BULL. AUSTRAL. MATH. SOC. 47D15
VOL. 44 (1991) [285-295]

ON OPERATOR IDEALS DETERMINED BY SEQUENCES

MANUEL GONZÁLEZ AND ANTONIO MARTINÓN

We associate with an operator ideal $\mathcal{A}$ (in the sense of Pietsch) a class of bounded sequences $s_{\mathcal{A}}$ by using the $\mathcal{A}$-variation of Astala. If $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are operator ideals, and we define $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ as the class of operators which map a sequence of $s_{\mathcal{A}}$ into a sequence of $s_{\mathcal{B}}$, we obtain the following:

THEOREM. *If $T_n: X \to Y$ is a sequence of operators and for every sequence $(x_n) \subset X$ in $s_{\mathcal{A}}$ there exists p such that $(T_p x_n)$ belongs to $s_{\mathcal{B}}$, then $T_m \in (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ for some m.*

The compact operators, weakly compact operators and some other operator ideals can be represented as $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$. Hence several results of Tacon and other authors are a consequence of this theorem.

1. INTRODUCTION

Tacon [14], by using techniques of non-standard analysis, showed that if $T: X \to X$ is a (linear and continuous) operator on the Banach space X, then T is power compact (that is, T^m is compact for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$) if and only if for every bounded sequence $(x_n) \subset X$ there exists $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(T^p x_n)$ is a relatively compact sequence. This result is obtained as corollary of the following theorem: if $T_n: X \to Y$ is a sequence of operators mapping a Banach space X into a Banach space Y, and for every bounded sequence $(x_n) \subset X$ there exists $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(T_p x_n)$ is relatively compact, then T_m is compact for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. He proved similar results for weakly compact operators.

Using standard techniques Barría [3] proved the above results in the case $X = Y$ a Hilbert space; Brown and Foias [5] in the case $X = Y$ a Banach space, and Buoni, Klein, Scott and Wadhwa [6, 7] proved the results of Tacon, and analogous results for the classes of completely continuous, weakly completely continuous and Rosenthal operators.

In this paper, using the $\mathcal{A}$-variation associated to an operator ideal $\mathcal{A}$, due to Astala [1], we introduce a class of operator ideals and, using analogous techniques to those in [5], we prove a theorem from which we derive the results of Tacon for all the previously considered classes [14, 3, 5, 6, 7], and for some other classes of operators,

Received 1 November 1990
Supported in part by DGICYT grant PB88-0417

for example, the dual of the completely continuous operators, the V operators, the V^* operators, the Dunford-Pettis operators, the Grothendieck operators and certain class of operators $\mathcal{SC}^S$, related to the strictly cosingular operators $\mathcal{SC}$. We show also that the equality of the classes $\mathcal{SC}$ and $\mathcal{SC}^S$ is equivalent to the positive solution of an old problem in Banach space theory: does every infinite dimensional Banach space have a infinite dimensional separable quotient?

In the following X, Y, Z will be Banach spaces; X^* the dual space of X; $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ the class of all operators between X and Y; $T^* \in \mathcal{L}(Y^*, X^*)$ the conjugate operator of $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$; B_X the closed unit ball of X; $\ell_\infty(X)$ the space of all bounded sequences (x_n) in X attached with the norm $\|(x_n)\| := \sup\{\|x_n\| : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. The range of the sequence (x_n) will be denoted by $\{x_n\}$.

2. The main results

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an operator ideal in the sense of Pietsch [13]. $\mathcal{A}(X, Y)$ will be the class of all operators of $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ belonging to $\mathcal{A}$. The operator ideal $\mathcal{A}$ is called closed if $\mathcal{A}(X, Y)$ is closed in $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$, for every X, Y. $\mathcal{A}$ is called surjective if for any surjective operator $Q \in \mathcal{L}(Z, X)$, an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}$ whenever $TQ \in \mathcal{A}(Z, Y)$; equivalently, if $S \in \mathcal{A}(Z, Y)$, $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ and $TB_X \subset SB_Z$, then $T \in \mathcal{A}(X, Y)$. We use the notation $\mathcal{A}^\wedge$ for the smallest surjective closed operator ideal containing $\mathcal{A}$.

