequence lattices for this class of r.i. spaces. In this section, we present a description of optimal upper lattices for separable Orlicz spaces as intersections of some special Musielak-Orlicz sequence spaces.

We start with an assertion that reduces the consideration of issues related to pairwise disjoint functions to that of a simpler case of multiples of characteristic functions of pairwise disjoint sets.

Proposition 6.11. *Let M be an Orlicz function such that $M \in \Delta_2^\infty$ with the constant K . For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and arbitrary pairwise disjoint functions y_k , $k = 1, \dots, n$, there exist two sequences $\{B_k\}_{k=1}^n$ and $\{B'_k\}_{k=1}^{2n}$ of pairwise disjoint subsets of $[0, 1]$, $r_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, and $r'_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $k = 1, \dots, 2n$, such that for the functions $h_k := r_k \chi_{B_k}$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, and $f_k := r'_k \chi_{B'_k}$, $k = 1, \dots, 2n$, we have*

$$(6.3) \quad \frac{1}{4} \|y_k\|_{L_M} \leq \|h_k\|_{L_M} \leq \|y_k\|_{L_M}, \quad \frac{1}{2} \|y_k\|_{L_M} \leq \|f_k\|_{L_M} \leq \frac{3}{2} \|y_k\|_{L_M}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n,$$

and

$$(6.4) \quad \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n h_k \right\|_{L_M} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n y_k \right\|_{L_M} \leq (K+1) \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2n} f_k \right\|_{L_M}.$$

Proof. Clearly, without loss of generality, we can assume that given functions $y_k \in L_M$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, are positive. Moreover, since $M \in \Delta_2^\infty$, the space L_M is separable, and, consequently, it can be assumed also that y_k are bounded functions.

For each $1 \leq k \leq n$ we set

$$c_k := \frac{\|y_k\|_{L_M}}{2\varphi_{L_M}(m(\text{supp } y_k))}, \quad u_k(t) := \begin{cases} y_k(t), & \text{if } y_k(t) \geq c_k, \\ 0, & \text{if } y_k(t) < c_k \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad g_k(t) := c_k \chi_{\text{supp } y_k \setminus \text{supp } u_k}(t).$$

Then, it follows

$$(6.5) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n u_k \leq \sum_{k=1}^n y_k \leq \sum_{k=1}^n u_k + \sum_{k=1}^n g_k.$$

Observe also that

$$(6.6) \quad \|g_k\|_{L_M} = c_k \varphi_{L_M}(m(\text{supp } y_k \setminus \text{supp } u_k)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|y_k\|_{L_M}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n$$

(φ_{L_M} is the fundamental function of L_M ; see formula (2.2)), and

$$(6.7) \quad \frac{1}{2} \|y_k\|_{L_M} = \|y_k\|_{L_M} - \|c_k \chi_{\text{supp } y_k}\|_{L_M} \leq \|u_k\|_{L_M} \leq \|y_k\|_{L_M}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Next, we estimate the norm $\|\sum_{k=1}^n u_k\|_{L_M}$. To this end, we show that there is $r_k \in [c_k, \sup_t u_k(t)]$ such that

$$(6.8) \quad M(r_k) = M\left(\frac{r_k}{\|u_k\|_{L_M}}\right) \int_0^1 M(u_k(t)) dt.$$

Indeed, let us consider the function

$$H_k(t) := \frac{M(u_k(t))}{M\left(\frac{u_k(t)}{\|u_k\|_{L_M}}\right)}, \quad t \in \text{supp } u_k.$$

From the equality $\int_0^1 M\left(\frac{u_k(t)}{\|u_k\|_{L_M}}\right) dt = 1$ it follows that

$$\inf_{t \in \text{supp } u_k} H_k(t) \leq \int_0^1 M(u_k(t)) dt \leq \sup_{t \in \text{supp } u_k} H_k(t).$$

Thus, since $\inf_{t \in \text{supp } u_k} u_k(t) \geq c_k$, by continuity of M , equality (6.8) holds for some r_k such that $r_k \in [c_k, \sup_t u_k(t)]$.

