Séminaire d'analyse fonctionnelle
École Polytechnique

G. Schechtman

A disjointness property of l_p^n sequences in L_p

Séminaire d'analyse fonctionnelle (Polytechnique) (1978-1979), exp. n° 21, p. 1-13
<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=SAF_1978-1979____A18_0>

© Séminaire d'analyse fonctionnelle
(École Polytechnique), 1978-1979, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives du séminaire d'analyse fonctionnelle 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/

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE

CENTRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES

PLATEAU DE PALAISEAU - 91128 PALAISEAU CEDEX

Téléphone : 941.82.00 - Poste N°

Télex : ECOLEX 691 596 F

S E M I N A I R E

D ' A N A L Y S E   F O N C T I O N N E L L E

1978-1979

A DISJOINTNESS PROPERTY OF ℓ_p^n SEQUENCES IN L_p

G. SCHECHTMAN

(Ohio State University (Columbus))

Exposé No XXI 16 Mars 1979

In [1] L. E. Dor proved that a subspace of $L_1(0, 1)$ which is almost isometric to a $L_1'(\mu)$ space is well complemented. The purpose of this note is to prove the analogous theorem for $1 < p < \infty$ thus solving a problem of Enflo and Rosenthal [2] and of Dor [1]. Since a detailed proof will appear shortly in [3], I'll try to give here a less formal and, hopefuly, more intuitive proof.

<u>Theorem 1</u>: let $1 < p < \infty$. <u>There exist a</u> $\lambda_0 > 1$ <u>and a function</u> $\varphi(\lambda)$, <u>defined for</u> $1 < \lambda < \lambda_0$, <u>such that</u> $\varphi(\lambda) \longrightarrow 1^+$ as $\lambda \longrightarrow 1^+$ <u>and if</u> $x_1, \dots x_n$ <u>are functions in</u> $L_p(0,1)$ <u>which satisfy</u>

$$\lambda^{-1}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |a_i|^p\right)^{1/p} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i x_i \right\| \leq \lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |a_i|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

<u>for all sequences</u> $a_1, \dots, a_n$ <u>of scalars then</u> $[x_i]_{i=1}^n$ <u>is complemented in</u> $L_p(0,1)$ <u>by means of a projection of norm at most</u> $\varphi(\lambda)$.

It is well known that this implies that any $\mathcal{L}_{p,\lambda}$ subspace of $L_p(0,1)$ is complemented if λ is small enough (and the norm of the projection tends to 1 as $\lambda \longrightarrow 1$). Also, a simple perturbation argument shows that Theorem 1 is a consequence of

<u>Theorem 2</u>: <u>Let</u> $1 < p < \infty$, $p \neq 2$. <u>There exists a function</u> $a(\varepsilon)$ <u>such that</u> $a(\varepsilon) \longrightarrow 0$

as $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$ and, if $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are functions in $L_p(0,1)$ which satisfy

$$(1-\epsilon)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|a_i|^p\right)^{1/p} \le \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n}a_i x_i\right\| \le (1+\epsilon)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|a_i|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

for all scalars $a_1, \ldots, a_n$, then there exist disjoint sets $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ of $[0,1]$ such that

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n}a_i(x_i - x_i|_{A_i})\right\| \le a(\epsilon)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|a_i|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

for all scalars $a_1, \ldots, a_n$.

Indeed, if Theorem 2 is true let P be a norm one projection from $L_p(0,1)$ onto $[x_i|_{A_i}]_{i=1}^{n}$. The conclusion of Theorem 2 ensures that $P|_{[x_i]_{i=1}^{\infty}}$ is an isomorphism provided ϵ is small enough (and $\|(P|_{[x_i]_{i=1}^{n}})^{-1}\| \longrightarrow 1$ as $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$). So the desired projection is given by $(P|_{[x_i]_{i=1}^{n}})^{-1}P$.

