POWER CONCAVE OPERATORS AND REPRESENTATION OF p-CONVEX AND q-CONCAVE BANACH LATTICES

OLVIDO DELGADO and ENRIQUE A. SÁNCHEZ PÉREZ

Communicated by Florian-Horia Vasilescu

ABSTRACT. As a consequence of the analysis of the class of (p,q)-power concave operators, we prove a general representation theorem for p-convex and q-concave Banach lattices as spaces of integrable functions with respect to vector measures. This result culminates a series of representation theorems for Banach lattices using vector measures that have been obtained in the last twenty years.

KEYWORDS: *Banach lattices, q-concave operators, quasi-Banach function spaces, vector measures, δ-ring.*

MSC (2010): Primary 47B38; Secondary 46G10, 46E30, 46B42.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $1 \leqslant p \leqslant q < \infty$. In this paper we provide a new representation theorem for p-convex and q-concave Banach lattices in terms of integrable functions with respect to vector measures. This type of representation has its origin in Theorem 8 of [6], where it was proved that every order continuous Banach lattice F with a weak unit is order isometric to a space $L^1(\nu)$ of a vector measure ν on a σ-algebra. Later on, in Proposition 2.4 of [14] it was proved that if F is also p-convex (with p-convexity constant equal to 1) then it is order isometric to $L^p(m)$ for another vector measure m. Similar results work for F without weak unit but in this case the vector measure used in the representation of F is defined to act in a δ-ring, see Theorem 5 of [12] and Theorem 10 of [5]. Also, there are representation theorems for F replacing σ-order continuity by the Fatou property, in this case through spaces of weakly integrable functions, see [7], [8], [12], [15]. Finally, some recent results on representation of quasi-Banach lattices using integration with respect to positive measures on quasi-Banach function spaces have been published in [30], showing that the vector measure representation technique can be extended to the quasi-Banach case successfully. As the reader will see, some of our results work — and are proved for — this case.

In Theorem 4.4 of this paper, we obtain that *every q-concave and p-convex Banach lattice is order isomorphic to a space $L^p(m)$ of an E-valued vector measure m defined on a δ-ring whose integration operator $I_{m_T} : L^1(m_T) \to E$ is (q/p)-concave; alternatively, and only for the case that the Banach lattice has a weak unit, this requirement can be substituted by $I_{m_T} : L^p(m_T) \to E$ to be (q, p)-power concave.* In a sense, this result closes the series of representation theorems for quasi-Banach lattices with specific geometric properties by adding the q-concavity requirement to the lattice to be represented.

Other characterizations of p-convex and q-concave Banach function lattices are known. For example, Theorem 1.d.10 in [19] establishes that a Banach lattice is q-concave if and only if every positive operator from a $C(K)$-space in it, is p-summing. Another one was provided by Reisner in [29]; in Theorem 1 of that paper, it is proved that a Banach function space $X(\mu)$ is p-convex and q-concave if and only if for every multiplication operator from $L^q(\mu)$ to $L^p(\mu)$, there is a factorization through $X(\mu)$ by means of multiplication operators in such a way that the product of their norms is uniformly bounded. However, although the general setting and the results are connected with our work, the arguments used for proving them are different.

Our method is essentially based on the vector measure integration theory. Indeed, our main technical tool will be the specific class of operators from Banach lattices and having values on Banach spaces that are called (p, q)-power-concave operators, and was introduced in Chapter 6 of [24]. As will be shown in Section 3, the description of this class requires the spaces of vector measure p-integrable functions. We will prove a general optimal domain theorem for this class of operators (Theorem 3.4) — which contains the q-concave operators — that is also valid for the case of σ-finite measures. In general, we will extend the characterizations and study their main properties in the setting of non-finite measures, in order to cover the case of quasi-Banach function spaces over σ-finite measures, and in general, the case of vector measures acting in δ-rings instead of σ-algebras. Also, we will use the notion of (what we call) q-concave core of a Banach function space, that has been used in several papers related to factorization theorems for operators on Banach function spaces involving q-concavity and p-convexity properties. We will consider the construction provided for example Theorem 1 of [27] and Lemma 6 of [28], although the procedure given there uses abstract Banach lattice notions, while we prefer to give explicit descriptions in terms of measure theoretical tools. We develop our analysis using some elements of the circle of ideas of the classical Krivine's theorem of factorization through L^p-space of operators factoring through p-convex and q-concave factors (see [17]), the so called Maurey–Rosenthal theorem (see for example [9], [10]) and other new results on *factorization* of operators acting in Banach function spaces (see Chapter 6 of [24]). On the other hand, the same type of requirements on p-convexity/q-concavity has been also used for finding *extensions* of regular operators from subspaces of a Banach lattice to the whole lattice (see [26]).

However, the key of our construction — the factorization of (p,q)-power concave operators from Banach function spaces over σ-finite measures — is essentially new. A good deal of the paper is devoted to show the properties of this new class, which are shown to have nice factorization/extension properties. This class of operators — that was introduced in Chapter 5 of [24] for the case of finite measures — is described by a concavity type inequality, and its main characterization is given — in the finite measure case — by factorization of an operator belonging to the class by a q-concave and a p-th factorable operator through a p-concave function lattice, and the natural adaptation in the case of non-finite measures. The reader can find all the required information on these concepts in Section 2 and Section 3 of the paper.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we establish the notation and present the basic results on quasi-Banach function spaces (including the proof of some of them for completeness) and on vector measure integration, which will be used through the whole paper.

Let (Ω, Σ) be a fixed measurable space. For a measure $\mu : \Sigma \to [0, \infty]$, we denote by $L^0(\mu)$ the space of all Σ-measurable real valued functions on Ω, where functions which are equal μ-a.e. are identified.

Given two set functions $\mu, \lambda : \Sigma \to [0, \infty]$ we will write $\lambda \ll \mu$ if $\mu(A) = 0$ implies $\lambda(A) = 0$. If $\lambda \ll \mu$ and $\mu \ll \lambda$ we will say that μ and λ are *equivalent*. If $\mu, \lambda : \Sigma \to [0, \infty]$ are two measures with $\lambda \ll \mu$, then the map $[i] : L^0(\mu) \to L^0(\lambda)$ which takes a μ-a.e. class in $L^0(\mu)$ represented by f into the λ-a.e. class represented by the same f, is a well defined linear map. In order to simplify notation we will write $[i](f) = f$. Note that if λ and μ are equivalent then $L^0(\mu) = L^0(\lambda)$ and $[i]$ is the identity map i.

2.1. QUASI-BANACH FUNCTION SPACES. In this section we establish the setting of our work regarding quasi-Banach function spaces. The results are essentially known, but we prefer to include complete proofs since we did not find precise references for them in the literature. We refer to the general books that the reader can find in the bibliography and the paper [21] by Maligranda for more information about. Let X be a real vector space and $\| \cdot \|_X$ a *quasi-norm* on X, that is a function $\| \cdot \|_X : X \to [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following conditions:

(i) $\|x\|_X = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$,
(ii) $\|\alpha x\|_X = |\alpha| \cdot \|x\|_X$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in X$, and
(iii) there is a constant $K \geqslant 1$ such that $\|x + y\|_X \leqslant K(\|x\|_X + \|y\|_X)$ for all $x, y \in X$.

For $0 < r \leqslant 1$ being such that $K = 2^{(1/r)-1}$, it follows that

$$(2.1) \qquad \Big\| \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j \Big\|_X \leqslant 4^{1/r} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|x_j\|_X^r \Big)^{1/r}$$

for every finite subset $(x_j)_{j=1}^n \subset X$, see Lemma 1.1 of [16]. The quasi-norm $\| \cdot \|_X$ induces a metrizable vector topology on X where a base of neighborhoods of 0 is given by sets of the form $\{x \in X : \|x\|_X \leqslant 1/n\}$. So, a sequence (x_n) converges to x in X if and only if $\|x - x_n\|_X \to 0$. If such topology is complete then X is said to be a *quasi-Banach space* (*Banach space* if $K = 1$).

Having in mind the inequality (2.1), standard arguments show the next result. Although the result is not the same, our ideas are similar to the ones that prove Theorem 1.1 in [21] (see also the rest of Section 1 in that paper).

PROPOSITION 2.1. *The following statements are equivalent:*
(i) *X is complete.*
(ii) *For every $0 < r' \leqslant r$ (r as in (2.1)), if $(x_n) \subset X$ is such that $\sum \|x_n\|_X^{r'} < \infty$, then $\sum x_n$ converges in X.*
(iii) *There exists $r' > 0$ satisfying that if $(x_n) \subset X$ is such that $\sum \|x_n\|_X^{r'} < \infty$ then $\sum x_n$ converges in X.*

Note that if a series $\sum x_n$ converges in X then

$$(2.2) \qquad \Big\| \sum x_n \Big\|_X \leqslant 4^{1/r} K \Big(\sum \|x_n\|_X^r \Big)^{1/r},$$

where r is as in (2.1). By using the map $\||\cdot\||$ given in Theorem 1.2 of [16], it is routine to check that if $x_n \to x$ in X then

$$(2.3) \qquad 4^{-1/r} \limsup \|x_n\|_X \leqslant \|x\|_X \leqslant 4^{1/r} \liminf \|x_n\|_X.$$

Also note that a linear map $T : X \to Y$ between quasi-Banach spaces is continuous if and only if there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that $\|Tx\|_Y \leqslant M\|x\|_X$ for all $x \in X$, see p. 8 of [16].

