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Let $T: X_{1} \rightarrow Y_{1}$ and $S: X_{2} \rightarrow Y_{2}$ be two continuous linear operators between Banach function spaces related to a finite measure space. Under some lattice requirements on the spaces involved, we give characterizations by means of inequalities of when $T$ can be strongly factorized through $S$, that is, $T=M_{g} \circ S \circ M_{f}$ with $M_{f}: X_{1} \rightarrow X_{2}$ and $M_{g}: Y_{2} \rightarrow Y_{1}$ being multiplication operators defined by some measurable functions $f$ and $g$. In particular, we study the cases when $S$ is a composition operator or a kernel operator.
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## 1. Introduction

Let $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ be a finite measure space and consider two continuous linear operators $T: X_{1} \rightarrow Y_{1}$ and $S: X_{2} \rightarrow Y_{2}$ between Banach function spaces related to $\mu$. The aim of this paper is to study when it is possible to factorize $T$ through $S$ as $T=M_{g} \circ S \circ M_{f}$ where $M_{f}: X_{1} \rightarrow X_{2}$ and $M_{g}: Y_{2} \rightarrow Y_{1}$ are multiplication operators defined by measurable functions $f$ and $g$. This type of factorization is called strong factorization for $T$, see for instance [16, Section III.H.§9]. There are many classical results relating inequalities for operators and factorizations, as the well known ones coming from the Maurey-Rosenthal cycle of ideas which allow to associate some convexity/concavity inequalities for operators with strong factorizations through $L^{p}$-spaces, see for instance [16, Proposition III.H.10] and
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[5, 6, 7]. In these results, the operator $S$ appearing in the factorization of $T$ is constructed from the inequality satisfied by $T$. In the present paper we are interested in analyzing the factorization of $T$ through a specifically given operator $S$. Our main results establish that, under some lattice type requirements on the spaces involved, mainly order continuity, a factorization for $T$ as $M_{g} \circ S \circ M_{f}$ is equivalent to a domination of $T$ by $S$ (Theorem 4.1) or by its transpose operator $S^{\prime}$ (Theorem 4.2). Section 5 is devoted to one of these requirements, namely we give conditions under which a product space is order continuous (Proposition 5.2). The proof of Theorem 4.2 uses a Radon-Nikodým Theorem for vector measures which characterizes when, for two vector measures $n, m: \Sigma \rightarrow E$ with values in a Banach space $E$, there exists a bounded function $h$ such that $n(A)=\int_{A} h d m$ for all $A \in \Sigma$. This Radon-Nikodým Theorem was proved by Musiał in [13, Theorem 1] by using a Ryll-Nardzewski lemma. In Section 3 we provide a simple proof of this characterization which is based in a completely different fundamental tool, a separation argument based on Ky Fan's Lemma.

We end the paper by studying in Section 6 the particular cases when $S$ is a composition operator or a kernel operator. In the first case, we added a new equivalent condition for $T$ to be strongly factorized through $S$ (Theorem 6.1), which involves a generalization of the concept of local operator (see for instance [1, Definition 2.2]).

## 2. Basic concepts and notation

We give in this section some basic definitions and results on Banach function spaces and vector measures which will be used along this paper. Let $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ be a finite measure space and $L^{0}(\mu)$ denote the space of all measurable real functions on $\Omega$, where functions which are equal $\mu$-a.e. are identified. As usual, $L^{\infty}(\mu)$ will denote the space of functions in $L^{0}(\mu)$ which are bounded $\mu$-a.e. By Banach function space (briefly B.f.s.) we will mean a Banach space $X \subset L^{0}(\mu)$ with norm $\|\cdot\|_{X}$ such that if $f \in L^{0}(\mu), g \in X$ and $|f| \leq|g| \mu$-a.e. then $f \in X$ and $\|f\|_{X} \leq\|g\|_{X}$. Note that every B.f.s. is a Banach lattice with the pointwise $\mu$-a.e. order. A B.f.s. $X$ has the Fatou property if for every sequence $\left(f_{n}\right) \subset X$ such that $0 \leq f_{n} \uparrow f$ $\mu$-a.e. and $\sup _{n}\left\|f_{n}\right\|_{X}<\infty$, it follows that $f \in X$ and $\left\|f_{n}\right\|_{X} \uparrow\|f\|_{X}$. We will say that $X$ is order continuous if for every $f, f_{n} \in X$ such that $0 \leq f_{n} \uparrow f \mu$-a.e., we have that $f_{n} \rightarrow f$ in norm. For issues related to B.f.s.', see [17, Ch. 15] considering the function norm $\rho$ defined as $\rho(f)=\|f\|_{X}$ if $f \in X$ and $\rho(f)=\infty$ in other case.
Given two B.f.s.' $X$ and $Y$, the space of multipliers from $X$ to $Y$ is defined as

