Glasgow Math. J. **56** (2014) 409–417.
doi:10.1017/S0017089513000347.

THE POSITION OF $\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ IN $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$

DANIELE PUGLISI
Department of Mathematics and Computer Sciences, University of Catania, Catania 95125, Italy
e-mail: dpuglisi@dmi.unict.it

(Received 2 November 2012; accepted 24 January 2013; first published online 13 August 2013)

Abstract. In this paper we investigate the nature of family of pairs of separable Banach spaces (X, Y) such that $\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ is complemented in $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$. It is proved that the family of pairs (X, Y) of separable Banach spaces such that $\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ is complemented in $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ is not Borel, endowed with the Effros–Borel structure.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46B20.

1. Introduction. Let X and Y be two infinite dimensional real Banach spaces. The following has been a longstanding question (see [**18**] and [**3**]):

QUESTION 1.1. Are the following properties equivalent?
(a) There exists a projection from the the space $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ of continuous linear operators onto the space $\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ of compact linear operators.
(b) $\mathcal{L}(X, Y) = \mathcal{K}(X, Y)$.

Many results have been found about this question. In [**19**], Tong and Wilken showed that if X has an unconditional basis, then the equivalence in the above question is true. Some years later, Kalton [**13**] extended this result showing the following.

THEOREM 1.2. *Let X be a Banach space with an unconditional finite dimensional expansion of the identity. If Y is any infinite-dimensional Banach space, the following are equivalent.*
(i) *$\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ is complemented in $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$;*
(ii) *$\mathcal{L}(X, Y) = \mathcal{K}(X, Y)$;*
(iii) *$\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ contains no copy of c_0;*
(iv) *$\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ contains no copy of ℓ_∞.*

In [**10**] and [**11**], Emmanuele proved that, without assumption of unconditional finite dimensional expansion of the identity, we still have some implication of the above theorem; i.e. if c_0 embeds in $\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$, then $\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ is uncomplemented in $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$. Moreover, he also showed that the classical Bourgain–Delbaen space $X_{a,b}$ (see [**6**]) is such that $\mathcal{K}(X_{a,b})$ contains no copy of c_0 despite $\mathcal{L}(X_{a,b}) \neq \mathcal{K}(X_{a,b})$.

Recently, Argyros and Haydon [**2**], in a truly spectacular way, have solved the above-mentioned Question 1.1. Indeed, using a mixed Tsirelson trick, they constructed a space $\mathfrak{X}_K$ in the wake of Bourgain–Delbaen space (see [**5**, **6**]) such that

$\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{X}_K)$ contains no copy of c_0;
$\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{X}_K) = \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{X}_K) \oplus \mathbb{R}I$,

where I denotes the identity map. In particular, $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{X}_K)$ is nontrivially complemented in $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{X}_K)$.

See also another interesting paper [**12**], where the authors extend the Argyros–Haydon construction in terms of totally incomparable spaces.

In what follows, we want to study the descriptive set nature of such spaces: the family of separable Banach spaces, endowed with the Effros–Borel structure such that $\mathcal{K}(X)$ is nontrivially complemented in $\mathcal{L}(X)$. In particular, we are interested to study the following.

QUESTION 1.3. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the family of all couple of separable Banach spaces (X, Y) such that $\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ is complemented in $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$. Is $\mathcal{A}$ Borel?

As a standard notation, we shall consider $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ the space of all bounded linear operators between the Banach spaces X and Y, endowed by the classical norm

$$\|T\| = \sup_{\|x\|\leq 1} \|Tx\|_Y.$$

We shall denote by $\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$ the closed subspace of $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ of all compact operators. In case $X = Y$, briefly $\mathcal{L}(X)$ and $\mathcal{K}(X)$ will stand for $\mathcal{L}(X, X)$ and $\mathcal{K}(X, X)$ respectively. We refer the reader to any book on classical functional analysis for any notation (i.e. see [**1**, **8**, **16**]).

Let us recall the following.

DEFINITION 1.4 [**14**]. Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. A separable Banach space X is said to have the *property* (m_p) if

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|x + x_n\|^p = \|x\|^p + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \|x_n\|^p$$

whenever $x_n \to 0$ weakly.

