

Hans Jarchow; Kamil John
Bilinear forms and nuclearity

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 44 (1994), No. 2, 367–373

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/128458>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1994

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://dml.cz>

BILINEAR FORMS AND NUCLEARITY

H. JARCHOW, Zürich, and KAMIL JOHN, Praha

(Received October 21, 1994)

INTRODUCTION

Back in 1965, A. Pietsch asked if a locally convex Hausdorff space (lcs) E must be nuclear whenever it has the property that every continuous bilinear form on $E \times E$ is nuclear (cf. [10], 7.4.5). The question remained open, even within the framework of Banach spaces where it translates to what is known as the “bounded non-nuclear operator problem”: is a Banach space X necessarily finite-dimensional when all operators from X to its dual X^* are nuclear?

The related “compact non-nuclear operator problem” has a negative solution. In 1983, G. Pisier [12] constructed (separable, infinite-dimensional) Banach spaces P which, among others, have the property that every approximable operator $P \rightarrow P$ is nuclear. In 1990, K. John [8] observed that this is also true for approximable operators $P^{(m)} \rightarrow P^{(n)}$ for any choice of positive integers m and n ; here $P^{(m)}$ is the m -th dual of P . He even proved that actually every compact operator $P \rightarrow P^*$ is nuclear.

It is open whether there are “Pisier spaces” which do not contain a copy of ℓ_1 (cf. [9]). In fact, for any such space P all operators $P \rightarrow P^*$ would be nuclear, and the answer to Pietsch’s question would be negative even when restricted to Banach spaces.

Nevertheless, the Pisier spaces P can be used to give a negative answer to Pietsch’s question within the class of Schwartz spaces; the clue is to change P ’s topology in such a way that compactness of the involved operators is automatic. An appropriate selection of a sequence of continuous seminorms on the resulting space makes it even possible to construct a non-nuclear Fréchet-Schwartz space on which all bounded bilinear forms are nuclear.

The topology in question is the compact-open topology on P . More generally, given any Banach space X , let us write

$$X_0$$

for X endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets of X^* . This topology is known to be the finest Schwartz topology on X which is consistent with the duality $\langle X, X^* \rangle$; equivalently, it can be characterized as the coarsest locally convex topology on X which renders compact all continuous operators from X into any Banach space. See e.g. [2] for definitions and background. If X is infinite dimensional, then X_0 can never be nuclear. One way of seeing this is by using an immediate consequence of a result of S.Bellenot [1] on factorization properties of compact Hilbert space operators. It follows from this that regardless of how we choose the infinite dimensional Banach space X , every Hilbert-Schmidt operator $u: \ell_2 \rightarrow \ell_2$ admits a factorization $u: \ell_2 \xrightarrow{w} X \xrightarrow{v} \ell_2$; see also [4]. Clearly, v can be chosen compact, so that v is continuous from X_0 to ℓ_2 . Nuclearity of X_0 would therefore entail that every Hilbert-Schmidt operator on ℓ_2 is nuclear—a plain contradiction.

RESULTS

In particular, if P is any Pisier space, then P_0 cannot be nuclear. However:

Theorem 1. *If P is a Pisier space, then every continuous bilinear form on $P_0 \times P_0$ is nuclear.*

A stronger result is the following:

Theorem 2. *If P is a Pisier space, then*

$$P_0 \otimes_\varepsilon P_0 = P_0 \otimes_\pi P_0.$$

Recall from Pisier's work [12] that $P \otimes_\varepsilon P = P \otimes_\pi P$. So the above can be looked at as a "quadratic" counterexample within the class of Schwartz spaces to Grothendieck's conjecture [2] that if two lcs E and F are such that $E \otimes_\varepsilon F = E \otimes_\pi F$, then one of them must be nuclear. Recall that there are "non-quadratic" such counterexamples, even within the class of all Fréchet-Schwartz spaces having a basis whose topologies are generated by hilbertian seminorms (cf. [7]); however, the hilbertian nature of such spaces prevents the existence of "quadratic" counterexamples of this kind (cf. [6]). Nevertheless, using Theorem 2 we are able to construct "quadratic" counterexamples within the class of all Fréchet-Schwartz spaces:

Theorem 3. *There exists a non-nuclear Fréchet-Schwartz space F such that*

- (a) $F \otimes_\varepsilon F = F \otimes_\pi F$ and
- (b) every continuous bilinear form on $F \times F$ is nuclear.