By a *quasi-Banach function space* (briefly, quasi-B.f.s.) we mean a quasi-Banach space $X(\mu) \subset L^0(\mu)$ satisfying that if $f \in X(\mu)$ and $g \in L^0(\mu)$ with $|g| \leqslant |f|$ μ-a.e. then $g \in X(\mu)$ and $\|g\|_{X(\mu)} \leqslant \|f\|_{X(\mu)}$. If $X(\mu)$ is a Banach space we will refer to it as a *Banach function space* (briefly, B.f.s.). In particular, a quasi-B.f.s. is a quasi-Banach lattice for the μ-a.e. pointwise order, in which the convergence in quasi-norm of a sequence implies the convergence μ-a.e. for some subsequence. Let us prove this important fact.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *If $f_n \to f$ in a quasi-B.f.s. $X(\mu)$, then there exists a subsequence $f_{n_j} \to f$ μ-a.e.*

Proof. Let r be as in (2.1). We can take a strictly increasing sequence $(n_j)_{j \geqslant 1}$ such that $\|f - f_{n_j}\|_{X(\mu)} \leqslant 1/2^j$. For every $m \geqslant 1$, since

$$\sum_{j \geqslant m} \|f - f_{n_j}\|_{X(\mu)}^r \leqslant \sum_{j \geqslant m} \frac{1}{2^{jr}} < \infty,$$

by Proposition 2.1 and (2.2), it follows that $g_m = \sum_{j \geqslant m} |f - f_{n_j}|$ converges in $X(\mu)$

and $\|g_m\|_{X(\mu)} \leqslant 4^{1/r} K \left(\sum_{j \geqslant m} (1/2^{jr}) \right)^{1/r}$. Fix $N \geqslant 1$ and let $A_j^N = \{\omega \in \Omega : |f(\omega) - f_{n_j}(\omega)| > 1/N\}$. Since

$$\chi_{\bigcap_{m \geqslant 1} \bigcup_{j \geqslant m} A_j^N} \leqslant \chi_{\bigcup_{j \geqslant m} A_j^N} \leqslant \sum_{j \geqslant m} \chi_{A_j^N} \leqslant N \sum_{j \geqslant m} |f - f_{n_j}| = N g_m,$$

then

$$\|\chi_{\bigcap_{m \geqslant 1} \bigcup_{j \geqslant m} A_j^N}\|_{X(\mu)} \leqslant N \|g_m\|_{X(\mu)} \leqslant 4^{1/r} N K \left(\sum_{j \geqslant m} \frac{1}{2^{jr}} \right)^{1/r}.$$

Taking $m \to \infty$ we have that $\|\chi_{\bigcap_{m \geqslant 1} \bigcup_{j \geqslant m} A_j^N}\|_{X(\mu)} = 0$ and so $\mu(\bigcap_{m \geqslant 1} \bigcup_{j \geqslant m} A_j^N) = 0$. Then $\mu(\bigcup_{N \geqslant 1} \bigcap_{m \geqslant 1} \bigcup_{j \geqslant m} A_j^N) = 0$, from which $f_{n_j} \to f$ μ-a.e. ∎

A quasi-B.f.s. $X(\mu)$ is *σ-order continuous* if for every $(f_n) \subset X(\mu)$ with $f_n \downarrow 0$ μ-a.e. it follows that $\|f_n\|_X \downarrow 0$. It has the *σ-Fatou property* if for every sequence $(f_n) \subset X$ such that $0 \leqslant f_n \uparrow f$ μ-a.e. and $\sup_n \|f_n\|_X < \infty$ we have that $f \in X$ and $\|f_n\|_X \uparrow \|f\|_X$.

A similar argument to that given in p. 2 of [19] for Banach lattices shows that every positive linear operator between quasi-Banach lattices is automatically continuous. In particular, all inclusions between quasi-B.f.s. are continuous.

The intersection $X(\mu) \cap Y(\mu)$ and the sum $X(\mu) + Y(\mu)$ of two quasi-B.f.s.' (B.f.s.') $X(\mu)$ and $Y(\mu)$ are quasi-B.f.s.' (B.f.s.') endowed respectively with the quasi-norm (norms)

$$\|f\|_{X(\mu) \cap Y(\mu)} = \max\{\|f\|_{X(\mu)}, \|f\|_{Y(\mu)}\} \quad \text{and}$$
$$\|f\|_{X(\mu) + Y(\mu)} = \inf(\|f_1\|_{X(\mu)} + \|f_2\|_{Y(\mu)}),$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible representations $f = f_1 + f_2$ μ-a.e. with $f_1 \in X(\mu)$ and $f_2 \in Y(\mu)$. The σ-order continuity is also preserved by these operations: if $X(\mu)$ and $Y(\mu)$ are σ-order continuous then $X(\mu) \cap Y(\mu)$ and $X(\mu) + Y(\mu)$ are σ-order continuous. Detailed proofs of these facts can be found in [13], see also Section 3, Theorem 1.3 of [1] for the standard parts.

Let $p \in (0, \infty)$. The *p-power* of a quasi-B.f.s. $X(\mu)$ is the quasi-B.f.s.

$$X(\mu)^p = \{f \in L^0(\mu) : |f|^p \in X(\mu)\}$$

endowed with the quasi-norm

$$\|f\|_{X(\mu)^p} = \| |f|^p \|_{X(\mu)}^{1/p}.$$

The reader can find a complete explanation of the space $X^p(\mu)$ for instance in Section 2.2 of [24] for the case when μ is finite and $\chi_\Omega \in X(\mu)$. The proofs given there, with the natural modifications, work in our general case. However, note that the notation is different: our p-powers here are the $(1/p)$-th powers there. This standard space can be found in different sources, unfortunately, notation is not exactly the same in all of them.

The following remark collects some results on the space $X(\mu)^p$ which will be used in the next sections. First, recall that a quasi-B.f.s. $X(\mu)$ is *p-convex* if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^p \right)^{1/p} \right\|_{X(\mu)} \leqslant C \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|f_j\|_{X(\mu)}^p \right)^{1/p}$$

for every finite subset $(f_j)_{j=1}^n \subset X(\mu)$. The smallest constant satisfying the previous inequality is called the *p-convexity constant* of $X(\mu)$ and is denoted by

$$M^{(p)}[X(\mu)].$$

REMARK 2.3. Let $X(\mu)$ be a quasi-B.f.s. The following statements hold:

(i) $X(\mu)^p$ is σ-order continuous if and only if $X(\mu)$ is σ-order continuous.

(ii) If $\chi_\Omega \in X(\mu)$ and $0 < p \leqslant q < \infty$ then $X(\mu)^q \subset X(\mu)^p$.

(iii) If $X(\mu)$ is a B.f.s. then $X(\mu)^p$ is p-convex.

(iv) If $X(\mu)$ is a B.f.s. and $p \geqslant 1$ then $\| \cdot \|_{X(\mu)^p}$ is a norm and so $X(\mu)^p$ is a B.f.s.

(v) If $X(\mu)$ is $(1/p)$-convex with $M^{(1/p)}[X(\mu)] = 1$ then $\| \cdot \|_{X(\mu)^p}$ is a norm and so $X(\mu)^p$ is a B.f.s.

Let $T : X(\mu) \to E$ be a linear operator defined on a quasi-B.f.s. $X(\mu)$ and with values in a quasi-Banach space E. For $q \in (0, \infty)$, the operator T is said to be *q-concave* if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|T(f_j)\|_E^q \right)^{1/q} \leqslant C \left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{X(\mu)}$$

for every finite subset $(f_j)_{j=1}^n \subset X(\mu)$. A quasi-B.f.s. $X(\mu)$ is *q-concave* if the identity map $i : X(\mu) \to X(\mu)$ is q-concave.

The reader can find an excellent presentation of the main results regarding p-convexity and q-concavity in Banach function spaces in Section 4 of [21].

Note that if T is q-concave then it is p-concave for all $p > q$. A proof of this fact can be found in Proposition 2.54(iv) of [24] for the case when μ is finite and $\chi_\Omega \in X(\mu)$. An adaptation of that proof to our context works.

PROPOSITION 2.4. *If $X(\mu)$ is a q-concave quasi-B.f.s. then it is σ-order continuous.*

Proof. Since q-concavity implies p-concavity for every $0 < q < p$, we only have to consider the case $q \geqslant 1$. Denote by C the q-concavity constant of $X(\mu)$

and consider $(f_n) \subset X(\mu)$ such that $f_n \downarrow 0$ μ-a.e. For every strictly increasing subsequence (n_k) we have that

$$\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \|f_{n_k} - f_{n_{k+1}}\|_{X(\mu)}^{q} \Big)^{1/q} \leqslant C \Big\| \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{m} |f_{n_k} - f_{n_{k+1}}|^q \Big)^{1/q} \Big\|_{X(\mu)} \leqslant C \Big\| \sum_{k=1}^{m} |f_{n_k} - f_{n_{k+1}}| \Big\|_{X(\mu)}$$

$$= C\|f_{n_1} - f_{n_{m+1}}\|_{X(\mu)} \leqslant C\|f_{n_1}\|_{X(\mu)}$$

for all $m \geqslant 1$. Then, (f_n) is a Cauchy sequence in $X(\mu)$, as otherwise we can find $\delta > 0$ and two subsequences (n_k), (m_k) such that $n_k < m_k < n_{k+1} < m_{k+1}$ and $\delta < \|f_{n_k} - f_{m_k}\|_{X(\mu)} \leqslant \|f_{n_k} - f_{n_{k+1}}\|_{X(\mu)}$ for all k, which is a contradiction. Let $h \in X(\mu)$ be such that $f_n \to h$ in $X(\mu)$. From Proposition 2.2, there exists a subsequence $f_{n_j} \to h$ μ-a.e. and so $h = 0$ μ-a.e. Hence, $\|f_n\|_{X(\mu)} \downarrow 0$. ∎

LEMMA 2.5. *Let $X(\mu)$ and $Y(\mu)$ be two quasi-B.f.s.' and consider a linear operator $T : X(\mu) + Y(\mu) \to E$ with values in a quasi-Banach space E. The operator T is q-concave if and only if both $T : X(\mu) \to E$ and $T : Y(\mu) \to E$ are q-concave.*

Proof. If $T : X(\mu) + Y(\mu) \to E$ is q-concave, since $X(\mu) \subset X(\mu) + Y(\mu)$ continuously, it follows that $T : X(\mu) \to E$ is q-concave. Similarly, $T : Y(\mu) \to E$ is q-concave.