Such a property has been intensively studied in [**14**], where it was proved that a Banach space X has the property (m_p) if and only if X is almost isometric to a subspace of some ℓ_p-sum of finite-dimensional spaces.

2. Preliminaries and notation.

Let X be a separable Banach space. We endow the set $\mathcal{F}(X)$ of all closed subsets of X with the *Effros–Borel* structure, i.e. the structure generated by the family

$$\{\{F \in \mathcal{F}(X) \,:\, F \cap O \neq \emptyset\} \,:\, O \text{ is an open subset of } X\}.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{SB}(X)$ the subset of $\mathcal{F}(X)$ consisting of all linear closed subspaces of X endowed with the relative Effros–Borel σ-algebra. If X is $C(2^\omega)$ (where $2^\omega = \{0, 1\}^\omega$ is a compact Polish space endowed with the product topology), we denote briefly $\mathcal{SB}(X)$ by $\mathcal{SB}$. It is well known that if X is a Polish space then $\mathcal{F}(X)$ with the Effros–Borel structure is a standard Borel space. We refer the reader to a recent book by Dodos [**9**].

We denote by $\omega = \{0, 1, \dots\}$ the first infinite ordinal, and let $\omega^{<\omega}$ be the tree of all finite sequences in ω. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the set of all trees on ω. If $s = (s(0), \dots, s(n-1))$ is a sequence of ω, we denote its length n by $|s|$. In particular, the empty sequence $\emptyset$ has length 0.

For $s = (s(0), \dots, s(n-1))$ and $t = (t(0), \dots, t(k-1))$, the concatenation $s \frown t$ is defined by

$$s \frown t = (s(0), \dots, s(n-1), t(0), \dots, t(k-1)).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017089513000347 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For a tree θ, a *branch* through θ is an $\varepsilon \in \omega^\omega$ such that for all $n \in \omega$,

$$\varepsilon|n = (\varepsilon(0), \dots, \varepsilon(n-1)) \in \theta.$$

We denote by

$$[\theta] = \{\varepsilon \in \omega^\omega \ : \ \varepsilon \text{ is a branch through } \theta\}$$

the *body* of θ.

We call θ *well founded* if $[\theta] = \emptyset$, i.e. θ has no branches. Otherwise, we will call θ *ill founded*. We will denote by $\mathcal{WF}$ (resp. $\mathcal{IF}$) the set of well-founded trees (resp. ill-founded trees) on ω.

For a tree $\theta \in \mathcal{T}$, roughly speaking the high of θ (denoted by $ht(\theta)$) is the supremum of the lengths of its elements (see **[13]** for the definition).

We refer the reader to Kechri's book **[15]** for all notion and notation of Descriptive Set theory.

Let us recall the constructive space of [**17**, Theorem 1] with normalized unconditional basis, which is universal for all spaces with unconditional basis (some time called Pelczynski's space $\mathcal{U}$).

THEOREM 2.1. *There exists a space $\mathcal{U}$ with a normalized unconditional basis $(u_n)_n$ such that for every semi-normalized unconditional basic sequence $(x_n)_n$ in a Banach space X there exists $L = \{l_0 < l_1 < \cdots\} \in [\omega]$ such that $(x_n)_n$ is equivalent to $(u_{l_n})_n$ and the natural projection P_L onto $\overline{span}\{u_n \ : \ n \in L\}$ has norm one. Moreover, if U' is another space with the above properties, then U' is isomorphic to $\mathcal{U}$.*

3. Proof of the main result. For $s \in \omega^{<\omega}$, we denote by $\chi_s : \omega^{<\omega} \longrightarrow \{0, 1\}$ the characteristic function of $\{s\}$. For a tree $\theta \in \mathcal{T}$, let $U_p(\theta)$ $(1 < p < \infty)$ be the completion of the *span*$\{\chi_s \ : \ s \in \theta\}$ under the norm

$$\|y\|_p = \sup \left[\sum_{j=0}^{k} \left\| \sum_{s \in I_j} y(s)\, u_{|s|} \right\|_{\mathcal{U}}^{p} \right]^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where the supremum is taken over $k \in \omega$ and over all admissible choice of intervals $\{I_j \ : \ 0 \leq j \leq k\}$ (an *admissible choice of intervals* is a finite set $\{I_j \ : \ 0 \leq j \leq k\}$ of intervals of θ such that every branch of θ meets at most one of these intervals).