Further, assuming as we can that the functions M and φ_{L_M} are strictly increasing, define the real numbers $d_k \in [0, 1]$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, as follows:

$$d_k := \begin{cases} \varphi_{L_M}^{-1}\left(\frac{\|u_k\|_{L_M}}{r_k}\right), & \text{if } \|u_k\|_{L_M} \leq r_k \varphi_{L_M}(m(\text{supp } y_k)), \\ m(\text{supp } y_k), & \text{if } \|u_k\|_{L_M} > r_k \varphi_{L_M}(m(\text{supp } y_k)). \end{cases}$$

Clearly, the definition of d_k implies that

$$(6.9) \quad r_k \varphi_{L_M}(d_k) \leq \|u_k\|_{L_M}.$$

Conversely, $r_k \varphi_{L_M}(d_k) = \|u_k\|_{L_M}$ if $\|u_k\|_{L_M} \leq r_k \varphi_{L_M}(m(\text{supp } y_k))$. Otherwise, since $r_k \geq c_k$, in view of (6.7) and the definition of c_k , we obtain

$$r_k \varphi_{L_M}(d_k) \geq c_k \varphi_{L_M}(m(\text{supp } y_k)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|u_k\|_{L_M}.$$

Thus, summing up, we conclude that

$$(6.10) \quad r_k \varphi_{L_M}(d_k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|u_k\|_{L_M}.$$

Now, observe that from inequality (6.10) and formula (2.2) for the function φ_{L_M} it follows that

$$d_k \geq \varphi_{L_M}^{-1}(\|u_k\|_{L_M}/(2r_k)).$$

and

$$\varphi_{L_M}^{-1}(u) = \frac{1}{M(1/u)}, \quad 0 < u \leq 1,$$

respectively. Hence, taking into account that $M \in \Delta_2^\infty$ with constant K and applying (6.8), we obtain

$$(6.11) \quad \begin{aligned} d_k M(r_k) &\geq \varphi_{L_M}^{-1}(\|u_k\|_{L_M}/(2r_k))M(r_k) = \frac{M(r_k)}{M\left(\frac{2r_k}{\|u_k\|_{L_M}}\right)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{K} \frac{M(r_k)}{M\left(\frac{r_k}{\|u_k\|_{L_M}}\right)} = \frac{1}{K} \int_0^1 M(u_k(t)) dt. \end{aligned}$$

In the converse direction, from the equality $1/d_k = M(1/\varphi_{L_M}(d_k))$ (see (2.2)), combined with (6.9) and (6.8), it follows

$$(6.12) \quad d_k M(r_k) = \frac{M(r_k)}{M\left(\frac{1}{\varphi_{L_M}(d_k)}\right)} \leq \frac{M(r_k)}{M\left(\frac{r_k}{\|u_k\|_{L_M}}\right)} = \int_0^1 M(u_k(t)) dt.$$

Furthermore, by the definition of d_k , we have $d_k \leq m(\text{supp } y_k)$. Therefore, we can define the following functions $h_k(t) := r_k \chi_{B_k}(t)$, where $B_k \subset \text{supp } y_k$ and $m(B_k) = d_k$. Since $\|h_k\|_{L_M} = r_k \varphi_{L_M}(d_k)$, according to (6.9) and (6.10), it holds

$$\frac{1}{2} \|u_k\|_{L_M} \leq \|h_k\|_{L_M} \leq \|u_k\|_{L_M}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Hence, from (6.7) it follows

$$(6.13) \quad \frac{1}{4} \|y_k\|_{L_M} \leq \|h_k\|_{L_M} \leq \|y_k\|_{L_M}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Moreover, since the functions h_k (respectively, u_k) are pairwise disjoint, in view of estimate (6.12), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 M\left(\sum_{k=1}^n h_k(t)\right) dt &= \sum_{k=1}^n d_k M(r_k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^1 M(u_k(t)) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^1 M\left(\sum_{k=1}^n y_k(t)\right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, by (6.11), we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^1 M(u_k(t)) dt \leq K \int_0^1 M\left(\sum_{k=1}^n h_k(t)\right) dt.$$