Suppose that $T : X(\mu) \to E$ and $T : Y(\mu) \to E$ are q-concave and denote by C_X and C_Y their respective q-concavity constants. Write K for the constant satisfying the property (iii) of the quasi-norm $\|\cdot\|_E$. We will use the inequality:

$$(2.4) \qquad\qquad (a+b)^t \leqslant \max\{1, 2^{t-1}\}(a^t + b^t)$$

where $0 \leqslant a, b < \infty$ and $0 < t < \infty$. Let $(f_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X(\mu) + Y(\mu)$. For $h = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} \in X(\mu) + Y(\mu)$, consider $h_1 \in X(\mu)$ and $h_2 \in Y(\mu)$ such that $h = h_1 + h_2$ μ-a.e. Taking the set $A = \{\omega \in \Omega : h(\omega) \leqslant 2|h_1(\omega)|\}$, $\alpha_q = \max\{1, 2^{q-1}\}$ and using (2.4), we have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|T(f_j)\|_E^q \leqslant K^q \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\|T(f_j \chi_A)\|_E + \|T(f_j \chi_{\Omega \setminus A})\|_E)^q$$

$$\leqslant K^q \alpha_q \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|T(f_j \chi_A)\|_E^q + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|T(f_j \chi_{\Omega \setminus A})\|_E^q \Big).$$

Note that $(f_j \chi_A)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X(\mu)$ as $|f_j|\chi_A \leqslant h\chi_A \leqslant 2|h_1|$ for all j. Then,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|T(f_j \chi_A)\|_E^q \leqslant C_X^q \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} \chi_A \Big\|_{X(\mu)}^q = C_X^q \|h\chi_A\|_{X(\mu)}^q \leqslant 2^q C_X^q \|h_1\|_{X(\mu)}^q.$$

Similarly, $(f_j \chi_{\Omega \setminus A})_{j=1}^{n} \subset Y(\mu)$ as $|f_j|\chi_{\Omega \setminus A} \leqslant h\chi_{\Omega \setminus A} \leqslant 2|h_2|$ μ-a.e. for all j and so

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|T(f_j \chi_{\Omega \setminus A})\|_E^q \leqslant 2^q C_Y^q \|h_2\|_{Y(\mu)}^q.$$

Denoting $C = \max\{C_X, C_Y\}$ and using again (2.4), it follows that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|T(f_j)\|_E^q \Big)^{1/q} \leqslant 2KC\alpha_q^{1/q} \left(\|h_1\|_{X(\mu)}^q + \|h_2\|_{Y(\mu)}^q \right)^{1/q}$$

$$\leqslant 2^{1+|1-(1/q)|} KC \left(\|h_1\|_{X(\mu)} + \|h_2\|_{Y(\mu)} \right).$$

Taking infimum over all representations $\Big(\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} = h_1 + h_2$ μ-a.e. with $h_1 \in X(\mu)$ and $h_2 \in Y(\mu)$, we have that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|T(f_j)\|_E^q \Big)^{1/q} \leqslant 2^{1+|1-(1/q)|} KC \left\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} \right\|_{X(\mu)+Y(\mu)}. \quad \blacksquare$$

Further information on Banach lattices and function spaces can be found for instance in [1], [16], [19], [20], [21], [24], [31].

2.2. Integration with respect to a vector measure defined on a δ-ring.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a *δ-ring* of subsets of Ω (i.e. a ring closed under countable intersections) and let $\mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{loc}}$ be the σ-algebra of all subsets A of Ω such that $A \cap B \in \mathcal{R}$ for all $B \in \mathcal{R}$. Note that $\mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{loc}} = \mathcal{R}$ whenever $\mathcal{R}$ is a σ-algebra. Write $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R})$ for the space of all *$\mathcal{R}$-simple functions* (i.e. simple functions supported in $\mathcal{R}$).

A Banach space valued set function $m : \mathcal{R} \to E$ is a *vector measure* (*real measure* when $E = \mathbb{R}$) if $\sum m(A_n)$ converges to $m(\bigcup A_n)$ in E for each sequence $(A_n) \subset \mathcal{R}$ of pairwise disjoint sets with $\bigcup A_n \in \mathcal{R}$.

The *variation* of a real measure $\lambda : \mathcal{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is the measure $|\lambda| : \mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{loc}} \to [0, \infty]$ given by

$$|\lambda|(A) = \sup \Big\{ \sum |\lambda(A_j)| : (A_j) \text{ finite disjoint sequence in } \mathcal{R} \cap 2^A \Big\}.$$

The variation $|\lambda|$ is finite on $\mathcal{R}$. The space $L^1(\lambda)$ of *integrable functions with respect to λ* is defined as the classical space $L^1(|\lambda|)$ with the usual norm $|f|_\lambda = \int_{\Omega} |f| \, \mathrm{d}|\lambda|$.

The integral of an $\mathcal{R}$-simple function $\varphi = \sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} a_j \chi_{A_j}$ over $A \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{loc}}$ is defined in the natural way by $\int_A \varphi \, \mathrm{d}\lambda = \sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} a_j \lambda(A_j \cap A)$. The space $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R})$ is dense in $L^1(\lambda)$. This allows to define the integral of a function $f \in L^1(\lambda)$ over $A \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{loc}}$ as $\int_A f \, \mathrm{d}\lambda = \lim \int_A \varphi_n \, \mathrm{d}\lambda$ for any sequence $(\varphi_n) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R})$ converging to f in $L^1(\lambda)$.

The *semivariation* of a vector measure $m : \mathcal{R} \to E$ is the function

$$\|m\| : \mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{loc}} \to [0, \infty]$$

defined by

$$\|m\|(A) = \sup_{x^* \in B_{E^*}} |x^*m|(A),$$

where B_{E^*} is the closed unit ball of the topological dual E^* of E and $|x^*m|$ is the variation of the real measure x^*m given by the composition of m with x^*. The semivariation $\|m\|$ is finite on $\mathcal{R}$.

A set $A \in \mathcal{R}^{\text{loc}}$ is said to be *m-null* if $m(B) = 0$ for every $B \in \mathcal{R} \cap 2^A$. This is equivalent to $\|m\|(A) = 0$. It is known that there exists a measure $\eta : \mathcal{R}^{\text{loc}} \to [0,\infty]$ equivalent to $\|m\|$ (see Theorem 3.2 of [2]). Denote $L^0(m) = L^0(\eta)$.

The space $L^1_w(m)$ of *weakly integrable* functions with respect to m is defined as the space of (m-a.e. equal) functions $f \in L^0(m)$ such that $f \in L^1(x^*m)$ for every $x^* \in E^*$. The space $L^1(m)$ of *integrable* functions with respect to m consists in all functions $f \in L^1_w(m)$ satisfying that for each $A \in \mathcal{R}^{\text{loc}}$ there exists $x_A \in E$, which is denoted by $\int_A f \, dm$, such that

$$x^*(x_A) = \int_A f \, dx^*m, \quad \text{for all } x^* \in E^*.$$

The spaces $L^1(m)$ and $L^1_w(m)$ are B.f.s.' related to the measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{R}^{\text{loc}}, \eta)$, and the expression

$$\|f\|_m = \sup_{x^* \in B_{E^*}} \int_\Omega |f| \, d|x^*m|$$

gives a norm for both spaces. The norm of $f \in L^1(m)$ can also be computed by means of the formula

(2.5) $$\|f\|_m = \sup \left\{ \left\| \int_\Omega f\varphi \, dm \right\|_E : \varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R}), |\varphi| \leqslant 1 \right\}.$$

Moreover, $L^1(m)$ is σ-order continuous and contains $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R})$ as a dense subset and $L^1_w(m)$ has the σ-Fatou property. For every $\mathcal{R}$-simple function $\varphi = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \chi_{A_i}$ it follows that $\int_A \varphi \, dm = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i m(A_j \cap A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{R}^{\text{loc}}$.

The *integration operator* $I_m : L^1(m) \to E$ given by $I_m(f) = \int_\Omega f \, dm$, is a continuous linear operator with $\|I_m(f)\|_E \leqslant \|f\|_m$. If m is *positive*, that is, it is defined on a Banach lattice and $m(A) \geqslant 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{R}$, then $\|f\|_m = \|I_m(|f|)\|_E$ for all $f \in L^1(m)$.

For every $g \in L^1(m)$, the set function $m_g : \mathcal{R}^{\text{loc}} \to E$ given by $m_g(A) = I_m(g\chi_A)$ is a vector measure. Moreover, $f \in L^1(m_g)$ if and only if $fg \in L^1(m)$, and in this case $\|f\|_{L^1(m_g)} = \|fg\|_{L^1(m)}$.

For definitions and general results regarding integration with respect to a vector measure defined on a δ-ring we refer to [4], [11], [18], [22], [23].

Let $p \in (0,\infty)$. We denote by $L^p(m)$ the *p*-power of $L^1(m)$, that is,

$$L^p(m) = \{f \in L^0(m) : |f|^p \in L^1(m)\}.$$

As noted in Remark 2.3, the space $L^p(m)$ is a (p-convex) σ-order continuous quasi-B.f.s. with the quasi-norm $\|f\|_{L^p(m)} = \| |f|^p \|_{L^1(m)}^{1/p}$. Moreover, if $p \geqslant 1$ then $\| \cdot \|_{L^p(m)}$ is a norm and so $L^p(m)$ is a B.f.s. Direct proofs of these facts and some general results on the spaces $L^p(m)$ can be found in [5].

2.3. The q-concave core of a σ-order continuous quasi-B.f.s. Let $X(\mu)$ be a σ-order continuous quasi-B.f.s. and $q \in (0, \infty)$. The following construction is rather standard, and can be found for example in Lemma 6 of [28] and Theorem 1 of [27]. However, we use measure theoretical tools for its definition instead of abstract Banach lattice elements as in these references. Again, we write complete proofs for the convenience of the readers. We define the space $qX(\mu)$ to be the set of functions $f \in X(\mu)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{qX(\mu)} = \sup \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|f_j\|_{X(\mu)}^q \Big)^{1/q} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite set $(f_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X(\mu)$ satisfying $|f| = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^q \Big)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e. Note that $\|f\|_{X(\mu)} \leqslant \|f\|_{qX(\mu)}$.

PROPOSITION 2.6. *The space $qX(\mu)$ is a quasi-B.f.s. with quasi-norm $\| \cdot \|_{qX(\mu)}$.*

Proof. First let us see that if $f \in qX(\mu)$ and $g \in L^0(\mu)$ with $|g| \leqslant |f|$ μ-a.e. then $g \in qX(\mu)$ and $\|g\|_{qX(\mu)} \leqslant \|f\|_{qX(\mu)}$. Note that $g \in X(\mu)$ as $f \in X(\mu)$. Let $(g_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X(\mu)$ be such that $|g| = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |g_j|^q \Big)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e. and take $h = | |f|^q - |g|^q |^{1/q} \in X(\mu)$. Since $|f| = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |g_j|^q + |h|^q \Big)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e., we have that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|g_j\|_{X(\mu)}^q \Big)^{1/q} \leqslant \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|g_j\|_{X(\mu)}^q + \|h\|_{X(\mu)}^q \Big)^{1/q} \leqslant \|f\|_{qX(\mu)}.$$

Taking supremum over all $(g_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X$ with $|g| = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |g_j|^q \Big)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e., we have that $g \in qX(\mu)$ with $\|g\|_{qX(\mu)} \leqslant \|f\|_{qX(\mu)}$.