Theorem 2 is a stronger version of the following theorem of Dor [1] :

Let $1 \le p < \infty$, $p \ne 2$. There exists a function $a(\epsilon)$ such that $a(\epsilon) \to 0$ as $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$ and if $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is a normalized sequence in $L_p(0,1)$ such that

$$(1-\epsilon)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|a_i|^p\right)^{1/p} \le \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n}a_i x_i\right\| \le (1+\epsilon)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|a_i|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

for all scalars $a_1, \ldots, a_n$, *then there are disjoint sets* $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ *of* $[0,1]$ *such that*

$$\|x_i|_{A_i^c}\| \le a(\varepsilon), \qquad i = 1, \ldots, n. \quad (A_i^c \text{ is the complement of } A).$$

The case $p = 1$ easily implies the analogue of Theorem 2 for $p = 1$. As we we'll see the proof of Theorem 2 for $1 < p < \infty$ is also based on Dor's theorem, however the deduction of Theorem 2 from Dor's theorem is much more complicated in this case.

We divide the proof into three parts. The first one is a reduction of the general case to the case where the x_i are exchangeable.

Fix n and $\varepsilon > 0$. Given normalized $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ which satisfy the assumption of Theorem 2 we find disjoint sets $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as in Dor's theorem. Let Π denote the set of all permutations of $(1, \ldots, n)$, let $\{I_\pi\}_{\pi\in\Pi}$ be a collection of disjoint subintervals of $[0,1]$ each of length $1/n!$ and for $\pi \in \Pi$, let φ_π be the natural linear transformation of I_π onto $[0,1]$.

Fix $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that $(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^p)^{1/p} = n^{1/p}$ and define a sequence $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of $L_p(0,1)$ functions by:

$$f_i(t) = a_{\pi(i)} x_{\pi(i)}(\varphi_\pi(t)) \text{ for } 1 \le i \le n,\ \pi \in \Pi \text{ and } t \in I_\pi$$

in a similar manner we define $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^n$ using $x_i|A_i$ and $x_i - x_i|A_i$, respectively, instead of x_i.

Lemma 1: (a)

$$(1-\epsilon)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |b_i|^p\right)^{1/p} \le \left\|\sum_{i=1}^n b_i f_i\right\| \le (1+\epsilon)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |b_i|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

for every sequence $b_1, \ldots, b_n$ of scalars.

(b) $f_i = h_i + g_i$, g_i and h_i are disjointly supported for each $i=1,\ldots,n$. $g_1,\ldots, g_n$ are disjointly supported .

(c) $\|f_i\| = 1$, $\|h_i\| < a(\epsilon)$ and $\|g_i\| > (1-a(\epsilon)^p)^{1/p}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

(d) $\|\sum_{i=1}^n h_i\| = \|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i z_i\|$

(e) $\{(g_i, h_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ is an exchangeable sequence; i.e., the distribution of the sequence

$$(g_1, h_1, g_2, h_2, \ldots, g_n, h_n)$$

is the same as the distribution of

$$(g_{\pi(1)}, h_{\pi(1)}, g_{\pi(2)}, h_{\pi(2)}, \ldots, g_{\pi(n)}, h_{\pi(n)})$$

for any $\pi \in \Pi$.

The proof is very simple, we'll prove only (d) and (e),

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i\right\| = \left(\sum_{\pi\in\Pi}\int_{I_\pi}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\pi(i)}\, z_{\pi(i)}\,(\varphi_\pi(t))\right|^p dt\right)^{1/p}$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{n!}\sum_{\pi\in\Pi}\int_0^1\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\pi(i)} z_{\pi(i)}\right|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{n!}\sum_{\pi\in\Pi}\int_0^1\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i z_i\right|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

$$= \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i z_i\right\|$$

To prove (e) we notice that for any $\pi, \rho \in \Pi$

$$\operatorname{dist}\{(g_i, h_i)_{|I_\pi}\}_{i=1}^{n} = \operatorname{dist}\{(g_{\rho(i)}, h_{\rho(i)})_{|I_{\pi\rho^{-1}}}\}_{i=1}^{n}$$

since both are equal to the distribution of

$$\{(a_{\pi(i)}\, y_{\pi(i)},\ a_{\pi(i)}\, z_{\pi(i)})\}_{i=1}^{n}$$

with respect to $\frac{1}{n!}\cdot$ Lebesque measure. $\square$

Lemma 1 reduces the proof of Theorem 2 to showing

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i\right\|^p \leq b(\epsilon)\cdot n$$

for some function $b(\epsilon)$, depending on ϵ and p alone, such that $b(\epsilon)\longrightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon\longrightarrow 0$.

