

ON A FUNCTION MODULE WITH APPROXIMATE HYPERPLANE SERIES PROPERTY

T. GRANDO[✉] and M. L. LOURENÇO

(Received 22 November 2017; accepted 2 March 2019)

Communicated by W. Moors

Abstract

We present a sufficient and necessary condition for a function module space X to have the approximate hyperplane series property (AHSP). As a consequence, we have that the space $C_0(L, E)$ of bounded and continuous E -valued mappings defined on the locally compact Hausdorff space L has AHSP if and only if E has AHSP.

2010 *Mathematics subject classification*: primary 46E25; secondary 15A03.

Keywords and phrases: Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás property for operators, approximate hyperplane series property, function module space.

1. Introduction

Throughout the paper, E and F will be complex Banach spaces. As usual, S_E , B_E and E^* will denote the unit sphere, the closed unit ball, and the (topological) dual of E , respectively. Given two Banach spaces E and F , $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ denotes the space of all bounded linear operators from E into F .

The Bishop–Phelps theorem states that the set of norm-attaining functionals on E is dense in E^* [8]. It has been usefully extended in many directions and in the study of optimization. After the celebrated Bishop–Phelps theorem, it was a natural question as to whether the set of norm-attaining linear operators is dense in $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$, for all E and F .

In 1963, J. Lindenstrauss [18] gave a counterexample showing that it does not hold in general and he also showed that, if E is reflexive, then the set of all norm-attaining operators is always dense in the space of $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$.

Motivated by the study of numerical ranges of operators, B. Bollobás in [9] proved a refinement of the Bishop–Phelps theorem, nowadays known as the Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás theorem [9, Theorem 1].

Carrying Bollobás’s ideas to the vector-valued case in 2008, Acosta, Aron, García and Maestre [1] introduced the notion of the Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás property for

operators (BPBP for operators, for short) (see the Definition 2.1). BPBP for operators is a stronger property than the denseness of norm-attaining operators. It had been known that the set of norm-attaining operators from ℓ_1 to any Banach space F is dense, but the pair (ℓ_1, F) has BPBP for operators if F has a special property. This property was introduced in [1], called the approximate hyperplane series property (AHSP, for short), with the purpose of characterizing those Banach spaces F such that (ℓ_1, F) has BPBP for operators. These two properties have attracted the attention of many researchers. For more details and recent results about BPBP for operators or AHSP, see [2–6, 10–12, 14–17].

In this note we study when a function module space X has AHSP and we obtain that the space $C(K, E)$ has AHSP if, and only if, a Banach space E has AHSP. In this sense, we have generalized a result of Choi and Kim [13]. We also obtain as a consequence, the space $C_0(L, E)$ of bounded and continuous E -valued mappings defined on the locally compact Hausdorff space L has AHSP if and only if E has AHSP.

2. Results

For our purposes, it will be useful to recall the definition of BPBP for operators.

DEFINITION 2.1. Let E and F be Banach spaces. We say that the pair (E, F) has the *Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás property for operators* (BPBP for operators, for short) if given $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\eta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that whenever $T \in S_{\mathcal{L}(E, F)}$ and $x_0 \in S_E$ satisfy that $\|Tx_0\| > 1 - \eta(\varepsilon)$, then there exist a point $u_0 \in S_E$ and an operator $S \in S_{\mathcal{L}(E, F)}$ satisfying the following conditions.

$$\|Su_0\| = 1, \quad \|u_0 - x_0\| < \varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \|S - T\| < \varepsilon.$$

Now we will give the definition of AHSP introduced in [1]. Recall that if $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset E$ and $(\lambda_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lambda_k \geq 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that the series given by $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k x_k$ is a *convex series* if $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k = 1$.

DEFINITION 2.2. A Banach space E is said to have AHSP (approximate hyperplane series property) if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $0 < \eta < \varepsilon$ such that for every sequence $(x_k)_k \subset S_E$ and convex series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k x_k$ with

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k x_k \right\| > 1 - \eta,$$

there exist a subset $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ and a subset $\{z_k : k \in A\}$ satisfying

- (i) $\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k > 1 - \varepsilon$;
- (ii) $\|z_k - x_k\| < \varepsilon$ for all $k \in A$;
- (iii) $x^*(z_k) = 1$ for a certain $x^* \in S_{X^*}$ and for all $k \in A$.

