

A.K. KATSARAS

**Tensor products and  $\gamma_0$ -nuclear spaces in  $p$ -adic analysis**

*Annales mathématiques Blaise Pascal*, tome 2, n° 1 (1995), p. 155-168

[http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AMBP\\_1995\\_\\_2\\_1\\_155\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AMBP_1995__2_1_155_0)

© Annales mathématiques Blaise Pascal, 1995, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales mathématiques Blaise Pascal » (<http://math.univ-bpclermont.fr/ambp/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme  
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques  
<http://www.numdam.org/>

## TENSOR PRODUCTS AND $\Lambda_0$ -NUCLEAR

### SPACES IN P-ADIC ANALYSIS

A.K. Katsaras

**Abstract.** The  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclearity of the topological tensor product of two  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear spaces is studied. This problem is related to the question of whether the operator  $T_1 \otimes T_2$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear when  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear.

*1991 Mathematics subject classification : 46S10.*

**0. INTRODUCTION** Throughout this paper,  $K$  will be a complete non-Archimedean valued field whose valuation is nontrivial.

As it shown in [1], if  $E, F$  are locally convex spaces over  $K$ , then  $E \otimes_{\pi} F$  is nuclear iff  $E, F$  are nuclear. In this paper we study the analogous problem for the  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear spaces which were introduced in [7]. We show that the question is related to each of the following two equivalent conditions :

(1) If  $T_1 : E_1 \rightarrow F_1, T_2 : E_2 \rightarrow F_2$  are  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear operators, then  $T_1 \otimes T_2 : E_1 \otimes_{\pi} E_2 \rightarrow F_1 \otimes_{\pi} F_2$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear.

(2) If  $\xi, \eta \in \Lambda_0 = \Lambda_0(P)$ , then there exists a bijection  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : N \rightarrow N \times N$  such that

$$(\xi_{\sigma_1(\eta)} \eta_{\sigma_2(\eta)}) \in \Lambda_0$$

In case the Köthe set  $P$  is countable, it is shown that the above conditions are equivalent to :

(3) For each  $\alpha \in P$  there exists  $\beta \in P$  such that  $\sup_n \alpha_{n^2} / \beta_n < \infty$ .

## 1. PRELIMINARIES

By a Köthe set we will mean a collection  $P$  of sequences  $\alpha = (\alpha_n)$  of non-negative real numbers with the following two properties :

(i) For every  $n \in N$  there exists  $\alpha \in P$  with  $\alpha_n \neq 0$ .

(ii) If  $\alpha, \alpha' \in P$ , then there exists  $\beta \in P$  with  $\alpha, \alpha' \ll \beta$ , where  $\alpha \ll \beta$  means that there exists  $d > 0$  such that  $\alpha_n \leq d\beta_n$  for all  $n$ .

For  $\alpha \in P$  and  $\xi = (\xi_n)$  a sequence in  $K$ , we define  $p_\alpha(\xi) = \sup_n \alpha_n |\xi_n|$ . The non-Archimedean Köthe sequence space  $\Lambda(P) = \Lambda$  is the space of all  $\xi \in K^N$  such that  $p_\alpha(\xi) < \infty$  for all  $\alpha \in P$ . On  $\Lambda(P)$  we consider the locally convex topology generated by the family of non-Archimedean seminorms  $\{p_\alpha : \alpha \in P\}$ . The subspace  $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_0(P)$  of  $\Lambda(P)$  consists of all  $\xi \in \Lambda(P)$  such that  $\alpha_n |\xi_n| \rightarrow 0$  for all  $\alpha \in P$ . The Köthe set  $P$  is called stable if for each  $\alpha \in P$  there exists  $\beta \in P$  such that  $\sup_n \alpha_{2n} / \beta_n < \infty$ . By [5, Proposition 2.12], if  $P$  is stable and if  $\xi, \eta \in \Lambda$  (resp.  $\xi, \eta \in \Lambda_0$ ), then

$$\xi * \eta = (\xi_1, \eta_1, \xi_2, \eta_2, \dots) \in \Lambda \quad (\text{resp. } \xi * \eta \in \Lambda_0).$$

The Köthe set  $P$  is called a power set of infinite type if

- 1) For each  $\alpha \in P$  we have  $0 < \alpha_n \leq \alpha_{n+1}$  for all  $n$ .
- 2) For every  $\alpha \in P$  there exists  $\beta \in P$  such that  $\alpha^2 \ll \beta$ .

If  $\gamma = (\gamma_n)$  is an increasing sequence and if we take  $P = \{(p^{\gamma_n}) : p > 1\}$ , then  $P$  is a power set of infinite type. In this case we denote  $\Lambda(P)$  by  $\Lambda_{\gamma, \infty}$ . If  $\gamma_n \rightarrow \infty$ , then for  $\Lambda = \Lambda_{\gamma, \infty}$ , we have  $\Lambda = \Lambda_0$  (see [3, Corollary 3.5]).

Next we will recall the concepts of a  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid set and a  $\Lambda_0$  nuclear map, which are given in [5], and the concept of a  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear space given in [7]. For a bounded subset  $A$ , of a locally convex space  $E$  over  $K$ , and for a non-negative integer  $n$ , the  $n$ th Kolmogorov diameter  $\delta_{n,p}(A)$  of  $A$ , with respect to a continuous seminorm  $p$  on  $E$  ( $p \in cs(E)$ ), is the infimum of all  $|\mu|$ ,  $\mu \in K$ , for which there exists a subspace  $F$  of  $E$ , with  $\dim F \leq n$ , such that  $A \subset F + \mu B_p(0, 1)$ , where

$$B_p(0, 1) = \{x \in E : p(x) \leq 1\}.$$

The set  $A$  is called  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid if, for each  $p \in cs(E)$ , there exists  $\xi = \xi_p \in \Lambda_0$  such that  $\delta_{n,p}(A) \leq |\xi_{n+1}|$  for all  $n$  (or equivalently  $\alpha_n \delta_{n-1,p}(A) \rightarrow 0$  for each  $\alpha \in P$ ). A continuous linear operator  $T : E \rightarrow F$  is called :

a)  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid if there exists a neighborhood  $V$  of zero in  $E$  such that  $T(V)$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid in  $F$ .

b)  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear if there exist an equicontinuous sequence  $(f_n)$  in  $E'$ , a bounded sequence  $(y_n)$  in  $F$  and  $(\lambda_n) \in \Lambda_0$  such that :

$$Tx = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n f_n(x) y_n \quad (x \in E).$$

For a continuous linear map  $T$ , from a normed space  $E$  to another one  $F$ , and for a non-negative integer  $n$ , the  $n$ th approximation number  $\alpha_n(T)$  of  $T$  is defined by

$$\alpha_n(T) = \inf \{\|T - A\| : A \in \mathcal{A}_n(E, F)\}$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_n(E, F)$  is the collection of all continuous linear operators  $A : E \rightarrow F$  with  $\dim A(E) \leq n$ .