Both of the below-mentioned Lemmas are essentially included in **[4]**.

LEMMA 3.1. *For any θ tree on ω, the sequence $\{\chi_{s_i} \ : \ s_i \in \theta\}$ determines an unconditional basis for $U_p(\theta)$.*

Proof. Let $(\lambda_i)_{i \in \omega}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{R}$, I be an interval of θ and n and $m \in \omega$. Let us denote by $c_{\underline{u}}$ the basis constant for the universal basis $\underline{u} = (u_n)_n$ of $\mathcal{U}$.

Let $\mathcal{K} : \omega \longrightarrow \omega^{<\omega}$ be an enumeration of $\omega^{<\omega}$ such that if $s \subsetneq t$ then $\overline{s} < \overline{t}$, where $\overline{s} = \mathcal{K}^{-1}(s)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017089513000347 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For $s \in T$, $(\sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_i \chi_{s_i})(s)$ is equal to $\lambda_{\bar{s}}$ if $\bar{s} \le n$, and 0 if not. Therefore,

$$\left\| \sum_{s\in I} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_i \chi_{s_i} \right)(s)\, u_{|s|} \right\|_{\mathcal{U}} = \left\| \sum_{\substack{s\in I\\ \bar{s}\le n}} \lambda_{\bar{s}} u_{|s|} \right\|_{\mathcal{U}} \le c_{\underline{u}} \left\| \sum_{\substack{s\in I\\ \bar{s}\le n+m}} \lambda_{\bar{s}} u_{|s|} \right\|_{\mathcal{U}} = c_{\underline{u}} \left\| \sum_{s\in I} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n+m} \lambda_i \chi_{s_i} \right)(s)\, u_{|s|} \right\|_{\mathcal{U}}$$

since for $s, t \in I$, then $t \supseteqq s$ if and only if $\bar{t} \ge \bar{s}$.

Let $\{I_j \ : \ 0 \le j \le k\}$ be an admissible choice of intervals. We have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} \left\| \sum_{s\in I_j} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_i \chi_{s_i} \right)(s)\, u_{|s|} \right\|_{\mathcal{U}}^{p} \le c_{\underline{u}}^{p} \sum_{j=0}^{k} \left\| \sum_{s\in I} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n+m} \lambda_i \chi_{s_i} \right)(s)\, u_{|s|} \right\|_{\mathcal{U}}^{p}.$$

Thus, $\| \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_i \chi_{s_i} \|_p \le c_{\underline{u}} \, \| \sum_{i=0}^{n+m} \lambda_i \chi_{s_i} \|_p$ and $\{\chi_{s_i} : i \in \omega\}$ is a basic sequence.

Using the unconditionality of $(u_n)_n$, the same argument as above shows that $\{\chi_{s_i} \ : \ s_i \in \theta\}$ is actually an unconditional basis for $U_p(\theta)$. □

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(A_i)_{i\in\omega}$ be a sequence of subsets of θ such that every branch meets at most one of these subsets. Then the spaces*

$$U_p\left(\bigcup_{i\in\omega} A_i \right) \text{ and } \left(\bigoplus_{i\in\omega} U_p(A_i) \right)_{\ell_p} \text{ are isometric.}$$

Proof. Pick $y \in span\left\{ \chi_s \ : \ s \in \bigcup_{i\in\omega} A_i \right\}$. We let $y_i = \sum_{s\in A_i} y(s)\chi_s$. Since the set $\{y_i : i \in \omega \text{ and } y_i \ne 0\}$ is finite, there is $m \in \omega$ such that $y = \sum_{i=0}^{m} y_i$. To finish the proof, it is enough to show the following:

Claim $\|y\|_p^p = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \|y_i\|_p^p$.

