

Ioana Ghenciu

A note on Dunford-Pettis like properties and complemented spaces of operators

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 59 (2018), No. 2, 207–222

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/147255>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 2018

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>

A note on Dunford-Pettis like properties and complemented spaces of operators

IOANA GHENCIU

Abstract. Equivalent formulations of the Dunford-Pettis property of order p (DPP_p), $1 < p < \infty$, are studied. Let $L(X, Y)$, $W(X, Y)$, $K(X, Y)$, $U(X, Y)$, and $C_p(X, Y)$ denote respectively the sets of all bounded linear, weakly compact, compact, unconditionally converging, and p -convergent operators from X to Y . Classical results of Kalton are used to study the complementability of the spaces $W(X, Y)$ and $K(X, Y)$ in the space $C_p(X, Y)$, and of $C_p(X, Y)$ in $U(X, Y)$ and $L(X, Y)$.

Keywords: Dunford-Pettis property of order p ; p -convergent operator; complemented spaces of operators

Classification: Primary 46B20; Secondary 46B25, 46B28

1. Introduction

In this paper we study equivalent formulations of the DPP_p , $1 < p < \infty$. We give a characterization of dual Banach spaces with the DPP_p . We show that X^* has the DPP_p if and only if every operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ with weakly p -compact adjoint has a completely continuous bitranspose, $1 < p < \infty$. Our results are motivated by results in [3].

For many years mathematicians have been interested in the problem of whether an operator ideal is complemented in the space $L(X, Y)$ of all bounded linear operators between X and Y , e.g. see [10], [9], [17], [12], and [11]. In [1] the authors studied the complementability of the space $W(X, \ell_\infty)$ in $L(X, \ell_\infty)$. It was shown that if X is not reflexive, then $W(X, \ell_\infty)$ is not complemented in $L(X, \ell_\infty)$, see [1, Theorem 3]. Let $\text{CC}(X, Y)$, $\text{Lcc}(X, Y)$, or $\text{LC}_p(X, Y)$ denote the set of all completely continuous, limited completely continuous, or limited p -convergent, respectively, operators from X to Y . We use classical results of Kalton to study the complementability of $W(X, Y)$, $K(X, Y)$, and $\text{CC}(X, Y)$ in $C_p(X, Y)$, and of $C_p(X, Y)$ in $U(X, Y)$. Further, we study the complementability of $C_p(X, Y)$, $\text{Lcc}(X, Y)$, and $\text{LC}_p(X, Y)$ in $L(X, Y)$.

2. Definitions and notation

Throughout this paper, X, Y, E and F denote Banach spaces. The unit ball of X is denoted by B_X and X^* denotes the continuous linear dual of X . The space X embeds in Y (in symbols $X \hookrightarrow Y$) if X is isomorphic to a closed subspace of Y . An operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is a continuous and linear function. The set of all operators, weakly compact operators, and compact operators from X to Y is denoted by $L(X, Y)$, $W(X, Y)$, and $K(X, Y)$.

A subset S of X is said to be *weakly precompact* provided that every sequence from S has a weakly Cauchy subsequence. An operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is called *weakly precompact* (or *almost weakly compact*) if $T(B_X)$ is weakly precompact.

An operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is called *completely continuous* (or *Dunford-Pettis*) if T maps weakly convergent sequences to norm convergent sequences.

For $1 \leq p < \infty$, p^* denotes the conjugate of p . If $p = 1$, ℓ_{p^*} plays the role of c_0 . The unit vector basis of ℓ_p is denoted by (e_n) .

Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. A sequence (x_n) in X is called *weakly p -summable sequence* if $(x^*(x_n)) \in \ell_p$ for each $x^* \in X^*$ [6, page 32]. Let $\ell_p^w(X)$ denote the set of all weakly p -summable sequences in X . The space $\ell_p^w(X)$ is a Banach space with the norm

$$\|(x_n)\|_p^w = \sup \left\{ \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\langle x^*, x_n \rangle|^p \right)^{1/p} : x^* \in B_{X^*} \right\}.$$

We recall the following isometries: $L(\ell_{p^*}, X) \simeq \ell_p^w(X)$ for $1 < p < \infty$; $L(c_0, X) \simeq \ell_p^w(X)$ for $p = 1$; $T \rightarrow (T(e_n))$, see [6, Proposition 2.2, page 36].

A series $\sum x_n$ in X is said to be *weakly unconditionally convergent* if for every $x^* \in X^*$ the series $\sum |x^*(x_n)|$ is convergent. An operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is *unconditionally converging* if it maps weakly unconditionally convergent series to unconditionally convergent ones.

Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. An operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is called *p -convergent* if T maps weakly p -summable sequences into norm null sequences, see [3]. The set of all p -convergent operators is denoted by $C_p(X, Y)$.

The 1-convergent operators are precisely the unconditionally converging operators and the ∞ -convergent operators are precisely the completely continuous operators. If $p < q$, then $C_q(X, Y) \subseteq C_p(X, Y)$.

A sequence (x_n) in X is called *weakly p -convergent* to $x \in X$ if the sequence $(x_n - x)$ is weakly p -summable, see [3]. Weakly ∞ -convergent sequences are precisely the weakly convergent sequences.

Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. A bounded subset K of X is *relatively weakly p -compact* if every sequence in K has a weakly p -convergent subsequence. An operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is *weakly p -compact* if $T(B_X)$ is relatively weakly p -compact, see [3].

The set of weakly p -compact operators $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is denoted by $W_p(X, Y)$. If $p < q$, then $W_p(X, Y) \subseteq W_q(X, Y)$. A Banach space $X \in C_p$ (or $X \in W_p$) if $\text{id}(X) \in C_p(X, X)$ (or $\text{id}(X) \in W_p(X, X)$, respectively), see [3], where $\text{id}(X)$ is the identity map on X .

A sequence (x_n) in X is called *weakly p -Cauchy* if $(x_{n_k} - x_{m_k})$ is weakly p -summable for any increasing sequences (n_k) and (m_k) of positive integers.

Every weakly p -convergent sequence is weakly p -Cauchy, and the weakly ∞ -Cauchy sequences are precisely the weakly Cauchy sequences.

Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. We say that a subset S of X is called *weakly p -precompact* if every sequence from S has a weakly p -Cauchy subsequence. The weakly ∞ -precompact sets are precisely the weakly precompact sets.

Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. An operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is called *weakly p -precompact* (or *almost weakly p -compact*) if $T(B_X)$ is weakly p -precompact. The set of all weakly p -precompact operators is denoted by $WPC_p(X, Y)$. We say that $X \in WPC_p$ if $\text{id}(X) \in WPC_p(X, X)$.

The weakly ∞ -precompact operators are precisely the weakly precompact operators. If $p < q$, then $\ell_p^w(X) \subseteq \ell_q^w(X)$, thus $WPC_p(X, Y) \subseteq WPC_q(X, Y)$.

A Banach space X has the *Dunford-Pettis property* (DPP) if every weakly compact operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is completely continuous for any Banach space Y . Equivalently, X has the DPP if and only if $x_n^*(x_n) \rightarrow 0$ whenever (x_n^*) is weakly null in X^* and (x_n) is weakly null in X , see [4, Theorem 1]. If X is a $C(K)$ -space or an L_1 -space, then X has the DPP. The reader can check [5], [4], and [7] for results related to the DPP.

The bounded subset A of X is called a *Dunford-Pettis* (or *limited*) subset of X if each weakly null (or w^* -null, respectively) sequence (x_n^*) in X^* tends to 0 uniformly on A ; i.e.

$$\sup_{x \in A} |x_n^*(x)| \rightarrow 0.$$

The bounded subset A of X^* is called an *L -subset* of X^* if each weakly null sequence (x_n) in X tends to 0 uniformly on A ; i.e.

$$\sup_{x^* \in A} |x^*(x_n)| \rightarrow 0.$$

A bounded subset A of X^* is called a *V -subset* of X^* provided that

$$\sup_{x^* \in A} |x^*(x_n)| \rightarrow 0$$

for each weakly unconditionally convergent series $\sum x_n$ in X .

The Banach space X has *property (V)* if every V -subset of X^* is relatively weakly compact. The following results were established in [21]: $C(K)$ spaces and reflexive spaces have property (V); X has property (V) if and only if every unconditionally converging operator T from X to any Banach space Y is weakly compact.

Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. A Banach space X has the *Dunford-Pettis property of order p* (DPP_p) if every weakly compact operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is p -convergent for any Banach space Y , see [3].

If X has the DPP_p , then it has the DPP_q , if $q < p$. Also, the DPP_∞ is precisely the DPP, and every Banach space X has the DPP_1 . $C(K)$ spaces and L_1 have

the DPP, and thus the DPP_p for all p . If $1 < r < \infty$, then ℓ_r has the DPP_p for $p < r^*$. If $1 < r < \infty$, then $L_r(\mu)$ has the DPP_p for $p < \min(2, r^*)$. Tsirelson's space T has the DPP_p for all $p < \infty$. Since T is reflexive, it does not have the DPP. Tsirelson's dual space T^* does not have the DPP_p , if $p > 1$, see [3].

Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. We say that a bounded subset A of X^* is called a *weakly p - L -set* if for all weakly p -summable sequences (x_n) in X ,

$$\sup_{x^* \in A} |x^*(x_n)| \rightarrow 0.$$

The weakly 1- L -subsets of X^* are precisely the V -subsets. If $p < q$, then a weakly q - L -subset is a weakly p - L -subset, since $\ell_p^w(X) \subseteq \ell_q^w(X)$.

The Banach space X has the *reciprocal Dunford-Pettis* (RDP) property if every completely continuous operator T from X to any Banach space Y is weakly compact, see [16, page 153]. The space X has the RDP property if and only if every L -subset of X^* is relatively weakly compact, see [15]. Banach spaces with property (V) of Pełczyński, in particular reflexive spaces and $C(K)$ spaces, have the RDP property, see [21].

Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. We say that the space X has the *reciprocal Dunford-Pettis of order p* or RDP_p property if every weakly p - L -subset of X^* is relatively weakly compact.

If X has the RDP_p property, then X has the RDP property (since any L -subset of X^* is a weakly p - L -set). If $p < q$ and X has the RDP_p property, then X has the RDP_q property.

The space X has the *Gelfand-Phillips (GP) property* (or is a *Gelfand-Phillips space*) if every limited subset of X is relatively compact. Schur spaces and separable spaces have the Gelfand-Phillips property, see [2].

The sequence (x_n) in X is called limited if the corresponding set of its terms is a limited set. If the sequence (x_n) is also weakly null (or weakly p -summable), then (x_n) is called a limited weakly null (or limited weakly p -summable, respectively) sequence in X .

An operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is called *limited completely continuous* (lcc) if it maps limited weakly null sequences to norm null sequences, see [22].

Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. A Banach space X has the *p -Gelfand-Phillips (p -GP) property* (or is a *p -Gelfand-Phillips space*) if every limited weakly p -summable sequence in X is norm null, see [13]. If X has the GP property, then X has the p -GP property for any $1 \leq p < \infty$.

3. The Dunford-Pettis property of order p

The following theorem gives equivalent conditions for a Banach space X to have the DPP_p . We note that an operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is p -convergent if and only if T takes weakly p -compact subsets of X into norm compact subsets of Y .

Theorem 1. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. The following statements are equivalent about a Banach space X .*

- (1) X has the DPP _{p} .
- (2) If (x_n) is a weakly p -summable sequence in X and (x_n^*) is a weakly null sequence in X^* , then $x_n^*(x_n) \rightarrow 0$.
- (3) For all Banach spaces Y , every weakly compact operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is p -convergent.
- (4) Every weakly compact operator $T: X \rightarrow c_0$ is p -convergent.
- (5) If (x_n) is a weakly p -summable sequence in X and (x_n^*) is a weakly Cauchy sequence in X^* , then $x_n^*(x_n) \rightarrow 0$.
- (6) For all Banach spaces Y , every operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ with weakly precompact adjoint is p -convergent.
- (7) Every operator $T: X \rightarrow c_0$ with weakly precompact adjoint is p -convergent.
- (8) If (x_n) is a weakly p -Cauchy sequence in X and (x_n^*) is a weakly null sequence in X^* , then $x_n^*(x_n) \rightarrow 0$.
- (9) If $T: Y \rightarrow X$ is a weakly p -precompact operator, then $T^*: X^* \rightarrow Y^*$ is completely continuous for all Banach spaces Y .
- (10) If $T: \ell_{p^*} \rightarrow X$ is an operator, then $T^*: X^* \rightarrow \ell_p$ is completely continuous.

PROOF: The statements (1), (2), and (3) are equivalent by [3, Proposition 3.2].