Definition 2.1: [1]. Let $D \subset X$ be bounded. Then the $\mathcal{A}$-variation of D is defined by

$$h_{\mathcal{A}}(D) := \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \exists Z, \exists K \in \mathcal{A}(Z, X), D \subset KB_Z + \varepsilon B_X\}.$$

It is verified [1] that $h_{\mathcal{A}^\wedge} = h_{\mathcal{A}}$ and moreover

$$h_{\mathcal{A}}(D) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \exists Z, \exists K \in \mathcal{A}^\wedge(Z, X), D \subset KB_Z.$$

If we denote $\overline{aco}D$ the closed absolutely convex hull of D, then $h_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{aco}\, D) = h_{\mathcal{A}}(D)$.

Using $h_{\mathcal{A}}$ we can define the following subspaces of $\ell_\infty(X)$.

Definition 2.2: [10, 11]. $s_{\mathcal{A}}(X) := \{(x_n) \in \ell_\infty(X) : h_{\mathcal{A}}(\{x_n\}) = 0\}$.

$s_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$ is a closed subspace of $\ell_\infty(X)$; moreover, for every $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ we have that $(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{A}}(X) \Rightarrow (Tx_n) \in s_{\mathcal{A}}(Y)$ [10, 11].

Note that the class $\mathcal{L}$ of all operators is a closed surjective operator ideal: $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^\wedge$. Moreover, $h_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$ and $s_{\mathcal{L}} = \ell_\infty$.

Definition 2.3: Let $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ be operator ideals. We define the class $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ in the following way:

$$(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})(X, Y) := \{T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y) : (x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{A}}(X) \Rightarrow (Tx_n) \in s_{\mathcal{B}}(Y)\}.$$

It is immediate to show that $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is an operator ideal.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ be operator ideals and $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$. Then*

$$C := \{(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{A}}(X) : (Tx_n) \notin s_{\mathcal{B}}(Y)\}$$

is either empty, when $T \in (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, or open dense in $s_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$, when $T \notin (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.

Proof: If C is not empty, then its complement in $s_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$ is a proper closed subspace of $s_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$. Consequently, C is open dense in $s_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$. ∎

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ be operator ideals. For a sequence of operators $(T_n) \subset \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$, the following assertions are equivalent:*

(1) *For every $(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$, there is $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(T_p x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{B}}(Y)$.*
(2) *There exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T_m \in (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.*

Proof: Suppose (1). If $(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$, then there exists $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(T_p x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{B}}(Y)$, hence

$$(x_n) \notin \{(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{A}}(X) : (T_p x_n) \notin s_{\mathcal{B}}(Y)\}.$$

Since (x_n) is arbitrary, it follows that

$$\bigcap_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \{(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{A}}(X) : (T_p x_n) \notin s_{\mathcal{B}}(Y)\} = \emptyset.$$

If neither of the operators T_p belongs to $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, by the lemma we would have a sequence of open dense subsets with empty intersection in the Banach space $s_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$, in contradiction with the Baire Category Theorem; hence there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T_m \in (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$. The other implication is obvious. ∎

Remark 2.6. The above theorem holds, with the same proof, for a sequence (T_n) of operators such that $T_n \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y_n)$.

Corollary 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ be operator ideals, and $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, X)$. There exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T^m \in (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ if and only if for every $(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$, there is $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(T^p x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{B}}(X)$.*

Given two operator ideals $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, the left quotient $\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{B}$ is an operator ideal defined in the following way [**13**, 3.2.1]

$$(\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{B})(X, Y) := \{T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y) : \forall Z, \forall S \in \mathcal{A}(Y, Z), ST \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

It is easy to verify that if $\mathcal{B}$ is closed, then $\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{B}$ is closed; if $\mathcal{B}$ is surjective, then $\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{B}$ is surjective.