We observe that the above property holds if it is satisfied just for a finite convex combination (instead of convex series). The very useful comment in [1] is:

‘Geometrically, E has AHSP if whenever we have a convex series of vectors in B_E whose norm is very close to 1, then a preponderance of these vectors are uniformly close to unit vectors that lie in the same hyperplane $(x^*)^{-1}(1)$, where $\|x^*\| = 1$.’

Among the spaces with AHSP, we may cite finite dimensional spaces, uniformly convex spaces and $C_0(L)$ spaces, as representative examples [1]. On the other hand, there are spaces failing this property: every strictly convex space which is not uniformly convex [1]. We refer the reader to the paper [15] for more examples of spaces with AHSP.

It was verified in [1] that in the Definition 2.2, we can consider sequences $(x_k)_k$ of vectors in the unit ball of E .

PROPOSITION 2.3. *Let E be a Banach space. E has AHSP if and only if for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $0 < \gamma(\epsilon) < \epsilon$ and $\eta(\epsilon) > 0$ with $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \gamma(\epsilon) = 0$ such that for every sequence, $(x_k)_k \subset B_E$ and every convex series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k x_k$ satisfying*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k x_k \right\| > 1 - \eta(\epsilon),$$

there exist a subset $A \subset \mathbb{N}$, $\{z_k : k \in A\} \subset S_E$ and $x^ \in S_{E^*}$ such that*

- (i) $\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k > 1 - \gamma(\epsilon)$;
- (ii) $\|z_k - x_k\| < \epsilon$ for all $k \in A$;
- (iii) $x^*(z_k) = 1$ for all $k \in A$.

Our objective is to study when a function module space has AHSP. For this, we define a function module space. Recall that a space X is a $C(K)$ -module space if for all $x \in X$ and for all $h \in C(K)$, we have that $hx \in X$, where $(hx)(t) := h(t)x(t)$.

DEFINITION 2.4. *Function Module* is (the third coordinate of) a triple $(K, (X_t)_{t \in K}, X)$, where K is a nonempty compact Hausdorff topological space, $(X_t)_{t \in K}$ a family of Banach spaces, and X a closed $C(K)$ -submodule of the $C(K)$ -module $\prod_{t \in K}^{\infty} X_t$ (the ℓ_{∞} -sum of the spaces X_t) such that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) for every $x \in X$, the function $t \mapsto \|x(t)\|$ from K to \mathbb{R} is upper semicontinuous;
- (2) for every $t \in K$, we have $X_t = \{x(t) : x \in X\}$;
- (3) the set $\{t \in K : X_t \neq 0\}$ is dense in K .

REMARK 2.5. In the Definition 2.4, K is called the base space and the family $(X_t)_{t \in K}$ is called the component spaces.

For function modules we follow the notation of [7], where the basic results of such theory can be found.

EXAMPLES 2.6.

- (a) Let K be a nonempty compact Hausdorff space and $E \neq \{0\}$. The space $C(K, E)$ can be viewed as a function module space when $X_t = E$ for all $t \in K$ and $X = C(K, E)$.
- (b) Let L be a nonempty locally compact Hausdorff space. The space $C_0(L, E)$ is the space of all continuous function $f : L \rightarrow E$ such that for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $C \subset L$ such that $\|f(t)\| \leq \epsilon$, for all $t \in L \setminus C$. It can be regarded in a natural way as a function module with base space $K = \beta L$ (the Stone–Cech compactification of L) and the component spaces $(X_t)_{t \in K}$ given by $X_t = E$ if $t \in L$ and $X_t = \{0\}$ if $t \in K \setminus L$.

THEOREM 2.7. *Let $(K, (X_t)_{t \in K}, X)$ be a complex function module and $\epsilon > 0$. Suppose that for all $t \in K$, $(X_t)_{t \in K}$ has AHSP with the same function $\eta(\epsilon)$ given by Proposition 2.3, and for every $x_t \in X_t$ there exists $f \in X$ such that $f(t) = x_t$ and $\|f\| \leq \|x_t\|$ then X has AHSP.*

PROOF. Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$. We consider a finite convex series $\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k x_k$ for $(x_k)_{k=1}^n \subset B_X$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k x_k \right\| > 1 - \eta\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right).$$