(2) \Rightarrow (5) Suppose (x_n) is a weakly p -summable sequence in X and (x_n^*) is a weakly Cauchy sequence in X^* , but $x_n^*(x_n) \not\rightarrow 0$. By passing to a subsequence if necessary, assume that $|x_n^*(x_n)| > \epsilon$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for some $\epsilon > 0$. Let $n_1 = 1$ and choose $n_2 > n_1$ so that $|x_{n_1}^*(x_{n_2})| < \epsilon/2$. We can do this since (x_n) is weakly null. Continue inductively. Choose $n_{k+1} > n_k$ so that $|x_{n_k}^*(x_{n_{k+1}})| < \epsilon/2$. By hypothesis, $(x_{n_{k+1}}^* - x_{n_k}^*)(x_{n_{k+1}}) \rightarrow 0$. Since

$$|(x_{n_{k+1}}^* - x_{n_k}^*)(x_{n_{k+1}})| \geq |x_{n_{k+1}}^*(x_{n_{k+1}})| - |x_{n_k}^*(x_{n_{k+1}})| > \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

we have a contradiction.

(5) \Rightarrow (6) Let $T: X \rightarrow Y$ be an operator with weakly precompact adjoint such that T is not p -convergent. Let (x_n) be a weakly p -summable sequence in X so that $\|T(x_n)\| > \epsilon$. Let (y_n^*) be a sequence in B_{Y^*} such that $y_n^*(T(x_n)) > \epsilon$ and let $x_n^* = T^*(y_n^*)$. Since T^* is weakly precompact, we can assume that (x_n^*) is weakly Cauchy. By assumption, $x_n^*(x_n) = T^*(y_n^*)(x_n) \rightarrow 0$, a contradiction.

(3) \Rightarrow (4), (6) \Rightarrow (7), and (7) \Rightarrow (4) are obvious.

(4) \Rightarrow (2) Let (x_n) be a weakly p -summable sequence in X and (x_n^*) be a weakly null sequence in X^* . Define $T: X \rightarrow c_0$, $T(x) = (x_i^*(x))$. Note that $T^*: \ell_1 \rightarrow X^*$, $T^*(b) = \sum b_i x_i^*$, $b = (b_i) \in \ell_1$. Note that T^* takes B_{ℓ_1} into the closed and absolutely convex hull of $\{x_i^*: i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, which is a relatively weakly compact set, see [7, page 51]. Then T^* , hence T , is weakly compact. By assumption, T is p -convergent. Thus $|x_n^*(x_n)| \leq \|T(x_n)\| = \sup_i |x_i^*(x_n)| \rightarrow 0$.

Thus (1)–(7) are equivalent.

(2) \Rightarrow (8) Let (x_n) be weakly p -Cauchy in X and (x_n^*) be weakly null in X^* . Suppose by contradiction that $x_n^*(x_n) \not\rightarrow 0$. Without loss of generality assume that $|x_n^*(x_n)| > \epsilon$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for some $\epsilon > 0$. Let $n_1 = 1$ and choose $n_2 > n_1$ so that $|x_{n_2}^*(x_{n_1})| < \epsilon/2$. We can do this since (x_n^*) is w^* -null. Continue inductively. Choose $n_k > n_{k-1}$ so that $|x_{n_k}^*(x_{n_{k-1}})| < \epsilon/2$. By hypothesis, $x_{n_k}^*(x_{n_k} - x_{n_{k-1}}) \rightarrow 0$. However,

$$|x_{n_k}^*(x_{n_k} - x_{n_{k-1}})| \geq |x_{n_k}^*(x_{n_k})| - |x_{n_k}^*(x_{n_{k-1}})| > \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

a contradiction.

(8) \Rightarrow (2) is obvious, since every weakly p -summable sequence in X is weakly p -Cauchy.

(8) \Rightarrow (9) Suppose $T: Y \rightarrow X$ is a weakly p -precompact operator. Suppose $T^*: X^* \rightarrow Y^*$ is not completely continuous. Let (x_n^*) be a weakly null sequence in X^* such that $\|T^*(x_n^*)\| > \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Choose (y_n) in B_Y such that $\langle T^*(x_n^*), y_n \rangle > \epsilon$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $(T(y_n))$ is weakly p -Cauchy. Hence $\langle T(y_n), x_n^* \rangle \rightarrow 0$, a contradiction.

(9) \Rightarrow (10) Suppose $T: \ell_{p^*} \rightarrow X$ is an operator. Since $1 < p^* < \infty$, $\ell_{p^*} \in W_p$, see [3, Proposition 1.4]. Then T is weakly p -compact. Thus T^* is completely continuous.

(10) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose (x_n) is a weakly p -summable sequence in X and (x_n^*) is a weakly null sequence in X^* . Define $T: \ell_{p^*} \rightarrow X$ by $T(b) = \sum b_i x_i$, $b = (b_i) \in \ell_{p^*}$. Note that $T^*: X^* \rightarrow \ell_p$, $T^*(x^*) = (x^*(x_i))$. Since T^* is completely continuous, $|x_n^*(x_n)|^p \leq \|T^*(x_n^*)\|^p = \sum_i |x_n^*(x_i)|^p \rightarrow 0$. \square

Corollary 2. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. If X has the DPP_p and Y is complemented in X , then Y has the DPP_p .*

PROOF: Suppose X has the DPP_p and let $P: X \rightarrow Y$ be a projection. Let (y_n) be a weakly p -summable sequence in Y and (y_n^*) be a weakly null sequence in Y^* . Since $(P^*y_n^*)$ is weakly null in X^* , by Theorem 1, $\langle y_n^*, P(y_n) \rangle = \langle P^*y_n^*, y_n \rangle \rightarrow 0$. Thus Y has the DPP_p . \square

Corollary 3. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) X has the DPP_p ;
- (ii) every weakly precompact subset of X^* is a weakly p - L -set;
- (iii) every weakly p -precompact subset of X is a DP set.

PROOF: (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Suppose X has the DPP_p . Let A be weakly precompact subset of X^* and let (x_n^*) be a sequence in A . By passing to a subsequence, we may suppose that (x_n^*) is weakly Cauchy. Let (x_n) be a weakly p -summable sequence in X . By Theorem 1, $x_n^*(x_n) \rightarrow 0$. Hence A is a weakly p - L -set.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i) Let (x_n^*) be a weakly Cauchy sequence in X^* and (x_n) be a weakly p -summable sequence in X . Since $\{x_n^*: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a weakly p - L -subset of X^* , $x_n^*(x_n) \rightarrow 0$. By Theorem 1, X has the DPP_p .