Therefore, since M is convex and $K \geq 1$, it follows that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n h_k \right\|_{L_M} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n u_k \right\|_{L_M} \leq K \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n h_k \right\|_{L_M}.$$

Noting that the collection $\{g_k, h_k\}_{k=1}^n$ consists of $2n$ pairwise disjoint functions, we relabel them as f_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2n$. Then, by (6.5) and the last inequality,

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n h_k \right\|_{L_M} &\leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n y_k \right\|_{L_M} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n u_k \right\|_{L_M} + \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n g_k \right\|_{L_M} \\
&\leq K \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n h_k \right\|_{L_M} + \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n g_k \right\|_{L_M} \\
&\leq (K+1) \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{2n} f_k \right\|_{L_M},
\end{aligned}$$

and hence (6.4) is proved. Since inequalities (6.3) follow from (6.13) and (6.6), the proof is completed. \square

From Proposition 6.11 and its proof we obtain

Corollary 6.12. *Let M be an Orlicz function such that $M \in \Delta_2^\infty$. Then,*

$$\|a\|_{(L_M)_U} \asymp \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \frac{\chi_{F_k}}{\varphi_{L_M}(m(F_k))} \right\|_{L_M} : n \in \mathbb{N}, F_k \subset [0, 1] \text{ pairwise disjoint} \right\},$$

with constants independent of $a = (a_k)_{k=1}^\infty$.

Recalling that the space $(L_M)_U$ is rearrangement invariant (see Theorem 3.3), denote by ϕ_U its fundamental function, i.e., $\phi_U(n) := \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n e_k \right\|_{(L_M)_U}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also, let Φ_g be the dilation function of a function $g : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ for large values of arguments defined by

$$\Phi_g(u) := \sup_{v \geq \max(1, 1/u)} \frac{g(vu)}{g(v)}, \quad u > 0.$$

Corollary 6.13. *Let M be an Orlicz function such that $M \in \Delta_2^\infty$. Then,*

$$\phi_U(n) \asymp \Phi_{M^{-1}}(n), \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where M^{-1} is the inverse function for M .

Proof. By Corollary 6.12, we have

$$(6.14) \quad \phi_U(n) \asymp \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\chi_{F_k}}{\varphi_{L_M}(m(F_k))} \right\|_{L_M} : F_k \subset [0, 1] \text{ are pairwise disjoint} \right\}.$$

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $F_k \subset [0, 1]$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, be pairwise disjoint. Then, by formula (2.2),

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\chi_{F_k}}{\varphi_{L_M}(m(F_k))} \right\|_{L_M} = \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \sum_{k=1}^n M \left(\frac{M^{-1}(1/m(F_k))}{\lambda} \right) m(F_k) \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Next, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n M \left(\frac{M^{-1}(1/m(F_k))}{\Phi_{M^{-1}}(n)} \right) m(F_k) &= \sum_{k: m(F_k) \geq 1/n} M \left(\frac{M^{-1}(1/m(F_k))}{\Phi_{M^{-1}}(n)} \right) m(F_k) \\ &+ \sum_{k: m(F_k) < 1/n} M \left(\frac{M^{-1}(1/m(F_k))}{\Phi_{M^{-1}}(n)} \right) m(F_k) \\ &= (I) + (II). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$(I) \leq \sum_{k: m(F_k) \geq 1/n} M \left(\frac{M^{-1}(n)}{\Phi_{M^{-1}}(n)} \right) m(F_k) \leq M(1) = 1$$

and

$$(II) \leq \sum_{k: m(F_k) < 1/n} M \left(\frac{M^{-1}(1/(m(F_k)n))M^{-1}(1/m(F_k))}{M^{-1}(1/m(F_k))} \right) m(F_k) = \sum_{k: m(F_k) < 1/n} \frac{1}{n} \leq 1.$$