Since

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k x_k \right\| = \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k x_k(t) \right\|_{X_t} : t \in K \right\} > 1 - \eta\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right),$$

there exists $t_0 \in K$ such that,

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k x_k(t_0) \right\|_{X_{t_0}} > 1 - \eta\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right).$$

And for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have,

$$\|x_k(t_0)\|_{X_{t_0}} \leq \|x_k\| \leq 1.$$

Then, the sequence $(x_k(t_0))_{k=1}^n \subset B_{X_{t_0}}$. By hypothesis X_{t_0} has AHSP and by Proposition 2.3 there exist $A \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\{z_k : k \in A\} \subset S_{X_{t_0}}$ and $z^* \in S_{X_{t_0}^*}$ such that:

- (1) $\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k > 1 - \gamma(\epsilon/2)$;
- (2) $\|z_k - x_k(t_0)\|_{X_{t_0}} < \epsilon/2$ for all $k \in A$;
- (3) $z^*(z_k) = 1$ for all $k \in A$.

By hypothesis, for all $k \in A$ there exist $f_k \in X$ such that $f_k(t_0) = z_k$ and $\|f_k\| \leq \|z_k\| = 1$. Now, we define the following subset in K :

$$U = \bigcap_{k \in A} \left\{ t \in K : \|f_k(t) - x_k(t)\|_{X_t} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right\}.$$

It is clear that $U \neq \emptyset$ and U is an open set of K , since the function $t \in K \mapsto \|x(t)\| \in \mathbb{R}$ is upper semicontinuous for all $x \in X$. By Urysohn's lemma there exists a function $\varphi : K \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\varphi(t_0) = 1$ and $\varphi(t) = 0$ for all $t \in K \setminus U$.

Now, for each $k \in A$ let $g_k : K \rightarrow \bigcup_{t \in K} X_t$ defined by

$$g_k(t) = \varphi(t)f_k(t) + \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)(1 - \varphi(t))x_k(t).$$

It is clear that $g_k \in X$ for all $k \in A$. We claim that $(g_k)_{k \in A} \subset S_X$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_k(t)\|_{X_t} &= \left\| \varphi(t)f_k(t) + \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)(1 - \varphi(t))x_k(t) \right\|_{X_t} \\ &\leq \varphi(t) + 1 - \varphi(t) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

and $\|g_k(t_0)\|_{X_{t_0}} = \|z_k\|_{X_{t_0}} = 1$. So, for all $k \in A$

$$\|g_k\| = \sup\{\|g_k(t)\|_{X_t} : t \in K\} = 1,$$

which means $g_k \in S_X$ for all $k \in A$.

Now, we will show that $\|g_k - x_k\| < \epsilon$ for all $k \in A$. In fact, if $t \in U$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_k(t) - x_k(t)\|_{X_t} &= \left\| \varphi(t)f_k(t) + \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)(1 - \varphi(t))x_k(t) - x_k(t) \right\|_{X_t} \\ &= \left\| \varphi(t)(f_k(t) - x_k(t)) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}(1 - \varphi(t))x_k(t) \right\|_{X_t} \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

If $t \in K \setminus U$, then $\|g_k(t) - x_k(t)\|_{X_t} = \|(1 - \epsilon/2)x_k(t) - x_k(t)\|_{X_t} < \epsilon$.

Thus,

$$\|g_k - x_k\| = \sup\{\|(g_k - x_k)(t)\| : t \in K\} < \epsilon, \quad \forall k \in A.$$

Now we consider the valuation mapping $\delta_{t_0} : X \rightarrow X_{t_0}$ and define the linear function $x^* := z^* \circ \delta_{t_0}$. If $x \in S_X$, then $|x^*(x)| = |z^*(x(t_0))| \leq \|z^*\| \|x(t_0)\| \leq 1$.

Besides that, for all $k \in A$, $|x^*(g_k)| = |z^*(g_k(t_0))| = |z^*(z_k)| = 1$. So $\|x^*\| = 1$.

Finally, $x^* \in S_{X^*}$ and $x^*(g_k) = 1$, for all $k \in A$. Then X has AHSP. \square

In the next theorem we will show that it is possible to get the reciprocal of Theorem 2.7. We need to add the additional hypothesis that the mapping $t \in K \mapsto \|x(t)\|$ is continuous for all $x \in X$, when $X_t = E$, for all $t \in K$ and for some E .