Now we show that the operator ideals of the type $\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})$ can be written in the form $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C})$. Consequently, Theorem 2.5 can be applied to these operator ideals.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a closed surjective operator ideal, $(x_n) \in \ell_\infty(X)$, and $K\colon \ell_1 \to X$ defined by $Ke_n := x_n$, where (e_n) is the canonical basis of ℓ_1. Then*

$$(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{C}}(X) \text{ if and only if } K \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Proof: Clearly K is a linear and continuous operator.

If $K \in \mathcal{C}$, from $\{x_n\} = \{Ke_n\} \subset KB_{\ell_1}$ and $K \in \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^\wedge$ we obtain $(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{C}}$.

Conversely, if $(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{C}}(X)$ we have $h_{\mathcal{C}}(\{x_n\}) = 0$, and consequently $h_{\mathcal{C}}(\overline{aco}\{x_n\}) = 0$. Now, since

$$KB_{\ell_1} = K\overline{aco}\{e_n\} \subset \overline{aco}\{Ke_n\} = \overline{aco}\{x_n\},$$

we conclude that $K \in \mathcal{C}$. ∎

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an operator ideal and $\mathcal{C}$ a closed surjective operator ideal. If we denote by $\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ s_{\mathcal{C}}$ the class defined in following way*

$$(\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ s_{\mathcal{C}})(X) := \{(x_n) \in \ell_\infty(X) : \forall Y, \forall A \in \mathcal{A}(X, Y), (Ax_n) \in s_{\mathcal{C}}(Y)\},$$

then we have that $s_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}\circ\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ s_{\mathcal{C}}$.

Proof: Suppose $(x_n) \in (\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ s_{\mathcal{C}})(X)$. We consider the operator $K\colon \ell_1 \to X$, defined by $Ke_n := x_n$. For every operator $A \in \mathcal{A}(X, Y)$ we have that $(Ax_n) \in s_{\mathcal{C}}(Y)$. Using Lemma 2.8 we find that the operator AK belongs to $\mathcal{C}(\ell_1, Y)$, and consequently $K \in (\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C})(\ell_1, X)$. Hence $(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}\circ\mathcal{C}}$.

Conversely, suppose $(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}\circ\mathcal{C}}(X)$. For some Banach space Z and operator $K \in (\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C})(Z, X)$ we have that $\{x_n\} \subset KB_Z$. If $A \in \mathcal{A}(X, Y)$, then $\{Ax_n\} \subset AKB_Z$ and $AK \in \mathcal{C}$. Hence $(Ax_n) \in s_{\mathcal{C}}$, for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and consequently $(x_n) \in (\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ s_{\mathcal{C}})(X)$. ∎

Proposition 2.10. *Let $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ be operator ideals and $\mathcal{C}$ a closed surjective operator ideal. Then $\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C})$.*

Proof: The following chain of equivalences holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&T \in [\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})](X, Y)\\
&\Leftrightarrow \forall Z, \forall A \in \mathcal{A}(Y, Z),\ AT \in (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})(X, Z)\\
&\Leftrightarrow \forall Z, \forall A \in \mathcal{A}(Y, Z),\ (x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{B}}(X) \Rightarrow (ATx_n) \in s_{\mathcal{C}}(Z)\\
&\Leftrightarrow (x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{B}}(X) \Rightarrow (Tx_n) \in (\mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ s_{\mathcal{C}})(Z) = s_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}\circ\mathcal{C}}(Z)\\
&\Leftrightarrow T \in (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C})(X, Y)
\end{aligned}$$

∎

3. Examples

We show several classical operator ideals which can be represented as $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ for suitable operator ideals $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.

3.1 The compact operators $\mathcal{C}o$. We use the following well-known characterisation of $\mathcal{C}o$:

$$T \in \mathcal{C}o \Leftrightarrow ((x_n) \text{ bounded } \Rightarrow \{Tx_n\} \text{ relatively compact})$$

$\mathcal{C}o$ is a closed surjective operator ideal: $\mathcal{C}o = \mathcal{C}o^{\wedge}$ [**13**, 1.4.2, 4.2.5, 4.7.12].