(i) \Rightarrow (iii) Suppose X has the DPP_p . Let A be a weakly p -precompact subset of X and let (x_n) be a sequence in A . By passing to a subsequence, we may suppose that (x_n) is weakly p -Cauchy. Suppose (x_n^*) is a weakly null sequence in X^* . By Theorem 1, $x_n^*(x_n) \rightarrow 0$. Hence A is a DP set.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Let (x_n) be a weakly p -summable sequence in X and (x_n^*) be a weakly null sequence in X^* . Since $\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a weakly p -precompact subset of X , it is a DP set. Then $x_n^*(x_n) \rightarrow 0$ and X has the DPP_p by Theorem 1. \square

We note that an operator $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is p -convergent if and only if T takes weakly p -precompact subsets of X into norm compact subsets of Y .

Corollary 4. *Let $1 < p < \infty$.*

- (i) *Suppose $S : X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly p -precompact and $T : Y \rightarrow Z$ is weakly compact. If Y has the DPP_p , then TS is compact.*
- (ii) *Suppose X has the DPP_p . If $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a weakly p -compact operator, then T^2 is compact.*

PROOF: (i) Suppose $S : X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly p -precompact and $T : Y \rightarrow Z$ is weakly compact. Since Y has the DPP_p , T is p -convergent. Then TS is compact.

(ii) Suppose X has the DPP_p and $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a weakly p -compact operator. Since T is weakly compact, T^2 is compact by (i). \square

Corollary 5. *Let $1 < p < \infty$.*

- (i) *Suppose X has the DPP_p . If $Y \in W_p$ and Y is complemented in X , then Y is finite dimensional.*
- (ii) *If Y is infinite dimensional and $Y \in W_p$, then Y does not have the DPP_p .*

PROOF: (i) Let $P : X \rightarrow Y$ be a projection of X onto Y . Since $Y \in W_p$, P is weakly p -compact. By Corollary 4, $P = P^2$ is compact. Since $B_Y \subset P(B_X)$, B_Y is relatively compact. Thus Y is finite dimensional.

(ii) Apply (i). \square

The following result gives a characterization of dual spaces with the DPP_p .

Theorem 6. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. Let X be a Banach space. The following are equivalent.*

- (i) *X^* has the DPP_p .*
- (ii) *If $S : Y \rightarrow X^*$ is a weakly p -precompact operator, then $S^* : X^{**} \rightarrow Y^*$ is completely continuous for all Banach spaces Y .*
- (iii) *If $S : \ell_p^* \rightarrow X^*$ is an operator, then $S^* : X^{**} \rightarrow \ell_p$ is completely continuous.*
- (iv) *If $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is an operator such that $T^* : Y^* \rightarrow X^*$ is weakly p -precompact, then $T^{**} : X^{**} \rightarrow Y^{**}$ is completely continuous for all Banach spaces Y .*
- (v) *If $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is an operator such that $T^* : Y^* \rightarrow X^*$ is weakly p -compact, then $T^{**} : X^{**} \rightarrow Y$ is completely continuous for all Banach spaces Y .*

(vi) If $T: X \rightarrow \ell_p$ is an operator, then $T^{**}: X^{**} \rightarrow \ell_p$ is completely continuous.

PROOF: (i), (ii), and (iii) are equivalent by Theorem 1.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iv) is clear.

(iv) \Rightarrow (v) is clear. We note that since T^* is weakly p -compact, T^* , thus T , is weakly compact. Hence $T^{**}(X^{**}) \subseteq Y$.

(v) \Rightarrow (vi) Suppose $T: X \rightarrow \ell_p$ is an operator. Since $1 < p^* < \infty$, $\ell_{p^*} \in W_p$, see [3, Proposition 1.4]. Then T^* is weakly p -compact. Thus T^{**} is completely continuous.

(vi) \Rightarrow (i) Suppose (x_n^*) is weakly p -summable in X^* and (x_n^{**}) is weakly null in X^{**} . Define $T: X \rightarrow \ell_p$ by $T(x) = (x_n^*(x))$. Then $T^*: \ell_{p^*} \rightarrow X^*$, $T^*(b) = \sum b_i x_i^*$, $b = (b_i) \in \ell_{p^*}$. If $x^{**} \in X^{**}$, then $T^{**}(x^{**}) = (x^{**}(x_i^*))$. Since T^{**} is completely continuous,

$$|x_n^{**}(x_n^*)|^p \leq \|T^{**}(x_n^{**})\|^p = \sum_i |x_n^{**}(x_i^*)|^p \rightarrow 0,$$

and thus X^* has the DPP $_p$. □

In the following theorem we use a lifting result of Lohman.

Lemma 7 ([19]). *Let X be a Banach space, Y a subspace not containing copies of ℓ_1 , and $Q: X \rightarrow X/Y$ the quotient map. Let (x_n) be a bounded sequence in X such that $(Q(x_n))$ is weakly Cauchy. Then (x_n) has a weakly Cauchy subsequence.*

Let E be a Banach space and F be a subspace of E^* . Let

$${}^\perp F = \{x \in E: y^*(x) = 0 \text{ for all } y^* \in F\}.$$

The space $C[0,1]$ has the DPP, and thus the DPP $_p$ for all p . The space ℓ_2 embeds in $C[0,1]$, but ℓ_2 fails the DPP $_p$ for $p \geq 2$ (since $\ell_2 \in W_2$ by [3, Proposition 1.4], it fails the DPP $_2$, and thus the DPP $_p$ for $p \geq 2$). Hence the DPP $_p$ is not inherited by closed subspaces.

Theorem 8. *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. Suppose E has the DPP $_p$ and F is a w^* -closed subspace of E^* not containing ℓ_1 . Then ${}^\perp F$ has the DPP $_p$.*

PROOF: Suppose (x_n) is weakly p -summable in ${}^\perp F$ and (z_n^*) is weakly Cauchy in $({}^\perp F)^* \simeq E^*/F$. Let $Q: E^* \rightarrow E^*/F$ be the quotient map. By Lemma 7, we can assume that $z_n^* = Q(x_n^*)$, where (x_n^*) is weakly Cauchy in E^* . Let $i: {}^\perp F \rightarrow E$ be the isometric embedding. By [20, Theorem 1.10.16],

$$\langle x_n, Q(x_n^*) \rangle = \langle i(x_n), x_n^* \rangle.$$

Since E has the DPP $_p$, $\langle i(x_n), x_n^* \rangle \rightarrow 0$ by Theorem 1. Hence $\langle x_n, z_n^* \rangle \rightarrow 0$, and ${}^\perp F$ has the DPP $_p$. □

4. Complementability of spaces of operators

We begin by studying the complementability of $W(X, \ell_\infty)$ and $K(X, \ell_\infty)$ in $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$.

