

## On scalar-valued nonlinear absolutely summing mappings

by DANIEL PELLEGRINO (Campina Grande)

**Abstract.** We investigate cases (“coincidence situations”) in which every scalar-valued continuous  $n$ -homogeneous polynomial (or every continuous  $n$ -linear mapping) is absolutely  $(p; q)$ -summing. We extend some well known coincidence situations and obtain several non-coincidence results, inspired by a linear technique due to Lindenstrauss and Pełczyński.

**1. Introduction.** Throughout this note  $X, X_1, \dots, X_n, Y$  will stand for Banach spaces and the scalar field  $\mathbb{K}$  can be either the real or the complex numbers.

An  $m$ -homogeneous polynomial  $P$  from  $X$  into  $Y$  is said to be *absolutely  $(p; q)$ -summing* ( $p \geq q/m$ ) if there is a constant  $L$  so that

$$(1.1) \quad \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \|P(x_j)\|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq L \|(x_j)_{j=1}^k\|_{w,q}^m$$

for every natural  $k$ , where  $\|(x_j)_{j=1}^k\|_{w,q} = \sup_{\varphi \in B_{X'}} (\sum_{j=1}^k |\varphi(x_j)|^q)^{1/q}$ . This is a natural generalization of the concept of  $(p; q)$ -summing operators and in the last years it has been studied by several authors. The infimum of the  $L > 0$  for which the inequality holds defines a norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{as}(p;q)}$  for  $p \geq 1$ , or a  $p$ -norm for  $p < 1$ , on the space of  $(p; q)$ -summing homogeneous polynomials. The space of all  $m$ -homogeneous  $(p; q)$ -summing polynomials from  $X$  into  $Y$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{as}(p;q)}({}^m X; Y)$  ( $\mathcal{P}_{\text{as}(p;q)}({}^m X)$  if  $Y = \mathbb{K}$ ).

When  $p = q/m$  we have an important particular case, since in this situation there is an analogue of the Grothendieck–Pietsch Domination Theorem. The  $(q/m; q)$ -summing  $m$ -homogeneous polynomials from  $X$  into  $Y$  are said to be  *$q$ -dominated* and this space is denoted by  $\mathcal{P}_{d,q}({}^m X; Y)$  ( $\mathcal{P}_{d,q}({}^m X)$  if  $Y = \mathbb{K}$ ).

The Banach space of all continuous  $m$ -homogeneous polynomials  $P$  from  $X$  into  $Y$  with the sup norm is denoted by  $\mathcal{P}({}^m X, Y)$  ( $\mathcal{P}({}^m X)$  if  $Y$  is

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 46B15; Secondary 46G25.

*Key words and phrases*: absolutely summing, dominated, polynomial.

Research partially supported by Instituto do Milênio, IMPA.

the scalar field). Analogously, the space of all continuous  $m$ -linear mappings from  $X_1 \times \dots \times X_m$  into  $Y$  (with the sup norm) is denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(X_1, \dots, X_m; Y)$  ( $\mathcal{L}(X_1, \dots, X_m)$  if  $Y = \mathbb{K}$ ). The concept of absolutely summing multilinear mapping follows the same pattern (for details we refer to [5]). Henceforth every polynomial and multilinear mapping are supposed to be continuous and every  $\mathcal{L}_p$ -space is assumed to be infinite-dimensional.

A natural problem is to find situations in which the space of absolutely summing polynomials coincides with the space of continuous polynomials (*coincidence situations*). When  $Y$  is the scalar field, these situations are not rare as we can see in the next two well known results:

**THEOREM 1.** *Every scalar-valued  $n$ -linear mapping is absolutely  $(1; 1)$ -summing. In particular, every scalar-valued  $n$ -homogeneous polynomial is absolutely  $(1; 1)$ -summing (and, a fortiori,  $(q; 1)$ -summing for every  $q \geq 1$ ).*

**THEOREM 2** (D. Pérez-García [6]). *If  $n \geq 2$  and  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space, then every scalar-valued  $n$ -linear mapping on  $X$  is  $(1; 2)$ -summing. In particular, every scalar-valued  $n$ -homogeneous polynomial on  $X$  is  $(1; 2)$ -summing (and, a fortiori,  $(q; 2)$ -summing for every  $q \geq 1$ ).*

The proof of Theorem 1 can be found in [1] and is credited to A. Defant and J. Voigt. The case  $n = 2$  of Theorem 2 was previously proved by Botelho [2] and is the unique known coincidence result for dominated polynomials.