Summing up, we obtain

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\chi_{F_k}}{\varphi_{L_M}(m(F_k))} \right\|_{L_M} \leq 2\Phi_{M^{-1}}(n),$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all pairwise disjoint $F_k \subset [0, 1]$, $k = 1, \dots, n$. Consequently, in view of (6.14), it follows

$$\phi_U(n) \preceq \Phi_{M^{-1}}(n), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Conversely, without loss of generality, assume that

$$\Phi_{M^{-1}}(n) = \frac{M^{-1}(nv_n)}{M^{-1}(v_n)}$$

for some $v_n \geq 1$. Let $F_k \subset [0, 1]$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, be arbitrary pairwise disjoint subsets of $[0, 1]$ such that $m(F_k) = (nv_n)^{-1}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_U(n) \succeq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\chi_{F_k}}{\varphi_{L_M}(m(F_k))} \right\|_{L_M} &= \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : M \left(\frac{M^{-1}(nv_n)}{\lambda} \right) \frac{1}{v_n} \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \frac{M^{-1}(nv_n)}{M^{-1}(v_n)} = \Phi_{M^{-1}}(n). \end{aligned}$$

□

Recall that a family of Banach spaces $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ forms a *strongly compatible scale* if there exists a Banach space \tilde{X} such that $X_\alpha \xrightarrow{1} \tilde{X}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

Let $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ be a strongly compatible scale. We set

$$\Delta(X_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} := \{x \in \cap_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} X_\alpha : \|x\|_{\Delta(X_\alpha)} := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \|x\|_{X_\alpha} < \infty\}.$$

Then, $(\Delta(X_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}, \|\cdot\|_{\Delta(X_\alpha)})$ is a Banach space with the following properties:

- (i) $\Delta(X_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \xrightarrow{1} X_\alpha$, $\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$;

(ii) If F is a Banach space such that $F \xrightarrow{1} X_\alpha, \forall \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, then $F \xrightarrow{1} \Delta(X_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$.

Let M be an Orlicz function, $M_v(u) := M(uv)/M(v)$, $u \geq 0, v > 0$. We consider the family of the Musielak-Orlicz sequence spaces $\{l_{M_{\bar{\beta}}}\}_{\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}}$, where \mathcal{B} is the set of all sequences $\bar{\beta} = (\beta_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^\infty 1/M(\beta_k) \leq 1$. Recall that the norm of the Musielak-Orlicz sequence space $l_{M_{\bar{\beta}}}$ is defined by

$$\|(a_k)\|_{l_{M_{\bar{\beta}}}} := \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \sum_{k=1}^\infty M_{\beta_k} \left(\frac{a_k}{\lambda} \right) \leq 1 \right\}$$

(see e.g. [23, 31]). One can easily check that $l_{M_{\bar{\beta}}} \xrightarrow{1} l_\infty$, for each $\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}$, and hence this family is a strongly compatible scale.

Theorem 6.14. *For every Orlicz function M such that $M \in \Delta_2^\infty$ we have $(L_M)_U = \Delta(l_{M_{\bar{\beta}}})_{\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}}$ (with equivalence of norms). Moreover, the following embeddings hold:*

$$(6.15) \quad l_{\Phi_M} \hookrightarrow (L_M)_U \hookrightarrow l_{p_M},$$

where Φ_M is the dilation function of M for large values of arguments and

$$p_M := \sup\{p \geq 1 : M(uv) \leq Cu^p M(v) \text{ for some } C > 0 \text{ and all } 0 < u \leq 1, uv \geq 1\}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we will assume that $a_k \geq 0, k = 1, 2, \dots$.