Throughout the rest of the paper,  $P$  will be a Köthe set, which is a power set of infinite type, and  $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_0(P)$ .

Let now  $E$  be a locally convex space over  $K$ . For  $p \in cs(E)$ , we will denote by  $E_p$  the quotient space  $E/\ker p$  equipped with the norm  $\| [x]_p \| = p(x)$ . A Hausdorff locally convex space  $E$  is called  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear (see [7]) if for each  $p \in cs(E)$  there exists  $q \in cs(E)$ ,  $p \leq q$ , such that the canonical map  $\phi_{pq} : E_q \rightarrow E_p$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear (or equivalently  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid). If  $\phi_q : E \rightarrow E_q$  is the quotient map, then  $\phi_q(B_q(0, 1))$  is the closed unit ball in  $E_q$ . It is now clear that  $E$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear iff for each  $p \in cs(E)$  the map  $\phi_p : E \rightarrow E_p$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear.

Note that if  $P$  consists of the single constant sequence  $(1, 1, \dots)$ , then  $\Lambda_0(P) = c_0$  and so in this case the  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid sets, the  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid operators and the  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear operators coincide with the compactoid sets, the compactoid operators and the nuclear operators, respectively. Also, if  $T_1 : E \rightarrow F, T_2 : F \rightarrow G$  are continuous linear maps and if one of the  $T_1, T_2$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid (resp.  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear), then  $T_1, T_2$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid (resp.  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear) ([5, Proposition 3.21 and Proposition 4.5]). But for normed spaces  $E, F$  the class of all  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear operators from  $E$  to  $F$  is not necessarily a closed subset of the space of all continuous linear operators from  $E$  to  $F$  ([6, Corollary 3.7]).

We will denote the completion, of a Hausdorff locally convex space  $E$ , by  $\widehat{E}$ .

We will need a Proposition which is given in [4, Proposition 5.1]. For an index set  $I$ , let  $c_0(I)$  be the vector space of all  $\xi \in K^I$  such that  $|\xi_i| \rightarrow 0$ , i.e. for each  $\epsilon > 0$  the set  $\{i \in I : |\xi_i| > \epsilon\}$  is finite. On  $c_0(I)$  we consider the norm  $\|\xi\| = \sup_i |\xi_i|$ .

**Proposition 0.1 :** *Let  $\zeta = (\zeta_i)$  be a fixed element of  $c_0(I)$  and consider the map*

$$T : c_0(I) \rightarrow c_0(I), (T\xi)_i = (\xi_i \zeta_i).$$

*Then, for each non-negative integer  $n$  we have*

$$\alpha_n(T) = \sup_{J \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1}} \inf_{i \in J} |\zeta_i|$$

*where  $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}$  is the collection of all subsets of  $I$  containing  $n + 1$  elements.*

## 2. ON THE $\Lambda_0$ -NUCLEAR MAPS

For a fixed  $\xi \in c_0$ , the map  $T_\xi : c_0 \rightarrow c_0$  is defined by  $(T_\xi x)_i = \xi_i x_i$  for each  $x \in c_0$ . As it easy to see, if  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$ , then  $T_\xi$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear.

**Proposition 2.1 :** *Let  $E, F$  be locally convex spaces over  $K$ , where  $F$  is complete, and let  $T : E \rightarrow F$  be a  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear map. Then, there exist  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$  and continuous linear maps  $T_1 : E \rightarrow c_0, T_2 : c_0 \rightarrow F$  such that  $T = T_2 T_\xi T_1$ .*

**Proof :** Let  $(\lambda_n) \in \Lambda_0$ ,  $(f_n)$  an equicontinuous sequence in  $E'$  and  $(y_n)$  a bounded sequence in  $F$  be such that  $Tx = \sum_n \lambda_n f_n(x) y_n$  for all  $x \in E$ . Let  $|\lambda| > 1$  and choose  $\mu_n \in K$  such that  $|\mu_n| \leq \sqrt{|\lambda_n|} \leq |\lambda \mu_n|$ . As it is shown in the proof of Theorem 4.6 in [5],  $(\mu_n) \in \Lambda_0$ . Let  $\xi = (\xi_n)$  where  $\xi_n = 0$  if  $\mu_n = 0$  and  $\xi_n = \lambda_n \mu_n^{-1}$  if  $\mu_n \neq 0$ . Then  $(\xi_n) \in \Lambda_0$ . Define

$$T_1 : E \rightarrow c_0, T_1 x = (\mu_n f_n(x)).$$

Let  $D = (T_\xi T_1)(E)$ . If  $\bar{D}$  is the closure of  $D$  in  $c_0$ , then there exists a projection  $Q$  of  $c_0$  onto  $\bar{D}$  with  $\|Q\| \leq |\lambda|$  (see [10, Theorem 3.16]). Let  $S : D \rightarrow F, S(T_\xi T_1 x) = Tx$ . Then  $S$  is well defined and continuous. Let  $\bar{S} : \bar{D} \rightarrow F$  be the continuous extension of  $S$  and define  $T_2 : c_0 \rightarrow F, T_2 = \bar{S}Q$ . Now  $T = T_2 T_\xi T_1$

**Lemma 2.2 :** Let  $\xi = (\xi_n) \in K^N$  be such that  $|\xi_n| \geq |\xi_{n+1}|$  for all  $n$ . If there exists a permutation  $\sigma$  of  $N$  such that  $(\xi_{\sigma(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ , then  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$

**Proof.** Let  $\zeta = (\xi_{\sigma(n)})$  and let  $T = T_\zeta : c_0 \rightarrow c_0$ . Since  $\zeta \in \Lambda_0$ ,  $T$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear. In view of [5, Theorem 4.1],  $T$  is of type  $\Lambda_0$  and so there exists  $(\mu_n) \in \Lambda_0$  such that  $\alpha_n(T) \leq |\mu_{n+1}|$  for all  $n$ . Using Proposition 0.1, we get that  $\alpha_n(T) = |\zeta_{n+1}|$ , which clearly implies that  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$ .

**Definition 2.3 :** Let  $\xi = (\xi_n) \in K^N$ . A sequence  $\zeta = (\zeta_n)$  is called a decreasing rearrangement of  $\xi$  if :

- a)  $|\zeta_n| \geq |\zeta_{n+1}|$ , for all  $n$ .
- b) There exists a permutation  $\sigma$  on  $N$  such that  $\zeta_n = \xi_{\sigma(n)}$  for all  $n$ .