THEOREM 2.8. *Let $(K, (X_t)_{t \in K}, X)$ be a complex function module where $X_t = E$, for all $t \in K$ for some Banach space E . Suppose that the mapping $t \in K \mapsto \|x(t)\|$ is continuous for all $x \in X$. If X has AHSP, then X_t has AHSP for all $t \in K$.*

PROOF. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Since X has AHSP, there exist $\eta(\epsilon), \gamma(\epsilon) > 0$ that satisfy the Proposition 2.3. Consider $(x_k)_k \subset B_E$ and the convex series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k x_k$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k x_k \right\|_E > 1 - \eta(\epsilon).$$

For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $f_k : K \rightarrow \bigcup_{t \in K} X_t$ by $f_k(t) = x_k$. So $(f_k)_k \subset B_X$ and

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k f_k \right\| = \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k f_k(t) \right\| : t \in K \right\} = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k x_k \right\|_E > 1 - \eta(\epsilon).$$

Since X has AHSP by Proposition 2.3, there are $A \subset \mathbb{N}$, $\{z_k : k \in A\} \subset S_X$ and $\Phi \in S_{X^*}$ such that $\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k > 1 - \gamma(\epsilon)$, $\|z_k - f_k\| < \epsilon$ and $\Phi(z_k) = 1$, for all $k \in A$. Now, we claim that $\|\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k\| = \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k$. Indeed,

$$\left\| \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k \right\| \leq \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k \|z_k\| = \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k.$$

Since for all $k \in A$, $\Phi(z_k) = 1$, then

$$\Phi \left(\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k \right) = \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k,$$

so

$$\left\| \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k \right\| = \sup \left\{ \left| \varphi \left(\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k \right) \right| : \varphi \in S_{X^*} \right\} = \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k.$$

Now,

$$\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k = \left\| \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k \right\| = \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k(t) \right\| : t \in K \right\}.$$

By hypothesis, the function $t \in K \mapsto \|\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k(t)\|_E$ is continuous. Then there is $t_0 \in K$, such that $\|\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k(t_0)\| = \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k$. Thus, $\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k(t_0) \neq \mathbf{0}$. So, there is a function $x^* \in S_{E^*}$ such that

$$x^* \left(\sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k(t_0) \right) = \left\| \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k z_k(t_0) \right\|_E = \sum_{k \in A} \alpha_k.$$

Now we consider $g_k := z_k(t_0)$ and observe that $x^*(g_k) = 1$ for all $k \in A$. That is, for all $k \in A$, $(g_k)_k \subset S_E$ and

$$\|g_k - x_k\|_E = \|z_k(t_0) - f_k(t_0)\|_E \leq \|z_k - f_k\| < \epsilon, \quad \forall k \in A.$$

The theorem follows. □

COROLLARY 2.9. *Let X be a dual complex Banach space such that X can be regarded as a function module space, where $X_t = E$, for all $t \in K$ and E a Banach space. Then X has AHSP if and only if X_t has AHSP for all $t \in K$.*

PROOF. Now for X as a dual space which can be represented as a complex function module with a base space K (see [7, Proposition 3.10]), then for every $x \in X$, the function $t \in K \mapsto \|x(t)\|$ is continuous [7, Theorem 5.13]. Therefore the assumptions in both Theorems 2.7 and 2.8 hold. □

COROLLARY 2.10. *Let L be a locally compact Hausdorff space and X a Banach space. Then $C_0(L, X)$ has AHSP if, and only if X has AHSP.*

PROOF. Consider $K = \beta L$ the Stone–Cech compactification of L ; the Theorems 2.7 and 2.8 imply the result. \square

As a consequence of Corollary 2.10 and Theorem 4.1 in [1] we have that $(\ell_1, C_0(L, E))$ has BPBP if, and only if E has AHSP. Generally, if $(K, (X_t)_{t \in K}, X)$ is a function module space with AHSP, then (ℓ_1, X) has BPBP.

COROLLARY 2.11. *Let $K \neq \emptyset$ be a compact Hausdorff topological space and E be a Banach space. Then E has AHSP if, and only if $C(K, E)$ has AHSP.*

PROOF. Since $C(K, E)$ is a function module, with K base space and $X_t = E$ for all $t \in K$ (see Examples 2.6(a)) and the mapping $t \in K \mapsto \|f(t)\|$ is continuous for all $f \in C(K, E)$, the result follows straight away by Theorems 2.7 and 2.8. \square

S. Y. Choi and S. Kim in [13, Theorem 11] showed that if $C(K, E)$ has AHSP, then E has AHSP. Here the Corollary 2.11 generalizes, in a sense, the result of Choi and Kim and we have the reciprocal.