It is direct to check that $\| \cdot \|_{qX(\mu)}$ satisfies the properties (i) and (ii) of a quasi-norm. Let K be the constant satisfying the property (iii) of a quasi-norm for $\| \cdot \|_{X(\mu)}$. Given $f, g \in qX(\mu)$ and $(h_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X$ such that $|f + g| = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |h_j|^q \Big)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e., by taking $A = \{\omega \in \Omega : |f(\omega) + g(\omega)| \leqslant 2|f(\omega)|\}$, $\alpha_q = \max\{1, 2^{q-1}\}$ and using (2.4), we have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|h_j\|_{X(\mu)}^q \leqslant K^q \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\|h_j \chi_A\|_{X(\mu)} + \|h_j \chi_{\Omega \setminus A}\|_{X(\mu)})^q$$

$$\leqslant K^q \alpha_q \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|h_j \chi_A\|_{X(\mu)}^q + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|h_j \chi_{\Omega \setminus A}\|_{X(\mu)}^q \Big).$$

Note that $|f+g|\chi_A, |f+g|\chi_{\Omega \setminus A} \in qX(\mu)$ as $|f+g|\chi_A \leqslant 2|f|$ and $|f+g|\chi_{\Omega \setminus A} \leqslant 2|g|$. Then,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|h_j\|_{X(\mu)}^q \leqslant K^q \alpha_q (\||f+g|\chi_A\|_{qX(\mu)}^q + \||f+g|\chi_{\Omega \setminus A}\|_{qX(\mu)}^q)$$

$$\leqslant 2^q K^q \alpha_q (\|f\|_{qX(\mu)}^q + \|g\|_{qX(\mu)}^q).$$

By using again (2.4), we have that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|h_j\|_{X(\mu)}^q \Big)^{1/q} \leqslant 2K \alpha_q^{1/q} (\|f\|_{qX(\mu)}^q + \|g\|_{qX(\mu)}^q)^{1/q}$$

$$\leqslant 2^{1+|1-(1/q)|} K (\|f\|_{qX(\mu)} + \|g\|_{qX(\mu)}).$$

Taking supremum over all $(h_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X$ with $|f+g| = \Big(\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} |h_j|^q \Big)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e., we have that

(2.6) $$\|f+g\|_{qX(\mu)} \leqslant 2^{1+|1-(1/q)|} K (\|f\|_{qX(\mu)} + \|g\|_{qX(\mu)}).$$

Finally, let us prove that $qX(\mu)$ is complete. Denote by r and r' the constants satisfying (2.1) for $X(\mu)$ and $qX(\mu)$ respectively. Note that $r' < r$ as $2^{1+|1-(1/q)|} K > K$. Let $(f_n) \subset qX(\mu)$ be such that $\sum \|f_n\|_{qX(\mu)}^{r'} < \infty$. Since $\|\cdot\|_{X(\mu)} \leqslant \|\cdot\|_{qX(\mu)}$, from Proposition 2.1, we have that $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{k} f_j \to g$ and $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{k} |f_j| \to \widetilde{g}$ in $X(\mu)$. From Proposition 2.2, it follows that $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{k} f_j \to g$ and $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{k} |f_j| \to \widetilde{g}$ pointwise except on a μ-null set Z. Fix any $\gamma > 1$ and consider the sets $A_k = \Big\{ \omega \in \Omega : |g(\omega)| \leqslant \gamma \sum\limits_{j=1}^{k} |f_j(\omega)| \Big\}$. Note that $\Omega \setminus \bigcup A_k \subset Z$ and so it is μ-null. Indeed, if $\omega \notin Z$ and $|g(\omega)| > \gamma \sum\limits_{j=1}^{k} |f_j(\omega)|$ for all k (in particular $\sum |f_n(\omega)| \neq 0$), then $\gamma \sum |f_n(\omega)| \leqslant |g(\omega)| \leqslant \sum |f_n(\omega)| < \infty$, which is a contradiction. Also note that $g\chi_{A_k} \in qX(\mu)$ as $|g|\chi_{A_k} \leqslant \gamma \sum\limits_{j=1}^{k} |f_j|$. Given $(h_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X$ with $|g| = \Big(\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} |h_j|^q \Big)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e., we have that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|h_j \chi_{A_k}\|_{X(\mu)}^q \Big)^{1/q} \leqslant \|g\chi_{A_k}\|_{qX(\mu)} \leqslant \gamma \Big\| \sum_{j=1}^{k} |f_j| \Big\|_{qX(\mu)}$$

$$\leqslant 4^{1/r'} \gamma \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \|f_j\|_{qX(\mu)}^{r'} \Big)^{1/r'} \leqslant 4^{1/r'} \gamma \Big(\sum \|f_n\|_{qX(\mu)}^{r'} \Big)^{1/r'}.$$

On the other hand, since $X(\mu)$ is σ-order continuous and $|h_j|\chi_{A_k} \uparrow |h_j|$ μ-a.e. as $k \to \infty$, we have that $h_j\chi_{A_k} \to h_j$ in $X(\mu)$ as $k \to \infty$. Taking the limit as $k \to \infty$ in the above inequality and applying (2.3), we obtain that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|h_j\|_{X(\mu)}^q \Big)^{1/q} \leqslant 4^{(1/r)+(1/r')} \gamma \Big(\sum \|f_n\|_{qX(\mu)}^{r'} \Big)^{1/r'}.$$

Now, taking supremum over all $(h_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X$ with $|g| = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |h_j|^q \Big)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e., it follows that $g \in qX(\mu)$ with $\|g\|_{qX(\mu)} \leqslant 4^{(1/r)+(1/r')} \gamma \Big(\sum \|f_n\|_{qX(\mu)}^{r'} \Big)^{1/r'}$. Even more, since γ is arbitrary, taking $\gamma \to 1$ we have that

$$\Big\| \sum f_n \Big\|_{qX(\mu)} \leqslant 4^{(1/r)+(1/r')} \Big(\sum \|f_n\|_{qX(\mu)}^{r'} \Big)^{1/r'}.$$

Of course $\sum_{j=1}^{n} f_j \to g$ in $qX(\mu)$ as

$$\Big\| g - \sum_{j=1}^{n} f_j \Big\|_{qX(\mu)} = \Big\| \sum_{j>n} f_j \Big\|_{qX(\mu)} \leqslant 4^{(1/r)+(1/r')} \Big(\sum_{j>n} \|f_j\|_{qX(\mu)}^{r'} \Big)^{1/r'} \to 0.$$

Therefore, from Proposition 2.1 it follows that $qX(\mu)$ is complete. ∎

PROPOSITION 2.7. *The space $qX(\mu)$ is q-concave. In consequence, it is also σ-order continuous.*

Proof. Let $(f_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset qX(\mu)$ and consider $(h_k^j)_{k=1}^{m_j} \subset X(\mu)$ with

$$|f_j| = \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{m_j} |h_k^j|^q \Big)^{1/q}$$

μ-a.e. for each j. Since $\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{m_j} |h_k^j|^q \Big)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e., it follows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{m_j} \|h_k^j\|_{X(\mu)}^q \leqslant \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} \Big\|_{qX(\mu)}^q.$$

Taking supremum for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$ over all $(h_k^j)_{k=1}^{m_j} \subset X(\mu)$ with $|f_j| = \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{m_j} |h_k^j|^q \Big)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e., we have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|f_j\|_{qX(\mu)}^q \leqslant \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} \Big\|_{qX(\mu)}^q$$

and so $qX(\mu)$ is q-concave. The σ-order continuity is given by Proposition 2.4. ∎

Even more, the following proposition shows that $qX(\mu)$ is in fact the q-*concave core* of $X(\mu)$, that is, the largest q-concave quasi-B.f.s. related to μ contained in $X(\mu)$. In particular, $qX(\mu) = X(\mu)$ whenever $X(\mu)$ is q-concave. As we said at the beginning of this section, recall that the "inclusion" $[i]$ appearing in the following result is not strictly such an inclusion.

PROPOSITION 2.8. *Let $Z(\xi)$ be a quasi-*B.f.s. *with $\mu \ll \xi$. The following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $[i] : Z(\xi) \to X(\mu)$ *is well defined and q-concave.*

(ii) $[i] : Z(\xi) \to qX(\mu)$ *is well defined.*

In particular, $qX(\mu)$ is the q-concave core of $X(\mu)$.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) Denote by C the q-concavity constant of the operator $[i] : Z(\xi) \to X(\mu)$. Let $f \in Z(\xi)$ (so $f \in X(\mu)$) and $(f_j)_{j=1}^n \subset X(\mu)$ with $|f| = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^q \right)^{1/q}$ except on a μ-null set N. Since $|f_j|\chi_{\Omega \setminus N} \leqslant |f|$ pointwise (so ξ-a.e.), then $f_j \chi_{\Omega \setminus N} \in Z(\xi)$. Noting that $f_j = f_j \chi_{\Omega \setminus N}$ μ-a.e., it follows that

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|f_j\|_{X(\mu)}^q\right)^{1/q} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|f_j \chi_{\Omega \setminus N}\|_{X(\mu)}^q\right)^{1/q} \leqslant C \left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^q\right)^{1/q} \chi_{\Omega \setminus N} \right\|_{Z(\xi)} \leqslant C \|f\|_{Z(\xi)}.$$

Hence $f \in qX(\mu)$ with $\|f\|_{qX(\mu)} \leqslant C \|f\|_{Z(\xi)}$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) Clearly $[i] : Z(\xi) \to X(\mu)$ is well defined as $qX(\mu) \subset X(\mu)$. Denote by M the continuity constant of $[i] : Z(\xi) \to qX(\mu)$ (recall that every positive operator between quasi-B.f.s.' is continuous). For every $(f_j)_{j=1}^n \subset Z(\xi)$ we have that $\left(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^q \right)^{1/q}$ is in $qX(\mu)$ as it is in $Z(\xi)$, and so

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|f_j\|_{X(\mu)}^q\right)^{1/q} \leqslant \left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^q\right)^{1/q} \right\|_{qX(\mu)} \leqslant M \left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^q\right)^{1/q} \right\|_{Z(\xi)}.$$

Hence, $[i] : Z(\xi) \to X(\mu)$ is q-concave.

