## A Note of Paper "Banach Spaces Failing the Almost Isometric Universal Extension Property"

ZHAN Hua Ying<sup>1,2</sup>

 College of Science, Tianjin University of Technology, Tianjin 300384, China;
School of Mathematics, Nankai University, Tianjin 300017, China) (E-mail: zhanhuaying@gmail.com)

Abstract The definition of property  $\mathcal{A}$  with constant  $\alpha$  was introduced by D. M. Speegle, who proved that every infinite dimensional separable uniformly smooth Banach space has property  $\mathcal{A}$  with constant  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ . In this paper, we give a sufficient condition for a Banach space to have property  $\mathcal{A}$  with constant  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ , and some remarks on Speegle's paper [1].

**Keywords** property  $\mathcal{A}$  with constant  $\alpha$ ; modulus of convexity;  $\lambda$ -EP;  $\lambda$ -UEP.

Document code A MR(2000) Subject Classification 46B20 Chinese Library Classification 0177.2

The definition of property  $\mathcal{A}$  with constant  $\alpha \in [0,1)$  was introduced by Speegle in [1].

**Definition 1** We say a Banach space E has property A with constant  $\alpha$  if there is a normalized weak\* null sequence  $\{e_n^*\}$ , an  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ , and a normalized sequence  $\{e_n\}$  in E such that (1)  $e_n^*(e_n) \to 1$  and (2)  $S(e_n, \alpha) \bigcap -S(e_m, \alpha) = \emptyset$  for all integers n and m, where  $S(e, \alpha) = \{e^* \in B(E^*) : e^*(e) > \alpha\}$ .

In [1, Proposition 4], Speegle showed us that every infinite dimensional separable uniformly smooth Banach space has property  $\mathcal{A}$  with constant  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ . Observing the proof of Proposition 4 more carefully, we can get the following theorem to give a somewhat weaker condition for an infinite dimensional Banach space to have property  $\mathcal{A}$  with constant  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ .

In this paper, X, E will stand for separable Banach spaces with infinite dimensions.

**Theorem 1** Let X be an infinite-dimensional separable Banach space. If for any sequence  $\{y_n\}$  in S(X) we have  $\inf_n \delta(y_n, 1/4) > 0$ , where

$$\delta(y_n, 1/4) = \inf\{1 - \frac{\|x + y_n\|}{2}; x \in S(X), \|x - y_n\| \ge 1/4\},\$$

then X has property  $\mathcal{A}$  with some  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ .

**Proof** We construct the necessary sequences  $\{y_n^*\}$ ,  $\{y_n\}$  and  $\alpha$ . Let  $\{x_n\}$  be a sequence which

Received date: 2006-06-22; Accepted date: 2007-01-17

**Foundation item**: the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 10571090); the Research Foundation for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education (No. 20060055010); the Research Foundation of Tianjin Municipal Education Commission (No. 20060402).

is dense in B(X). Let  $y_1^*$  be in  $S(X^*)$ , and let  $y_1$  be in S(X) such that  $y_1^*(y_1) \ge 1 - 1/2$ . Let  $S_1 = \{x^* \in S(X^*) : |x^*(y_1)| < 1/2^2, x^*(x_1) < 1/2\}$ . Since X is infinite dimensional, by the Josefson-Nissenzweig's theorem, there is a normalized sequence which is w\*-null. Hence we know that  $S_1 \ne \emptyset$ . So, let  $y_2^* \in S_1$  and  $y_2 \in S(X)$  such that  $y_2^*(y_2) \ge 1 - 1/2^2$ . Let  $S_2 = \{x^* \in S(X^*) : |x^*(y_i)| < 3/2^3, x^*(x_i) < 1/3, 1 \le i \le 2\}$ . Similarly,  $S_2 \ne \emptyset$ . So, let  $y_3^* \in S_2$ and  $y_3 \in S(X)$  such that  $y_3^*(y_3) \ge 1 - 1/2^3$ . Continuing in this fashion, we get

$$y_{n+1}^* \in S_n = \{x^* \in S(X^*) : |x^*(y_i)| < \frac{2^n - 1}{2^{n+1}}, \ x^*(x_i) < \frac{1}{n+1}, \ 1 \le i \le n\},\$$

where  $y_i \in S(X)$  satisfying  $y_i^*(y_i) \ge 1 - 1/2^i$ .