It is easy to see that if  $(\zeta_n)$  and  $(\mu_n)$  are decreasing rearrangements of  $\xi$ , then  $|\zeta_n| = |\mu_n|$  for all  $n$ ,

**Proposition 2.4 :** Let  $\xi = (\xi_n) \in c_0$  with  $\xi_n \neq 0$  for all  $n$ . Then :

- a) There exists a decreasing rearrangement of  $\xi$ .
- b) If  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$  and if  $(\xi_{\sigma(n)})$  is any decreasing rearrangement of  $\xi$ , then  $(\xi_{\sigma(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ .

**Proof :** a) Let  $n_1$  be the first of all indices  $k$  with  $|\xi_k| = \sup_m |\xi_m| = \max_m |\xi_m|$ . Having chosen  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_m$ , let  $n_{m+1}$  be the first index  $k \neq n_1, n_2, \dots, n_m$  with  $|\xi_k| = \max\{|\xi_n| : n \neq n_1, n_2, \dots, n_m\}$ . Let  $\sigma : N \rightarrow N, \sigma(m) = n_m$ . We claim that  $(\xi_{\sigma(n)})$  is a decreasing rearrangement of  $\xi$ . Since  $|\xi_{n_m}| \geq |\xi_{n_{m+1}}|$  for all  $m$ , it only remains to show that  $\sigma(N) = N$ . So, let  $m \in N$  and suppose  $m \notin \sigma(N)$ . For each  $k \in N$ , since  $m \neq n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{k-1}$ , we have  $|\xi_m| \leq |\xi_{n_k}|$ . This contradicts the fact that the set  $N_1 = \{k : |\xi_k| \geq |\xi_m|\}$  is finite.

- b) It follows from Lemma 2.2.

Let  $\phi$  be the subspace of  $\Lambda_0$  consisting of all sequences in  $K$  with only a finite number of non-zero terms. Suppose that  $\Lambda_0 \neq \phi$  (this for instance happens when  $P$  is countable

by [6, Remark 4,4]). If  $\xi \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \phi$  and if  $\mu_n \in K, |\mu_n| = \sup_{k \geq n} |\xi_k|$ , then  $(\mu_n) \in \Lambda_0$  and  $\mu_n \neq 0$  for all  $n$ .

**Proposition 2.5 :** *Let  $E, F$  be locally convex spaces, where  $F$  is metrizable and let  $G$  be a dense subspace of  $F$ . Let  $T \in L(E, F)$  be  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear and suppose that  $P$  is stable and that  $\Lambda_0 \neq \phi$ . Then, there exist  $(\xi_n) \in \Lambda_0$ , an equicontinuous sequence  $(g_n)$  in  $E'$  and a bounded sequence  $(z_n)$  in  $G$  such that*

$$Tx = \sum_n \xi_n g_n(x) z_n \quad (x \in E)$$

**Proof :** Let  $(p_m)$  be an increasing sequence of continuous seminorms on  $F$  generating its topology. Since  $G$  is dense in  $\widehat{F}$ , we may assume that  $F$  is complete. Let  $(\lambda_n) \in \Lambda_0, 0 < |\lambda_{n+1}| \leq |\lambda_n|$ . Since  $T$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear, there exist  $(\mu_n) \in \Lambda_0, (h_n)$  an equicontinuous sequence in  $E'$  and a bounded sequence  $(y_n)$  in  $F$  such that  $Tx = \sum_n \mu_n h_n(x) y_n$ . We may assume that  $|\mu_n| \leq 1$  for all  $n$ . For each positive integer  $n$ , there are unique positive integers  $k, m$  such that  $n = (2m - 1)2^{k-1}$ . Set  $\xi_m^{(k)} = \lambda_{(2m-1)2^{k-1}}$ . Choose  $z_m^{(k)} \in G$  such that

$$\max\{p_m(z_m^{(k)} - y_k), p_k(z_m^{(k)} - y_k)\} \leq |\xi_{m+1}^{(k)}|.$$

Set  $w_1^{(k)} = z_1^{(k)}$  and  $w_m^{(k)} = z_m^{(k)} - z_{m-1}^{(k)}$  if  $m \geq 2$ . For all  $k$ , we have  $y_k = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} z_m^{(k)}$ . Indeed, let  $n \in N$ . If  $m \geq n$ , then

$$p_n(z_m^{(k)} - y_k) \leq p_m(z_m^{(k)} - y_k) \leq |\xi_{m+1}^{(k)}| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since  $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(k)} = z_m^{(k)}$ , we have that  $y_k = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} w_m^{(k)}$ . Thus, for all  $x \in E$ , we have

$$Tx = \sum_k \mu_k h_k(x) y_k = \sum_k \sum_m \mu_k h_k(x) w_m^{(k)}.$$

Let  $v_1^{(k)} = w_1^{(k)}, \eta_1^{(k)} = 1$ . For  $m \geq 2$ , let  $v_m^{(k)} = w_m^{(k)} / \xi_m^{(k)}, \eta_m^{(k)} = \xi_m^{(k)}$ . The set  $\{v_m^{(k)} : m \geq 2, k \in N\}$  is bounded in  $G$ . In fact, let  $n \in N$ . If  $k > n$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} p_n(w_m^{(k)}) &= \max\{p_k(z_m^{(k)} - y_k), p_k(z_{m-1}^{(k)} - y_k)\} \\ &\leq \max\{|\xi_{m+1}^{(k)}|, |\xi_m^{(k)}|\} = |\xi_m^{(k)}|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for  $m > n$ , we have

$$p_n(w_m^{(k)}) \leq \max\{p_m(z_m^{(k)} - y_k), p_{m-1}(z_{m-1}^{(k)} - y_k)\} \leq |\xi_m^{(k)}|.$$

Also, the set  $\{v_1^{(k)} : k \in N\} = \{z_1^{(k)} : k \in N\}$  is bounded since, for  $n \in N$  and  $k > n$  we have

$$p_n(z_1^{(k)}) \leq \max\{p_k(z_1^{(k)} - y_k), p_n(y_k)\} \leq \max\{|\xi_2^{(k)}|, p_n(y_k)\}$$

and so  $\sup_k p_n(z_1^{(k)}) < \infty$  since  $(y_k)$  and  $(\lambda_m)$  are bounded. Let

$$\{n_1 < n_2 < \dots\} = \{(2m-1)2^{k-1} : k \in N, m \geq 2\}.$$

For  $i \in N$ , set  $\xi_i = \mu_k \lambda_{(2m-1)2^{k-1}}$ ,  $f_i = h_k$  and  $z_i = v_m^{(k)}$  if  $n_i = (2m-1)2^{k-1}$ . Since every subsequence of  $(\lambda_n)$  is in  $\Lambda_0$  and since  $|\mu_k| \leq 1$  for all  $k$ , it is clear that  $\xi = (\xi_i) \in \Lambda_0$ . Let  $\zeta_k = \mu_k$ ,  $w_k = z_1^{(k)}$ . If  $\zeta = (\zeta_k)$  then  $\xi * \zeta \in \Lambda_0$  since  $P$  is stable. Moreover

$$Tx = \xi_1 f_1(x) z_1 + \zeta_1 h_1(x) w_1 + \xi_2 f_2(x) z_2 + \zeta_2 h_2(x) w_2 + \dots$$

This completes the proof.