Lemma 9 ([18, Proposition 5]). *Let X be a separable Banach space, and $\varphi: \ell_\infty \rightarrow L(X, \ell_\infty)$ be a bounded linear operator so that $\varphi(e_n) = 0$ for all n . Then there is an infinite subset M of \mathbb{N} such that for each $b \in \ell_\infty(M)$, $\varphi(b) = 0$, where $\ell_\infty(M)$ is the set of all $b = (b_n) \in \ell_\infty$ with $b_n = 0$ for each $n \notin M$.*

Observation 1 ([1, Lemma 2.4]). *If $T: Y \rightarrow X^*$ is an operator such that $T^*|_X$ is weakly compact (or compact), then T is weakly compact (or compact, respectively). To see this, let $T: Y \rightarrow X^*$ be an operator such that $T^*|_X$ is weakly compact (or compact). Let $S = T^*|_X$. Suppose $x^{**} \in B_{X^{**}}$ and choose a net (x_α) in B_X which is w^* -convergent to x^{**} . Then $(T^*(x_\alpha)) \xrightarrow{w^*} T^*(x^{**})$. Now, $(T^*(x_\alpha)) \subseteq S(B_X)$, which is a relatively weakly compact (or relatively compact) set. Then $(T^*(x_\alpha)) \xrightarrow{w} T^*(x^{**})$ (or $(T^*(x_\alpha)) \rightarrow T^*(x^{**})$). Hence $T^*(B_{X^{**}}) \subseteq \overline{S(B_X)}$, which is relatively weakly compact (or relatively compact). Therefore $T^*(B_{X^{**}})$ is relatively weakly compact (or relatively compact), and thus T is weakly compact (or compact, respectively).*

Theorem 10. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. If X has the DPP $_p$ and X does not have the RDP $_p$ property, then $W(X, \ell_\infty)$ is not complemented in $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$.*

PROOF: Since X has the DPP $_p$, every weakly compact operator $T: X \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ is p -convergent. Let A be a weakly p - L -subset of X^* which is not relatively weakly compact. Let (x_n^*) be a sequence in A with no weakly convergent subsequence. Define $S: X \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ by $S(x) = (x_n^*(x))_n$, $x \in X$. Since $S^*(e_n^*) = x_n^*$, S^* , thus S , is not weakly compact. Let (y_n) be a sequence in B_X such that $(S(y_n))$ has no weakly convergent subsequence. Let $X_0 = [y_n]$ be the closed linear span of $\{y_n: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Note that X_0 is a separable subspace of X and $L = S|_{X_0}$ is not weakly compact. If $y_n^* = x_n^*|_{X_0}$, then $(y_n^*) \subseteq X_0^*$ is bounded and has no weakly convergent subsequence. (If (y_n^*) is weakly convergent, then $L^*|_{\ell_1}$ is weakly compact, since $L^*(e_n^*) = y_n^*$. By Observation 1, L is weakly compact. This is a contradiction.)

Define $T: \ell_\infty \rightarrow L(X, \ell_\infty)$ by $T(b)(x) = (b_n x_n^*(x))_n$, $b = (b_n) \in \ell_\infty$, $x \in X$. Note that the operator T is well-defined and $T(e_n) = x_n^* \otimes e_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $b \in \ell_\infty$ and suppose that (x_m) is a weakly p -summable sequence in X . Since (x_n^*) is a weakly p - L -set,

$$\lim_m \|T(b)(x_m)\| = \lim_m \sup_n |b_n x_n^*(x_m)| = 0,$$

and thus $T(b)$ is p -convergent.

Suppose that $W(X, \ell_\infty)$ is complemented in $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$. Let $P: C_p(X, \ell_\infty) \rightarrow W(X, \ell_\infty)$ be a projection, and let $R: L(X, \ell_\infty) \rightarrow L(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ be the natural restriction map. Define $\varphi: \ell_\infty \rightarrow C_p(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ by $\varphi(b) = RT(b)$ and $\psi: \ell_\infty \rightarrow$

$W(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ by $\psi(b) = RPT(b)$. Since $T(e_n)$ is a rank one operator, it is compact, hence weakly compact. Thus

$$\psi(e_n) = RPT(e_n) = RT(e_n) = \varphi(e_n)$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

By Lemma 9, there is an infinite subset M of \mathbb{N} such that $\psi(\chi_M) = \varphi(\chi_M)$. Hence $\varphi(\chi_M)$ is weakly compact. However, $\varphi(\chi_M)^*(e_n^*) = y_n^*$, $n \in M$. This contradiction concludes the proof. \square

We note that every compact operator is p -convergent.

Theorem 11. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. If X is a Banach space such that X^* contains a weakly p - L -subset which is not relatively compact, then $K(X, \ell_\infty)$ is not complemented in $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$.*

PROOF: The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 10. \square

Corollary 12. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. Suppose $\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow Y$. Then the following assertions hold.*

- (i) *If X has the DPP_p and does not have the RDP_p property, then $W(X, Y)$ is not complemented in $C_p(X, Y)$.*
- (ii) *If X^* contains a weakly p - L -subset which is not relatively compact, then $K(X, Y)$ is not complemented in $C_p(X, Y)$.*

PROOF: We only prove (i). The other proof is similar. Suppose that $W(X, Y)$ is complemented in $C_p(X, Y)$. Since ℓ_∞ is injective and $\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow Y$, $\ell_\infty \xhookrightarrow{c} Y$, see [5, page 71]. Then $W(X, \ell_\infty)$ is complemented in $W(X, Y)$, and thus in $C_p(X, Y)$. Since $W(X, \ell_\infty) \subseteq C_p(X, \ell_\infty) \subseteq C_p(X, Y)$, it follows that $W(X, \ell_\infty)$ is complemented in $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$, a contradiction with Theorem 10. Hence $W(X, Y)$ is not complemented in $C_p(X, Y)$. \square

In the next corollary we need the following result.