$$
X^{Y}=\left\{h \in L^{0}(\mu): h f \in Y \text { for all } f \in X\right\} .
$$

The map $\|\cdot\|_{X^{Y}}$ given by $\|h\|_{X^{Y}}=\sup _{f \in B_{X}}\|h f\|_{Y}$ for all $h \in X^{Y}$, where $B_{X}$ is the open unit ball of $X$, defines a natural seminorm on $X^{Y}$ which becomes a norm only in the case when $X$ is saturated, i.e. there is no $A \in \Sigma$ with $\mu(A)>0$ such that $f \chi_{A}=0 \mu$-a.e. for all $f \in X$. Note that $X$ is saturated if and only if it has a weak unit (i.e. $g \in X$ such that $g>0 \mu$-a.e.). In this case, $X^{Y}$ is a B.f.s. The particular multiplier space $X^{L^{1}}$ is just the classical Köthe dual of $X$ which will be
denoted by $X^{\prime}$. For each $h \in X^{Y}$, we denote by $M_{h}: X \rightarrow Y$ the multiplication operator defined as $M_{h}(f)=h f$ for all $f \in X$. For more information on these spaces see [12] and also [2].
The product space $X \pi Y$ of two B.f.s.' $X$ and $Y$ is defined as the space of functions $f \in L^{0}(\mu)$ such that $|f| \leq \sum_{i>1}\left|x_{i} y_{i}\right| \mu$-a.e. for some sequences $\left(x_{i}\right) \subset X$ and $\left(y_{i}\right) \subset Y$ satisfying $\sum_{i \geq 1}\left\|x_{i}\right\|_{X}\left\|y_{i}\right\|_{Y}<\infty$. For $f \in X \pi Y$, denote

$$
\|f\|_{X \pi Y}=\inf \left\{\sum_{i \geq 1}\left\|x_{i}\right\|_{X}\left\|y_{i}\right\|_{Y}\right\}
$$

where the infimum is taken over all sequences $\left(x_{i}\right) \subset X$ and $\left(y_{i}\right) \subset Y$ such that $|f| \leq \sum_{i \geq 1}\left|x_{i} y_{i}\right| \mu$-a.e. and $\sum_{i \geq 1}\left\|x_{i}\right\|_{X}\left\|y_{i}\right\|_{Y}<\infty$. If $X, Y$ and $X^{Y^{\prime}}$ are saturated then $X \pi \bar{Y}$ is a saturated B.f.s. with norm $\|\cdot\|_{X \pi Y}$. An study of these product spaces can be found in [8].
Let $m: \Sigma \rightarrow E$ be a vector measure, that is, a countably additive set function, where $E$ is a real Banach space. A set $A \in \Sigma$ is $m$-null if $m(B)=0$ for every $B \in \Sigma$ with $B \subset A$. For each $x^{*}$ in the topological dual $E^{*}$ of $E$, we denote by $\left|x^{*} m\right|$ the variation of the real measure $x^{*} m$ given by the composition of $m$ with $x^{*}$. There exists $x_{0}^{*} \in E^{*}$ such that $\left|x_{0}^{*} m\right|$ has the same null sets as $m$, see $[9, \mathrm{Ch}$. IX. 2]. We will call $\left|x_{0}^{*} m\right|$ a Rybakov control measure for $m$.