In particular, if $Z(\mu)$ is a q-concave quasi-B.f.s. such that $Z(\mu) \subset X(\mu)$, we have that $i : Z(\mu) \to X(\mu)$ is well defined, continuous and so q-concave. Then, from (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) we have that $Z(\mu) \subset qX(\mu)$. ∎

For $p \in (0, \infty)$, the p-power of $qX(\mu)$ can be described in terms of the p-power of $X(\mu)$.

PROPOSITION 2.9. *The equality $(qX(\mu))^p = qpX(\mu)^p$ holds with equal norms.*

Proof. Let $f \in (qX(\mu))^p$. Since $|f|^p \in qX(\mu)$, in particular $|f|^p \in X(\mu)$ and so $f \in X(\mu)^p$. Consider $(f_j)_{j=1}^n \subset X(\mu)^p$ satisfying that $|f| = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^{qp} \right)^{1/qp}$ μ-a.e.

Noting that $(|f_j|^p)_{j=1}^n \subset X(\mu)$ and $|f|^p = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n (|f_j|^p)^q \right)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e., we have that

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|f_j\|_{X(\mu)^p}^{qp} \right)^{1/qp} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \| |f_j|^p \|_{X(\mu)}^q \right)^{1/qp} \leqslant \| |f|^p \|_{qX(\mu)}^{1/p} = \|f\|_{(qX(\mu))^p}.$$

Then, $f \in qpX(\mu)^p$ and $\|f\|_{qpX(\mu)^p} \leqslant \|f\|_{(qX(\mu))^p}$.

Let now $f \in qpX(\mu)^p$. In particular $f \in X(\mu)^p$ and so $|f|^p \in X(\mu)$. Consider $(f_j)_{j=1}^n \subset X(\mu)$ satisfying that $|f|^p = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^q \right)^{1/q}$ μ-a.e. Noting that $(|f_j|^{1/p})_{j=1}^n \subset X(\mu)^p$ and $|f| = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n (|f_j|^{1/p})^{qp} \right)^{1/qp}$ μ-a.e., we have that

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|f_j\|_{X(\mu)}^q \right)^{1/q} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \| |f_j|^{1/p} \|_{X(\mu)^p}^{qp} \right)^{1/q} \leqslant \|f\|_{qpX(\mu)^p}^p.$$

Then, $|f|^p \in qX(\mu)$ and $\| |f|^p \|_{qX(\mu)} \leqslant \|f\|_{qpX(\mu)^p}^p$. Hence, $f \in (qX(\mu))^p$ and $\|f\|_{(qX(\mu))^p} = \| |f|^p \|_{qX(\mu)}^{1/p} \leqslant \|f\|_{qpX(\mu)^p}$. ∎

3. OPTIMAL DOMAIN FOR (p,q)-POWER-CONCAVE OPERATORS

In this section we prove a factorization/optimal domain theorem for the class of (p,q)-power concave operators for Banach function spaces over σ-order continuous q-B.f. This result, together with the characterization of these operators, will allow to prove our representation theorem. As we will show, at least in the finite measure case, an operator is (p,q)-power concave if and only if it can be extended to a bigger Banach function space Z with p-th factorable extension in such a way that the inclusion $X \subseteq Z$ is q-concave. In this case, the space Z can be chosen to be p-convex. Recall that the word "inclusion" is not used here in the strict meaning. As we explained before, this is the reason why we use the symbol $[i]$ instead of i.

Let $X(\mu)$ be a σ-order continuous quasi-B.f.s. satisfying what we call the σ-property:

$$\Omega = \bigcup \Omega_n \quad \text{with } \chi_{\Omega_n} \in X(\mu) \text{ for all } n,$$

and let $T : X(\mu) \to E$ be a continuous linear operator with values in a Banach space E. We consider the δ-ring

$$\Sigma_{X(\mu)} = \{A \in \Sigma : \chi_A \in X(\mu)\}$$

and the vector measure $m_T : \Sigma_{X(\mu)} \to E$ given by $m_T(A) = T(\chi_A)$. Note that the σ-property of $X(\mu)$ guarantees that $\Sigma_{X(\mu)}^{\text{loc}} = \Sigma$ and since $\|m_T\| \ll \mu$ we have that $[i] : L^0(\mu) \to L^0(m_T)$ is well defined. Also note that a quasi-B.f.s. has the σ-property if and only if it contains a function $g > 0$ μ-a.e.

As an extension of Section 3 in [3] to quasi-B.f.s.', in [13] it is proved that $[i] : X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$ is well defined and $T = I_{m_T} \circ [i]$. Even more, $L^1(m_T)$ is the largest σ-order continuous quasi-B.f.s. with this property. That means, if $Z(\xi)$ is a σ-order continuous quasi-B.f.s. with $\xi \ll \mu$ and T factors as

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
X(\mu) & \xrightarrow{\quad T \quad} & E \\
{\scriptstyle [i]} \searrow & & \nearrow {\scriptstyle S} \\
 & Z(\xi) &
\end{array}
$$

with S being a continuous linear operator, then $[i] : Z(\xi) \to L^1(m_T)$ is well defined and $S = I_{m_T} \circ [i]$. In other words, $L^1(m_T)$ is the optimal domain to which T can be extended preserving continuity.

Let us now give a natural non-finite measure version of the so called p-th power factorable operators, which were developed for the first time in Section 5.1 of [24] for the case of finite measures. For $p \in (0, \infty)$, we say that T is a *p-th power factorable operator with a continuous extension* if there is a continuous linear extension of T to $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$, i.e. T factors as

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
X(\mu) & \xrightarrow{\quad T \quad} & E \\
{\scriptstyle i} \searrow & & \nearrow {\scriptstyle S} \\
 & X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) &
\end{array}
$$

for a continuous linear operator S.

Regarding this definition and having in mind Remark 2.3(ii), two standard cases must be considered whenever $\chi_\Omega \in X(\mu)$. If $0 < 1 < p$ we have that $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) = X(\mu)^{1/p}$, and then the definition of p-th power factorable operator with a continuous extension coincides with the one given in Definition 5.1 of [24]. However, if $p \leqslant 1$ we have that $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) = X(\mu)$ and so p-th power factorable operators with continuous extensions are just continuous operators.

The following result, which is proved in [13] in order to find the optimal domain for p-th power factorable operators, will be the starting point of our work in this section. The proof is an adaptation to our setting of the proof given in Theorem 5.7 of [24] for the case when μ is finite, $\chi_\Omega \in X(\mu)$ and $p \geqslant 1$.

THEOREM 3.1. *The following statements are equivalent:*
  (i) *T is p-th power factorable with a continuous extension.*
 (ii) *$[i] : X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$ is well defined.*
(iii) *$[i] : X(\mu) \to L^p(m_T) \cap L^1(m_T)$ is well defined.*
 (iv) *There exists $M > 0$ such that $\|Tf\|_E \leqslant M\|f\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p}+X(\mu)}$ for all $f \in X(\mu)$.*

Moreover, if (i)–(iv) *holds, the extension of T to $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$ coincides with the integration operator $I_{m_T} \circ [i]$.*

In a brief overview, (i) implies (ii) and the fact that the extension of T to $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$ is just $I_{m_T} \circ [i]$ follow from the optimality of $L^1(m_T)$. Indeed, by the results in [13] quoted above, $L^1(m_T)$ is the largest σ-order continuous quasi-B.f.s to which T can be extended, and so it must contain $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$; note that $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$ is σ-order continuous as $X(\mu)$ is so. The equivalence between (ii) and (iii) is a direct check. Statement (ii) implies (iv) since $[i] : X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$ is continuous (as it is positive) and $T = I_{m_T} \circ [i]$. Finally, (iv) implies (i) is based on a standard argument which uses the approximation of a measurable function through functions in $X(\mu)$ (possible by the σ-property) to construct an extension of T to $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$. For a detailed proof of Theorem 3.1, see [13], where moreover it is proved that if T is p-th power factorable with a continuous extension then $L^p(m_T) \cap L^1(m_T)$ is the optimal domain to which T can be extended preserving this property.

Now, let us go to the new results on optimal domains. We consider the following property stronger than p-th power factorable and look for its optimal domain.

For $p, q \in (0, \infty)$, we say that T is (p, q)-*power-concave* if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|T(f_j)\|_E^{q/p} \right)^{p/q} \leqslant C \left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^{q/p} \right)^{p/q} \right\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p}+X(\mu)}$$

for every finite subset $(f_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X(\mu)$. If $\chi_\Omega \in X(\mu)$ and $p \geqslant 1$ we have that $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) = X(\mu)^{1/p}$, and then our definition of (p, q)-power-concave operator coincides with the one given in Definition 6.1 of [24].

REMARK 3.2. The following statements hold:

(i) A $(1, q)$-power-concave operator is just a q-concave operator.

(ii) If T is (p, q)-power-concave then T is (q/p)-concave, as $X(\mu) \subset X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$ continuously.

(iii) If $\chi_\Omega \in X(\mu)$ and $0 < p < 1$, since $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) = X(\mu)$, we have that (p, q)-power-concavity coincides with (q/p)-concavity.

(iv) If T is (p, q)-power-concave then T is p-th power factorable with a continuous extension. Indeed, the (p, q)-power-concave inequality applied to a unique function is just the item (iv) of Theorem 3.1

As we will see in the next result, (p, q)-power-concavity is closely related to the following property. We say that T is *p-th power factorable with a q-concave extension* if there exists a q-concave linear extension of T to $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$, i.e. T factors as

$$X(\mu) \xrightarrow{\quad T \quad} E$$

$$i \qquad\qquad S$$

$$X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$$

with S being a q-concave linear operator. In this case, one checks directly that T is q-concave.