In Section 2 we obtain new coincidence situations, generalizing Theorem 1 and extending the results of Theorem 2. Section 3 has a different purpose: to obtain a technical estimate (inspired by a linear result due to Lindenstrauss and Pełczyński [3]) and to explore its consequences. In particular, it is shown that Theorems 1 and 2 cannot be generalized in some other directions, and converses for the aforementioned theorems are obtained.

**2. Coincidence situations.** The next theorem, inspired by a result of C. A. Soares, leads us to extensions of the two theorems stated in the first section:

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $A \in \mathcal{L}(X_1, \dots, X_n; Y)$  and suppose that there exists  $C > 0$  so that for any  $x_1 \in X_1, \dots, x_r \in X_r$ , the  $s$ -linear ( $s = n - r$ ) mapping  $A_{x_1 \dots x_r}(x_{r+1}, \dots, x_n) = A(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is absolutely  $(1; q_1, \dots, q_s)$ -summing and*

$$\|A_{x_1 \dots x_r}\|_{as(1; q_1, \dots, q_s)} \leq C \|A\| \|x_1\| \dots \|x_r\|.$$

*Then  $A$  is absolutely  $(1; 1, \dots, 1, q_1, \dots, q_s)$ -summing.*

*Proof.* For  $x_1^{(1)}, \dots, x_1^{(m)} \in X_1, \dots, x_n^{(1)}, \dots, x_n^{(m)} \in X_n$ , consider  $\varphi_j \in B_Y$  such that

$$\|A(x_1^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)})\| = \varphi_j(A(x_1^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)}))$$

for every  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Then, denoting by  $r_j(t)$  the Rademacher functions on  $[0, 1]$  and by  $\lambda$  the Lebesgue measure on  $I = [0, 1]^r$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_I \sum_{j=1}^m \left( \prod_{l=1}^r r_j(t_l) \right) \\ & \quad \times \varphi_j A \left( \sum_{j_1=1}^m r_{j_1}(t_1) x_1^{(j_1)}, \dots, \sum_{j_r=1}^m r_{j_r}(t_r) x_r^{(j_r)}, x_{r+1}^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)} \right) d\lambda \\ &= \sum_{j, j_1, \dots, j_r=1}^m \varphi_j A(x_1^{(j_1)}, \dots, x_r^{(j_r)}, x_{r+1}^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)}) \\ & \quad \times \int_0^1 r_j(t_1) r_{j_1}(t_1) dt_1 \dots \int_0^1 r_j(t_r) r_{j_r}(t_r) dt_r \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{j_1=1}^m \dots \sum_{j_r=1}^m \varphi_j A(x_1^{(j_1)}, \dots, x_r^{(j_r)}, x_{r+1}^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)}) \delta_{j j_1} \dots \delta_{j j_r} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m \varphi_j A(x_1^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \|A(x_1^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)})\| = (*). \end{aligned}$$

So, for each  $l = 1, \dots, r$ , assuming  $z_l = \sum_{j=1}^m r_j(t_l) x_l^{(j)}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (*) &= \int_I \sum_{j=1}^m \left( \prod_{l=1}^r r_j(t_l) \right) \\ & \quad \times \varphi_j A \left( \sum_{j_1=1}^m r_{j_1}(t_1) x_1^{(j_1)}, \dots, \sum_{j_r=1}^m r_{j_r}(t_r) x_r^{(j_r)}, x_{r+1}^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)} \right) d\lambda \\ &\leq \int_I \left| \sum_{j=1}^m \left( \prod_{l=1}^r r_j(t_l) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \times \varphi_j A \left( \sum_{j_1=1}^m r_{j_1}(t_1) x_1^{(j_1)}, \dots, \sum_{j_r=1}^m r_{j_r}(t_r) x_r^{(j_r)}, x_{r+1}^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)} \right) \left. \right| d\lambda \\ &\leq \int_I \sum_{j=1}^m \left\| A \left( \sum_{j_1=1}^m r_{j_1}(t_1) x_1^{(j_1)}, \dots, \sum_{j_r=1}^m r_{j_r}(t_r) x_r^{(j_r)}, x_{r+1}^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)} \right) \right\| d\lambda \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \sup_{t_l \in [0,1], l=1, \dots, r} \sum_{j=1}^m \left\| A \left( \sum_{j_1=1}^m r_{j_1}(t_1) x_1^{(j_1)}, \dots, \right. \right. \\
 &\qquad \qquad \qquad \left. \left. \sum_{j_r=1}^m r_{j_r}(t_r) x_r^{(j_r)}, x_{r+1}^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)} \right) \right\| \\
 &\leq \sup_{t_l \in [0,1], l=1, \dots, r} \|A_{z_1 \dots z_r}\|_{\text{as}(1; q_1, \dots, q_s)} \|x_{r+1}^{(j)}\|_{w, q_1}^m \cdots \|x_n^{(j)}\|_{w, q_s}^m \\
 &\leq \sup_{t_l \in [0,1], l=1, \dots, r} C \|A\| \|z_1\| \cdots \|z_r\| \|x_{r+1}^{(j)}\|_{w, q_1}^m \cdots \|x_n^{(j)}\|_{w, q_s}^m \\
 &\leq C \|A\| \left( \prod_{l=1}^r \|x_l^{(j)}\|_{w, 1}^m \right) \left( \prod_{l=r+1}^n \|x_l^{(j)}\|_{w, q_l}^m \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