The $\mathcal{C}o$-variation $h_{\mathcal{C}o}$ agree with the Hausdorff measure of noncompactness [**1**, **2**]. Hence $s_{\mathcal{C}o}$ is the class of all bounded sequences with relatively compact range; that is, every subsequence has a convergent subsequence. Hence

$$T \in \mathcal{C}o \Leftrightarrow ((x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{L}}(X) \Rightarrow (Tx_n) \in s_{\mathcal{C}o})$$

and $\mathcal{C}o = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{C}o)$.

3.2 The weakly compact operators $\mathcal{WC}o$.

$T \in \mathcal{WC}o \Leftrightarrow ((x_n)$ bounded $\Rightarrow \{Tx_n\}$ weakly relatively compact$)$ [**13**, 1.5.2]. $\mathcal{WC}o$ is a closed surjective operator ideal: $\mathcal{WC}o = \mathcal{WC}o^{\wedge}$ [**13**, 1.4.2, 4.2.5, 4.7.12].

The $\mathcal{WC}o$-variation $h_{\mathcal{WC}o}$ agrees with the De Blasi measure of weak noncompactness [**1**, **8**]. Hence $s_{\mathcal{WC}o}$ is the class of all bounded sequences with relatively weakly compact range; that is, every subsequence has a weakly convergent subsequence. Hence

$$T \in \mathcal{WC}o \Leftrightarrow ((x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{L}} \Rightarrow \{Tx_n\} \in s_{\mathcal{WC}o})$$

and $\mathcal{WC}o = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{WC}o)$.

3.3 The completely continuous operators $\mathcal{CC}$.

$T \in \mathcal{CC} \Leftrightarrow ((x_n)$ weakly convergent $\Rightarrow (Tx_n)$ convergent$)$ [**13**, 1.6.1]. Consequently we obtain that

$$T \in \mathcal{CC} \Leftrightarrow ((x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{WC}o} \Rightarrow (Tx_n) \in s_{\mathcal{C}o})$$

and $\mathcal{CC} = (\mathcal{WC}o, \mathcal{C}o)$.

We note that $\mathcal{CC}$ is a closed operator ideal [**13**, 1.6.2, 4.2.5], but it is not surjective: $\mathcal{CC}^{\wedge} = \mathcal{L}$ [**13**, 4.7.13]. Hence $h_{\mathcal{CC}} = h_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$ and $s_{\mathcal{CC}} = s_{\mathcal{L}} = \ell_{\infty}$.

The completely continuous operators $\mathcal{CC}$ can also be characterised in the following way [**13**, 1.6.3]:

$$T \in \mathcal{CC} \Leftrightarrow ((x_n) \text{ weakly Cauchy } \Rightarrow (Tx_n) \text{ convergent}).$$

3.4 The Rosenthal operators $\mathcal{R}o$.

$T \in \mathcal{R}o \Leftrightarrow ((x_n)$ bounded $\Rightarrow (Tx_n)$ has a weakly Cauchy subsequence) [**13,** 3.2.4]. We have that $\mathcal{R}o = \mathcal{CC}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C}o$ [**13,** 3.2.4], hence $\mathcal{R}o$ is a closed surjective operator ideal: $\mathcal{R}o = \mathcal{R}o^{\wedge}$. Using Proposition 2.10 we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}o = \mathcal{CC}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C}o = \mathcal{CC}^{-1} \circ (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{C}o) = \left(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{CC}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C}o\right) = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}o).$$

By Lemma 2.9, it follows that

$$s_{\mathcal{R}o}(X) := \{(x_n) \in \ell_\infty(X) : \forall Y, \forall A \in \mathcal{CC}(X, Y), \{Ax_n\} \text{ relatively compact}\}.$$

Then $s_{\mathcal{R}o}$ is the class of all bounded sequences such that every subsequence has a weakly Cauchy subsequence. In fact, if $(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{R}o}(X)$ and (y_n) is a subsequence of (x_n), for every $f \in X^* \subset \mathcal{CC}$, there exists a subsequence (z_n) of (y_n) such that (fz_n) is convergent, hence (z_n) is weakly Cauchy; conversely, if (x_n) is a sequence such that every subsequence (y_n) has a weakly Cauchy subsequence (z_n) and if $A \in \mathcal{CC}(X, Y)$, then (Az_n) is convergent, hence $\{Ax_n\}$ is relatively compact.