**Proposition 2.6 :** *Let  $F$  be a dense subspace of a Hausdorff locally convex space over  $K$ . Then,  $E$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear iff  $F$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear.*

**Proof :** In view of [7, Proposition 3.4], a locally convex space  $M$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear iff every continuous linear map from  $M$  to any Banach space  $G$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear. Now the result follows easily from this and the fact that every continuous linear map, from  $F$  to any Banach space, has a continuous extension to all of  $E$ .

### 3. TENSOR PRODUCTS AND $\Lambda_0$ -NUCLEAR SPACES

**Proposition 3.1 :** *Let  $P$  be countable. Then, the following are equivalent :*

- (1)  $P$  is stable.
- (2) For all  $\xi, \eta \in \Lambda_0$  we have  $\xi * \eta \in \Lambda_0$ .
- (3) For every  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$  we have  $\xi * \xi \in \Lambda_0$ .
- (4) If  $\xi, \eta \in \Lambda_0$ , then some rearrangement of the sequence  $\xi * \eta$  is in  $\Lambda_0$ .
- (5) If  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$ , then some rearrangement of  $\xi * \xi$  is in  $\Lambda_0$ .

**Proof :** (1) implies (2) by [5, Proposition 2.12].

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4). Let  $\zeta_n \in K$ ,  $|\zeta_n| = \max\{|\xi_n|, |\eta_n|\}$ . Then  $\zeta = (\zeta_n) \in \Lambda_0$ . Since  $\zeta * \zeta \in \Lambda_0$ , it is clear that  $\xi * \eta \in \Lambda_0$ .

(5)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). Let  $|\lambda| > 1$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $P = \{\alpha^n : n \in N\}$ ,  $|\lambda| \alpha^n \leq \alpha^{n+1}$ .

Suppose that  $P$  is not stable and let  $\alpha \in P$  be such that  $\sup_n \alpha_{2n}/\beta_n = \infty$  for every  $\beta \in P$ . Choose indices  $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$  such that  $\alpha_{2n_k}/\alpha_{n_k}^{(k)} > k$  for all  $k$ . There are  $\lambda_k \in K$  with

$$|\lambda^{-1} \lambda_k \leq (k \alpha_{n_k}^{(k)})^{-1} \leq |\lambda_k|.$$

Let  $n_0 = 0$  and for  $n_{k-1} < n \leq n_k$  set  $\xi_n = \lambda_k$ . Now, for every  $k \in K$  we have  $|\lambda_{k+1}| \leq |\lambda_k|$ . Moreover  $\xi = (\xi_n) \in \Lambda_0$ . In fact, if  $k_0 \in N$ , then for  $k \geq k_0$  we have

$$\alpha_{n_k}^{(k_0)} |\xi_{n_k}| \leq \alpha_{n_k}^{(k)} |\xi_{n_k}| \leq |\lambda|/k \rightarrow 0.$$

By our assumption (5), there exists a rearrangement of the sequence  $(\gamma_n) = \xi * \xi$  which belongs to  $\Lambda_0$ . This, and the fact that  $|\gamma_n| \geq |\gamma_{n+1}|$  for all  $n$ , imply that  $(\gamma_n) \in \Lambda_0$  (by Lemma 2.2). But  $\alpha_{2n_k} |\xi_{n_k}| \geq k \alpha_{n_k}^{(k)} (k \alpha_{n_k}^{(k)})^{-1} = 1$ , a contradiction.

**Proposition 3.2 :** *Let  $P$  be countable and suppose that for each  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$  there exists a bijection  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : N \rightarrow N \times N$  such that  $(\xi_{\sigma_1(n)} \xi_{\sigma_2(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ . Then,  $P$  is stable.*

**Proof :** Let  $|\lambda| > 1$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $P = \{\alpha^{(n)} : n \in N\}$ ,  $|\lambda| \alpha^{(n)} \leq \alpha^{(n+1)}$  for all  $n$ . Suppose that  $P$  is not stable and let  $\alpha \in P$  be such that  $\sup_n \alpha_{2n}/\beta_n = \infty$  for all  $\beta \in P$ . As in the proof of the implication (5)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) in the preceding proposition, let  $n_0 = 0 < n_1 < \dots$  be such that  $\alpha_{2n_k}/\alpha_{n_k}^{(k)} > k$  and let  $|\lambda|^{-1} \lambda_k \leq (k \alpha_{n_k}^{(k)})^{-1} \leq |\lambda_k|$ . If  $n_{k-1} < n \leq n_k$ , set  $\xi_n = \lambda_k$ . Then  $(\xi_n) \in \Lambda_0$ . By our hypothesis there is some rearrangement of the sequence

$$\zeta = (\xi_1 \xi_1, \xi_1 \xi_2, \xi_2 \xi_1, \xi_1 \xi_3, \xi_2 \xi_2, \xi_3 \xi_1, \dots)$$

which belongs to  $\Lambda_0$ . In view of Lemma 2.2, if  $(\gamma_n)$  is a decreasing rearrangement of  $\zeta$ , then  $(\gamma_n) \in \Lambda_0$ . Consider the sequence

$$\eta = (\xi_1 \xi_1, \xi_2 \xi_1, \xi_2 \xi_2, \xi_1 \xi_2, \xi_3 \xi_1, \xi_1 \xi_3, \dots, \xi_n \xi_1, \xi_1 \xi_n, \dots)$$

and let  $(\delta_n)$  be a decreasing rearrangement of  $\eta$ . Then  $|\delta_k| \leq |\gamma_k|$  for all  $k$ . In fact, suppose that  $|\delta_k| > |\gamma_k|$  for some  $k$ . Then  $|\delta_1| \geq |\delta_2| \geq \dots \geq |\delta_k| > |\gamma_k|$ . Since  $|\gamma_m| \leq |\gamma_k| < |\delta_k|$  for all  $m \geq k$ , we must have that

$$\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k\} \subset \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}\}$$

which clearly is a contradiction. Thus,  $|\delta_k| \leq |\gamma_k|$  for all  $k$ , and so  $(\delta_n) \in \Lambda_0$ . let  $\mu \in K$ ,  $|\mu| = \min\{|\xi_1|, |\xi_2|\}$ , and consider the sequence

$$(\lambda_n) = (\xi_1, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_3, \dots) = \xi * \xi.$$

Since  $|\eta_n| \geq |\mu \lambda_n|$  for all  $n$ , there exists some rearrangement of  $(\lambda_n)$  which belongs to  $\Lambda_0$  and so  $(\lambda_n) \in \Lambda_0$  since  $|\lambda_n| \geq |\lambda_{n+1}|$  for all  $n$ . Since  $\alpha_{2n_k} |\xi_{n_k}| \geq 1$ , we got a contradiction. This clearly completes the proof.