Let $F_k \subset [0, 1], k = 1, 2, \dots$, be arbitrary pairwise disjoint sets of positive measure. Then, setting $\beta_k := M^{-1}(1/m(F_k)), k = 1, 2, \dots$, we see that

$$\sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{M(\beta_k)} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty m(F_k) \leq 1,$$

and hence $\bar{\beta} = (\beta_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{B}$. Conversely, for each $\bar{\beta} = (\beta_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{B}$ we can find pairwise disjoint sets $F_k \subset [0, 1], m(F_k) > 0$, such that $\beta_k = M^{-1}(1/m(F_k)), k = 1, 2, \dots$. These observations together with Corollary 6.12 imply, for every $a = \{a_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \|a\|_{(L_M)_U} &\asymp \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \frac{\chi_{F_k}}{\varphi_{L_M}(m(F_k))} \right\|_{L_M} : n \in \mathbb{N}, F_k \subset [0, 1] \text{ pairwise disjoint} \right\} \\ &= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, F_k \text{ pairwise disjoint}} \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \sum_{k=1}^n M \left(\frac{a_k M^{-1}(1/m(F_k))}{\lambda} \right) m(F_k) \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}, n \in \mathbb{N}} \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{M \left(\frac{a_k}{\lambda} \beta_k \right)}{M(\beta_k)} \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}, n \in \mathbb{N}} \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \sum_{k=1}^n M_{\beta_k}(a_k/\lambda) \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \|a\|_{\Delta(l_{M_{\bar{\beta}}})_{\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $(L_M)_U = \Delta(l_{M_{\bar{\beta}}})_{\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}}$, with equivalence of norms.

To prove the left-hand side embedding in (6.15) we assume that $\|(a_k)\|_{l_{\Phi_M}} \leq 1$. This implies that $\sum_{k=1}^n \Phi_M(a_k) \leq 1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for each sequence $\bar{\beta} = (\beta_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{B}$ we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{M(a_k \beta_k)}{M(\beta_k)} = \sum_{k: a_k \beta_k \leq 1} \frac{M(a_k \beta_k)}{M(\beta_k)} + \sum_{k: a_k \beta_k > 1} \frac{M(a_k \beta_k)}{M(\beta_k)} \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{M(\beta_k)} + \sum_{k=1}^n \Phi_M(a_k) \leq 2.$$

Thus, $\|(a_k)\|_{l_{M_{\bar{\beta}}}} \leq 2$ for every $\bar{\beta} = (\beta_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{B}$ and therefore, by the first assertion of the theorem, it follows

$$\|(a_k)\|_{(L_M)_U} \leq C \|(a_k)\|_{\Delta(l_{M_{\bar{\beta}}})_{\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}}} \leq 2C.$$

Furthermore, by [15], p_M is the supremum of the set of all $p \geq 1$ such that M is equivalent to a p -convex function on the interval $[1, \infty)$, or equivalently p_M is the supremum of the set of all $p \geq 1$ such that the Orlicz space $L_M[0, 1]$ admits an upper p -estimate. Thus, by using the notation of this paper, we have $p_M = \delta(L_M[0, 1])$ and hence the right-hand side embedding in (6.15) is a consequence of Proposition 3.9(i). This completes the proof. \square

Remark 6.15. Informally, the Orlicz space l_{Φ_M} is located rather "close" to the space $(L_M)_U$, because the fundamental functions of these spaces are equivalent. Indeed, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Then, by definition, $\phi_{l_{\Phi_M}}(n) = 1/u_n$, where u_n satisfies the conditions:

$$\frac{M(u_n v_n)}{M(v_n)} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{1}{n} \text{ for some } v_n \geq 1/u_n \text{ and } \frac{M(u_n v)}{M(v)} \leq \frac{1}{n} \text{ for all } v \geq 1/u_n.$$