Theorem 13 ([14, Theorem 21]). *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. Suppose that X is a Banach space. The following are equivalent.*

- (i) *For every Banach space Y , if $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is a p -convergent operator, then $T^*: Y^* \rightarrow X^*$ is weakly compact (or compact).*
- (ii) *The same as (i) with $Y = \ell_\infty$.*
- (iii) *Every weakly p - L -subset of X^* is relatively weakly compact (or relatively compact).*

Corollary 14. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. Suppose X and Y are Banach spaces.*

1. *If X has the DPP_p property and $\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow Y$, then the following are equivalent:*
 - (i) *X has the RDP_p property;*
 - (ii) *$C_p(X, Y) = W(X, Y)$;*
 - (iii) *$W(X, Y)$ is complemented in $C_p(X, Y)$.*

2. If $\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow Y$, then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $C_p(X, Y) = K(X, Y)$;
- (ii) $K(X, Y)$ is complemented in $C_p(X, Y)$.

PROOF: 1. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Since X has the RDP_p property, $C_p(X, Y) \subseteq W(X, Y)$ (by Theorem 13). Since X also has the DPP_p , $C_p(X, Y) = W(X, Y)$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) by Corollary 12.

2. (ii) \Rightarrow (i) Suppose there is a p -convergent operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ which is not compact. By Theorem 13, X^* contains a weakly p - L -subset which is not relatively compact. Hence $K(X, Y)$ is not complemented in $C_p(X, Y)$ by Corollary 12. \square

Theorem 15. Let $1 < p < \infty$. Suppose that U has an unconditional and seminormalized basis (u_i) with biorthogonal coefficients (u_i^*) , $U \xhookrightarrow{c} X$, and $T: U \rightarrow Y$ is an operator such that $(T(u_i))$ is not relatively weakly p -compact in Y . Let $S(X, Y)$ be a closed linear subspace of $L(X, Y)$ which properly contains $W_p(X, Y)$ such that $\varphi(b) \in S(U, Y)$ for all $b \in \ell_\infty$, where $\varphi(b)(u) = \sum b_i u_i^*(u) T(u_i)$, $u \in U$. Then $W_p(X, Y)$ is not complemented in $S(X, Y)$.

PROOF: The proof is similar to the proof of [1, Theorem 20], replacing “relatively weakly p -compact” with “relatively compact”. \square

Corollary 16. Let $1 < p < \infty$. If $\ell_1 \xhookrightarrow{c} X$ and $Y \notin W_p$, then $W_p(X, Y)$ is not complemented in $L(X, Y)$.

PROOF: Let (y_n) be a sequence in B_Y with no weakly p -convergent subsequence and $S(X, Y) = L(X, Y)$. Define $T: \ell_1 \rightarrow Y$ by $T(x) = \sum x_n y_n$, $x = (x_n) \in \ell_1$. Let $\varphi: \ell_\infty \rightarrow L(\ell_1, Y)$, $\varphi(b)(x) = \sum b_n x_n y_n$, $x = (x_n) \in \ell_1$. Apply Theorem 15. \square

We use the following notation. Let $A: X \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ be an operator and M be a nonempty subset of \mathbb{N} . We define $A_M: X \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ by

$$A_M(x) = \sum_{n \in M} e_n^*(A(x)) e_n, \quad x \in X.$$

A closed operator ideal \mathcal{O} has property $(*)$ if whenever X is a Banach space and $A \notin \mathcal{O}(X, \ell_\infty)$, then there is an infinite subset M_0 of \mathbb{N} such that $A_M \notin \mathcal{O}(X, \ell_\infty)$ for all infinite subsets M of M_0 , see [1].

Theorem 17. Let $1 < p < \infty$. The ideal of p -convergent operators has property $(*)$.

PROOF: The idea for the proof comes from Theorem 2.17 in [1]. Let $A: X \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ be an operator which is not p -convergent. Let (x_n) be a weakly p -summable sequence in X and $\delta > 0$ such that $\|A(x_n)\| > \delta$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $n_1 = 1$ and choose $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|e_{N_1}^*(A(x_{n_1}))| > \delta$. Since $(A(x_n))$ is weakly null, $\lim_n e_{N_1}^*(A(x_n)) = 0$. Choose $n_2 > n_1$ so that $|e_k^*(A(x_n))| < \delta$ for $n \geq n_2$ and $1 \leq k \leq N_1$. Choose $N_2 > N_1$ such that $|e_{N_2}^*(A(x_{n_2}))| > \delta$. Continuing this process

we obtain a subsequence (x_{n_i}) of (x_n) and an increasing sequence (N_i) of natural numbers such that $|e_{N_i}^*(A(x_{n_i}))| > \delta$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $M_0 = \{N_i : i = 1, 2, \dots\}$. Note that M_0 is an infinite subset of \mathbb{N} and $\|A_{M_0}(x_{n_i})\| \geq \delta$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. If M is an infinite subset of M_0 , then A_M is not p -convergent. Therefore the operator ideal of p -convergent operators has property $(*)$. \square

We note that every p -convergent operator is unconditionally converging.

Theorem 18. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. If X^* contains a V -set which is not a weakly p - L -set, then $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$ is not complemented in $U(X, \ell_\infty)$.*

PROOF: Let A be a V -subset of X^* which is not a weakly p - L -set. Let (x_n^*) be a sequence in A and (x_n) be a weakly p -summable sequence in X such that $|x_n^*(x_n)| \not\rightarrow 0$. Without loss of generality assume that for some $\epsilon > 0$, $|x_n^*(x_n)| > \epsilon$ for all n . Define $S : X \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ by $S(x) = (x_n^*(x))_n$, $x \in X$. Since $\|S(x_n)\| > \epsilon$, S is not p -convergent. Let $X_0 = [x_n]$ be the closed linear span of $\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Note that X_0 is a separable subspace of X and $S|_{X_0}$ is not p -convergent. By Theorem 17, there is an infinite subset M_0 of \mathbb{N} so that $S_M \notin C_p(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ for all infinite subsets M of M_0 .

Define $T : \ell_\infty \rightarrow L(X, \ell_\infty)$ by $T(b)(x) = (b_n x_n^*(x))_n$, $b = (b_n) \in \ell_\infty$, $x \in X$. Note that the operator T is well-defined and $T(e_n) = x_n^* \otimes e_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $b \in \ell_\infty$ and suppose that $\sum x_m$ is weakly unconditionally convergent in X . Since (x_n^*) is a V -set,

$$\lim_m \|T(b)(x_m)\| = \lim_m \sup_n |b_n x_n^*(x_m)| = 0,$$

and thus $T(b)$ is unconditionally converging.