**Proposition 3.3 :** *Consider the following conditions :*

- (1) *For each  $\alpha \in P$  there exists  $\beta \in P$  such that  $\sup_n \alpha_{n^2}/\beta_n < \infty$ .*



(2) If  $\xi, \eta \in \Lambda_0$ , then there exists a bijection  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : N \rightarrow N \times N$  such that  $(\xi_{\sigma_1(n)} \xi_{\sigma_2(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ .

(3) If  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$ , then there exists a bijection  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : N \rightarrow N \times N$  such that  $(\xi_{\sigma_1(n)} \xi_{\sigma_2(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ .

Then (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3). If  $P$  is countable, then (1), (2), (3) are equivalent.

**Proof:** (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). Let  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : N \rightarrow N \times N$  be defined as follows : Let  $\sigma(1) = (1, 1)$ . For  $j = [1 + 2 + \dots + (n - 1)] + k = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} + k, 1 \leq k \leq n$ , let  $\sigma(j) = (k, n + 1 - k)$ . Then  $(\lambda_n) = (\xi_{\sigma_1(n)} \xi_{\sigma_2(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ . In fact, let  $\alpha \in P$ . Our assumption on  $P$  implies that  $P$  is stable. Thus, there exists  $\beta \in P$  such that  $\sup_n \alpha_{2n^2} / \beta_n = d < \infty$ . Let  $d_1 > 0$  be such that  $|\xi_k|, |\eta_k| \leq d_1$  for all  $k$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given and choose  $n_0$  such that  $\beta_k |\xi_k|, \beta_k |\eta_k| < \frac{\epsilon}{d_1}$  if  $k \geq k_0$ . Let now  $j > \frac{m(m-1)}{2}$ , where  $m \geq 2k_0$ , and let  $j = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} + k, 1 \leq k \leq n$ . Clearly  $n \geq m$ . We have that either  $k \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$  or  $n+1-k \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$ . If, say,  $k \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$ , then  $j \leq \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \leq 2k^2$  and  $\alpha_j |\xi_k \eta_{n+1-k}| \leq d_1 \alpha_{2k^2} |\xi_k| \leq d_1 d \beta_k |\xi_k| < \epsilon$  since  $k \geq \frac{n+1}{2} \geq \frac{m+1}{2} > k_0$ . The same happens when  $n + 1 - k \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$ . Thus, for  $j > \frac{m(m-1)}{2}$ , we have  $|\alpha_j \lambda_j| < \epsilon$ , which proves that  $(\lambda_n) \in \Lambda_0$ .

Assume next that  $P$  is countable and that (3) holds. Let  $|\lambda| > 1$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that From : Athanasios Katsaras jakatsar@cc.uoi.gr; Organization : University of Ioannina Computer Center Dourouti, Ioannina, Greece 451 10 tel : +30-651-45298, fax : +30-651-45298 Date : Wed, 12 Oct 94 12 :32 :30 +0200 To : escassut@ucfma, katsara@cc.uoi.gr

$$P = \{\alpha^{(n)} : n = 0, 1, \dots\}, [\alpha^{(n-1)}]^2 \leq \alpha^{(n)}, |\lambda| \alpha^{(n)} \leq \alpha^{(n+1)}$$

$\alpha_1^{(0)} \geq 1$ . Suppose that (1) does not hold and let  $\alpha \in P$  be such that  $\sup_n \alpha_{n^2} / \beta_n = \infty$  for all  $\beta \in P$ . Let  $(n_k)$  be a sequence of natural numbers, with  $n_k > 2n_{k-1}$ , such that  $\alpha_{n_k^2} / \alpha_{n_k}^{(k)} > k^2$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ . Choose  $\lambda_k \in K$  with

$$|\lambda^{-1} \lambda_k| \leq (k \alpha_{n_k}^{(k-1)})^{-1} \leq |\lambda_k|.$$

Let  $n_0 = 0$  and, for  $n_{k-1} < n \leq n_k$ , let  $\xi_n = \lambda_k$ . If  $k \geq k_0 + 1$ , then

$$\alpha_{n_k}^{(k_0)} |\xi_{n_k}| \leq \alpha_{n_k}^{(k-1)} |\lambda| (k \alpha_{n_k}^{(k-1)})^{-1} = \frac{|\lambda|}{k} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

This proves that  $(\xi_n) \in \Lambda_0$ . Also,

$$|\xi_{n_{k+1}}| \leq |\lambda| ((k+1) \alpha_{n_{k+1}}^{(k)})^{-1} \leq (k \alpha_{n_k}^{(k-1)})^{-1} \leq |\xi_{n_k}|.$$

Let  $I_k = \{n : n_{k-1} < n \leq n_k\}$ . If  $i, j \in I_k$ , then  $|\xi_i \xi_j| = |\xi_{n_k}^2|$ . Let

$$\zeta = (\xi_1 \xi_1, \xi_1 \xi_2, \xi_2 \xi_1, \xi_1 \xi_3, \xi_2 \xi_2, \xi_3 \xi_1, \dots)$$

and let  $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots)$  be the sequence which we get by writing first those  $\xi_i \xi_j$  with  $i, j \in I_1$ , then those  $i, j \in I_2$  e.t.c. Clearly  $|\eta_1| \geq |\eta_2| \geq \dots$ . By our hypothesis (3), there exists a rearrangement, of the terms of the sequence  $\zeta$ , which belongs to  $\Lambda_0$ . This implies that any decreasing rearrangement  $(\mu_n)$  of  $\zeta$  also belongs to  $\Lambda_0$ . Now, for every  $k$ , we have  $|\mu_k| \geq |\eta_k|$ . In fact, if  $|\mu_k| < |\eta_k|$ , for some  $k$ , then

$$\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_k\} \subset \{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_{k-1}\},$$