THEOREM 3.3. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *T is (p, q)-power-concave.*

(ii) *T is p-th power factorable with a (q/p)-concave extension.*

(iii) *$[i] : X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$ is well defined and (q/p)-concave.*

(iv) *$[i] : X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$ is well defined and (q/p)-concave, and $[i] : X(\mu) \to L^p(m_T)$ is well defined and q-concave.*

(v) *$[i] : X(\mu) \to (q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T)$ is well defined.*

Moreover, if (i)–(v) *holds, the extension of T to $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$ coincides with the integration operator $I_{m_T} \circ [i]$.*

Proof. First note that $(q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T)$ is σ-order continuous as a consequence of Proposition 2.4.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) From Remark 3.2(iv) we have that T is p-th power factorable with a continuous extension. Let $S : X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) \to E$ be a continuous linear operator extending T. We are going to see that S is (q/p)-concave. Since T is (p, q)-power-concave and $S = T$ on $X(\mu)$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^n \|S(f_j)\|_E^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \leqslant C \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \Big\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p}+X(\mu)}$$

for any finite subset $(f_j)_{j=1}^n \subset X(\mu)$. Consider $(f_j)_{j=1}^n \subset X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$ with $f_j \geqslant 0$ μ-a.e. for all j. The σ-property of $X(\mu)$ allows to find for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$ a sequence $(h_k^j) \subset X(\mu)$ such that $0 \leqslant h_k^j \uparrow f_j$ μ-a.e. as $k \to \infty$ (see [13] for the details). For every k, we have that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^n \|S(h_k^j)\|_E^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \leqslant C \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n |h_k^j|^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \Big\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p}+X(\mu)}$$

$$\leqslant C \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \Big\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p}+X(\mu)}.$$

On the other hand, since $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$ is σ-order continuous, it follows that $h_k^j \to f_j$ in $X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$ as $k \to \infty$, and so $S(h_k^j) \to S(f_j)$ in E as $k \to \infty$. Hence, taking limit as $k \to \infty$ in the above inequality, it follows that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^n \|S(f_j)\|_E^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \leqslant C \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \Big\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p}+X(\mu)}.$$

For a general $(f_j)_{j=1}^n \subset X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$, write $f_j = f_j^+ - f_j^-$ where f_j^+ and f_j^- are the positive and negative parts respectively of each f_j. By using inequality (2.4)

and denoting $\alpha_{p,q} = \max\{1, 2^{1-(p/q)}\}$, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|S(f_j)\|_E^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} &\leqslant \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} (\|S(f_j^+)\|_E + \|S(f_j^-)\|_E)^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \\
&\leqslant \alpha_{p,q} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|S(f_j^+)\|_E^{q/p} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|S(f_j^-)\|_E^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \\
&\leqslant \alpha_{p,q}\, C \, \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j^+|^{q/p} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j^-|^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \Big\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)} \\
&= \alpha_{p,q}\, C \, \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \Big\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)}
\end{aligned}
$$

(for the last equality note that $|f_j|^{q/p} = |f_j^+|^{q/p} + |f_j^-|^{q/p}$ as f_j^+ and f_j^- have disjoint support).

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) Since T is p-th power factorable with a (q/p)-concave (and so continuous) extension, from Theorem 3.1, the map $[i] : X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$ is well defined. Let $S : X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) \to E$ be a (q/p)-concave linear operator extending T. Note that $S = I_{m_T} \circ [i]$ (Theorem 3.1). Denote by C the (q/p)-concavity constant of S. Consider $(f_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$ and fix $\varepsilon > 0$. For each j, by (2.5), we can take $\varphi_j \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma_{X(\mu)})$ such that $|\varphi_j| \leqslant 1$ and

$$
\|f_j\|_{L^1(m_T)} \leqslant \Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{2^j} \Big)^{p/q} + \|I_{m_T}(f_j \varphi_j)\|_E.
$$

Since $f_j \varphi_j \in X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)$ as $|f_j \varphi_j| \leqslant |f_j|$, then $I_{m_T}(f_j \varphi_j) = S(f_j \varphi_j)$. So, by using inequality (2.4) and the (q/p)-concavity of S, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|f_j\|_{L^1(m_T)}^{q/p} &\leqslant \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Big(\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{2^j} \Big)^{p/q} + \|S(f_j \varphi_j)\|_E \Big)^{q/p} \\
&\leqslant \max\{1, 2^{(q/p)-1}\} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\varepsilon}{2^j} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|S(f_j \varphi_j)\|_E^{q/p} \Big) \\
&\leqslant \max\{1, 2^{(q/p)-1}\} \Big(\varepsilon + C^{q/p} \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j \varphi_j|^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \Big\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)}^{q/p} \Big) \\
&\leqslant \max\{1, 2^{(q/p)-1}\} \Big(\varepsilon + C^{q/p} \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \Big\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)}^{q/p} \Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we obtain

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|f_j\|_{L^1(m_T)}^{q/p} \leqslant C^{q/p} \max\{1, 2^{(q/p)-1}\} \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |f_j|^{q/p} \Big)^{p/q} \Big\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu)}^{q/p}
$$

and so

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\|f_j\|_{L^1(m_T)}^{q/p}\Big)^{p/q} \leqslant C \max\{1, 2^{1-(p/q)}\}\Big\|\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n}|f_j|^{q/p}\Big)^{p/q}\Big\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p}+X(\mu)}.$$

Hence, $[i]: X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$ is (q/p)-concave.

(iii) ⇔ (iv) From Theorem 3.1, we have that $[i] : X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$ is well defined if and only if $[i] : X(\mu) \to L^p(m_T) \cap L^1(m_T)$ is well defined, which is equivalent to $[i] : X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$ and $[i] : X(\mu) \to L^p(m_T)$ well defined. By Lemma 2.5 we have that $[i] : X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$ is (q/p)-concave if and only if $[i] : X(\mu)^{1/p} \to L^1(m_T)$ and $[i] : X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$ are (q/p)-concave. On the other hand, it is straightforward to verify that $[i] : X(\mu)^{1/p} \to L^1(m_T)$ is (q/p)-concave if and only if $[i] : X(\mu) \to L^p(m_T)$ is q-concave.

(iv) ⇔ (v) follows from Proposition 2.8.

(iii) ⇒ (i) Denote by C the (q/p)-concavity constant of $[i] : X(\mu)^{1/p} + X(\mu) \to L^1(m_T)$. Consider $(f_j)_{j=1}^{n} \subset X(\mu)$ and note that $f_j \in L^1(m_T)$ with $I_{m_T}(f_j) = T(f_j)$ for all j. Then,

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\|T(f_j)\|_E^{q/p}\Big)^{p/q} = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\|I_{m_T}(f_j)\|_E^{q/p}\Big)^{p/q} \leqslant \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\|f_j\|_{L^1(m_T)}^{q/p}\Big)^{p/q}$$

$$\leqslant C\Big\|\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n}|f_j|^{q/p}\Big)^{p/q}\Big\|_{X(\mu)^{1/p}+X(\mu)}. \qquad \blacksquare$$

Note that $qL^p(m_T) = ((q/p)L^1(m_T))^p$ (see Proposition 2.9). In particular, in the case when T is (p,q)-power-concave and $\chi_\Omega \in X(\mu)$ (so $\chi_\Omega \in (q/p)L^1(m_T)$), from Remark 2.3(ii) it follows that $(q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T) = qL^p(m_T)$ if $p \geqslant 1$ and $(q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T) = (q/p)L^1(m_T)$ if $0 < p < 1$.

THEOREM 3.4. *Suppose that T is (p,q)-power-concave. Then, T factors as*

(3.1)

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
X(\mu) & \xrightarrow{\quad T \quad} & E \\
{\scriptstyle[i]}\searrow & & \nearrow{\scriptstyle I_{m_T}} \\
& (q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T) &
\end{array}
$$

with I_{m_T} being (p,q)-power-concave. Moreover, the factorization is optimal in the following sense: if $Z(\xi)$ is a σ-order continuous quasi-B.f.s. such that $\xi \ll \mu$ and

(3.2)

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
X(\mu) & \xrightarrow{\quad T \quad} & E \\
{\scriptstyle[i]}\searrow & & \nearrow{\scriptstyle S} \\
& Z(\xi) &
\end{array}
$$

with S being a (p,q)-power-concave linear operator then we have that $[i] : Z(\xi) \to (q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T)$ is well defined and $S = I_{m_T} \circ [i]$.

Proof. The factorization (3.1) follows from Theorem 3.3. The space

$$(q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T)$$

is σ-order continuous as noted before and satisfies the σ-property as $X(\mu)$ does. Since $I_{m_T} : (q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T) \to E$ is continuous (as $I_{m_T} : L^1(m_T) \to E$ is so), we can apply Theorem 3.3 to see that it is (p,q)-power-concave. Note that $\Sigma_{X(\mu)} \subset \Sigma_{(q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T)}$ and $m_{I_{m_T}}(A) = I_{m_T}(\chi_A) = T(\chi_A) = m_T(A)$ for all $A \in \Sigma_{X(\mu)}$. That is, m_T is the restriction of $m_{I_{m_T}} : \Sigma_{(q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T)} \to E$ to $\Sigma_{X(\mu)}$. From Lemma 3 of [3], it follows that $L^1(m_{I_{m_T}}) = L^1(m_T)$. Then,

$$[i] : (q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T) \to (q/p)L^1(m_{I_{m_T}}) \cap qL^p(m_{I_{m_T}})$$

is well defined as $(q/p)L^1(m_{I_{m_T}}) \cap qL^p(m_{I_{m_T}}) = (q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T)$.

Let $Z(\xi)$ satisfy (3.2). In particular, $Z(\xi)$ has the σ-property. From Theorem 3.3 applied to the operator $S : Z(\xi) \to E$, we have that $[i] : Z(\xi) \to (q/p)L^1(m_S) \cap qL^p(m_S)$ is well defined and $S = I_{m_S} \circ [i]$. Since $\Sigma_{X(\mu)} \subset \Sigma_{Z(\xi)}$ and $m_S(A) = S(\chi_A) = T(\chi_A) = m_T(A)$ for all $A \in \Sigma_{X(\mu)}$ (i.e. m_T is the restriction of

$$m_S : \Sigma_{Z(\xi)} \to E$$

to $\Sigma_{X(\mu)}$), from Lemma 3 of [3], it follows that $L^1(m_S) = L^1(m_T)$ and $I_{m_S} = I_{m_T}$. Therefore,

$$[i] : Z(\xi) \to (q/p)L^1(m_S) \cap qL^p(m_S) = (q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T)$$

is well defined and $S = I_{m_S} \circ [i] = I_{m_T} \circ [i]$.   ∎

We can rewrite Theorem 3.4 in terms of optimal domains.