From the second characterisation of $\mathcal{CC}$ we obtain

$$T \in \mathcal{CC} \Leftrightarrow ((x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{R}o} \Rightarrow (Tx_n) \in s_{\mathcal{C}o}),$$

hence $\mathcal{CC} = (\mathcal{R}o, \mathcal{C}o)$.

Proposition 3.5. *If $\mathcal{CC}^* := \{T : T^* \in \mathcal{CC}\}$, then $\mathcal{WC}o^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C}o = \mathcal{CC}^*$.*

Proof: Suppose $T \in \mathcal{CC}^*(X, Y)$ and $A \in \mathcal{WC}o(Y, Z)$. If $(x_n) \in \ell_\infty(Z^*)$, then $(A^*x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{WC}o}(Y^*)$, hence $(T^*A^*x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{C}o}(X^*)$. Consequently $T^*A^* \in (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{C}o) = \mathcal{C}o$, hence $AT \in \mathcal{C}o$ and $T \in \mathcal{WC}o^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C}o$.

Conversely, suppose $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ and $T \notin \mathcal{CC}^*$. There exists a sequence $(g_n) \subset Y^*$ such that the weak limit of (g_n) is 0, but (T^*g_n) does not converge to 0 in the norm topology. We define an operator

$$A : Y \to c_0, \quad Ay := (g_n(y)).$$

A is weakly compact, because $A^*e_n^* = g_n$ and (g_n) is weakly null [**9**, VII, Exercise 4(i)], where (e_n^*) is the canonical basis of c_0^*. Consequently,

$$AT : X \to c_0, ATx = (g_n(Tx)),$$

but $g_n(Tx) = T^*g_n(x)$ and the sequence of general term

$$(AT)^*e_n^* = T^*A^*e_n^* = T^*g_n$$

is not norm null in X^*, hence $AT \notin \mathcal{C}o$ [**9**, VII, Exercise 4(ii)]. ∎

3.6 The dual of the completely continuous operators $\mathcal{CC}^*$. From Propositions 2.10 and 3.5 we find that $\mathcal{CC}^*$ is a closed surjective operator ideal, $\mathcal{CC}^{*\wedge} = \mathcal{CC}^*$, and

$$\mathcal{CC}^* = \mathcal{WC}o^{-1} \circ (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{C}o) = \left(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{WC}o^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C}o\right) = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{CC}^*).$$

Moreover, from Lemma 2.9, we have that

$$s_{\mathcal{CC}^*}(X) = \{(x_n) \in \ell_\infty(X) : \forall Y, \forall A \in \mathcal{WC}o(X, Y), \{Ax_n\} \text{ relatively compact}\}.$$

3.7 The V operators $\mathcal{V}$. Pelczynski introduced in [**12**] the class of Banach spaces with property (V) as those spaces X such that every unconditionally converging operator from X into any Banach space is weakly compact. This property suggests that we consider the following class of operators $\mathcal{V}$:

$$T \in \mathcal{V}(X, Y) \Leftrightarrow [\forall Z, \forall S \in \mathcal{U}c(Y, Z), ST \in \mathcal{WC}o(X, Z)].$$

where $\mathcal{U}c$ is the operator ideal of all unconditionally convergent operators (that is: $\sum_1^\infty x_n$ weakly unconditionally Cauchy implies $\sum_1^\infty Tx_n$ unconditionally convergent). Clearly X has property (V) if and only if $I_X \in \mathcal{V}$.