a contradiction. Hence  $|\mu_m| \geq |\eta_m|$ , for all  $m$  and so  $(\eta_k) \in \Lambda_0$ . The number of the terms  $\xi_i \xi_j$ , with  $i, j \in I_k$ , is  $(\eta_k - \eta_{k-1})^2$ . Let  $m_1 = n_1^2, m_k = m_{k-1} + (\eta_k - \eta_{k-1})^2$  for  $k \geq 2$ . Since  $n_k > 2n_{k-1}$ , we have  $n_k - n_{k-1} > \frac{n_k}{2}$  and so  $m_k > \frac{n_k^2}{4}$ . In view of Proposition 3.2, there exists  $\beta \in P$  and  $\mu \in K$  with  $\alpha_{4n}/\beta_n \leq |\mu|$  for all  $n$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{m_k} |\eta_{m_k}| &= \beta_{m_k} |\xi_{n_k}|^2 \geq |\mu|^{-1} \alpha_{4m_k} |\xi_{n_k}|^2 \\ &\geq |\mu|^{-1} \alpha_{n_k^2} |\xi_{n_k}|^2 \geq |\mu|^{-1} k^2 \alpha_{n_k}^{(k)} |\xi_{n_k}|^2 \\ &\geq |\mu|^{-1} k^2 (\alpha_{n_k}^{(k-1)})^2 |\xi_{n_k}|^2 \geq |\mu|^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the fact that  $(\eta_m) \in \Lambda_0$ . This clearly completes the proof.

**Proposition 3.4 :** Let  $\psi : c_0 \times c_0 \rightarrow c_0(N \times N)$  be defined by  $\psi(x, y) = (x_i y_j)_{i,j}$  for  $x = (x_i), y = (y_i)$ . Then

(1)  $\psi$  is a continuous bilinear map and  $\|\psi(x, y)\| = \|x\| \|y\|$ .

(2) If  $\tilde{\psi} : c_0 \otimes_{\pi} c_0 \rightarrow c_0(N \times N)$  is the corresponding linear map, then  $\tilde{\psi}$  is an isometry and  $D = \tilde{\psi}(c_0 \otimes_{\pi} c_0)$  is dense in  $c_0(N \times N)$ .

(3) The continuous extension  $\omega : c_0 \widehat{\otimes}_{\pi} c_0 \rightarrow c_0(N \times N)$  of  $\tilde{\psi}$  is an onto isometry.

**Proof :** (1) It is trivial.

(2) Let  $u \in c_0 \otimes_{\pi} c_0$  and let  $p$  the norm on  $c_0$  and set  $\| \cdot \| = p \otimes_{\pi} p$ . If  $u = \sum_{k=1}^m x^k \otimes_{\pi} y^k$ , then

$$\|\tilde{\psi}(u)\| \leq \max_k \|\tilde{\psi}(x^k \otimes y^k)\| = \max_k \|\psi(x^{(k)}, y^{(k)})\| = \max_k p(x^{(k)}) p(y^{(k)})$$

and so  $\|\tilde{\psi}(u)\| \leq \|u\|$ . On the other hand, given  $0 < t < 1$ , there are  $t$ -orthogonal elements  $y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(n)}$  of  $c_0$  and  $x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)} \in c_0$  such that  $u = \sum_{k=1}^n x^k \otimes y^k$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\psi}(u)\| &= \sup_{i,j} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n x_i^k y_j^k \right\| \\ &= \sup_i [\sup_j |x_i^1 y_j^1 + x_i^2 y_j^2 + \dots + x_i^n y_j^n|] \\ &= \sup_i p(x_i^1 y^{(1)} + x_i^2 y^{(2)} + \dots + x_i^n y^{(n)}) \\ &\geq t \sup_i \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} |x_i^{(k)}| p(y^{(k)}) = t \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} p(x^{(k)}) p(y^{(k)}) \geq t \|u\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $0 < t < 1$  was arbitrary, we have that  $\|\widehat{\psi}(u)\| \geq \|u\|$  and so  $\|\widehat{\psi}(u)\| = \|u\|$ . To see that  $D$  is dense in  $c_0(N \times N)$ , let  $w = (\xi_{ij})_{i,j} \in c_0(N \times N)$  and let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Choose  $m$  such that  $|\xi_{ij}| < \epsilon$  if  $i > m$  or  $j > m$ . Let  $w_0 = (\mu_{ij})$  with  $\mu_{ij} = \xi_{ij}$  if  $i, j \leq m$  and  $\mu_{ij} = 0$  if  $i > m$  or  $j > m$ . Then  $w_0 \in D$  and  $\|w - w_0\| \leq \epsilon$ .

(3) If  $u \in c_0 \widehat{\otimes}_\pi c_0$ , then there exists a sequence  $(u^{(n)})$  in  $c_0 \otimes_\pi c_0$  converging to  $u$ . Now

$$\|\omega(u)\| = \lim_n \|\widetilde{\psi}(u^{(n)})\| = \lim_n \|u^{(n)}\| = \|u\|$$

and so  $u$  is an isometry. This and the fact that  $\omega(c_0 \widehat{\otimes}_\pi c_0)$  is dense in  $c_0(N \times N)$  imply that  $\omega$  is onto.

**Proposition 3.5** *Let  $E, F$  be locally convex spaces over  $K, E, F \neq \{0\}$ . If  $E \otimes F$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear, then  $E$  and  $F$  are  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear.*

**Proof.** Since  $E \otimes_\pi F$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear, it is by definition Hausdorff which implies that both  $E$  and  $F$  are Hausdorff. Let now  $p \in cs(E)$  and choose  $y_0 \in F$  and  $q \in cs(F)$  such that  $q(y_0) \neq 0$ . Since  $E \otimes_\pi F$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear, there exist (by [7, Proposition 3.4])  $(\lambda_n) \in \Lambda_0$  and an equicontinuous sequence  $h_n$  in  $(E \otimes_\pi F)'$  such that

$$p \otimes q(u) \leq \sup_n |\lambda_n h_n(u)| \quad (u \in E \otimes_\pi F).$$

Let  $f_n : E \rightarrow K, f_n(x) = h_n(x \otimes y_0)$ . Then  $(f_n)$  is an equicontinuous sequence in  $E'$ . Let  $\mu \in K$  with  $q(y_0) \geq |\mu|^{-1}$ . Then

$$p(x) \leq |\mu| \sup_n |\lambda_n f_n(x)| \quad (x \in E)$$

Thus  $E$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear (by [7, Proposition 3.4]). The proof of the  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclearity of  $F$  is analogous.