Obviously, the sequence  $\{y_n^*(y_n)\}$  is convergent to 1. Since  $\{x_n\}$  is dense in B(X), we can show that the sequence  $\{y_n^*\}$  is convergent to  $\theta$  in the weak\* topology. In fact, given  $x \in B(X), \varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $x_{m_0} \in \{x_n\}$  such that  $||x - x_{m_0}|| < \varepsilon$ . For any large enough n with  $n > \max\{m_0, 1/\varepsilon\}$ , we have that  $y_n^*(x_{m_0}) < 1/n$  for  $y_n^* \in S_{n-1}$ . Hence,

$$|y_n^*(x)| \le |y_n^*(x) - y_n^*(x_{m_0})| + |y_n^*(x_{m_0})| \le ||x - x_{m_0}|| + 1/n \le 2\varepsilon.$$

Let  $\alpha = 1 - \inf_n \delta(y_n, 1/4)$ . From the condition of X, we have that  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ . So, it remains to show that

$$S(y_i, \alpha) \bigcap -S(y_j, \alpha) = \emptyset$$
 for all  $i, j \in \mathbf{N}$ .

Obviously, it holds for i = j. For  $i > j \ge 1$ ,

$$||y_i + y_j|| \ge |y_i^*(y_i + y_j)| > 1 - \frac{1}{2^i} - \frac{2^{i-1} - 1}{2^i} = \frac{1}{2}$$

Suppose that  $x^* \in S(y_i, \alpha) \bigcap -S(y_j, \alpha)$ . WLOG,  $x^* \in S(X^*)$ . Let  $x \in S(X)$  such that  $x^*(x) > \frac{1+\alpha}{2}$ . We claim that  $||x - y_i|| < 1/4$  and  $||x + y_j|| < 1/4$ . Conversely, if  $||x - y_i|| > 1/4$ , then we have

$$\alpha = 1 - \inf_{n} \delta(y_n, 1/4) \ge 1 - \delta(y_i, 1/4) \ge \frac{\|x + y_i\|}{2} \ge \frac{x^*(x + y_i)}{2} > \frac{\frac{1 + \alpha}{2} + \alpha}{2} = \frac{1 + 3\alpha}{4}$$

It follows that  $\alpha > 1$ . A contradiction! It is similar for  $||x+y_j|| \ge 1/4$ . Hence,  $S(y_i, \alpha) \bigcap -S(y_j, \alpha) = \emptyset$ . The proof is completed.  $\Box$ 

**Remark 1** Let  $\delta_X(\varepsilon)$  be the modulus of convexity of the Banach space X. If  $\delta_X(1/4) > 0$ , then X has the property  $\mathcal{A}$  with constant  $\alpha = 1 - \delta_X(1/4)$ .

**Remark 2** In [1, Proposition 4], X needs to be reflexive and  $\delta_{X^*}(1/4) > 0$ . Although, we have no concrete nonreflexive Banach space which satisfies the conditions described in the Theorem 1, we conjecture that  $c_0$  with the Day's norm is such a case. By the definition,  $\delta_X(\varepsilon) \leq \inf_n \delta(y_n, \varepsilon)$ for any sequence  $\{y_n\}$  in X. We should note that, even  $\inf_n \delta(y_n, 1/4) > 0$  for any sequence  $\{y_n\}$ , we can't claim that  $\delta_X(1/4) > 0$ . Moreover, it is not sufficient to claim that X is uniformly convex if  $\delta_X(1/4) > 0$ .

We recall that a pair of Banach spaces (E, X) with E a closed subspace of X is said to have the  $\lambda$ -into-C(K) extension property ( $\lambda$ -EP for short) if for every C(K) space, and every bounded linear map  $T : E \to C(K)$ , there is an extension  $\tilde{T} : X \to C(K)$  of T such that  $\|\tilde{T}\| \leq \lambda \|T\|$ . We will say that a separable space E has the  $\lambda$ -universal extension property ( $\lambda$ -UEP) if (E, X) has the  $\lambda$ -EP where E imbeds as a (closed) subspace of a separable space X.

In [1], Speegle showed us that every Banach space satisfying property  $\mathcal{A}$  with constant  $\alpha \in [0,1)$  fails the  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -UEP for any  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}^{[1, \text{ Theorem 3}]}$ . Moreover, two claims were given in [1] without proofs, though the claims are not so clear. Next, we will give the proofs.

Claim 1 Every Banach space E with property  $\mathcal{A}$  with constant  $\alpha$  fails the  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -into- $c_0$  extension property, where  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}$ .