Indeed, let $\{I_j \ : \ 0 \le j \le k\}$ be an admissible choice of intervals. We set, for $0 \le j \le k$ and $0 \le i \le m$, $I_j(y) = \sum_{s\in I_j} y(s) u_{|S|}$ and $M_i = \{j \in \omega : 0 \le j \le k, \ I_j \cap A_i \ne \emptyset\}$. The largest interval with ends in $I_j \cap A_i$ is denoted by J_j^i. For any $i \in \omega$, $\{J_j^i : j \in M_i\}$ is an admissible choice of intervals, thus

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} \|I_j(y)\|^p = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j\in M_i} \|J_j^i(y_i)\|^p \le \sum_{i=0}^{m} \|y_i\|_p^p.$$

It follows by taking the supremum over admissible choices of intervals that

$$\|y\|_p^p \le \sum_{i=0}^{m} \|y_i\|_p^p.$$

Now for any $0 \le i \le m$, let $\{I_j^i : 0 \le j \le_i\}$ be an admissible choice of intervals. We denote by $\widetilde{I}_j^i$ the largest interval with ends in $I_j^i \cap A_i$. Then $\{\widetilde{I}_j^i \ : \ 0 \le i \le m, \ 0 \le j \le k_i\}$ is an admissible choice of intervals because every branch of T meets at most one of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017089513000347 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A_i's. For any i,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k_i} \left\| I_j^i(y_i) \right\|^p = \sum_{j=0}^{k_i} \left\| \widetilde{I}_j^i(y_i) \right\|^p = \sum_{j=0}^{k_i} \left\| I_j^i(y) \right\|^p ,$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{k_i} \left\| I_j^i(y_i) \right\|^p = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{k_i} \left\| \widetilde{I}_j^i(y) \right\|^p \leq \|y\|_p^p,$$

thus,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m} \|y_i\|_p^p \leq \|y\|_p^p.$$

□

THEOREM 3.3. *Let $\theta \in \mathcal{T}$, and let $1 < q < p < \infty$.*

(i) *If θ is ill founded, then $\mathcal{K}(U_p(\theta), U_q(\theta))$ is uncomplemented in $\mathcal{L}(U_p(\theta), U_q(\theta))$.*
(ii) *If θ is well founded, then $\mathcal{K}(U_p(\theta), U_q(\theta))$ is complemented in $\mathcal{L}(U_p(\theta), U_q(\theta))$.*

Proof. (i) We actually show that if θ is ill founded, then $U_p(\theta)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{U}$. Since both spaces $U_p(\theta)$ and $U_q(\theta)$ are isomorphic, we get that $\mathcal{K}(U_p(\theta), U_q(\theta)) \neq \mathcal{L}(U_p(\theta), U_q(\theta))$. Since $\mathcal{U}$ has an unconditional basis, the thesis follows [**19**, Theorem 6].

Suppose θ is ill founded, and let $b \in [\theta]$ a branch of θ. Let

$$U_p(b) = U_p(\{s \in \theta \ : \ s \subseteq b\}).$$

We show that actually $U_p(b)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{U}$.

Indeed, it is enough to show that the elements $\{\chi_{b|j} \ : \ j \in \omega\}$ are equivalent to the basis of $\mathcal{U}$.

Note that if $\lambda \in \ell_\infty$ then

$$\left\| \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_j \chi_{b|j} \right\|_p = \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{s \in I} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_j \chi_{b|j} \right) (s) \, u_{|s|} \right\| \ : \ I \text{ interval}, \ I \subseteq \{s : s \subsetneq b\} \right\}$$
$$= \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=l}^{m} \lambda_j u_j \right\| \ : \ 0 \leq l \leq m \leq n \right\}.$$

Thus,

$$\left\| \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_j u_j \right\|_{\mathcal{U}} \leq \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_j \chi_{b|j} \right\|_p \leq 2c_{\underline{u}} \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda_j u_j \right\|_{\mathcal{U}} ,$$

where $c_{\underline{u}}$ is the unconditional basis constant of the basis of $\mathcal{U}$.