We have $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U}c^{-1} \circ \mathcal{WC}o$. Consequently $\mathcal{V}$ is a closed surjective operator ideal and from Proposition 2.10 and Lemma 2.9 we obtain $\mathcal{V} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{V})$ and

$$s_{\mathcal{V}}(X) := \{(x_n) \in \ell_\infty(X) : \forall Y, \forall A \in \mathcal{U}c(X, Y), \{Ax_n\} \text{ relatively weakly compact}\}.$$

3.8 The V^* operators $\mathcal{V}^*$. Analogously as in the last example, we consider the following class of operators $\mathcal{V}^*$:

$$T \in \mathcal{V}^*(X, Y) \Leftrightarrow (\forall S \in \mathcal{L}(Y, \ell_1), ST \in \mathcal{C}o(X, \ell_1)).$$

X has property (V^*) ([**12**]; see also [4]) if and only if $I_X \in \mathcal{V}$.

If $op\{\ell_1\}$ is the operator ideal of all operators which factorise in ℓ_1, then we have

$$\mathcal{V}^* = [op\{\ell_1\}]^{-1} \circ \mathcal{C}o$$

and consequently $\mathcal{V}^*$ is a closed surjective operator ideal: $\mathcal{V}^{*\wedge} = \mathcal{V}^*$.

From Proposition 2.10, we obtain $\mathcal{V}^* = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{V}^*)$. Also,

$$s_{\mathcal{V}^*}(X) = \{(x_n) \in \ell_\infty(X) : \forall S \in \mathcal{L}(X, \ell_1), \{Sx_n\} \text{ relatively compact}\}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0004972700029737 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In fact, if $(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{V}^*}(X)$, then $h_{\mathcal{V}^*}(\{x_n\}) = 0$, and hence there exists $K \in \mathcal{V}^*(Z, X)$ such that $\{x_n\} \subset KB_Z$. For every $S \in \mathcal{L}(X, \ell_1)$ we obtain $\{Sx_n\} \subset SKB_Z$ with $SK \in \mathcal{C}o$; hence SKB_Z is relatively compact, and consequently $\{Sx_n\}$ is relatively compact. Conversely, let $(x_n) \in \ell_\infty(X)$ such that for every $S \in \mathcal{L}(X, \ell_1)$ the sequence (Sx_n) is relatively compact. We consider the operator

$$K: \ell_1 \to X, \quad Ke_n := x_n,$$

where (e_n) is the canonical basis of ℓ_1. From Lemma 2.8 we obtain $SK \in \mathcal{C}o(\ell_1, \ell_1)$; consequently $K \in \mathcal{V}^*$, and $(x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{V}^*}(X)$.

3.9 The Dunford-Pettis operators $\mathcal{DP}$. We consider the class $\mathcal{DP}$ defined in the following way [**13**, 3.2.5]:

$$T \in \mathcal{DP}(X, Y) \Leftrightarrow ((x_n) \subset X,\ w-\lim x_n = 0,\ (b_n) \subset Y^*,$$
$$w\text{-}\lim b_n = 0 \Rightarrow \lim b_n(Tx_n) = 0).$$

We note that $\mathcal{DP} = \mathcal{WC}o^{-1} \circ \mathcal{CC}$ [**13**, 3.2.5] and consequently $\mathcal{DP}$ is a closed operator, but $\mathcal{CC} \subset \mathcal{DP}$, hence $\mathcal{CC}^\wedge = \mathcal{DP}^\wedge = \mathcal{L}$, $h_{\mathcal{DP}} = h_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$ and $s_{\mathcal{DP}} = s_{\mathcal{L}} = \ell_\infty$. Moreover, by using Proposition 2.10, $\mathcal{DP} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{DP})$.

3.10 The Grothendieck operators $\mathcal{G}r$.

$$T \in \mathcal{G}r \Leftrightarrow ((b_n) \subset Y^*,\ w^*\text{-}\lim b_n = 0 \Rightarrow w\text{-}\lim T^*b_n = 0) \quad [\mathbf{13},\ 3.2.6].$$

If $\mathcal{S}$ is the operator ideal of all operators with separable range, then $\mathcal{G}r = \mathcal{S}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{WC}o$ [**13**, 3.2.6]. Hence $\mathcal{G}r$ is a closed surjective operator ideal: $\mathcal{G}r = \mathcal{G}r^\wedge$. Moreover, from Proposition 2.10 we obtain $\mathcal{G}r = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{G}r)$.