The second step in the proof consists of the following inequality

Lemma 2: In the situation above

$$\left|\int_0^1 \left|\sum_{j=1}^n g_j + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p - \frac{n}{\ell}\int_0^1 \left|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f_i\right|^p + \frac{h-\ell}{\ell}\int_0^1 \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p\right| \le \frac{n^2}{\ell}\, c(\epsilon)$$

for all $\ell = 1, \ldots, n$ where $c(\epsilon)$ depends on p and ϵ alone and $c(\epsilon) \longrightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$.

We pospone the proof and continue with the third step which is the deduction of Theorem 2 from Lemma 2. As we mentioned above we'll give a heuristic proof which we hope will give the idea behind the proof. A complete formal proof, which however looks quite mysterious, can be found in [3].

The first object is to show that any two partial sums of the h_i with the same number of terms are closed each to the other.

Lemma 3: Let M_1, M_2 be two subsets of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ of the same cardinality then

$$\left\| \sum_{k\in M_1} h_k - \sum_{k\in M_2} h_k \right\|^p \le d(\epsilon)\cdot n$$

where $d(\epsilon) \longrightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$ and depends on ϵ and p alone.

Proof: First notice that it is enough to prove the lemma for $M_1 \cap M_2 = \emptyset$, and then it is enought to consider $M_1 = \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$, $M_2 = \{\ell+1, \ldots, 2\ell\}$ for some $1 \le \ell \le \frac{n}{2}$. Now since $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is exchangeable $h_1 - h_{\ell+1}$, $h_2 - h_{\ell+2}, \ldots, h_\ell - h_{2\ell}$ is a 1-unconditional basic sequence so if $1 < p < 2$

$$\|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} h_i - \sum_{i=\ell+1}^{2\ell} h_i\| \leq \|h_i - h_{\ell+1}\| . \ell^{1/p} \leq 2\epsilon n^{1/p}.$$

If $p > 2$ the proof is more involved:

First notice that by Khinchine's inequality,

$$(1) \qquad \|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} h_i - \sum_{i=\ell+1}^{2\ell} h_i\| \leq K_p \|(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |h_i - h_{\ell+1}|^2)^{1/2}\| \leq K_p 2^{1/2} \|(\sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} |h_i|^2)^{1/2}\|$$

for some constant K_p depending only on p.

Now, let $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ be the first n Rademacher functions, then

$$2\ell(1+\epsilon)^p \geq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |\sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} r_i(t) f_i(s)|^p dt ds \geq \int_0^1 (\int_0^1 |\sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} r_i(t) f_i(s)|^2 dt)^{p/2} ds$$

$$= \int_0^1 (\sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} |f_i(s)|^2)^{p/2} ds = \int_0^1 (\sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} |g_i(s)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} |h_i(s)|^2)^{p/2} ds$$

$$\geq \int_0^1 (\sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} |g_i(s)|^2)^{p/s} + \int_0^1 (\sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} |h_i(s)|^2)^{p/2}$$

$$= \int_0^1 |\sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} g_i(s)|^p + \int_0^1 (\sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} |h_i(s)|^2)^{p/2}$$

$$\geq (1-\epsilon^p) 2\ell + \|(\sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} |h_i|^2)^{1/2}\|^p$$

which together with (1) finishes the proof.

We are going to use Lemma 2 only for $\ell = n/2$ and $\ell = n/4$ (assuming for simplicity that n is divisible by 4), for these values $\frac{n^2}{\ell} < 4.n$ also, using Lemma 3, we can write the conclusion of Lemma 2 as

$$(2)\qquad \left|\int_0^1 \left|\sum_{j=1}^n g_j + \frac{\ell}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n h_k\right|^p + \frac{n-\ell}{\ell}\int_0^1 \left|\frac{\ell}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n h_k\right|^p - n\right| \le n.d(\varepsilon)$$

$\ell = \frac{n}{2}$ or $\ell = \frac{n}{4}$, $d(\varepsilon) \longrightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \longrightarrow 0$ and depends on ε and p alone.