Thus, $U_p(b)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{U}$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017089513000347 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let $y = \sum_{i\in\omega} y(s_i)\chi_{s_i}$ be an element of $U_p(\theta)$. We have

$$\left\| \sum_{\substack{i\in\omega \\ s_i\in b}} y(s_i)\chi_{s_i} \right\|_p = \sup\left\{ \left\| \sum_{s\in I} y(s)\, u_{|s|} \right\| \;:\; I \text{ interval},\; I \subseteq \{s : s \subsetneq b\} \right\}$$
$$\leq \|y\|_p.$$

That means $U_p(b) \cong \mathcal{U}$ is complemented in $U_p(\theta)$. By properties of $\mathcal{U}$, we get that $U_p(\theta) \cong \mathcal{U}$.

(ii) Suppose that θ is well founded. Since $U_p(\theta)$ has an unconditional basis, by [**19**, Theorem 6], it is equivalent to show that

$$\mathcal{K}(U_p(\theta), U_q(\theta)) = \mathcal{L}(U_p(\theta), U_q(\theta)).$$

For $s \in T$ and $i \in \omega$, we define

$$s \frown \theta = \{s \frown t : t \in \theta\}, \qquad \theta_i = \{t \in T : (i) \frown t \in \theta\}.$$

Since $U_p(\theta) = U_p(\emptyset \frown \theta)$, to prove the theorem, it is enough to show the following.

Claim. If θ is well founded, then for any $s \in T$,

$$\mathcal{K}(U_p(s \frown \theta), U_q(s \frown \theta)) = \mathcal{L}(U_p(s \frown \theta), U_q(s \frown \theta)).$$

Since θ is well founded, and since the map $ht : \mathcal{WF} \longrightarrow \omega_1$ is a Π^1_1-rank on $\mathcal{WF}$ (see [**15**]), we will show the Claim using transfinite induction on $ht(\theta)$.

We assume that for every tree $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $ht(\tau) < \alpha < \omega_1$,

$$\mathcal{K}(U_p(s \frown \tau), U_q(s \frown \tau)) = \mathcal{L}(U_p(s \frown \tau), U_q(s \frown \tau))$$

for any $s \in T$.

Let us take θ such that $ht(\theta) = \alpha$, and for $s \in T$, let

$$N_s = \{i \in \omega : s \frown (i) \in \theta\}.$$

We let $A_i = s \frown (i) \frown \theta_i$ for $i \in N_s$ so that

$$\cup_{i\in N_s} A_i = s \frown (\theta \setminus \{s\})$$

and every branch of T meets at most one of the A_i's. If $i \in N_s$, then $ht(A_i) < \alpha$, thus

$$\mathcal{K}(U_p(A_i), U_q(A_i)) = \mathcal{L}(U_p(A_i), U_q(A_i)).$$

By Lemma 3.2, we have

$$U_r(s \frown (\theta \setminus \{s\})) = U_r\left(\bigcup_{i\in N_s} A_i\right) = \left(\bigoplus_{i\in N_s} U_r(A_i)\right)_{\ell_r},$$

for $r = p, q$ respectively.

Since $\{\chi_{s_j} : j \in \omega,\; s_j \in s \frown \theta\}$ is a basis of $U_r(s \frown \theta)$ with the first element χ_s and the other element generate $U_r(s \frown (\theta \setminus \{s\}))$. Then, we have $U_r(s \frown \theta) \cong \mathbb{R} \times U_r(s \frown (\theta \setminus \{s\}))$. Thus, the theorem will be complete once we prove the next two Lemmas. $\square$

LEMMA 3.4. *Let $1 < p < \infty$. For every $\theta \in \mathcal{WF}$, $U_p(\theta)$ is reflexive and it has the property (m_p).*

