

# Some remarks on Banach spaces in which martingale difference sequences are unconditional

J. Bourgain

## Introduction

This note deals with Banach spaces  $X$  which have so-called UMD-property, which means that  $X$ -valued martingale difference sequences are unconditional in  $L_X^p(1 < p < \infty)$ . These spaces were recently studied in [2], [3], [4] and we refer the reader to them for details not presented here. Let us recall following fact (see [2]).

**Theorem.** *For a Banach space  $X$ , following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $X$  has UMD,
- (ii) *There exists a symmetric biconvex function  $\zeta$  on  $X \times X$  satisfying  $\zeta(0, 0) > 0$  and  $\zeta(x, y) \cong \|x + y\|$  if  $\|x\| \cong 1 \cong \|y\|$ .*

If  $X$  has UMD, then the same holds for subspaces and quotients of  $X$ ,  $X^*$  and for the spaces  $L_X^p(1 < p < \infty)$ . It is shown in [1] that if  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $L_X^p(0, 1)$  has an unconditional basis, then  $X$  is UMD. Conversely, it is not difficult to see that if  $X$  is a UMD-space possessing an unconditional basis, then the spaces  $L_X^p(0, 1)$  ( $1 < p < \infty$ ) have unconditional basis.

In [3], it is proved that if  $X$  is UMD, then certain singular integrals such as the Hilbert transform are bounded operators on  $L_X^p(1 < p < \infty)$ . Our first purpose will be to show the converse, i.e. Hilbert transform boundedness implies UMD.

From [1], we know that UMD implies super-reflexivity. Another, more direct argument will be given in the remarks below. In [7], an example is described of a superreflexive space failing UMD. We will show that superreflexivity does not imply UMD also for lattices, a question left open by [7].

At this point, the class UMD seems rather small, in the sense that the only basis examples we know about are spaces appearing in classical analysis.

**1. Hilberttransform and martingale difference sequences**

Denote  $D$  the Cantor group and  $\Pi$  the circle group (equipped with their respective Haar measure). Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the Hilbert transform acting on  $L^p(\Pi)$ . It will be convenient to introduce following definition:

For  $1 < p < \infty$ , say that the Banach space  $X$  has property  $(h_p)$  provided  $\mathcal{H}$  acts boundedly on  $L^p_X(\Pi)$ , i.e.

$$\|\mathcal{H}(f)\|_p \leq C\|f\|_p \text{ for } f \in L^p_X(\Pi).$$

In [3], a classical approach is used to derive  $(h_p)$  from the  $p$ -boundedness of the martingale transforms acting on  $L^p_X(D)$ . We will explain here a reverse procedure.

As a consequence, each of the properties  $(h_p)$  is equivalent to UMD. The main point is following fact

**Lemma 1.** Denote for  $k=1, 2, \dots$   $\Pi^k = \underbrace{\Pi \times \dots \times \Pi}_k$ . Assume given for each  $k=1, 2, \dots$  a function  $\Phi_k \in L^p_X(\Pi^k)$  and a scalar function  $\varphi_k \in L^\infty(\Pi)$ ,  $\int \varphi_k = 0$ . If  $X$  satisfies  $(h_p)$ , one has the inequality

$$\|\Sigma' \Phi_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k) \mathcal{H}(\varphi_k)(\theta_{k+1})\|_p \leq C \|\Sigma' \Phi_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k) \varphi_k(\theta_{k+1})\|_p,$$

( $\Sigma' = \sum_{k=1}^n$  for some integer  $n$ ).

*Proof.* By an approximation argument, we can assume the  $\Phi_k$ -functions to be  $X$ -valued polynomials, say

$$|\gamma| = |\gamma_1| + \dots + |\gamma_k| \leq N_k \text{ if } \gamma \in \text{Spec } \Phi_k \subset \mathbf{Z}^k$$

where  $N_k$  is some positive integer.