PRELIMINARIES

We are going to use standard terminology and results on Banach spaces, operator ideals, and locally convex spaces; our main references are [11] and [3]. Let us just recall some basic notions.

Let E be any lcs (all lcs will be over $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{R}$ or \mathbf{C}). The system of all closed, absolutely convex neighbourhoods of zero in E will be denoted by

$$\mathcal{U}(E).$$

Given $U \in \mathcal{U}(E)$, let p_U be its gauge functional, let

$$E_U$$

be the Banach space obtained from completing the associated normed space $E/\ker(p_U)$, and let

$$\Phi_U: E \rightarrow E_U$$

be the corresponding canonical map. If $V \in \mathcal{U}(E)$ is contained in U , then there is a unique $\Phi_{UV} \in \mathcal{L}(E_V, E_U)$ such that $\Phi_U = \Phi_{UV} \circ \Phi_V$.

We write

$$\mathcal{B}(E, E)$$

for the space of all continuous bilinear forms $E \times E \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$. Given $\beta \in \mathcal{B}(E, E)$, we can find $U \in \mathcal{U}(E)$ such that

$$|\beta(x, y)| \leq p_U(x) \cdot p_U(y)$$

for all $x, y \in E$. It follows that β admits a factorization $\beta = \beta_U \circ (\Phi_U \times \Phi_U)$ with $\beta_U \in \mathcal{B}(E_U, E_U)$. Since

$$\mathcal{L}(E_U, E_U^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(E, E): u \mapsto \langle \Phi_U^* \circ u \circ \Phi_U(\cdot), \cdot \rangle$$

is clearly a linear injection, we arrive at the identification

$$\mathcal{B}(E, E) = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(E)} \mathcal{L}(E_U, E_U^*).$$

Let \mathcal{N} denote the ideal of all nuclear operators between Banach spaces. The members of

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N}}(E, E) := \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}(E)} \mathcal{N}(E_U, E_U^*)$$

are called the *nuclear bilinear forms* on $E \times E$. To say that a bilinear form $\beta: E \times E \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ is nuclear thus amounts to requiring the existence of a $U \in \mathcal{U}(E)$ and of sequences $(x_n^*), (y_n^*)$ in E_U^* such that

$$\sum_n \|x_n^*\|_{E_U^*} \cdot \|y_n^*\|_{E_U^*} < \infty$$

and

$$\beta(x, y) = \sum_n \langle x_n^*, x \rangle \cdot \langle y_n^*, y \rangle$$

for all $x, y \in E$. Here we have used that the adjoint of Φ_U identifies E_U^* with a linear subspace of E^* , the continuous dual of E .

PROOFS

Though Theorem 2 implies Theorem 1, we start by a simple direct proof of the latter result.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $\beta \in \mathcal{B}(P_0, P_0)$ be given. By what we have just explained, there is a $U \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$ together with an operator $u \in \mathcal{L}(P_U, P_U^*)$ such that

$$\beta(x, y) = \langle (\Phi_U^* u \Phi_U)x, y \rangle$$

for all $x, y \in P$. By P_0 's nature, $v := \Phi_U^* u \Phi_U: P \rightarrow P^*$ is compact; it was shown in [8] that it is even nuclear. Therefore it factors $v: P \xrightarrow{a} c_0 \xrightarrow{\Delta} \ell_1 \xrightarrow{b^*} P^*$ with Δ a diagonal operator and $a, b \in \mathcal{L}(P, c_0)$. Clearly, we may even chose a and b to be compact, so that $a = \tilde{a}\Phi_V$ and $b = \tilde{b}\Phi_V$ for some $V \in \mathcal{U}(P_C)$ and suitable operators $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b} \in \mathcal{L}(P_V, c_0)$. Of course, we may suppose $V \subset U$ so that, if we define $v \in \mathcal{N}(P_V, P_V^*)$ by $v := \tilde{b}^* \Delta \tilde{a}$, then $v = \Phi_{UV}^* u \Phi_{UV}$. It follows that $\beta_V: P_V \times P_V \rightarrow \mathbf{K}: (x, y) \mapsto \langle vx, y \rangle$ is a nuclear bilinear form, and since $\beta = \beta_V \circ (\Phi_V \times \Phi_V)$, we are done. □