A measurable function $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is integrable with respect to $m$ if:
(i) $\int|f| d\left|x^{*} m\right|<\infty$ for all $x^{*} \in E^{*}$.
(ii) For each $A \in \Sigma$, there exists $x_{A} \in E$ such that

$$
x^{*}\left(x_{A}\right)=\int_{A} f d x^{*} m, \text { for all } x^{*} \in E .
$$

The element $x_{A}$ will be written as $\int_{A} f d m$. Denote by $L^{1}(m)$ the space of integrable functions with respect to $m$, where functions which are equal $m$-a.e. are identified. The space $L^{1}(m)$ is a Banach space endowed with the norm

$$
\|f\|_{m}=\sup _{x^{*} \in B_{E^{*}}} \int|f| d\left|x^{*} m\right| .
$$

Note that $L^{\infty}\left(\left|x_{0}^{*} m\right|\right) \subset L^{1}(m)$. In particular every measure of the type $\left|x^{*} m\right|$ is finite as $\left|x^{*} m\right|(\Omega) \leq\left\|x^{*}\right\| \cdot\left\|\chi_{\Omega}\right\|_{m}$.
Given $f \in L^{1}(m)$, the set function $m_{f}: \Sigma \rightarrow E$ given by $m_{f}(A)=\int_{A} f d m$ for all $A \in \Sigma$ is a vector measure. Moreover, $g \in L^{1}\left(m_{f}\right)$ if and only if $g f \in L^{1}(m)$ and in this case $\int g d m_{f}=\int g f d m$.

For a complete overview about integration with respect to vector measures we refer to [4], [14, Ch. 3] and the references therein.

## 3. The Radon-Nikodým theorem for vector measures

In the next section we will use the following Radon-Nikodým theorem for vector measures proved by Musiał in [13, Theorem 1]. We include here a totally different
proof for the real Banach space case based on Ky Fan's lemma (see for instance [15, E. 4]).
Theorem 3.1. Let m, $n: \Sigma \rightarrow E$ be two vector measures and take $\left|x_{0}^{*} m\right|$ a Rybakov control measure for $m$. The following statements are equivalent.
(1) There exists a positive constant $K$ such that

$$
x^{*} n(A) \leq K\left|x^{*} m\right|(A) \text { for all } A \in \Sigma \text { and } x^{*} \in E^{*} .
$$

(2) There exists a function $g \in L^{\infty}\left(\left|x_{0}^{*} m\right|\right)$ such that

$$
n(A)=\int_{A} g d m \text { for all } A \in \Sigma
$$

Proof. Let us show that (1) implies (2). Denote $\xi=\left|x_{0}^{*} m\right|$. For each $x^{*} \in E^{*}$, since the measure $x^{*} m$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\xi$, there exists $h_{x^{*}} \in L^{1}(\xi)$ such that

$$
x^{*} m(A)=\int_{A} h_{x^{*}} d \xi
$$

for all $A \in \Sigma$, i.e. $h_{x^{*}}$ is the Radon-Nikodým derivative of $x^{*} m$ with respect to $\xi$. For every finite measurable partition $\left\{A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}\right\}$ of $\Omega$ and every finite set of vectors $x_{1}^{*}, \ldots, x_{n}^{*} \in E^{*}$, we define the function $\phi: B_{L^{\infty}(\xi)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
\phi(f)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{*} n\left(A_{i}\right)-K \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{A_{i}} f h_{x_{i}^{*}} d \xi
$$

for all $f \in B_{L^{\infty}(\xi)}$. Note that $\phi$ is convex. Considering the weak ${ }^{*}$ topology on $B_{L^{\infty}(\xi)}$, we have that $\phi$ is a continuous function on a compact convex set. Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the family of the functions $\phi$ defined in this way. If $\phi_{1}$ and $\phi_{2}$ are two functions in $\mathcal{F}$ and $0<\alpha<1$, since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha \phi_{1}(f)+(1-\alpha) \phi_{2}(f)= & \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha x_{1, i}^{*} n\left(A_{i}^{1}\right)-K \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{A_{i}^{1}} f h_{\alpha x_{1, i}^{*}} d \xi \\
& \quad+\sum_{j=1}^{k}(1-\alpha) x_{2, j}^{*} n\left(A_{j}^{2}\right)-K \sum_{j=1}^{k} \int_{A_{j}^{2}} f h_{(1-\alpha) x_{2, j}^{*}} d \xi \\
= & \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\alpha x_{1, i}^{*}+(1-\alpha) x_{2, j}^{*}\right) n\left(A_{i}^{1} \cap A_{j}^{2}\right) \\
& \quad-K \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \int_{A_{i}^{1} \cap A_{j}^{2}} f h_{\alpha x_{1, i}^{*}+(1-\alpha) x_{2, j}^{*}} d \xi
\end{aligned}
$$

we have that $\alpha \phi_{1}+(1-\alpha) \phi_{2} \in \mathcal{F}$ as $\left\{A_{i}^{1} \cap A_{j}^{2}: i=1, \ldots, n, j=1, \ldots, k\right\}$ is a partition of $\Omega$. Then, it follows that $\mathcal{F}$ is a concave family of real functions. If (1)
holds, for each $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$, taking $f_{\phi}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{sign}\left(h_{x_{i}^{*}}\right) \chi_{A_{i}} \in B_{L^{\infty}(\xi)}$, we have that