Define inductively an increasing sequence  $(n_k)$  of integers, taking

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= 0, \\ n_{k+1} &= n_k N_k + 1. \end{aligned}$$

For fixed  $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots)$ , notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{H}_\psi(\Phi_k(\theta_1 + n_1\psi, \dots, \theta_k + n_k\psi) \varphi_k(\theta_{k+1} + n_{k+1}\psi)) \\ &= \Phi_k(\theta_1 + n_1\psi, \dots, \theta_k + n_k\psi) \mathcal{H}(\varphi_k)(\theta_{k+1} + n_{k+1}\psi) \end{aligned}$$

since it concerns the product of a function with spectrum contained in  $]-n_{k+1}, n_{k+1}[$  and a function with spectrum contained in  $n_{k+1}(\mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\})$ . So, if  $X$  has  $(h_p)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \|\Sigma' \Phi_k(\theta_1 + n_1\psi, \dots, \theta_k + n_k\psi) \mathcal{H}(\varphi_k)(\theta_{k+1} + n_{k+1}\psi)\|^p m(d\psi) \\ &\leq c^p \int \|\Sigma' \Phi_k(\theta_1 + n_1\psi, \dots, \theta_k + n_k\psi) \varphi_k(\theta_{k+1} + n_{k+1}\psi)\|^p m(d\psi) \end{aligned}$$

and integration on  $\psi$  clearly leads to the required conclusion.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $X$  be  $(h_p)$  and consider for each  $k=1, 2, \dots$  a function  $\Delta_k \in L^p_X(D)$  depending on the first  $k$  Rademachers  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_k$ . Then*

$$\|\Sigma' \alpha_{k+1} \Delta_k(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k) \varepsilon_{k+1}\|_p \leq C^2 \|\Sigma' \Delta_k(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k) \varepsilon_{k+1}\|_p,$$

for all sequences  $\alpha_k = \pm 1$ . Consequently,  $X$  possesses UMD.

*Proof.* Considering again  $\Pi^N$ , one can replace  $D$  by  $\Pi^N$ , writing

$$\varepsilon_k = \text{sign} \cos \theta_k \quad (\text{sign} = \text{sign function}).$$

So, define

$$\Phi_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k) = \Delta_k(\text{sign} \cos \theta_1, \dots, \text{sign} \cos \theta_k)$$

and let

$$\varphi_k(\theta) = \text{sign} \cos \theta$$

for each  $k$ .

Thus  $\Phi_k$  is even in  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k$  and  $\mathcal{H}(\varphi_k)$  is an odd function. Thus, applying Lemma 1 and replacing  $\theta_k$  by  $\alpha_k \theta_k$ , it follows

$$\|\Sigma' \alpha_{k+1} \Phi_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k) \mathcal{H}(\varphi_k)(\theta_{k+1})\|_p \leq C \|\Sigma' \Phi_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k) \varphi_k(\theta_{k+1})\|_p.$$

But, again by Lemma 1

$$\|\Sigma' \alpha_{k+1} \Phi_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k) \varphi_k(\theta_{k+1})\|_p \leq C \|\Sigma' \alpha_{k+1} \Phi_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k) \mathcal{H}(\varphi_k)(\theta_{k+1})\|_p.$$

Thus, the desired inequality is obtained.

Remark that the method extends to more variables and allows to translate inequalities for polydisc in inequalities for multiindexed martingales.

## 2. An example

From [9] we know that each superreflexive lattice can be obtained as complex interpolation space between a Hilbert space and some lattice. Therefore, one could hope to prove UMD for this class of spaces. The next example shows however that this is not possible.

**Proposition.** *For  $1 < p < q < \infty$ , there is a lattice  $X$  satisfying an upper- $p$  and lower- $q$  estimate and failing UMD.*

The reader is referred to [6] for definitions and basic facts. We will construct finite dimensional lattices  $X$  with upper- $p$  and lower- $q$  constant 1 and for which the bound for martingale transforms acting on  $L^p_X(D)$  goes to infinity. The final lattice is then obtained as  $l^p$ -direct sum (again  $D$  stands for the Cantor group or a finite Cantor group). The following definition will be useful.