Put $\quad g = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i, \qquad h = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i.$

From Clarkson's inequality we get, for $1 < p < 2$,

$$\|g+\tfrac{1}{2}h\|^p + \|\tfrac{1}{2}h\|^p \le \tfrac{1}{2}(\|g+h\|^p + \|g\|^p) \le (1+\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2})n$$

so (2) with $\ell = \frac{n}{2}$ says that we have an almost equality in Clarkson's inequality. The same thing holds for $p > 2$. Recall that equality in Clarkson's inequality holds if and only if the two functions are disjoint. This suggests that $g + \frac{1}{2}h$ and $\frac{1}{2}h$ are almost disjoint, that is, there exist two disjoint sets A and B such that $A \cup B = [0,1]$ and

$$(3)\qquad \|h_{|A}\|^p < e(\varepsilon).n\ , \qquad \|(g+\tfrac{1}{2}h)_{|B}\|^p < e(\varepsilon).n$$

for some $e(\varepsilon)$ with the same properties as the previous functions. (This can be proved using the proof of Proposition 2.1 in [1]).

Using (3) we can write (2) for $\ell = \frac{n}{4}$ in the form ($\approx$ means that the difference between the two sides is of the form $e(\varepsilon).n$ for an appropriate $e(\varepsilon)$.

$$n \approx \int_0^1 |g + \tfrac{1}{4}h|^p + 3\int_0^1 |\tfrac{1}{4}h|^p$$

$$\approx \int_A |g|^p + \int_B |g + \tfrac{1}{4}h|^p + 3\int_B |\tfrac{1}{4}h|^p$$

$$\approx \int_A |g|^p + \int_B |\tfrac{1}{2}g|^p + (2^p - 1)\int_B |\tfrac{1}{2}g|^p + (4-2^p)\int_B |\tfrac{1}{4}h|^p$$

$$\approx \int_A |g|^p + \int_B |g|^p + \frac{4 - 2^p}{4^p}\int_0^1 |h|^p$$

$$\approx n + \frac{4-2^p}{4^p}\|h\|^p$$

and this means that

$$\|h\|^p \leq b(\varepsilon)\cdot n$$

We return now to the proof of Lemma 2. We first need another lemma.

Denote the support of g_i by B_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$. By (e) of Lemma 1, whenever M_1 and M_2 are two subsets of $\{1,\dots,n\}$ of the same cardinality and $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ satisfy either $i \in M_1$ and $j \in M_2$ or $i \notin M_1$ and $j \notin M_2$

$$\int_{B_i} \Big|\sum_{k\in M_1} h_k\Big|^p = \int_{B_j} \Big|\sum_{k\in M_2} h_k\Big|^p$$

and

$$\int_{B_i} \Big|g_i + \sum_{k\in M_1} h_k\Big|^p = \int_{B_j} \Big|g_j + \sum_{k\in M_2} h_k\Big|^p.$$

Indeed in each of these two cases there exists $\pi \in \Pi$ such that $\pi(M_1) = M_2$ and $\pi(i) = j$, so,

$$\operatorname{dist}(g_i, \sum_{k\in M_1} h_k) = \operatorname{dist}(g_j, \sum_{k\in M_1} h_{\pi(k)}) = \operatorname{dist}(g_j, \sum_{k\in M_2} h_k).$$

The next lemma asserts that, up to a certain error, the same is true without any restrictions on i and j.

<u>Lemma 4</u>: <u>Let</u> M_1, M_2 <u>be subsets of</u> $\{1,\dots,n\}$ <u>with</u> card M_1 = card M_2 <u>and let</u> i, j <u>satisfy</u> $1 \le i,\ j \le n$ <u>then</u>

(a) $$\left| \int_{B_i} \left|\sum_{k\in M_1} h_k\right|^p - \int_{B_i} \left|\sum_{k\in M_2} h_k\right|^p \right| < c(\varepsilon)$$

(b) $$\left| \int_{B_i} \left|g_i + \sum_{k\in M_1} h_k\right|^p - \int_{B_j} \left|g_j + \sum_{k\in M_2} h_k\right|^p \right| < c(\varepsilon)$$

<u>for some function</u> $c(\varepsilon)$ <u>depending on</u> p and ε <u>alone</u> <u>and such that</u> $c(\varepsilon) \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

<u>Proof</u>: By the remark before the statement of the lemma, it is enough to assume that $M_1 = M_2$ $\{1,\dots,\ell\}$ for some $1 \le \ell < n$ and that $1 \le i \le \ell < j \le n$. First notice that, since

$$\mathrm{dist}(g_i, \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k) = \mathrm{dist}(g_r, \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k) \text{ for all } 1 \le r \le \ell,$$