In order to prove Theorem 2, we must look closer at the map

$$(*) \quad \mathcal{L}(P_U, P_U^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(P, P^*): u \mapsto \Phi_U^* u \Phi_U$$

established in the preceding proof. We have already seen that for each $u \in \mathcal{L}(P_U, P_U^*)$ there is a $V \subset U$ in $\mathcal{U}(P_0)$ such that $\Phi_{UV}^* u \Phi_{UV}$ belongs to $\mathcal{N}(P_V, P_V^*)$;

so the range of the map $(*)$ is actually the union of all $\mathcal{N}(P_V, P_V^*), V \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$. We are going to show that all of $\mathcal{L}(P_U, P_U^*)$ is actually mapped into $\mathcal{N}(P_V, P_V^*)$ for a single V . More precisely:

Proposition. *No matter how we select a neighbourhood $U \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$, it contains a neighbourhood $V \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$ such that $u \mapsto \Phi_{UV}^* u \Phi_{UV}$ defines a bounded operator of $\mathcal{L}(P_U, P_U^*)$ to $\mathcal{N}(P_V, P_V^*)$.*

Proof. We shall now use that, by [12], $\mathcal{N}(P, P^*)$ is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{L}(P, P^*)$!

The adjoint of $\Phi_U \otimes \Phi_U: P \otimes_\pi P \rightarrow P_U \otimes_\pi P_U$ is given by $u \mapsto \Phi_U^* u \Phi_U$, i.e. the map appearing in $(*)$.

Since U belongs to $\mathcal{U}(P_0)$, Φ_U is compact, and so the operator in $(*)$ is compact as well. There is thus a null sequence (v_n) in $\mathcal{N}(P, P^*)$ such that $\{\Phi_U^* u \Phi_U: u \in B_{\mathcal{L}(P_U, P_U^*)}\}$ is contained in $\overline{\text{con}}\{v_n: n \in \mathbf{N}\}$. We may even assume that each v_n is of the form $v_n = \Phi_U^* u_n \Phi_U$ where $u_n \in B_{\mathcal{L}(P_U, P_U^*)}$, see e.g. 9.4.2 in [3].

Each v_n has a decomposition $v_n = b_n^* \Delta_n a_n$ where a_n and b_n are compact operators $P \rightarrow c_0$ and $\Delta: c_0 \rightarrow \ell_1$ is a diagonal operator. Let $\nu(\cdot)$ denote the nuclear norm. Clearly, we may suppose that $\|a_n\| \cdot \|\Delta_n\| \cdot \|b_n\| \leq 2 \cdot \nu(v_n)$, and we may arrange for $\|\Delta_n\| \leq 2$ and $\max\{\|a_n\|, \|b_n\|\} \leq \nu(v_n)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for each n . In particular, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a_n\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|b_n\| = 0$.

Introduce the Banach space $X = c_0(c_0)$ of all norm null sequences in c_0 , and let $p_n: X \rightarrow c_0$ be the projection onto the n -th coordinate, $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Then $a: P \rightarrow X: x \mapsto (a_n x)_n$ and $b: P \rightarrow X: x \mapsto (b_n x)_n$ are well-defined operators, and we may write $v_n = b^* p_n^* \Delta_n p_n a$ since $a_n = p_n a$ and $b_n = p_n b$ for each n . A standard diagonalization argument reveals that a and b are even compact. Therefore we can find $V \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$ satisfying $V \subset U$, together with operators $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b} \in \mathcal{L}(P_V, X)$ such that $a = \tilde{a} \Phi_V$ and $b = \tilde{b} \Phi_V$. Write $v_n = \Phi_V^* w_n \Phi_V$ where $w_n := \tilde{b}^* p_n^* \Delta_n p_n \tilde{a}$ belongs to $\mathcal{N}(P_V, P_V^*)$. Since the involved operators are continuous and since Φ_V has dense range we may conclude that $\Phi_{UV}^* u_n \Phi_{UV} = w_n \in \mathcal{N}(P_V, P_V^*)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(w_n) &= \nu(\Phi_{UV}^* u_n \Phi_{UV}) = \nu(\tilde{b}^* p_n^* \Delta_n p_n \tilde{a}) \\ &\leq \|\tilde{a}\| \cdot \|\tilde{b}\| \cdot \nu(\Delta_n) \leq 2 \cdot \|\tilde{a}\| \cdot \|\tilde{b}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Let now $u \in B_{\mathcal{L}(P_U, P_U^*)}$ be arbitrary. There are $\lambda_n \geq 0$ such that $v := \Phi_U^* u \Phi_U$ has the representation $v = \sum_n \lambda_n v_n$ in $\mathcal{N}(P, P^*)$. To complete the proof, just observe that $w := \sum_n \lambda_n w_n$ exists in $\mathcal{N}(P_V, P_V^*)$ and equals $\Phi_{UV}^* u \Phi_{UV}$. \square