3.11 The weakly completely continuous operators $\mathcal{WCC}$. The class $\mathcal{WCC}$ is defined as follows:

$$T \in \mathcal{WCC} \Leftrightarrow ((x_n) \text{ weakly Cauchy } \Rightarrow (Tx_n) \text{ weakly convergent}).$$

X is weakly sequentially complete if and only if $I_X \in \mathcal{WCC}$. It is immediate to prove that

$$T \in \mathcal{WCC} \Leftrightarrow ((x_n) \in s_{\mathcal{R}o} \Rightarrow (Tx_n) \in s_{\mathcal{WC}o});$$

hence $\mathcal{WCC} = (\mathcal{R}o, \mathcal{WC}o)$.

We note that $\mathcal{WCC}$ is an operator ideal, but it is not surjective. As $\mathcal{CC} \subset \mathcal{WCC}$ we have $\mathcal{CC}^\wedge = \mathcal{WCC}^\wedge = \mathcal{L}$. Hence $h_{\mathcal{CC}} = h_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$ and $s_{\mathcal{WCC}} = s_{\mathcal{L}} = \ell_\infty$.

3.12 The strictly cosingular operators $\mathcal{SC}$. The class $\mathcal{SC}$ is defined as follows [**13**, 1.10.2]:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0004972700029737 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$T \in \mathcal{SC}(X, Y) \Leftrightarrow$ (for every quotient Y/U, $Q_U T$ surjection $\Rightarrow \dim(Y/U) < \infty$) where $Q_U : Y \to Y/U$ is the quotient map. $\mathcal{SC}$ is a closed surjective operator ideal: $\mathcal{SC} = \mathcal{SC}^\wedge$ [**13**, 1.10.4, 4.2.7, 4.7.14].

We shall denote by $\mathcal{SC}^s$ the operator ideal $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{SC})$. Clearly $\mathcal{SC}^s$ contains $\mathcal{SC}$, and we do not know if they coincide. However we can show that the equality is equivalent to an old open problem in Banach space theory.

PROPOSITION 3.13. *$\mathcal{SC} = \mathcal{SC}^s$ if and only if every infinite dimensional Banach space has an infinite dimensional separable quotient.*

PROOF: We recall that $\mathcal{SC}$ is the greatest surjective operator ideal $\mathcal{A}$ that verifies [**13**, 4.7.14]:

$$I_X \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow \dim(X) < \infty,$$

where I_X is the identity operator on X. Consequently,

$$\mathcal{SC}^s = \mathcal{SC} \Leftrightarrow (I_X \in \mathcal{SC}^s \Rightarrow \dim(X) < \infty),$$

or equivalently

$$\ell_\infty(X) = s_{SC}(X) \Rightarrow \dim(X) < \infty.$$

From this, it is enough to prove that $I_X \in \mathcal{SC}^s$ if and only if X has no infinite dimensional separable quotients.

First, supposing that X has a separable quotient of infinite dimension X/U, we will show that $\ell_\infty(X) \neq s_{SC}(X)$.

Let $Q_U : X \to X/U$ denote the quotient map, and let (y_n) be a sequence dense in $B_{X/U}$. We take $(x_n) \subset 2B_X$ such that $Q_U x_n = y_n$. If $T \in \mathcal{L}(Z, X)$ is an operator such that $\{x_n\} \subset TB_Z$, we have that $Q_U T$ is surjective [**15**, IV.5.4]; hence $T \in \mathcal{SC}$ and consequently $(x_n) \notin s_{SC}(X)$.

Now we prove the converse. If there is a sequence $(x_n) \in \ell_\infty(X) \setminus s_{SC}(X)$, then the operator $T : \ell_1 \to X$ defined by $Te_n := x_n$ is not strictly cosingular; hence there exists an infinite dimensional quotient X/U such that $Q_U T$ is surjective. X/U is a quotient of ℓ_1, hence it is separable; and we conclude that X has a separable quotient of infinite dimension. ∎

Finally we give sufficient conditions assuring that $\mathcal{SC}^s(X, Y) = \mathcal{SC}(X, Y)$. In these cases we can apply our theorem for strictly cosingular operators.