Open problem: We do not know if Theorem 2.8 is true if there are two distinct component spaces. That means, there are $t_1, t_2 \in K$ such that $X_{t_1} \neq X_{t_2}$.

References

- [1] M. D. Acosta, R. M. Aron, D. García and M. Maestre, ‘The Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás theorem for operators’, *J. Funct. Anal.* **254** (2008), 2780–2799.
- [2] M. D. Acosta, J. Becerra-Guerrero, Y. S. Choi, M. Ciesielski, S. K. Kim, H. J. Lee, M. L. Lourenço and M. Martín, ‘The Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás property for operators between spaces of continuous functions’, *Nonlinear Anal.* **95** (2014), 323–332.
- [3] M. D. Acosta, J. Becerra-Guerrero, D. García, S. K. Kim and M. Maestre, ‘Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás property for certain spaces of operators’, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **414** (2014), 532–545.
- [4] R. M. Aron, B. Cascales and O. Kozhushkina, ‘The Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás theorem and Asplund operators’, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **139**(10) (2011), 3553–3560.
- [5] R. M. Aron, Y. S. Choi, D. García and M. Maestre, ‘The Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás theorem for $\mathcal{L}(L_1(\mu), L_\infty[0, 1])$ ’, *Adv. Math.* **228**(1) (2011), 617–628.
- [6] R. M. Aron, Y. S. Choi, S. K. Kim, H. J. Lee and M. Martín, ‘The Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás version of Lindenstrauss properties A and B’, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **367** (2015), 6085–6101.
- [7] E. Behrends, *M-Structure and the Banach–Stone Theorem* (Springer, Berlin, 1979).
- [8] E. Bishop and R. R. Phelps, ‘A proof that every Banach space is subreflexive’, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **67** (1961), 97–98.
- [9] B. Bollobás, ‘An extension to the theorem of Bishop and Phelps’, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **2** (1970), 181–182.
- [10] B. Cascales, A. J. Guirao and V. Kadets, ‘A Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás type theorem for uniform algebras’, *Adv. Math.* **240** (2013), 370–382.
- [11] M. Chica, V. Kadets, M. Martín, S. Moreno-Pulido and F. Rambla-Barreno, ‘Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás moduli of a Banach space’, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **412**(2) (2014), 697–719.
- [12] Y. S. Choi and S. K. Kim, ‘The Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás theorem for operators from $L_1(\mu)$ to Banach spaces with the Radon–Nikodým property’, *J. Funct. Anal.* **261**(6) (2011), 1446–1456.
- [13] Y. S. Choi and S. K. Kim, ‘The Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás property and lush spaces’, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **390** (2012), 549–555.

- [14] Y. S. Choi, S. K. Kim, H. J. Lee and M. Martín, ‘The Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás theorem for operators on $L_1(\mu)$ ’, *J. Funct. Anal.* **267**(91) (2014), 214–242.
- [15] Y. S. Choi, S. K. Kim, H. J. Lee and M. Martín, ‘On Banach spaces with the approximate hyperplane series property’, *Banach J. Math. Anal.* **9**(4) (2015), 243–258.
- [16] S. K. Kim, ‘The Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás theorem for operators from c_0 to uniformly convex spaces’, *Israel J. Math.* **197**(1) (2013), 425–435.
- [17] S. K. Kim and H. J. Lee, ‘Uniform convexity and Bishop–Phelps–Bollobás property’, *Canad. J. Math.* **66**(2) (2014), 372–386.
- [18] J. Lindenstrauss, ‘On operators which attain their norm’, *Israel J. Math.* **1** (1963), 139–148.

T. GRANDO, Department of Mathematics, University of São Paulo,
P.O. Box 66281, 05315-970,
São Paulo, Brazil
e-mail: tgrando@ime.usp.br

M. L. LOURENÇO, Department of Mathematics, University of São Paulo,
P.O. Box 66281, 05315-970,
São Paulo, Brazil
e-mail: mllouren@ime.usp.br