The proof of Theorem 2 is now immediate. Given $U \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$, let $V \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$ be such that $V \subset U$ and $u \mapsto \Phi_{UV}^* u \Phi_{UV}$ maps $\mathcal{L}(P_U, P_U^*) = (P_U \otimes_\pi P_U)^*$

continuously into $\mathcal{N}(P_V, P_V^*)$ and hence continuously into $(P_V \otimes_\varepsilon P_V)^*$. Our map is the adjoint of $\Phi_{UV} \otimes \Phi_{UV}$ which therefore is continuous from $P_V \otimes_\varepsilon P_V$ to $P_U \otimes_\pi P_U$. But since $P_0 \tilde{\otimes}_\varepsilon P_0$ and $P_0 \tilde{\otimes}_\pi P_0$ have natural representations as projective limits of the $P_U \tilde{\otimes}_\varepsilon P_U$ and the $P_U \tilde{\otimes}_\pi P_U$, respectively ($U \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$; cf. [3], 16.3.3 and 15.4.3), we may conclude that the identity $P_0 \otimes_\varepsilon P_0 \rightarrow P_0 \otimes_\pi P_0$ is continuous. \square

Theorem 1 follows from Theorem 2: in fact, the latter implies that every continuous bilinear form on $P_0 \times P_0$ is integral. It must be nuclear since each $U \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$ contains a $V \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$ such that $\Phi_{UV}: P_V \rightarrow P_U$ is compact; cf. [11], 24.6.3.

Let us now proceed to our final goal.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. As before, (b) follows from (a); indeed, (a) and (b) are equivalent since we are dealing with metrizable lcs.

Given an lcs E , we call a neighbourhood $U \in \mathcal{U}(E)$ *non-nuclear* if there is no $V \in \mathcal{U}(E)$ such that the operator $\Phi_{UV}: E_V \rightarrow E_U$ is nuclear. Clearly, if $U \in \mathcal{U}(E)$ is non-nuclear, then any $V \in \mathcal{U}(E)$ which is contained in U is non-nuclear as well. Certainly, E is a non-nuclear lcs if and only if $\mathcal{U}(E)$ contains non-nuclear members.

Let P be a *separable* Pisier space. Then $[P^*, \sigma(P^*, P)]$ is separable; let $\{x_n^*: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a countable dense subset of this space. By Theorem 2, each $U \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$ contains a $V_U \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$ such that $\Phi_{UV_U}: P_{V_U} \rightarrow P_U$ is compact and $\Phi_{UV_U} \otimes \Phi_{UV_U}: P_{V_U} \otimes_\varepsilon P_{V_U} \rightarrow P_U \otimes_\pi P_U$ is continuous. Since P_0 is a non-nuclear Schwartz space, we can construct a decreasing sequence $(U_n)_n$ of non-nuclear members of $\mathcal{U}(P_0)$ by fixing a non-nuclear $U_1 \in \mathcal{U}(P_0)$ and then setting $U_{n+1} = V_{U_n}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$; moreover, we may certainly assume that $x_n^* \in U_n^\circ$ for each n . Then $\bigcup_n U_n^\circ$ is weak $*$ dense in P^* , and so $\bigcap_n U_n = \{0\}$. Consequently, the seminorms p_{U_n} generate a metrizable lc topology \mathcal{T}_m^n on P . The completion of $[P, \mathcal{T}_m]$ is a non-nuclear Fréchet-Schwartz space which has the property (a). \square

REMARKS. If E is P , or $[P, \sigma(P, P^*)]$, then $E \otimes_\varepsilon E = E \otimes_\pi E$ and so one might conjecture that this also holds when E is P endowed with any lc topology \mathcal{T} which is compatible with $\langle P, P^* \rangle$. Such a conjecture, however, turns out to be too optimistic.