Say that a collection  $\mathfrak{A}$  of subsets of  $D$  is a translation invariant paving iff

- (i)  $A \in \mathfrak{A}, B \subset A \Rightarrow B \in \mathfrak{A}$ ,
- (ii)  $A \in \mathfrak{A}, g \in D \Rightarrow A_g \in \mathfrak{A}$  ( $A_g = g$ -translate of  $A$ ).

Let  $1 < p < q < \infty$  and define following function lattice  $X = X_{p,q}(\mathfrak{A})$  on  $D$

$$\|f\|_X = \sup (\sum \|f\chi_{A_i}\|_p^q)^{1/q}.$$

Here the supremum is taken over all disjoint collection  $\{A_i\}$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$ -members. ( $\chi_A$  denotes the indicator function of the set  $A$ .) The proof of following facts is standard and left as exercise to the reader.

**Lemma 3.**

- (i)  $X$  has upper- $p$  and lower- $q$  estimates with constant 1,
- (ii)  $\|f\|_X = \|f_g\|_X$  for all  $g \in D$ ,
- (iii)  $\|f\|_X \cong \|f\|_p^{p/q} \sup_{\mathfrak{A}} \|f\chi_A\|_p^{1-p/q}$ .

Denote  $\tilde{\cdot}$  some transform. For a fixed  $\varphi \in X$ , define  $\tilde{\Phi} \in L^p_X(D)$  by  $\tilde{\Phi}(g) = \varphi_g$ . Then  $\tilde{\Phi}(g) = (\tilde{\varphi})_g$  and the norm of  $\tilde{\cdot}$  acting on  $L^p_X(D)$  is thus minorated by the ratio  $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_X \|\varphi\|_X^{-1}$ . In order to introduce  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\varphi$ , we need following additional lemma

**Lemma 4.** For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist  $\varphi \in L^p(D)$  and a measurable subset  $M \subset D$  satisfying

- (i)  $\|\varphi\|_p = 1$ ,
- (ii)  $\|\varphi_g \chi_M\|_p < \varepsilon$  for each  $g \in D$ ,
- (iii)  $\|S(\varphi) \chi_M\|_p \cong 1/2$

(denoting  $S$  the Walsh—Paley square function).

Let us first show how to conclude.

Define  $\mathfrak{A}$  as the class of measurable subsets  $A$  of  $D$  contained in some translate  $M_g$  of  $M$ . By Lemma 3 (iii) and Lemma 4 (ii)

$$\|\varphi\|_X \cong \varepsilon^{1-p/q}$$

while from Lemma 4 (iii), for some transform  $\tilde{\cdot}$ , one has

$$\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_X \cong \|\tilde{\varphi} \chi_M\|_p \cong \frac{1}{2}.$$

So  $\|\tilde{\cdot}\|_p \geq \varepsilon^{p/q-1} \rightarrow \infty$  for  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.* Fix a positive integer  $n$  and consider  $D = \{1, -1\}^{2n}$ . Define for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$

$$R_k^+ = (1 + \varepsilon_1) \dots (1 + \varepsilon_k) (1 - \varepsilon_{k+1}) \dots (1 - \varepsilon_n) (1 + \varepsilon_{n+1}) \dots (1 + \varepsilon_{n+k-1}) (1 + \varepsilon_{n+k}),$$

$$R_k^- = (1 + \varepsilon_1) \dots (1 + \varepsilon_k) (1 - \varepsilon_{k+1}) \dots (1 - \varepsilon_n) (1 + \varepsilon_{n+1}) \dots (1 + \varepsilon_{n+k-1}) (1 - \varepsilon_{n+k}).$$

Take

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &= n^{-1/p} \sum_{k=1}^n 2^{-\frac{n+k}{p'}} R_k^+, \\ \chi_M &= \sum_{k=1}^n 2^{-(n+k)} R_k^-. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\|\varphi\|_p=1$ . One also checks easily that

$$\|S(\varphi)\chi_M\|_p^p = \Sigma \|S(\varphi)2^{-(n+k)} R_k^-\|_p^p \cong \Sigma \frac{1}{n} 2^{-\frac{p}{p'}(n+k)} 2^{-p} 2^{(p-1)(n+k)}$$

and thus

$$\|S(\varphi)\chi_M\|_p \cong \frac{1}{2}$$

To verify (ii) of Lemma 4, fix  $g \in D$  and distinguish following cases

(a)  $g_k \neq 1$  for some coordinate  $k=1, 2, \dots, n$ .