We have the following straightforward consequence, generalizing Theorem 1:

COROLLARY 1. *If*

$$\mathcal{L}(X_1, \dots, X_m; Y) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{as}(1; q_1, \dots, q_m)}(X_1, \dots, X_m; Y)$$

*then, for any Banach spaces*  $X_{m+1}, \dots, X_n$ , *we have*

$$\mathcal{L}(X_1, \dots, X_n; Y) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{as}(1; q_1, \dots, q_m, 1, \dots, 1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n; Y).$$

The following corollary (whose proof is simple and we omit it) is a consequence of Theorems 2 and 3.

COROLLARY 2. *If*  $X_1, \dots, X_s$  *are*  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -*spaces then, for any Banach spaces*  $X_{s+1}, \dots, X_n$ , *we have*

$$\mathcal{L}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{as}(1; q_1, \dots, q_n)}(X_1, \dots, X_n),$$

*where*  $q_1 = \dots = q_s = 2$  *and*  $q_{s+1} = \dots = q_n = 1$ .

It is obvious that Corollary 2 is still true if we replace the scalar field by any finite-dimensional Banach space. A natural question is whether Corollary 2 can be stated for some infinite-dimensional Banach space in place of  $\mathbb{K}$ . Precisely, the question is:

- If  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  are  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces, is there some infinite-dimensional Banach space  $Y$  such that

$$\mathcal{L}(X_1, \dots, X_k, \dots, X_n; Y) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{as}(1; q_1, \dots, q_n)}(X_1, \dots, X_k, \dots, X_n; Y),$$

where  $q_1 = \dots = q_k = 2$  and  $q_{k+1} = \dots = q_n = 1$ , regardless of the choice of the Banach spaces  $X_{k+1}, \dots, X_n$ ?

The answer to this question is no, as shown by the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 1. *Suppose that*  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  *are*  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -*spaces. If*  $q_1 = \dots = q_k = 2$ ,  $q_{k+1} = \dots = q_n = 1$  *and*

$$\mathcal{L}(X_1, \dots, X_k, \dots, X_n; Y) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{as}(1; q_1, \dots, q_n)}(X_1, \dots, X_k, \dots, X_n; Y),$$

*regardless of the choice of the Banach spaces*  $X_{k+1}, \dots, X_n$ , *then*  $\dim Y < \infty$ .

*Proof.* By a standard localization argument, it suffices to prove that if  $\dim Y = \infty$ , then

$$\mathcal{L}({}^n c_0; Y) \neq \mathcal{L}_{\text{as}(1; q_1, \dots, q_n)}({}^n c_0; Y),$$

where  $q_1 = \dots = q_k = 2$  and  $q_{k+1} = \dots = q_n = 1$ . But from [5, Theorem 8] we even have

$$\mathcal{L}({}^n c_0; Y) \neq \mathcal{L}_{\text{as}(q; q_1, \dots, q_n)}({}^n c_0; Y)$$

for any  $q < 2$  and  $q_1, \dots, q_n \geq 1$ .

**3. Non-coincidence situations.** Assume that  $X$  is an infinite-dimensional Banach space and suppose that  $X$  has a normalized unconditional Schauder basis  $(x_n)$  with coefficient functionals  $(x_n^*)$ . If  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{as}(q;1)}({}^m X; Y) = \mathcal{P}({}^m X; Y)$ , it is natural to ask:

What is the infimum of the  $t$  such that in this situation  $(x_n^*(x)) \in l_t$  for each  $x \in X$ ? This infimum will be denoted by  $\mu = \mu(X, Y, q, m)$ .