(a) For a first counterexample, take \mathcal{T} to be the lc topology \mathcal{T}_2 generated by all hilbertian seminorms on P , that is, by all seminorms of the form $\|u(\cdot)\|$, u any operator from P into any Hilbert space. It was shown in [5] that $P_2 := [P, \mathcal{T}_2]$ cannot be nuclear. This implies that $P_2 \otimes_\varepsilon P_2 \neq P_2 \otimes_\pi P_2$. In fact, we may either invoke [6] or argue that otherwise each $U \in \mathcal{U}(P_2)$ would contain a $V \in \mathcal{U}(P_2)$ such that $\Phi_{UV}: P_V \tilde{\otimes}_\varepsilon P_V \rightarrow P_U \tilde{\otimes}_\pi P_U$ is continuous, equivalently, that $\Phi_{UV}: P_V \rightarrow P_U$ would be a Hilbert-Schmidt operator between Hilbert spaces [4], contradicting the non-nuclearity of P_2 .

(b) Another example can be obtained by essentially repeating the argument given at the end of the introduction.

Let $P_{2,0}$ be the space P with the lc topology generated by all seminorms $\|v(\cdot)\|$, $v: P \rightarrow \ell_2$ any compact operator. It follows from Bellenot's result [1] mentioned in the introduction that every Hilbert-Schmidt operator admits a factorization through P and hence through $P_{2,0}$ since we may assume the factors to be compact. As before, $P_{2,0} \otimes_\varepsilon P_{2,0} \neq P_{2,0} \otimes_\pi P_{2,0}$: otherwise $P_{2,0}$ would be nuclear and this would force all Hilbert-Schmidt operators to be nuclear.— $P_{2,0}$ and P_2 are different whenever P contains a copy of ℓ_1 ; see [9] for more on this.

We conclude by posing a more restricted version of the problem we started with and which has its origins of course in the main result of [7]: Is there a non-nuclear Fréchet-Schwartz space F with a basis such that all continuous bilinear forms $F \times F \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ are nuclear or, equivalently, such that $F \otimes_\varepsilon F = F \otimes_\pi F$?

References

- [1] *S. Bellenot*: The Schwartz-Hilbert variety. *Mich. Math. J.* 22 (1975), 373–377.
- [2] *A. Grothendieck*: Produits tensoriels topologiques et espaces nucléaires. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 16 (1955).
- [3] *H. Jarchow*: Locally convex spaces. Teubner-Verlag, 1981.
- [4] *H. Jarchow*: On Hilbert-Schmidt spaces. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (Suppl.) II* (1982), no. 2, 153–160.
- [5] *H. Jarchow*: Remarks on a characterization of nuclearity. *Arch. Math.* 43 (1984), 469–472.
- [6] *K. John*: Zwei Charakterisierungen der nuklearen lokalkonvexen Räume. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae* 8 (1967), 117–128.
- [7] *K. John*: Counterexample to a conjecture of Grothendieck. *Math. Ann.* 265 (1983), 169–179.
- [8] *K. John*: On the compact non-nuclear problem. *Math. Ann.* 287 (1990), 509–514.
- [9] *K. John*: On the space $\mathcal{K}(P, P^*)$ of compact operators on Pisier space P . *Note di Mat.* To appear.
- [10] *A. Pietsch*: Nukleare lokalkonvexe Räume. Akademie-Verlag, 1969.
- [11] *A. Pietsch*: Operator ideals. VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1978.
- [12] *G. Pisier*: Counterexample to a conjecture of Grothendieck. *Acta Math.* 151 (1983), 180–208.

Authors' addresses: H. Jarchow, Mathematisches Institut, Universität Zürich, Rämistrasse 74, CH 8001 Zürich, Switzerland; K. John, Mathematical Institute, Academy of Sciences, Žitná 25, CS 115 67 Praha, Czech Republic.