In particular, from the last estimate it follows that $M(1/u_n) \geq n$. Therefore, since M^{-1} is concave, we get

$$u_n \geq \frac{M^{-1}((1 - \varepsilon)s_n/n)}{M^{-1}(s_n)} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{M^{-1}(s_n/n)}{M^{-1}(s_n)}, \text{ where } s_n = M(v_n) \geq M(1/u_n),$$

and

$$u_n \leq \frac{M^{-1}(s/n)}{M^{-1}(s)}, \text{ for all } s \geq M(1/u_n).$$

Thus,

$$\frac{1}{\phi_{l_{\Phi_M}}(n)} = \inf_{s \geq M(1/u_n)} \frac{M^{-1}(s/n)}{M^{-1}(s)},$$

whence

$$\phi_{l_{\Phi_M}}(n) = \sup_{s \geq M(1/u_n)} \frac{M^{-1}(s)}{M^{-1}(s/n)} = \sup_{t \geq M(1/u_n)/n} \frac{M^{-1}(tn)}{M^{-1}(t)}.$$

Consequently, since $M(1/u_n)/n \geq 1$, by Corollary 6.13, we have

$$\phi_{l_{\Phi_M}}(n) \leq \mathcal{M}_{M^{-1}}(n) \preceq \phi_{(L_M)_U}(n), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It remains to note that the opposite inequality follows from the left-hand side embedding (6.15).

Data availability statement. *All data generating or analysed during this study are included in this published article.*

REFERENCES

- [1] Aliprantis, C. and Burkinshaw, O. Locally Solid Riesz Spaces with Applications to Economics. *Math. Surv. Monogr* (2003). 6.3
- [2] Astashkin, S. V., Cwikel, M. and Nilsson, P. G. *Arazy-Cwikel and Calderón-Mityagin type properties of the couples (ℓ^p, ℓ^q) , $0 \leq p < q \leq \infty$* , *Annali di Matem. Pura ed Appl.* **202** (2023), 1643–1678. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10231-022-01296-6>. 1
- [3] Bergh, J. Löfström J. *Interpolation spaces. An introduction.* Springer Berlin 207 (1976). 1, 5
- [4] Brudnyi, Yu. A. and Kruglyak, N. Ya., *Interpolation Functors and Interpolation Spaces 1*, North-Holland, 1991. 1, 1, 1, 1, 2.1, 2.1, 5, 5
- [5] Brudnyi, Yu. A., Krein, S. G. and Semenov, E. M. *Interpolation of linear operators.* *J. Soviet Math.* **42** (1988), 2009–2113. 1, 5
- [6] Calderón, A. *Spaces between L_1 and L_∞ and the theorem of Marcinkiewicz.* *Studia Math.* **26** (1966), 273–299. 1
- [7] Cwikel, M., *Monotonicity properties of interpolation spaces.* *Ark. Mat.* **14** (1976), 213–236. 1, 5
- [8] Cwikel, M., *Monotonicity properties of interpolation spaces II.* *Ark. Mat.* **19** (1981), 123–136. 1
- [9] Cwikel, M. *K-divisibility of the K-functional and Calderón couples.* *Ark. Mat.* **22** (1984), 39–62. 1, 1, 1, 2.1, 2.1, 5, 5
- [10] Cwikel, M. and Nilsson, P. G. *The coincidence of real and complex interpolation methods for couples of weighted Banach lattices*, *Proceedings of a conference on Interpolation Spaces and Allied Topics in Analysis*, Lund, 1983, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 1070, Springer Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York-Tokyo, 1984, 54–65. 1
- [11] Cwikel, M., Nilsson, P. G. and Schechtman, G. *Interpolation of weighted Banach lattices. A characterization of relatively decomposable Banach Lattices.* *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **165** (2003) No. 787, 1–105. 1, 1, 1, 2.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4, 4.7, 5, 5
- [12] Dilworth, S. J. *Special Banach lattices and their applications*, in *Handbook of the Geometry of Banach Spaces*, Vol. 1, ed. by W. B. Johnson and J. Lindenstrauss, Elsevier Sci., 2001, 497–532. 3.10
- [13] Johnson, W. B., Maurey, B., Schechtman, G. and Tzafriri, L. *Symmetric structures in Banach spaces*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **19** (1979) No. 217, 1–298. 2.2, 6
- [14] Junge, M. *On cotype and summing properties in Banach spaces.* *Illinois J. Math.* **46** (2002), 331–356. 3.1
- [15] Kamińska, A. Maligranda, L. and Persson, L. E. *Type, cotype and convexity properties of Orlicz spaces*, *Publ. del Depart. de Anal. Matem., Fac. de Matem., Univ. Compl. de Madrid*, No. 42, 1996-97, 113–126. 6
- [16] Krasnoselskiĭ, M. A. and Rutickiĭ, Ja. B. *Convex Functions and Orlicz Spaces*, Fizmatgiz, Moscow, 1958 (Russian); English transl. Noordhoff, Groningen, 1961. 2.4
- [17] Krein, S. G., Petunin, Yu. I. and Semenov, E. M. *Interpolation of linear operators*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1982. 2.4
- [18] Lindenstrauss, J. and Tzafriri, L. *On Orlicz sequence spaces. III.* *Israel J. Math.* **14** (1973), 368–389. 6
- [19] Lindenstrauss, J. and Tzafriri, L. *Classical Banach Spaces vol. I.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1973. 6
- [20] Lindenstrauss, J. and Tzafriri, L., *Classical Banach Spaces vol. II.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979. 2, 2.2, 2.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 6