COROLLARY 3.5. *Suppose that T is (p,q)-power-concave. Then $(q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T)$ is the largest σ-order continuous quasi-B.f.s. to which T can be extended as a (p,q)-power-concave operator still with values in E. Moreover, the extension of T to the space $(q/p)L^1(m_T) \cap qL^p(m_T)$ is given by the integration operator I_{m_T}.*

Recalling that $(1,q)$-power-concave operators coincide with q-concave operators, we obtain the following result, that is already well-known, as a particular case of our construction. The reader can find arguments that implicitly prove our result in the paper by Reisner [28] (Proposition 5, Lemma 6). Indeed, the space M appearing in the factorization of Proposition 5 in that paper is q-concave. A look at how it is defined makes clear that it is also optimal, since any other q-concave factorization space is included in it. We notice also that the result itself can be directly deduced from Theorem 1 and Proposition 2 in [27] for the class of Banach lattices. The space $qL^1(m_T)$ provides an explicit representation of the factorization space appearing in these results as a space of integrable functions.

COROLLARY 3.6. *Suppose that T is q-concave. Then $qL^1(m_T)$ is the largest σ-order continuous quasi-B.f.s. to which T can be extended as a q-concave operator still*

with values in E. Moreover, the extension of T to $qL^1(m_T)$ is given by the integration operator I_{m_T}.

To end this section we give a direct application related to the Maurey–Rosenthal factorization of q-concave operators defined on a q-convex quasi-B.f.s. In the case when T is q-concave, the integration operator I_{m_T} extends T to the space $qL^1(m_T)$ by Corollary 3.6. Note that the map $[i] : X(\mu) \rightarrow qL^1(m_T)$ is q-concave as it is continuous and $qL^1(m_T)$ is q-concave. From a variant of the Maurey–Rosenthal theorem proved in Corollary 5 of [9], under some extra conditions, if $X(\mu)$ is q-convex then $[i] : X(\mu) \rightarrow qL^1(m_T)$ factors through the space $L^q(\mu)$. So, we obtain the following improvement of the usual factorization of q-concave operators on q-convex quasi-B.f.s.'.

COROLLARY 3.7. *Let $1 \leqslant q < \infty$. Assume that μ is σ-finite and that $X(\mu)$ is q-convex and has the σ-Fatou property. If T is q-concave then it can be factored as*

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
X(\mu) & \xrightarrow{\;\;\;T\;\;\;} & E \\
{\scriptstyle M_g}\Big\downarrow & & \Big\uparrow{\scriptstyle I_{m_T}} \\
L^q(\mu) & \underset{M_{g^{-1}}}{\dashrightarrow} & qL^1(m_T)
\end{array}
$$

for positive multiplication operators M_g and $M_{g^{-1}}$. The converse is also true.

4. VECTOR MEASURE REPRESENTATION OF q-CONCAVE BANACH LATTICES

In this last section we show our characterization of the class of Banach lattices which are p-convex and q-concave in terms of spaces of integrable functions with respect to a vector measure. For $1 < p$, it is known that order continuous p-convex Banach lattices with p-convexity constant equal to 1 can be order isometrically represented as spaces L^p of a vector measure defined on a δ-ring (see Theorem 10 of [5]). We will see that the addition of the q-concavity property to the represented Banach lattice translates to adding some concavity property to the corresponding integration map. For the aim of clarity, we will assume in all this section that *the p-convexity constants of the p-convex lattices appearing are* 1; this is not a real restriction to our results, since it is well-known that each p-convex Banach lattice can be renormed with a Banach lattice norm for which the space has p-convexity constant equal to 1 (see Proposition 1.d.8 of [19]).

First let us show two results concerning concavity for the integration operator of a vector measure which will be needed later.

Let $m : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow E$ be a vector measure defined on a δ-ring $\mathcal{R}$ of subsets of Ω and with values in a Banach space E.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *The integration operator $I_m : L^1(m) \rightarrow E$ is q-concave if and only if $L^1(m)$ is q-concave.*

Proof. Suppose that $I_m : L^1(m) \to E$ is q-concave and denote by C its q-concavity constant. Take $(f_j)_{j=1}^n \subset L^1(m)$ and $(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^n \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R})$ with $|\varphi_j| \leqslant 1$ for all j. Since $(f_j \varphi_j)_{j=1}^n \subset L^1(m)$, as $|f_j \varphi_j| \leqslant |f_j|$ for all j, we have that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^n \|I_m(f_j \varphi_j)\|_E^q \Big)^{1/q} \leqslant C \left\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j \varphi_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^1(m)} \leqslant C \left\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^1(m)}.$$

Taking supremum for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$ over all $\varphi_j \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{R})$ with $|\varphi_j| \leqslant 1$, from (2.5), if follows that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^n \|f_j\|_{L^1(m)}^q \Big)^{1/q} \leqslant C \left\| \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n |f_j|^q \Big)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^1(m)}.$$

The converse is obvious as I_m is continuous. ∎

Direct useful consequences can be deduced of the fact that the integration map $I_m : L^1(m) \to E$ is q-concave. Assume that m is defined on a σ-algebra and note that q-concavity for $q \geqslant 1$ always implies $(q, 1)$-concavity (see the definition for instance in p. 61 of [25]). Thus, by Proposition 7.9 of [25], if I_m is q-concave for $q \geqslant 1$ then it is *weakly completely continuous* (i.e. it maps weak Cauchy sequences into weakly convergent sequences). Moreover, this implies that $L^1(m)$ coincides with the space $L_w^1(m)$ and so it has the σ-Fatou property.

In the case when $\chi_\Omega \in L^1(m)$ (for instance if m is defined on a σ-algebra), we obtain a further result regarding (p, q)-power-concave operators.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *Suppose that $\chi_\Omega \in L^1(m)$ and $p \geqslant 1$. The integration operator $I_m : L^p(m) \to E$ is (p, q)-power-concave if and only if $L^p(m)$ is q-concave.*

Proof. First note that under the hypothesis it follows that $L^p(m)$ has the σ-property (in fact $\chi_\Omega \in L^p(m)$) and $L^p(m) \subset L^1(m)$. So, $I_m : L^p(m) \to E$ is well defined and continuous.

Suppose that $I_m : L^p(m) \to E$ is (p, q)-power-concave. From Theorem 3.3, we have that $[i] : L^p(m) \to (q/p)L^1(m_{I_m}) \cap qL^p(m_{I_m})$ is well defined. Note that $(\mathcal{R}^{loc})_{L^p(m)} = \mathcal{R}^{loc}$ and so m_{I_m} coincides with m_{χ_Ω} (see Preliminaries). Then, $L^1(m_{I_m}) = L^1(m)$ and so

$$L^p(m) \subset (q/p)L^1(m) \cap qL^p(m) \subset qL^p(m).$$

Hence, $L^p(m)$ is q-concave as $L^p(m) = qL^p(m)$.

Suppose now that $L^p(m)$ is q-concave. Then, it is direct to check that $L^1(m)$ is (q/p)-concave. Since $L^p(m) \subset L^1(m)$, the integration operator $I_m : L^1(m) \to E$ is continuous and $(L^p(m))^{1/p} + L^p(m) = L^1(m)$, it follows that $I_m : L^p(m) \to E$ satisfies the inequality of the definition of (p, q)-power-concave operator. ∎

Let us go now to the representation of q-concave Banach lattices as spaces of integrable functions. We begin by considering B.f.s.'.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $p, q \in (0, \infty)$ and let $Z(\xi)$ be a q-concave B.f.s. which is also p-convex in the case when $p > 1$. Then, $Z(\xi)$ coincides with the space $L^p(m)$ of a Banach space valued vector measure $m : \mathcal{R} \to E$ defined on a δ-ring whose integration operator $I_m : L^1(m) \to E$ is (q/p)-concave. Moreover, if $\chi_\Omega \in Z(\xi)$, the vector measure m is defined on a σ-algebra.*

Proof. Note that if $p \leqslant 1$ then $Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ is a B.f.s. (see Remark 2.3(iv)). In the case when $p > 1$, renorming $Z(\xi)$ if it is necessary, we can assume that the p-convexity constant of $Z(\xi)$ is equal to 1 (see Proposition 1.d.8 of [19]), and so $Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ is a B.f.s. (see Remark 2.3(v)). Consider the δ-ring $\Sigma_{Z(\xi)} = \{A \in \Sigma : \chi_A \in Z(\xi)\}$ and the finitely additive set function $m : \Sigma_{Z(\xi)} \to Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ given by $m(A) = \chi_A$. Since $Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ is σ-order continuous, as $Z(\xi)$ is so by Proposition 2.4, it follows that m is a vector measure. Let us see that $L^1(m) = Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ with equal norms and so we will have that $Z(\xi)$ coincides with $L^p(m)$. For $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma_{Z(\xi)})$ we have that $\varphi \in Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ and $I_m(\varphi) = \varphi$. Moreover, since m is positive,

$$(4.1) \qquad \|\varphi\|_{L^1(m)} = \|I_m(|\varphi|)\|_{Z(\xi)^{1/p}} = \|\varphi\|_{Z(\xi)^{1/p}}.$$

In particular, by taking $\varphi = \chi_A$, we obtain that $\|m\|$ is equivalent to ξ. Given $f \in L^1(m)$, since $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma_{Z(\xi)})$ is dense in $L^1(m)$, we can take $(\varphi_n) \subset \mathcal{S}(\Sigma_{Z(\xi)})$ such that $\varphi_n \to f$ in $L^1(m)$ and m-a.e. From (4.1), we have that (φ_n) is a Cauchy sequence in $Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ and so there is $h \in Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ such that $\varphi_n \to h$ in $Z(\xi)^{1/p}$. Taking a subsequence $\varphi_{n_j} \to h$ ξ-a.e. we see that $f = h \in Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ and

$$\|f\|_{Z(\xi)^{1/p}} = \lim \|\varphi_n\|_{Z(\xi)^{1/p}} = \lim \|\varphi_n\|_{L^1(m)} = \|f\|_{L^1(m)}.$$

Let now $f \in Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ and take $(\varphi_n) \subset \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ such that $0 \leqslant \varphi_n \uparrow |f|$. For any n, writing $\varphi_n = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_j \chi_{A_j}$ with $(A_j)_{j=1}^{m}$ being pairwise disjoint and $\alpha_j > 0$ for all j, we see that $\chi_{A_j} \leqslant \alpha_j^{-1/p} |f|^{1/p}$ and so $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma_{Z(\xi)})$. On the other hand, since $Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ is σ-order continuous, we have that $\varphi_n \to f$ in $Z(\xi)^{1/p}$. From (4.1), we have that (φ_n) is a Cauchy sequence in $L^1(m)$ and so there is $h \in L^1(m)$ such that $\varphi_n \to h$ in $L^1(m)$. Taking a subsequence $\varphi_{n_j} \to h$ m-a.e. we see that $f = h \in L^1(m)$.