PROPOSITION 3.14.

(1) *If every infinite dimensional quotient of Y has a infinite dimensional separable quotient, then $\mathcal{SC}^s(X, Y) = \mathcal{SC}(X, Y)$ for every X.*

(2) *If every infinite dimensional quotient of X has a infinite dimensional separable quotient, then $\mathcal{SC}^s(X, Y) = \mathcal{SC}(X, Y)$ for every Y.*

PROOF: Suppose $T \notin SC(X, Y)$; then there exists an infinite dimensional quotient of Y, Y/U, such that $Q_U T$ is surjective; moreover, Y/U has a infinite dimensional separable quotient, Y/V with $U \subset V$. We take a dense sequence (y_n) in $B_{Y/V}$ and a bounded sequence (x_n) in X such that $Q_V T x_n = y_n$. As in the proof of the above proposition, we can prove that $(y_n) \notin s_{SC}(Y/V)$; then $(Tx_n) \notin s_{SC}(Y)$; hence $T \notin SC^s(X, Y)$.

(2) The proof is the same, noting that Y/U is isomorphic to $X/T^{-1}U$, because $Q_U T$ is surjective. ∎

REMARK 3.15. As a consequence of the above descriptions we conclude that the results of Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.7 apply to the operator ideals considered in Examples 3.1–3.4 and 3.6–3.11.

REFERENCES

[1] K. Astala, 'On measures of noncompactness and ideal variations in Banach spaces', *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. Dissertationes* **29** (1980).

[2] J. Banas and K. Goebel, *Measures of noncompactness in Banach spaces* (Marcel Dekker, New York, Basel, 1980).

[3] J. Barría, 'On power compact operators', *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **80** (1980), 123–124.

[4] F. Bombal, 'On (V^*) sets and Pelczynski's property (V^*)', *Glasgow Math. J.* **32** (1990), 109–120.

[5] L.G. Brown and C. Foias, 'An elementary proof of a theorem of Tacon', *Int. Eq. and Oper. Theory* **4** (1981), 596–599.

[6] J.J. Buoni, A. Klein, B.M. Scott and B.L. Wadhwa, 'On power compactness in a Banach space', *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **32** (1983), 177–185.

[7] J.J. Buoni, A. Klein, B.M. Scott and B.L. Wadhwa, 'Compact-like operators and the Baire category theorem', *Int. Eq. and Oper. Theory* **7** (1984), 10–26.

[8] F.S. De Blasi, 'On a property of the unit sphere in a Banach space', *Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. R. S. Roumanie* **21 (60)** (1977), 259–262.

[9] J. Diestel, 'Sequences and series in Banach spaces', in *Graduate Texts in Math.* 92 (Springer-Verlag, New York, Berlin, Heidelberg, Tokyo, 1984).

[10] M. Gonzalez and A. Martinon, 'On the generalized Sadovskii functor', *Rev. Acad. Canaria de Ciencias* **1** (1990), 109–117.

[11] M. Gonzalez and A. Martinon, 'Some extension of the Sadovskii functor', *Extracta Math.* **5** (1990), 15–17.

[12] A. Pelczynski, 'Banach spaces on which every unconditionally converging operator is weakly compact', *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci.* **10** (1962), 641–648.

[13] A. Pietsch, *Operator ideals* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, New York, Oxford, 1980).

[14] D.G. Tacon, 'Two characterizations of power compact operators', *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **73** (1979), 356–360.

[15] A.E. Taylor and D.C. Lay, *Introduction to functional analysis*, Second ed. (John Wiley, New York, Chichester, Brisbane, Toronto, 1980).

Departamento de Matemáticas
Universidad de Cantabria
39071 Santander
Spain

Departamento de Análisis Matemático
Universidad de La Laguna
38271 La Laguna (Tenerife)
Spain