Suppose that $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$ is complemented in $U(X, \ell_\infty)$. Let $P : U(X, \ell_\infty) \rightarrow C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$ be a projection, and let $R : L(X, \ell_\infty) \rightarrow L(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ be the natural restriction map. Define $\varphi : \ell_\infty \rightarrow U(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ by $\varphi(b) = RT(b)$ and $\psi : \ell_\infty \rightarrow C_p(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ by $\psi(b) = RPT(b)$. Since $T(e_n)$ is a rank one operator,

$$\psi(e_n) = RPT(e_n) = RT(e_n) = \varphi(e_n)$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 9, there is an infinite subset M of M_0 such that $\psi(\chi_M) = \varphi(\chi_M)$. Therefore $\varphi(\chi_M)$ is p -convergent. Nevertheless, $\varphi(\chi_M) = T(\chi_M)|_{X_0} = S_M$. This contradiction proves that $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$ is not complemented in $U(X, \ell_\infty)$. \square

Corollary 19. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. If X does not have the DPP_p , then $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$ is not complemented in $U(X, \ell_\infty)$.*

PROOF: Since X does not have the DPP_p , there exist a weakly p -summable sequence (x_n) in X and a weakly null sequence (x_n^*) in X^* such that $x_n^*(x_n) \not\rightarrow 0$. Since (x_n^*) is weakly null, it is a V -set, see [21]. Thus (x_n^*) is a V -subset of X^* which is not a weakly p - L -set. Apply Theorem 18. \square

Corollary 20. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. If X does not have the DPP_p and $\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow Y$, then $C_p(X, Y)$ is not complemented in $U(X, Y)$.*

Corollary 21. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. Suppose X has property (V). If $\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow Y$, then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) X has the DPP_p ;
- (ii) $C_p(X, Y) = U(X, Y)$;
- (iii) $C_p(X, Y)$ is complemented in $U(X, Y)$.

PROOF: (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Every unconditionally converging operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is p -convergent, since X has property (V) and the DPP_p . Since $C_p(X, Y) \subseteq U(X, Y)$, it follows that $C_p(X, Y) = U(X, Y)$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) by Corollary 20. □

Theorem 22. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. If X^* contains a weakly p - L -set which is not an L -set, then $\text{CC}(X, \ell_\infty)$ is not complemented in $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$.*

PROOF: Let A be a weakly p - L -set which is not an L -set. Let (x_n^*) be a sequence in A and (x_n) be a weakly null sequence in X such that for some $\epsilon > 0$, $|x_n^*(x_n)| > \epsilon$ for all n . Define $S: X \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ by $S(x) = (x_n^*(x))_n$, $x \in X$. Since $\|S(x_n)\| > \epsilon$, S is not completely continuous. Let $X_0 = [x_n]$ be the closed linear span of $\{x_n: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Note that X_0 is a separable subspace of X and $S|_{X_0}$ is not completely continuous. By [1, Theorem 2.17], the ideal of completely continuous operators has property (*). Let M_0 be an infinite subset of \mathbb{N} so that $S_M \notin \text{CC}(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ for all infinite subsets M of M_0 .

Define $T: \ell_\infty \rightarrow L(X, \ell_\infty)$ by $T(b)(x) = (b_n x_n^*(x))_n$, $b = (b_n) \in \ell_\infty$, $x \in X$. Note that the operator T is well-defined and $T(e_n) = x_n^* \otimes e_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since (x_n^*) is a weakly p - L -set, $T(b)$ is p -convergent.

Suppose that $\text{CC}(X, \ell_\infty)$ is complemented in $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$. Let $P: C_p(X, \ell_\infty) \rightarrow \text{CC}(X, \ell_\infty)$ be a projection, and let $R: L(X, \ell_\infty) \rightarrow L(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ be the natural restriction map. Define $\varphi: \ell_\infty \rightarrow C_p(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ by $\varphi(b) = RT(b)$ and $\psi: \ell_\infty \rightarrow \text{CC}(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ by $\psi(b) = RPT(b)$. Since $T(e_n)$ is a rank one operator,

$$\psi(e_n) = RPT(e_n) = RT(e_n) = \varphi(e_n)$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 9, there is an infinite subset M of M_0 such that $\psi(\chi_M) = \varphi(\chi_M)$. Hence $\varphi(\chi_M)$ is completely continuous. However, $\varphi(\chi_M) = T(\chi_M)|_{X_0} = S_M$. This is a contradiction that completes the proof. □

Corollary 23. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. If $X \in C_p$ and X does not have the Schur property, then $\text{CC}(X, \ell_\infty)$ is not complemented in $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$.*

PROOF: Since $X \in C_p$ and X does not have the Schur property, B_{X^*} is a weakly p - L -set which is not an L -set. Apply Theorem 22. □

Tsirelson's space T is reflexive and $T \in C_p$ for all $p < \infty$, see [3]. Thus T satisfies the hypothesis of the previous corollary.

Corollary 24. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. Suppose $X \in C_p$ and X does not have the Schur property. If $\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow Y$, then $CC(X, Y)$ is not complemented in $C_p(X, Y)$.*

Theorem 25. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. If $X \notin C_p$, then $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$ is not complemented in $L(X, \ell_\infty)$.*

PROOF: Suppose that (x_n) is a weakly p -summable normalized sequence in X . Since (x_n) is weakly null and normalized, we can assume that it is a basic sequence (by the Bessaga-Pelczynski selection principle, see [5]). Let $X_0 = [x_n]$ and let (x_n^*) be the associated sequence of coefficient functionals. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_n^* \in X^*$ be a Hahn-Banach extension of x_n^* . Define $T: \ell_\infty \rightarrow L(X, \ell_\infty)$ by $T(b)(x) = (b_n f_n^*(x))$, $b = (b_n) \in \ell_\infty$, $x \in X$. Note that the operator T is well-defined and $T(e_n) = f_n^* \otimes e_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Suppose that $C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$ is complemented in $L(X, \ell_\infty)$. Let $P: L(X, \ell_\infty) \rightarrow C_p(X, \ell_\infty)$ be a projection, and let $R: L(X, \ell_\infty) \rightarrow L(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ be the natural restriction map. Define $\varphi: \ell_\infty \rightarrow L(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ by $\varphi(b) = RT(b)$ and $\psi: \ell_\infty \rightarrow C_p(X_0, \ell_\infty)$ by $\psi(b) = RPT(b)$. Note that $\varphi(e_n) = x_n^* \otimes e_n = \psi(e_n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 9, there is an infinite subset M of \mathbb{N} such that $\psi(\chi_M) = \varphi(\chi_M)$. Hence $\varphi(\chi_M)$ is p -convergent. However, $\varphi(\chi_M)(x_n) = e_n$, $n \in M$, a contradiction. \square

A Banach space X has the Gelfand-Phillips property if and only if every limited weakly null sequence in X is norm null, see [8].