(4) $$\left(\int_{B_i} \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p\right)^{1/p} = \left(\frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{\ell} \int_{B_r} \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p\right)^{1/p} \le \frac{1}{\ell^{1/p}} \left\|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right\|$$

$$\le \frac{1}{\ell^{1/p}} \left(\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} f_k\right\| + \left\|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} g_k\right\|\right) \le 2 + \varepsilon$$

Now, since

$$\mathrm{dist}(g_j, \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k) = \mathrm{dist}(g_i, \sum_{\substack{k=1\\k\ne i}}^{\ell+1} h_k),$$

and since g_i and h_i are disjointly supported,

$$\Big(\int_{B_j} \Big|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p\Big)^{1/p} = \Big(\int_{B_i} \Big|\sum_{\substack{k=1\\k\neq i}}^{\ell+1} h_k\Big|^p\Big)^{1/p} = \Big(\int_{B_i} \Big|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell+1} h_k\Big|^p\Big)^{1/p}$$

$$\leq \Big(\int_{B_i} \Big|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p\Big)^{1/p} + \varepsilon$$

and similarly

$$\Big(\int_{B_j} \Big|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p\Big)^{1/p} \geq \Big(\int_{B_i} \Big|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p\Big)^{1/p} - \varepsilon$$

so that, by the mean value theorem and (1), we get (a) with $c(\varepsilon) = p(2+2\varepsilon)^{p-1}\varepsilon$. (b) is proved in a similar way, noting that

$$\Big(\int_{B_i} \Big|g_i + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p\Big)^{1/p} \leq \|g_i\| + 2 + \varepsilon \leq 3 + \varepsilon \,.$$

<u>Proof of Lemma 2</u>: By Lemma 4(b) for each i and j,

$$\int_{B_j} \Big|g_j + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p \leq \int_{B_i} \Big|g_i + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p + c(\varepsilon)$$

Summing over j we get that for every i

$$\int_0^1 \Big|\sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_{B_j} \Big|g_j + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p \leq$$

$$\leq n \int_{B_i} \Big|g_i + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p + n.\ c(\varepsilon)$$

summing over $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and dividing by ℓ we get

(5) $$\int_0^1 \Big|\sum_{j=1}^{n} g_j + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p \leq \frac{n}{\ell} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \int_{B_i} \Big|g_i + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\Big|^p + n.c(\varepsilon)$$

$$= \frac{n}{\ell}\int_{\bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} B_i} \left|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} g_i + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p + nc(\epsilon).$$

$$= \frac{n}{\ell}\int_0^1 \left|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f_i\right|^p - \frac{n}{\ell}\int_{\bigcup_{i=\ell+1}^{n} B_i} \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p + nc(\epsilon).$$

By Lemma 4(a), for every i and j,

$$\int_{B_i} \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p \geq \int_{B_j} \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p - c(\epsilon)$$

so, for every j,

$$\int_{\bigcup_{i=\ell+1}^{n} B_i} \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p \geq (n-\ell)\int_{B_j} \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p - (n-\ell)\ c(\epsilon),$$

summing over $1 \leq j \leq n$ we get

$$\int_{\bigcup_{i=\ell+1}^{n} B_i} \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p \geq \frac{n-\ell}{n}\int_0^1 \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p - (n-\ell)\ c(\epsilon) \tag{6}$$

combining (5) and (6) we get

$$\int_0^1 \left|\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} g_j + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p \leq \frac{n}{\ell}\int_0^1 \left|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f_i\right|^p - \frac{n-\ell}{\ell}\int_0^1 \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} h_k\right|^p + \frac{n^2}{\ell}\ c(\epsilon).$$

The otherside inequality is proved similarly.

REFERENCES

(1) L. E. Dor, On projections in L_1, Ann of Math. 102 (1975), 463 -474.

(2) P. Enflo and H.P. Rosenthal, Some results concerning $L_p(\mu)$ spaces, J. Funct. Anal. 14(1973), 325-348.

(3) G. Schechtman, Almost isometric L_p subspaces of $L_p(0,1)$, to appear in the J. of the London Math. Soc.