**Proof** For any weak\* null sequence  $\{e_n^*\}$  in  $S(E^*)$ , define a map  $\Phi : E \to c_0$  by  $\Phi(x) = (e_n^*(x))_n$ . Obviously,  $\Phi$  is well defined and linear. Moreover,  $\|\Phi\| \leq 1$ . Suppose, on the contrary, that (E, X) has the  $(1+\varepsilon)$ -into- $c_0$  extension property for some X containing E isometrically and some  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}$ . That is, there is an extension  $\Psi$ , defined on X to  $c_0$ , of  $\Phi$  with  $\|\Psi\| \leq (1+\varepsilon) \|\Phi\|$ . Let  $\Psi(x)(n)$  be the *n*th coordinate of  $\Psi(x)$ . Define  $f_n^* : X \to \mathbf{R}$  by  $f_n^*(x) = \Psi(x)(n)$ . Obviously,  $f_n^*$  is well defined and linear. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi\| &= \sup_{x \in B(X)} \|\Psi(x)\| = \sup_{x \in B(X)} \sup_{n} |\Psi(x)(n)| \\ &= \sup_{n} \sup_{x \in B(X)} |f_n^*(x)| \le (1+\varepsilon) \|\Phi\| \le (1+\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

That is,  $||f_n^*|| \le (1 + \varepsilon)$  for any  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ .

We say that  $f_n^*$  is an extension of  $e_n^*$ . Indeed,  $f_n^*(y) = \Psi(y)(n) = \Phi(y)(n) = e_n^*(y)$  for any  $y \in E$ . By the definition,  $\{f_n^*\}$  is obviously convergent to  $\theta$  in the weak\* topology. Hence, we get a weak\*-weak\* continuous function from  $E^*$  into  $X^*$  which maps  $e_n^*$  to  $f_n^*$  and satisfies the conditions described in [1, Proposition 1]. So, (E, X) has the  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -into-C(K) extension property, which contradict with [1, Theorem 3]. The proof is completed.

**Claim 2**  $c_0$  has property  $\mathcal{A}$  with constant  $\alpha$  for all  $\alpha > 0$  if we consider slices of the extreme points of  $B(l_1)$  rather than slices of  $B(l_1)$ . Hence,  $c_0$  fails the  $(2 - \varepsilon)$ -UEP.

**Proof** The result is not clear. If we modify the definition of property  $\mathcal{A}$  as above, the proof of [1, Theorem 3] will not stand any longer. Because we need the slices to be open in the weak<sup>\*</sup> topology. But the slices of extreme points of  $B(l_1)$  are obviously not weak<sup>\*</sup>-open. So, we need to show it in another way.

Let  $\{e_n\}$  be the standard unit basis for  $c_0$ , and let  $S'_n = S(e_n, \alpha) \bigcap \operatorname{ext} B(l_1)$ , where

 $extB(l_1) = \{(\xi_n) \in S(l_1): \text{ there is } n_0 \in \mathbf{N}, \text{ such that } |\xi_{n_0}| = 1\}$ 

is the set of all extreme points of  $B(l_1)$ . Obviously,  $S'_n \bigcap -S'_m = \emptyset$  for any integers n and m and any  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ . Let

$$K' = B(l_1) \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} S'_n$$
 and  $K = B(l_1) \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} S(e_n, \alpha).$ 

Then  $C(K) \subset C_b(K')$  for  $K \subset K'$ . From the proof of [1, Theorem 3],  $c_0$  can be isometrically imbedded into C(K). Hence,  $c_0$  can be isometrically imbedded into  $C_b(K')$ . We claim that  $(c_0, C_b(K'))$  fails the  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -EP. In fact, for  $e_n^*$ , the *n*th coefficient function of the basis  $\{e_n\}$ in  $B(l_1)$ , let  $\Phi_n$  be any extension of  $e_n^*$  defined on  $C_b(K')$ . Then  $\Phi_n|_{C(K)} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \mu_n$  is an extension of  $e_n^*$  defined on C(K). If  $\|\Phi_n\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)$ , then  $\|\mu_n\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)$ . By the proof of [1, Theorem 3],  $\mu_n(f)$  is bounded away from 0, where f is the constant one function in C(K). Hence,  $\Phi_n(f)$ is also bounded away from 0, if f is considered as an element of  $C_b(K')$ . That is, the sequence  $\{\Phi_n\}$  cannot converge to  $\theta$  in the weak\* topology. By [1, Proposition 2],  $(c_0, C_b(K'))$  fails the  $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -EP. The Claim is proved.

From the proof of Claim 2 above, we can get the following corollary immediately.

**Corollary 1** If (E,X) fails the  $\lambda$ -EP and Z is a superspace of X, then (E,Z) fails the  $\lambda$ -EP either.

**Acknowledgement** The author would like to thank Professor Ding Guanggui for his guidance, and thank the referees for their valuable comments and suggestions.

## References

 SPEEGLE D M. Banach spaces failing the almost isometric universal extension property [J]. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 1998, 126(12): 3633–3637.