Hence, $L^1(m) = Z(\xi)^{1/p}$ with equal norms and, since $Z(\xi)$ is q-concave, it follows that $L^1(m)$ is (q/p)-concave. From Proposition 4.1, the integration operator $I_m : L^1(m) \to E$ is (q/p)-concave.

Note that if $\chi_\Omega \in Z(\xi)$, then $\Sigma_{Z(\xi)} = \Sigma$ and so m is defined on a σ-algebra. ∎

For the final result we need some concepts related to Banach lattices. The definitions of p-convexity, q-concavity and σ-order continuity for Banach lattices are the same that for B.f.s.'. A Banach lattice F is said to be *order continuous* if for every downwards directed system $(x_\tau) \subset F$ with $x_\tau \downarrow 0$ it follows that $\|x_\tau\|_F \downarrow 0$

and is said to be *σ-complete* if every order bounded sequence in F has a supremum. A Banach lattice which is $σ$-order continuous and $σ$-complete at the same time is order continuous, see Proposition 1.a.8 of [19]. A *weak unit* of a Banach lattice F is an element $0 \leqslant e \in F$ such that $\inf\{x, e\} = 0$ implies $x = 0$. An operator $T : F_1 \to F_2$ between Banach lattices is said to be an *order isometry* if it is linear, one to one, onto, $\|Tx\|_{F_2} = \|x\|_{F_1}$ for all $x \in F_1$ and $T(\inf\{x, y\}) = \inf\{Tx, Ty\}$ for all $x, y \in F_1$. In particular, an order isometry is a positive operator. So, by using Proposition 1.d.9 of [19], it is direct to check that every order isometry preserves p-convexity and q-concavity whenever $p, q \geqslant 1$.

THEOREM 4.4. *Let* $p, q \in [1, \infty)$ *and let* F *be a Banach lattice. The following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *F is q-concave and p-convex.*

(ii) *F is order isometric to a space* $L^p(m)$ *of a Banach space valued vector measure* $m : \mathcal{R} \to E$ *defined on a δ-ring whose integration operator* $I_m : L^1(m) \to E$ *is* (q/p)-*concave.*

Moreover, (i) *holds with F having a weak unit if and only if* (ii) *holds with m defined on a σ-algebra. In this last case* $I_m : L^p(m) \to E$ *is* (p, q)-*power-concave.*

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) Since F is q-concave, it satisfies a lower q-estimate (see Definition 1.f.4 of [19]) and then it is $σ$-complete and $σ$-order continuous (see the proof of Proposition 1.f.5 of [19]). So, F is order continuous. From Theorem 5 of [12] we have that F is order isometric to a space $L^1(\nu)$ of a Banach space valued vector measure ν defined on a δ-ring. Then, $L^1(\nu)$ is a B.f.s. satisfying the conditions of Proposition 4.3 and so $L^1(\nu) = L^p(m)$ with $m : \mathcal{R} \to E$ being a vector measure defined on a δ-ring $\mathcal{R}$ and with values in a Banach space E, whose integration operator $I_m : L^1(m) \to E$ is (q/p)-concave.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) Since $L^p(m)$ is p-convex (Remark 2.3(iii)) and q-concave (as $L^1(m)$ is (q/p)-concave by Proposition 4.1), F also is.

Now suppose that (i) holds with F having a weak unit. From Theorem 8 of [6] we have that F is order isometric to a space $L^1(\nu)$ of a Banach space valued vector measure ν defined on a $σ$-algebra. Since $\chi_\Omega \in L^1(\nu)$, from Proposition 4.3 we have that (ii) holds with m defined on a $σ$-algebra.

Conversely, if (ii) holds with m defined on a $σ$-algebra then $\chi_\Omega \in L^p(m)$ (as $\chi_\Omega \in L^1(m)$). So, the image of χ_Ω by the order isometry is a weak unit in F. Moreover, from Proposition 4.2 it follows that $I_m : L^p(m) \to E$ is (p, q)-power-concave. ∎

In particular, from Theorem 4.4 we obtain that a Banach lattice is q-concave (with $q \geqslant 1$) if and only if it is order isometric to a space $L^1(m)$ of a vector measure m with a q-concave integration operator.

REFERENCES

[1] C. BENNETT, R. SHARPLEY, *Interpolation of Operators*, Academic Press, Boston 1988.

[2] J.K. BROOKS, N. DINCULEANU, Strong additivity, absolute continuity and compactness in spaces of measures, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **45**(1974), 156–175.

[3] J.M. CALABUIG, O. DELGADO, E.A. SÁNCHEZ PÉREZ, Factorizing operators on Banach function spaces through spaces of multiplication operators, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **364**(2010), 88–103.

[4] J.M. CALABUIG, O. DELGADO, M.A. JUAN, E.A. SÁNCHEZ PÉREZ, On the Banach lattice structure of L^1_w of a vector measure on a δ-ring, *Collect. Math.* **65**(2014), 67–85.

[5] J.M. CALABUIG, M.A. JUAN, E.A. SÁNCHEZ PÉREZ, Spaces of p-integrable functions with respect to a vector measure defined on a δ-ring, *Oper. Matrices* **6**(2012), 241–262.

[6] G.P. CURBERA, Operators into L^1 of a vector measure and applications to Banach lattices, *Math. Ann.* **293**(1992), 317–330.

[7] G.P. CURBERA, W.J. RICKER, Banach lattices with the Fatou property and optimal domains of kernel operators, *Indag. Math. (N.S.)* **17**(2006), 187–204.

[8] G.P. CURBERA, W.J. RICKER, The Fatou property in p-convex Banach lattices, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **328**(2007), 287–294.

[9] A. DEFANT, Variants of the Maurey–Rosenthal theorem for quasi Köthe function spaces, *Positivity* **5**(2001), 153–175.

[10] A. DEFANT, E.A. SÁNCHEZ PÉREZ, Maurey–Rosenthal factorization of positive operators and convexity, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **297**(2004), 771–790.

[11] O. DELGADO, L^1-spaces of vector measures defined on δ-rings, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **84**(2005), 432–443.

[12] O. DELGADO, M.A. JUAN, Representation of Banach lattices as L^1_w spaces of a vector measure defined on a δ-ring, *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin* **19**(2012), 239–256.

[13] O. DELGADO, E.A. SÁNCHEZ PÉREZ, Optimal extensions for p-th power factorable operators, *Mediterr. J. Math.* **13**(2016), 4281–4303.

[14] A. FERNÁNDEZ, F. MAYORAL, F. NARANJO, C. SÁEZ, E.A. SÁNCHEZ PÉREZ, Spaces of p-integrable functions with respect to a vector measure, *Positivity* **10**(2006), 1–16.

[15] M.A. JUAN, E.A. SÁNCHEZ PÉREZ, Maurey–Rosenthal domination for abstract Banach lattices, *J. Inequal. Appl.* **2013:213**(2013), 1–12.

[16] N.J. KALTON, N.T. PECK, J.W. ROBERTS, *An F-Space Sampler*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes, vol. 89, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1985.

[17] J.L. KRIVINE, *Théorèmes de factorisation dans les espaces réticulés*, Séminaire Maurey–Schwartz 1973–1974: Espaces L^p, applications radonifiantes et géométrie des espaces de Banach, Exp. Nos. 22 et 23, Centre de Math., École Polytech., Paris 1974.

[18] D.R. Lewis, On integrability and summability in vector spaces, *Illinois J. Math.* **16** (1972), 294–307.

[19] J. Lindenstrauss, L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach Spaces*, Vol. II, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1979.

[20] W.A.J. Luxemburg, A.C. Zaanen, *Riesz Spaces*. I, North-Holland, Amsterdam 1971.

[21] L. Maligranda, Type, cotype and convexity properties of quasi-Banach spaces, in *Banach and Function Spaces*, Yokohama Publ., Yokohama 2004, pp. 83–120.

[22] P.R. Masani, H. Niemi, The integration theory of Banach space valued measures and the Tonelli–Fubini theorems. I. Scalar–valued measures on δ-rings, *Adv. Math.* **73**(1989), 204–241.

[23] P.R. Masani, H. Niemi, The integration theory of Banach space valued measures and the Tonelli–Fubini theorems. II. Pettis integration, *Adv. Math.* **75**(1989), 121–167.

[24] S. Okada, W.J. Ricker, E.A. Sánchez Pérez, *Optimal Domain and Integral Extension of Operators Acting in Function Spaces*, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., vol. 180, Birkhäuser, Basel 2008.

[25] S. Okada, W.J. Ricker, E.A. Sánchez Pérez, Lattice copies of c_0 and ℓ^∞ in spaces of integrable functions for a vector measure, *Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.)* **500**(2014).

[26] G. Pisier, Some applications of the complex interpolation method to Banach lattices, *J. Anal. Math.* **35**(1979), 264–281.

[27] Y. Raynaud, P. Tradacete, Interpolation of Banach lattices and factorization of p-convex and q-concave operators, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* **66**(2010), 79–112.

[28] S. Reisner, Operators which factor through convex Banach lattices, *Canad. J. Math* **32**(1980), 1482–1500.

[29] S. Reisner, A factorization theorem in Banach lattices and its application to Lorentz spaces, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **31**(1981), 239–255.

[30] E.A. Sánchez Pérez, P. Tradacete, Bartle–Dunford–Schwartz integration for positive vector measures and representation of quasi-Banach lattices, *J. Nonlin. Convex Anal.* **17**(2016), 387–402.

[31] A.C. Zaanen, *Riesz Spaces*. II, North-Holland, Amsterdam 1983.

Olvido Delgado, Departamento de Matemática Aplicada I, E. T. S. de Ingeniería de Edificación, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla, 41012, Spain
E-mail address: olvido@us.es

Enrique A. Sánchez Pérez, Instituto Universitario de Matemática Pura y Aplicada, Universitat Politècnica de València, Valencia, 46022, Spain
E-mail address: easancpe@mat.upv.es