Then it is easy to see that  $(R_k^+)_g R_l^- \neq 0$  for at most 2 pairs  $(k, l)$ .

(b)  $g_k = 1$  for all  $k=1, 2, \dots, n$ .

Then  $(R_k^+)_g R_l^- = 0$  for  $k \neq l$  and  $(R_k^+)_g R_l^- \neq 0$  for at most 1 value of  $k$ .

Therefore  $\|\varphi_g \chi_M\|_p \cong 2n^{-1/p} \rightarrow 0$  for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

### 3. Some further remarks

Assuming  $X$  a UMD-space and denoting  $\|\mathcal{H}\|_{\infty,1}$  the  $L_X^\infty \rightarrow L_X^1$  norm of the Hilbert-transform, one obtains in terms of the Hilbert-matrix

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^n \frac{\langle x_i, x_j^* \rangle}{i-j} \right| \cong n \|\mathcal{H}\|_{\infty,1} \max \|x_i\| \max \|x_j^*\|$$

for each  $n$  and all sequences  $(x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ ,  $(x_j^*)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$  in  $X$  and  $X^*$  (resp.).

Fixing  $\delta > 0$ , define  $N_\delta$  as the largest positive integer for which there exists a sequence  $(x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n=N_\delta}$  in the unit ball of  $X$  such that

$$\text{dist}(\text{conv}(x_1, \dots, x_j), \text{conv}(x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n)) \cong \delta$$

for each  $j=1, \dots, n$ .

From the preceding, we get

$$\delta \log N_\delta \cong \|\mathcal{H}\|_{\infty,1}. \quad (*)$$

Since in particular  $N_\delta < \infty$  for each  $\delta > 0$ ,  $X$  must be superreflexive (cfr. [5]).

In [7], interpolation is used to construct a superreflexive space for which left hand side of  $(*)$  is unbounded for  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . It might be interesting to determine the worse bound on the Hilbert transform for  $\dim X = d < \infty$ . In particular, what is

$$\sup_{\dim X = d} \sup_{\delta > 0} (\delta \log N_\delta)?$$

## References

1. ALDOUS, D. J.: Unconditional bases and martingales in  $L_p(F)$ , *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **85**, 117—123 (1979).
2. BURKHOLDER, D. L.: A geometrical characterization of Banach spaces in which martingale difference sequences are unconditional, preprint
3. BURKHOLDER, D. L.: A geometrical condition that implies the existence of certain singular integrals of Banach-space-valued functions, to appear in *Proc. Conf. Harmonic Analysis, University of Chicago*, March 1981.
4. BURKHOLDER, D. L.: Martingale transforms and the geometry of Banach spaces, to appear in *Proc. Third International Conf. on Probability in Banach Spaces*, LNM.
5. JAMES, R. C.: Super-reflexivity in Banach spaces, *Canadian J. Math.*, Vol. **24**, 896—904 (1972)
6. LINDENSTRAUSS, J., TZAFRIRI, L.: *Classical Banach Spaces II*, *Ergebnisse der Mathematik* 97 (1979).
7. PISIER, G.: Un exemple concernant la super-réflexivité, *Séminaire Maurey—Schwartz, Ecole Polytechnique Paris* (1975).
8. PISIER, G.: Martingales with values in uniformly convex spaces, *Israel J. Math.* **20**, 326—350 (1975).
9. PISIER, G.: Some applications of the complex interpolation method to Banach lattices, *J. d'Analyse Math.*, Vol. **35**, 264—281 (1979).

Received July, 1981

Department of Mathematics  
Vrije Universiteit Brussel  
Pleinlaan 2-F7  
1050 Brussels