Proof. Since θ is well founded, one can use transfinite induction on $ht(\theta)$. As before, we can write

$$U_p(\theta) = \left(\bigoplus_{n\in\omega} U_p(A_n) \right)_{\ell_p},$$

with $ht(A_n) < ht(\theta)$. By induction, since $U_p(A_n)$ has (m_p), whenever we fix x and a weakly null sequence $(w_n)_n$ in $U_p(\theta)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|x + w_n\|^p_{U_p(\theta)} &= \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i\in\omega} \|x^i + w^i_n\|^p_{U_p(A_i)} \\
&= \sum_{i\in\omega} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \|x^i + w^i_n\|^p_{U_p(A_i)} \\
&= \sum_{i\in\omega} \|x^i\|^p_{U_p(A_i)} + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i\in\omega} \|w^i_n\|^p_{U_p(A_i)} \\
&= \|x\|^p_{U_p(\theta)} + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \|w_n\|^p_{U_p(\theta)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The reflexivity of $U_p(\theta)$ follows by a standard argument. □

The following Lemma slightly extends a classical Pitt's compactness theorem.

LEMMA 3.5. *Let $1 \le q < p < \infty$ and let $(X_n)_n$ and $(Y_n)_n$ two sequences of Banach spaces, with X_n to be reflexive for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that*
- *X_n has the property (m_p), for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*
- *Y_n has the property (m_q), for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Then

$$\mathcal{K}\left(\left(\bigoplus_n X_n \right)_{\ell_p}, \left(\bigoplus_n Y_n \right)_{\ell_q} \right) = \mathcal{L}\left(\left(\bigoplus_n X_n \right)_{\ell_p}, \left(\bigoplus_n Y_n \right)_{\ell_q} \right).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of **[7]**. We give a sketch for sake of completeness. Let

$$T : \left(\bigoplus_n X_n \right)_{\ell_p} \longrightarrow \left(\bigoplus_n Y_n \right)_{\ell_q}$$

be a norm one operator. Since $(\bigoplus_n X_n)_{\ell_p}$ is reflexive, any bounded sequence has a weak convergent subsequence. Thus, it is enough to show that T is weak-norm continuous.

Let $(h_n) \subseteq (\bigoplus_n X_n)_{\ell_p}$ be a weakly null sequence.

By hypothesis, since $(\bigoplus_n Z_n)_{\ell_r}$ has the property (m_r), where $Z_n = X_n$ (resp. $Z_n = Y_n$) if $r = p$ (resp. $r = q$), for every $x \in (\bigoplus_n Z_n)_{\ell_r}$ and every weakly null sequence $(w_n)_n$ in $(\bigoplus_n Z_n)_{\ell_r}$,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|x + w_n\|^r = \|x\|^r + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \|w_n\|^r. \tag{3.1}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017089513000347 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For every $\varepsilon > 0$, let x_ε be of norm one such that

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \|T(x_\varepsilon)\| \leq 1.$$

For all $n \in \omega$ and $t > 0$

$$\|T(x_\varepsilon) + T(th_n)\| \leq \|x_\varepsilon + th_n\|. \tag{3.2}$$

Now applying (3.1) to the left-hand side of (3.2) inequality for $r = q$ and to the right-hand side for $r = p$ we get

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|T(h_n)\|^q \leq \frac{1}{t^q}[(1 + t^p M^p)^{\frac{q}{p}} - (1 - \varepsilon)^q],$$

where $M > 0$ is an upper bound for $(\|h_n\|)_n$.

Taking $t = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}}$, we get

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|T(h_n)\|^q \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\frac{q}{p}}}\left[1 + \frac{q}{p}M^p\varepsilon - (1 - q\varepsilon) + o(\varepsilon)\right].$$

Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ we get that $(T(h_n))_n$ norm converges to zero. □

THEOREM 3.6. *For* $1 < q < p < \infty$, *the map* $\varphi_{p,q} : \mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \mathcal{SB} \times \mathcal{SB}$ *defined by*

$$\varphi_{p,q}(\theta) = U_p(\theta) \times U_q(\theta)$$

tis Borel.

Proof. It is enough to show that the map

$$\theta \longmapsto U_p(\theta)$$

is Borel.

Let O be open subsets of $C(2^\omega)$. It is enough to show that $\Omega = \{\theta \in \mathcal{T} : U_p(\theta) \cap O \neq \emptyset\}$ is Borel.