In [5], inspired by an important linear result due to Lindenstrauss and Pełczyński, we have proved:

**THEOREM 4** (Pellegrino [5, Theorem 5]). *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be infinite-dimensional Banach spaces. Suppose that  $X$  has an unconditional Schauder basis  $(x_n)$ . If  $Y$  finitely factors the formal inclusion  $l_p \rightarrow l_\infty$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{as}(q;1)}({}^m X; Y) = \mathcal{P}({}^m X; Y)$  with  $1/m \leq q$ , then*

- (a)  $\mu \leq mpq/(p - q)$  if  $q < p$ ,
- (b)  $\mu \leq mq$  if  $q \leq p/2$ .

However, by inspecting the proof of this theorem in [5], one can see that it is by no means necessary to assume that  $\dim Y = \infty$ . Only in Corollary of [5] (when the Dvoretzky–Rogers Theorem is invoked) is it indeed necessary to assume  $\dim Y = \infty$ . A slight change in the proof of [5, Theorem 5] yields the following result:

**THEOREM 5.** *Let  $X$  be an infinite-dimensional Banach space with a normalized unconditional Schauder basis  $(x_n)$ . If  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{as}(q;1)}({}^m X) = \mathcal{P}({}^m X)$ , then*

- (a)  $\mu \leq mq/(1 - q)$  if  $q < 1$ ,
- (b)  $\mu \leq mq$  if  $q \leq 1/2$ .

*Proof.* If  $x = \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j x_j$  and  $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is such that  $\sum_{j=1}^n |\mu_j|^{1/q} = 1$ , define  $P : X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  by  $Px = \sum_{j=1}^n |\mu_j|^{1/q} a_j^m$ .

Since  $(x_n)$  is an unconditional basis, there exists a  $\varrho > 0$  satisfying

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j a_j x_j \right\| \leq \varrho \|x\| \quad \text{for every } n \text{ and any } \varepsilon_j = \pm 1.$$

Hence

$$|Px| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \left| |\mu_j|^{1/q} a_j^m \right| \leq \varrho^m \|x\|^m \sum_{j=1}^n |\mu_j|^{1/q},$$

and thus  $\|P\| \leq \varrho^m$  and  $\|P\|_{\text{as}(q;1)} \leq C\varrho^m$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (3.1) \quad \left( \sum_{j=1}^n |a_j^m |\mu_j|^{1/q} \right)^{1/q} &\leq \left( \sum_{j=1}^n |Pa_j x_j|^q \right)^{1/q} \\ &\leq \|P\|_{\text{as}(q;1)} \max_{\varepsilon_j \in \{1, -1\}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j a_j x_j \right\|^m \\ &\leq \|P\|_{\text{as}(q;1)} (\varrho \|x\|)^m \leq C\varrho^{2m} \|x\|^m. \end{aligned}$$

Defining  $s = 1/q$ , we have  $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{s-1} = 1$  and

$$(3.2) \quad \left( \sum_{j=1}^n |a_j|^{\frac{s}{s-1}mq} \right)^{1/\frac{s}{s-1}} \leq \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n |\mu_j| |a_j|^{mq} : \sum_{j=1}^n |\mu_j|^s = 1 \right\}.$$

Since (3.1) is true whenever  $\sum_{j=1}^n |\mu_j|^s = 1$ , by (3.1) and (3.2) we obtain

$$\left( \sum_{j=1}^n |a_j|^{\frac{s}{s-1}mq} \right)^{1/\frac{s}{s-1}mq} \leq [C\varrho^{2m} \|x\|^m]^{1/m}.$$

But  $\frac{s}{s-1}mq = \frac{mq}{1-q}$  and  $n$  is arbitrary, and hence part (a) is proved. Now, if  $1/m \leq q \leq 1/2$ , define  $S : X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  by  $Sx = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^m$ . Since  $m \geq \frac{s}{s-1}mq$ , we obtain

$$|Sx| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n |a_j^m| \leq \left[ \left( \sum_{j=1}^n |a_j|^{\frac{s}{s-1}mq} \right)^{1/\frac{s}{s-1}mq} \right]^m \leq C\varrho^{2m} \|x\|^m.$$

Thus  $\|S\| \leq C\varrho^{2m}$  and  $\|S\|_{\text{as}(q;1)} \leq C^2\varrho^{2m}$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n |a_j^m|^q &= \sum_{j=1}^n |Sa_j x_j|^q \leq \|S\|_{\text{as}(q;1)}^q \max_{\varepsilon_j \in \{1, -1\}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j a_j x_j \right\|^{mq} \\ &\leq (C^2\varrho^{2m})^q (\varrho \|x\|)^{mq}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, since  $n$  is arbitrary, we have  $\sum_{j=1}^\infty |a_j|^{mq} < \infty$  whenever  $x = \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j x_j \in X$ . ■

Now we list several important consequences of Theorem 5. For example, Corollaries 3 and 4 below give converses for Theorems 1 and 2, respectively. The proofs of Corollaries 3–6 are simple (using Theorem 5 and standard localization techniques in order to extend the results from  $c_0$  to  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces):

**COROLLARY 3.** *Let  $m$  be a fixed natural number. Then  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{as}(q;1)}({}^m X) = \mathcal{P}({}^m X)$  for every  $X$  if and only if  $q \geq 1$ .*

COROLLARY 4. If  $m \geq 2$  and  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space, then  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{as}(q;2)}({}^m X) = \mathcal{P}({}^m X)$  if and only if  $q \geq 1$ .