Theorem 26. (i) *If X does not have the Gelfand-Phillips property, then $Lcc(X, \ell_\infty)$ is not complemented in $L(X, \ell_\infty)$.*

(ii) *Let $1 < p < \infty$. If X does not have the p -GP property, then $LC_p(X, \ell_\infty)$ is not complemented in $L(X, \ell_\infty)$.*

PROOF: (i) Let (x_n) be a limited weakly null sequence in X of norm one. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 25.

(ii) Let (x_n) be a limited weakly p -summable sequence in X of norm one. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 25. \square

Corollary 27. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. Suppose $\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow Y$.*

(i) *If $X \notin C_p$, then $C_p(X, Y)$ is not complemented in $L(X, Y)$.*

(ii) *If X does not have the Gelfand-Phillips property, then $Lcc(X, Y)$ is not complemented in $L(X, Y)$.*

(iii) *If X does not have the p -GP property, then $LC_p(X, Y)$ is not complemented in $L(X, Y)$.*

Corollary 28. *Suppose X and Y are Banach spaces, $\ell_\infty \hookrightarrow Y$, and $1 < p < \infty$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) (i) $X \in C_p$;

(ii) $C_p(X, Y) = L(X, Y)$;

(iii) $C_p(X, Y)$ is complemented in $L(X, Y)$.

- (2) (i) X has the Gelfand-Phillips property;
 (ii) $\text{Lcc}(X, Y) = L(X, Y)$;
 (iii) $\text{Lcc}(X, Y)$ is complemented in $L(X, Y)$.
- (3) (i) X has the p -GP property;
 (ii) $\text{LC}_p(X, Y) = L(X, Y)$;
 (iii) $\text{LC}_p(X, Y)$ is complemented in $L(X, Y)$.

PROOF: (i) \Rightarrow (ii) (1) If $X \in C_p$, then every operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is p -convergent. (2) If X has the Gelfand-Phillips property, then every operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is limited completely continuous. (3) If X has the p -GP property, then every operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is limited p -convergent.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) by Corollary 27. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Bahreini M., Bator E., Ghenciu I., *Complemented subspaces of linear bounded operators*, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **55** (2012), no. 3, 449–461.
- [2] Bourgain J., Diestel J., *Limited operators and strict cosingularity*, *Math. Nachr.* **119** (1984), 55–58.
- [3] Castillo J. M. F., Sanchez F., *Dunford-Pettis like properties of continuous vector function spaces*, *Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid* **6** (1993), no. 1, 43–59.
- [4] Diestel J., *A survey of results related to the Dunford-Pettis property*, *Proc. of Conf. on Integration, Topology, and Geometry in Linear Spaces*, Univ. North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1979, *Contemp. Math.* **2** Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1980, pp. 15–60.
- [5] Diestel J., *Sequences and Series in Banach Spaces*, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, 92, Springer, New York, 1984.
- [6] Diestel J., Jarchow H., Tonge A., *Absolutely Summing Operators*, *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, 43, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [7] Diestel J., Uhl J. J. Jr., *Vector Measures*, *Mathematical Surveys*, 15, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1977.
- [8] Drewnowski L., Emmanuele G., *On Banach spaces with the Gelfand-Phillips property II*, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo* (2) **38** (1989), no. 3, 377–391.
- [9] Emmanuele G., *Remarks on the uncomplemented subspace $W(E, F)$* , *J. Funct. Anal.* **99** (1991), no. 1, 125–130.
- [10] Emmanuele G., *A remark on the containment of c_0 in spaces of compact operators*, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **111** (1992), no. 2, 331–335.
- [11] Emmanuele G., John K., *Uncomplementability of spaces of compact operators in larger spaces of operators*, *Czechoslovak Math. J.* **47(122)** (1997), no. 1, 19–32.
- [12] Feder M., *On subspaces of spaces with an unconditional basis and spaces of operators*, *Illinois J. Math.* **24** (1980), no. 2, 196–205.
- [13] Fourie J. H., Zeekoei E. D., *On weak-star p -convergent operators*, *Quaest. Math.* **40** (2017), no. 5, 563–579.
- [14] Ghenciu I., *The p -Gelfand Phillips property in spaces of operators and Dunford-Pettis like sets*, available at arXiv:1803.00351v1 [math.FA] (2018), 16 pages.
- [15] Ghenciu I., Lewis P., *The Dunford-Pettis property, the Gelfand-Phillips property, and L -sets*, *Colloq. Math.* **106** (2006), no. 2, 311–324.
- [16] Grothendieck A., *Sur les applications linéaires faiblement compactes d'espaces du type $C(K)$* , *Canadian J. Math.* **5** (1953), 129–173 (French).
- [17] John K., *On the uncomplemented subspace $K(X, Y)$* , *Czechoslovak Math. J.* **42(117)** (1992), no. 1, 167–173.

- [18] Kalton N. J., *Spaces of compact operators*, Math. Ann. **208** (1974), 267–278.
- [19] Lohman R. H., *A note on Banach spaces containing l_1* , Canad. Math. Bull. **19** (1976), no. 3, 365–367.
- [20] Megginson R. E., *An Introduction to Banach Space Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 183, Springer, New York, 1998.
- [21] Pełczyński A., *Banach spaces on which every unconditionally converging operator is weakly compact*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys. **10** (1962), 641–648.
- [22] Salimi M., Moshtaghiun S. M., *The Gelfand-Phillips property in closed subspaces of some operator spaces*, Banach J. Math. Anal. **5** (2011), no. 2, 84–92.

I. Ghenciu:

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN,
54022, U.S.A.

E-mail: ioana.ghenciu@uwrf.edu

(Received November 27, 2017, revised December 18, 2017)