- [21] Maligranda, L. Orlicz spaces and interpolation. Seminars in Mathematics 5 Campinas SP, Brazil, University of Campinas, 1989. 2.4
- [22] Meyer-Nieberg, P. Banach Lattices, Universitytext, Springer Verlag, 1991. 2, 2.3
- [23] Musielak, J. Orlicz spaces and modular spaces, Springer, Berlin, 1983. 6
- [24] Mityagin, B. An interpolation theorem for modular spaces. Proc. Conf. "Interpol. Spaces and Allied Topics in Anal." (Lund, 1983), Lecture Notes in Math. 1070, 10–23 (1984). (translated from Mat. Sb. 66, 473–482 (1965) (in Russian)). 1
- [25] Peetre, J. Banach Couples. I. Elementary Theory. Technical Report, Lund (1971). See also arXiv.org 2303.06622 math.FA (2023). 1, 1, 1
- [26] Rao, M. M. and Ren, Z. D. Theory of Orlicz spaces. Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 146 - Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1991. 2.4
- [27] Schaefer, H. H. Banach Lattices and Positive Operators. Springer Science & Business Media 378 (2012). 1, 2
- [28] Sedaev, A. A. and Semenov, E. M. On the possibility of describing interpolation in terms of the K-method of Peetre, Optimizascja **4** (1971), 98–114 (in Russian). 1
- [29] Schep, A. R. Krivine's theorem and the indices of a Banach lattice, Acta Appl. Math. **27** (1992), 111–121. 3.2, 4, 4
- [30] Sparr, G. Interpolation of weighted L_p spaces. Studia Math. **62** (1978), 229–271. 1
- [31] Woo, J. On modular sequence spaces, Studia Math. **58** (1973), 271–289.

6

ASTASHKIN: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SAMARA NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY, MOSKOVSKOYE SHOSSE 34, 443086, SAMARA, RUSSIAN FEDERATION; DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAHCESEHIR UNIVERSITY, 34353, ISTANBUL, TURKEY

Email address: `astash56@mail.ru`

NILSSON: STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

Email address: `pgn@plntx.com`