If  $E_1, E_2, F_1, F_2$  are locally convex spaces over  $K$  and if  $T_i : E_i \rightarrow F_i, i = 1, 2$ , are linear maps, then  $T_1 \otimes T_2 : E_1 \otimes E_2 \rightarrow F_1 \otimes F_2$  will be defined by

$$T_1 \otimes T_2(x \otimes y) = T_1(x) \otimes T_2(y).$$

We will denote by  $N_{\Lambda_0}(E, F)$  the collection of all  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear operators from  $E$  to  $F$ . Recall also that for  $\xi \in c_0, T_\xi : c_0 \rightarrow c_0$  is defined by  $(T_\xi x)_k = \xi_k x_k$ .

**Theorem 3.6 :** *Consider the following properties :*

(1) *If  $E_1, E_2, F_1, F_2$  are locally convex spaces over  $K$ , where  $F_1, F_2$  are Hausdorff, and if  $T_i \in N_{\Lambda_0}(E_i, F_i), i = 1, 2$ , then  $T_1 \otimes T_2 \in N_{\Lambda_0}(E_1 \otimes_\pi E_2, F_1 \otimes_\pi F_2)$ .*

(2) *If  $\xi, \eta \in \Lambda_0$ , then  $T_\xi \otimes T_\eta \in N_{\Lambda_0}(c_0 \otimes_\pi c_0, c_0 \otimes_\pi c_0)$ .*

- (3) If  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$ , then  $T_\xi \otimes T_\xi \in N_{\Lambda_0}(c_0 \otimes_\pi c_0, c_0 \otimes_\pi c_0)$ .
  - (4) If  $\xi, \eta \in \Lambda_0$ , then there exists a bijection  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : N \rightarrow N \times N$  such that  $(\xi_{\sigma_1(n)}\eta_{\sigma_2(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ .
  - (5) If  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$ , then there exists a bijection  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : N \rightarrow N \times N$  such that  $(\xi_{\sigma_1(n)}\xi_{\sigma_2(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ .
  - (6) If  $E, F$  are  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear spaces, then  $E \otimes_\pi F$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear.
- Then, (1)-(5) are equivalent and they imply (6).

**Proof :** Since, for  $\xi \in \Lambda_0$ ,  $T_\xi$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear, it is clear that (1) implies (2).

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) Let  $\mu_n \in K$  with  $|\mu_n| = \max\{|\xi_n|, |\eta_n|\}$ . Then  $\zeta = (\mu_n) \in \Lambda_0$ . If there exists a bijection  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : N \rightarrow N \times N$  such that  $(\xi_{\sigma_1(n)}\eta_{\sigma_2(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ , then  $(\xi_{\sigma_1(n)}\eta_{\sigma_2(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ .

Thus, we may assume that  $\xi = \eta$ . If now  $\xi$  has only a finite number of nonzero terms, then it is clear that  $(\xi_{\sigma_1(n)}\eta_{\sigma_2(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$  for any bijection  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : N \rightarrow N \times N$ . So, we may assume that the set  $\{n : \xi_n \neq 0\}$  is infinite. If  $\mu_n \in K$ ,  $|\mu_n| = \sup_{k \geq n} |\xi_k|$ , then  $(\mu_n) \in \Lambda_0$ . It is clear that if we prove the result for  $(\mu_n)$ , then it would also hold for  $\xi$ . Thus, we may assume that  $0 < |\xi_{n+1}| \leq |\xi_n|$  for all  $n$ . Let  $T = T_\xi$ . By our hypothesis  $T \otimes T \in N_{\Lambda_0}(c_0 \otimes_\pi c_0, c_0 \otimes_\pi c_0)$ . Let  $\omega : c_0 \widehat{\otimes}_\pi c_0 \rightarrow c_0(N \times N)$  be the onto isometry in Proposition 3.4. Since  $T \otimes T$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear, the same is true with the continuous extension  $T \widehat{\otimes} T : c_0 \widehat{\otimes}_\pi c_0 \rightarrow c_0 \widehat{\otimes}_\pi c_0$ . In view of [5, Proposition 4.5], the map

$$S = \omega(T \widehat{\otimes} T)\omega^{-1} : c_0(N \times N) \rightarrow c_0(N \times N)$$

is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear. It is easy to see that for every  $w = (w_{i,j})$  in  $c_0(N \times N)$  we have  $S(w) = (\xi_i \xi_j w_{i,j})$ . Let

$$\zeta = (\xi_1 \xi_1, \xi_1 \xi_2, \xi_2 \xi_1, \xi_1 \xi_3, \xi_2 \xi_2, \xi_3 \xi_1, \dots)$$

and let  $(\mu_n)$  be a decreasing rearrangement of  $\zeta$ .

It is clear that there exists some bijection  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : N \rightarrow N \times N$  such that  $\mu_n = \xi_{\sigma_1(n)}\xi_{\sigma_2(n)}$  for all  $n$ . So it suffices to show that  $(\mu_n) \in \Lambda_0$ . If  $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}$  is the family of all subsets  $J$  of  $N \times N$  containing  $n + 1$  elements, then

$$\alpha_n(S) = \sup_{J \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1}} \inf_{(i,j) \in J} |\xi_i \xi_j|$$

by Proposition 0.1. Since  $|\mu_k| \geq |\mu_{k+1}|$  for all  $k$ , it is clear that  $\alpha_n(S) = |\mu_{n+1}|$ . Thus  $(\mu_n) \in \Lambda_0$  since  $S$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear and hence of type  $\Lambda_0$  (see[5, Theorem 4.2]). This completes the proof of the implication (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (4).

(5)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). Let  $E_1, E_2, F_1, F_2, T_1, T_2$  be as in (1). Since  $T_1 : E_1 \rightarrow \widehat{F}_1$  and  $T_2 : E_2 \rightarrow \widehat{F}_2$  are  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear, there are (by Proposition 2.1)  $\gamma = (\gamma_n), \delta = (\delta_n) \in \Lambda_0$  and continuous linear maps  $S_1 : E_1 \rightarrow c_0, S_2 : c_0 \rightarrow \widehat{F}_1, H_1 : E_2 \rightarrow c_0, H_2 : c_0 \rightarrow \widehat{F}_2$  such that

$$T_1 = S_2 T_\gamma S_1 \quad \text{and} \quad T_2 = H_2 T_\delta H_1.$$

Now

$$T_1 \otimes T_2 = (S_2 \otimes H_2)(T_\gamma \otimes T_\delta)(S_1 \otimes H_1).$$