Since $\{\chi_{s_i} : i \in \omega, s_i \in \theta\}$ defines a basis of $U_p(\theta)$, we have

$$U_p(\theta) \cap O \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{Q}^{<\omega} \text{ such that } \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_i \chi_{s_i} \in O \text{ and if } \lambda_i \neq 0 \text{ then } s_i \in \theta.$$

Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}^{<\omega} : \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_i \chi_{s_i} \in O\}$. Then

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \bigcap_{i \in supp(\lambda)} \{\theta \in \mathcal{T} : s_i \in \theta\},$$

thus Ω is Borel since $\{\theta \in \mathcal{T} : s_i \in \theta\}$ is an open and closed subset. □

THEOREM 3.7. *The family* $\mathcal{A}$ *of all couple of separable Banach spaces* (X, Y) *such that*

$$\mathcal{K}(X, Y) \text{ is complemented in } \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$$

is not Borel in $\mathcal{SB} \times \mathcal{SB}$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017089513000347 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ is even analytic. For $1 < q < p < \infty$, let $\varphi_{p,q}$ be the map defined in Theorem 3.6. Then $\varphi_{p,q}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ is analytic containing $\mathcal{WF}$. Since $\mathcal{WF}$ is not analytical, there is some θ_0 in $\varphi_{p,q}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ which is ill founded. Therefore, by Theorem 3.3, $\varphi_{p,q}(\theta_0)$ does not lie in $\mathcal{A}$. A contradiction. □

We would like to finish this paper with the following.

QUESTION 3.8. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the family of all separable Banach space X such that $\mathcal{K}(X) \neq \mathcal{L}(X)$, and $\mathcal{K}(X)$ is complemented in $\mathcal{L}(X)$. Is it $\mathcal{B}$ Borel? Is it coanalytical?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. The author wishes to thank G. Emmanuele for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

1. F. Albiac and N. J. Kalton, *Topics in Banach space theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol 233 (Springer, New York, NY, 2006).

2. S. A. Argyros and R. G. Haydon, A hereditarily indecomposable $\mathcal{L}_\infty$-space that solves the scalar-plus-compact problem, *Acta Math.* **206** (1) (2011), 1–54.

3. D. Arterburn and R. J. Whitley, Projections in the space of bounded linear operators, *Pacific J. Math.* **15** (1965), 739–746.

4. B. Bossard, A coding of separable Banach spaces. Analytic and coanalytic families of Banach spaces, *Fund. Math.* **172** (2) (2002), 117–152.

5. J. Bourgain, *New classes of $\mathcal{L}_p$-spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 889 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1981).

6. J. Bourgain and F. Delbaen, A class of special $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ spaces, *Acta Math.* **145** (3–4) (1980), 155–176.

7. S. Delpech, A short proof of Pitt's compactness theorem, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **137** (4) (2009), 1371–1372.

8. J. Diestel, *Geometry of Banach spaces: selected topics*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 485 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1975).

9. P. Dodos, *Banach spaces and descriptive set theory: selected topics*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1993, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 2010).

10. G. Emmanuele, A remark on the containment of c_0 in spaces of compact operators, *Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **111** (2) (1992), 331–335.

11. G. Emmanuele, Answer to a question by M. Feder about $\mathcal{K}(X, Y)$, *Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid* **6** (2) (1993), 263–266.

12. D. Freeman, E. Odell and Th. Schlumprecht, The universality of ℓ_1 as a dual space, *Math. Ann.* **351** (1) (2011), 149–186.

13. N. J. Kalton, Spaces of compact operators, *Math. Ann.* **208** (1974), 267–278.

14. N. J. Kalton and D. Werner, Property (M), M-ideals, and almost isometric structure of Banach spaces, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **461** (1995), 137–178.

15. A. S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 156 (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995).

16. J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 338 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1973).

17. A. Pelczynski, Universal bases, *Studia Math.* **32** (1969), 247–268.

18. E. Thorp, Projections onto the subspace of compact operators, *Pacific J. Math.* **10** (1960), 693–696.

19. A. E. Tong and D. R. Wilken, The uncomplemented subspace K(E,F), *Studia Math.* **37** (1971), 227–236.