COROLLARY 5. If  $m \geq 2$  and  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space, then  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{d},q}({}^m X) \neq \mathcal{P}({}^m X)$  for every  $q < m$ .

In particular, if  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space and  $m = 2$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{d},2}({}^2 X) = \mathcal{P}({}^2 X)$  and thus we have:

COROLLARY 6. If  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space, then  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{d},q}({}^2 X) = \mathcal{P}({}^2 X)$  if and only if  $q \geq 2$ .

We also have:

COROLLARY 7. If  $q \leq 1/2$  and  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_p$ -space ( $p \geq 2$ ), then  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{as}(q;1)}({}^m X) = \mathcal{P}({}^m X)$  if and only if  $p \leq mq$ .

*Proof.* A localization argument allows us to assume that  $X = l_p$ . If  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{as}(q;1)}({}^m X) = \mathcal{P}({}^m X)$ , Theorem 5 ensures that  $p \leq mq$ . On the other hand, if  $p \leq mq$  and  $P \in \mathcal{P}({}^m X)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \|P(x_j)\|^q \right)^{1/q} &\leq \|P\| \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \|x_j\|^{mq} \right)^{1/q} \\ &\leq \|P\| \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \|x_j\|^p \right)^{m/p} \leq C_p(X) \|P\| \|(x_j)_{j=1}^k\|_{w,1}^m, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_p(X)$  is the cotype constant of  $l_p$  and the last inequality holds since  $l_p$  has cotype  $p$  (for  $p \geq 2$ ) and thus  $\text{id} : l_p \rightarrow l_p$  is absolutely  $(p; 1)$ -summing.

All these results can be adapted (including Theorem 5), *mutatis mutandis*, to the multilinear case. Furthermore, one can extend Corollary 2:

COROLLARY 8. Let  $X_1, \dots, X_s$  be  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces,  $q_1 = \dots = q_s = 2$  and  $q_{s+1} = \dots = q_n = 1$ . Then

$$\mathcal{L}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{as}(q; q_1, \dots, q_n)}(X_1, \dots, X_n),$$

for any choice of Banach spaces  $X_{s+1}, \dots, X_n$ , if and only if  $q \geq 1$ .

REMARK 1. For the bilinear case it is not hard to prove that when  $X$  is an  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space,  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{d},q}({}^2 X) \neq \mathcal{L}({}^2 X)$  if  $q < 2$ . However, this result cannot be straightforwardly adapted for polynomials and thus Corollary 6 is in fact non-trivial. Non-coincidence results for absolutely summing multilinear mappings, in general, do not imply non-coincidence results for absolutely summing polynomials.

**References**

- [1] R. Alencar and M. C. Matos, *Some classes of multilinear mappings between Banach spaces*, Publ. Depto Anál. Mat., Univ. Complut. Madrid, Section 1, 12 (1989).
- [2] G. Botelho, *Cotype and absolutely summing multilinear mappings and homogeneous polynomials*, Proc. Roy. Irish Acad. Sect. A 97 (1997), 145–153.
- [3] J. Lindenstrauss and A. Pełczyński, *Absolutely summing operators in  $\mathcal{L}_p$  spaces and their applications*, Studia Math. 29 (1968), 275–326.
- [4] M. C. Matos, *Absolutely summing holomorphic mappings*, An. Acad. Brasil. Cienc. 68 (1996), 1–13.
- [5] D. Pellegrino, *Cotype and absolutely summing homogeneous polynomials in  $\mathcal{L}_p$  spaces*, Studia Math. 157 (2003), 121–131.
- [6] D. Pérez-García, *Operadores multilineales absolutamente sumantes*, dissertation, Univ. Complut. Madrid, 2002.

Departamento de Matemática e Estatística  
Universidade Federal de Campina Grande  
Caixa Postal 10044  
Campina Grande, PB, 58109-970, Brazil  
E-mail: dmp@dme.ufcg.edu.br

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 18.11.2003*

(1485)