In order to show that  $T_1 \otimes T_2$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear, it suffices (by [5, Proposition 4.5]) to show that

$$S = T_\gamma \otimes T_\delta : c_0 \otimes_\pi c_0 \rightarrow c_0 \otimes_\pi c_0$$

is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear. For this, it is enough to show that the continuous extension

$$\widehat{S} : c_0 \widehat{\otimes}_\pi c_0 \rightarrow c_0 \widehat{\otimes}_\pi c_0$$

is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear. Let  $\omega : c_0 \widehat{\otimes}_\pi c_0 \rightarrow c_0(N \times N)$  be the onto isometry defined in proposition 3.4 and let

$$H = \omega \widehat{S} \omega^{-1} : c_0(N \times N) \rightarrow c_0(N \times N)$$

Since  $\widehat{S} = \omega^{-1} H \omega$ , it suffices to show that  $H$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear. It is easy to see that (5) implies (4). Thus, our hypothesis (5) implies that there exists a bijection  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : N \rightarrow N \times N$  such that  $(\gamma_{\sigma_1(n)} \delta_{\sigma_2(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ . For each  $n \in N$ , let  $f_n \in c_0(N \times N)'$  be defined by  $f_n(w) = w_{\sigma_1(n)\sigma_2(n)}$  and let  $z^{(n)} \in c_0(N \times N)$ , where  $z_{ij}^{(n)} = 1$  if  $(i, j) = \sigma(n)$  and  $z_{ij}^{(n)} = 0$  if  $(i, j) \neq \sigma(n)$ . Now,  $(z^{(n)})$  is a bounded sequence in  $c_0(N \times N)$ ,  $(f_n)$  an equicontinuous sequence in  $c_0(N \times N)'$  and

$$H(w) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \xi_n f_n(w) z^{(n)}, \quad \xi_n = \gamma_{\sigma_1(n)} \delta_{\sigma_2(n)}.$$

Thus  $H$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear, which proves the implication (5)  $\Rightarrow$  (1).

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (6). Let  $p, q$  be continuous seminorms on  $E$  and  $F$ , respectively, and  $r = p \otimes q$ . Consider the canonical linear isometry

$$h = E_p \otimes_\pi E_q \rightarrow (E \otimes F)_r.$$

Since  $E, F$  are  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear, the quotient maps

$$\phi_p : E \rightarrow E_p \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_q : F \rightarrow F_q$$

are  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear and so the map

$$\phi_p \otimes \phi_q : E \otimes_\pi F \rightarrow E_p \otimes_\pi F_q$$

is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear. It follows that the map

$$f = h \circ (\phi_p \otimes \phi_q) : E \otimes_\pi F \rightarrow (E \otimes F)_r$$

is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear. Since  $f$  is the canonical surjection, it follows that  $E \otimes_\pi F$  is  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear.

In view of Proposition 3.3, we have the following

**Corollary 3.7** Consider the following property for  $P$  :

( $\star$ ) For each  $\alpha \in P$  there exists  $\beta \in P$  such that  $\sup_n \alpha_{n^2}/\beta_n < \infty$ . Then

a) If ( $\star$ ) holds, then (1)-(6) of the preceding Theorem hold.

b) If  $P$  is countable, then property ( $\star$ ) is equivalent to each of the (1)-(5) in the preceding Theorem.

**Proposition 3.8** Let  $\Lambda = \Lambda_{\gamma, \infty}$ , where  $\gamma = (\gamma_n)$  is not bounded. Then, the following are equivalent :

(1)  $\sup_n \gamma_{n^2}/\gamma_n < \infty$ .

(2) If  $\zeta, \eta \in \Lambda = \Lambda_0$ , then there exists a bijection  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2 : N \rightarrow N \times N$  such that  $(\xi_{\sigma_1(n)} \eta_{\sigma_2(n)}) \in \Lambda_0$ .

**Proof :** (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) Let  $d = \sup_n \gamma_{n^2}/\gamma_n$ . Then  $d \geq 1$ . Given  $\rho > 1$ , let  $\rho_1 = \rho^d$ . Then

$$\rho^{\gamma_{n^2}}/\rho_1^{\gamma_n} \leq \rho^{d\gamma_n}/\rho_1^{\gamma_n} = 1.$$

Now the implication follows from Proposition 3.3.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) If  $\alpha^{(m)} = (m^{\gamma_n})$ , for  $m = 2, 3, \dots$  and if  $P = \{\alpha^{(m)} : m \geq 2\}$ , then  $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_0(P)$ . In view of proposition 3.3, for each  $\alpha \in P$  there exists  $\beta \in P$  such that  $\sup_n \alpha_{n^2}/\beta_n < \infty$ . Hence, there exists  $m \geq 2$  such that  $\sup_n 2^{\gamma_{n^2}}/m^{\gamma_n} < \infty$ . Suppose now that  $\sup_n \gamma_{n^2}/\gamma_n = \infty$ . Choose indices  $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$  such that  $\gamma_{n_k^2}/\gamma_{n_k} > k$ . If  $2^k > m$ , then

$$2^{\gamma_{n_k^2}}/m^{\gamma_{n_k}} \geq \left(\frac{2^k}{m}\right)^{n_k} > \frac{2^k}{m} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

a contadiction.

### REFERENCES

- [1] N. de Grande-de Kimpe and S. Navarro, Non-Archimedean nuclearity and spaces of continuous functions, *Indag. Math. N.S.*, **2** (1991), 201-206.
- [2] A. K. Katsaras, Non-Archimedean Köthe sequence spaces, *Boll. U.M.I.*, **5-B**(7) (1991), 703-725.
- [3] A. K. Katsaras, On non-Archimedean sequence spaces, *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sinica*, **18** (1990), 113-126.
- [4] A. K. Katsaras, Non-Archimedean  $\Lambda$ -nuclear spaces, Proc. of the Laredo Conf. on p-adic Functional Analysis, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. **137** (1992), 101-119
- [5] A. K. Katsaras, Non-Archimedean  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid sets and  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear operators, *Boll. U.M.I.*, (7) **7-B** (1993), 691-718.
- [6] A. K. Katsaras and C. Perez-Garcia,  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid sets and  $\Lambda_0$ -compactoid operators versus compactoid sets and compact operators, *Boll. U.M.I.* (7) **8-B** (1994), 371-389.

- [7] A. K. Katsaras and C. Perez-Garcia,  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear operators and  $\Lambda_0$ -nuclear spaces in p-adic Analysis (preprint).
- [8] C. Perez-Garcia and W.H. Schikhof, Tensor product and p-adic vector valued continuous functions (preprint).
- [9] W.H. Schikhof, Locally convex topologies over non-spherically complete fields I-II, *Bull. Soc. Math. Belg. Ser. B*, **38** (1986), 187-224.
- [10] A.C.M. van Rooij, *Non-Archimedean Functional Analysis*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1978.

Department of Mathematics,  
University of Ioannina,  
Ioannina,  
Greece