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{*} n\left(A_{i}\right) \leq K \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|x_{i}^{*} m\right|\left(A_{i}\right)=K \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{A_{i}}\left|h_{x_{i}^{*}}\right| d \xi=K \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{A_{i}} f_{\phi} h_{x_{i}^{*}} d \xi
$$

that is $\phi\left(f_{\phi}\right) \leq 0$. Therefore, by applying Ky Fan's lemma, there exists a function $f_{0} \in B_{L^{\infty}(\xi)}$ such that $\phi\left(f_{0}\right) \leq 0$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$. Consequently, for every $A \in \Sigma$ and $x^{*} \in E^{*}$, if we consider the partition $\{A, \Omega \backslash A\}$ and the vectors $x^{*}$ and 0 , we obtain

$$
x^{*} n(A) \leq K \int_{A} f_{0} h_{x^{*}} d \xi
$$

and

$$
-x^{*} n(A) \leq K \int_{A} f_{0} h_{-x^{*}} d \xi=-K \int_{A} f_{0} h_{x^{*}} d \xi
$$

that is $x^{*} n(A)=K \int_{A} f_{0} h_{x^{*}} d \xi$. Since this happens for every $x^{*} \in E^{*}$, taking into account that $\int_{A} f_{0} h_{x^{*}} d \xi=\int_{A} f_{0} d x^{*} m=x^{*}\left(\int_{A} f_{0} d m\right)$, we have that $n(A)=$ $K \int_{A} f_{0} d m$ for every $A \in \Sigma$ and so (2) holds for $g=K f_{0}$.
The converse implication is obtained easily as follows. If (2) holds, for every $A \in \Sigma$ and $x^{*} \in E^{*}$ we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
x^{*} n(A) \leq\left|x^{*} n(A)\right| & =\left|x^{*}\left(\int_{A} g d m\right)\right|=\left|\int_{A} g d x^{*} m\right| \\
& \leq \int_{A}|g| d\left|x^{*} m\right| \leq\|g\|_{\infty}\left|x^{*} m\right|(A)
\end{aligned}
$$

## 4. Strongly factorized operators between B.f.s.'

Let $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ be a fixed finite measure space and $X_{1}, X_{2}, Y_{1}, Y_{2}$ B.f.s.' related to $\mu$ such that $L^{\infty}(\mu) \subset X_{1} \subset X_{2}$ and $L^{\infty}(\mu) \subset Y_{2} \subset Y_{1}$. This guarantees that $X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ and $Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$ are B.f.s.' containing $L^{\infty}(\mu)$.
Consider two continuous linear operators $T: X_{1} \rightarrow Y_{1}$ and $S: X_{2} \rightarrow Y_{2}$. This section is devoted to characterize when $T$ factorizes strongly through $S$, that is, the following diagram commutes

for some $f \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ and $g \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$. We will give two different characterizations. In the first one we will use the Ky Fan's lemma ([15, E. 4]) and the product space $Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}$ which under our conditions is a saturated B.f.s. (see [8, Proposition 2.2]).
Theorem 4.1. Suppose that $Y_{1}, Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}$ are order continuous and moreover $Y_{1}$ has the Fatou property. The following statements are equivalent:
(i) There exists a function $h \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ such that

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int T\left(x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime} d \mu \leq\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} S\left(h x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime}\right\|_{Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}}
$$

for every $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in X_{1}$ and $y_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, y_{n}^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$.
(ii) There exist functions $f \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ and $g \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$ such that $T(x)=g S(f x)$ for all $x \in X_{1}$, i.e. $T$ factorizes strongly through $S$ as in (1).

Proof. First note that since $Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}$ is order continuous, the Köthe dual $\left(Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}$ can be identified with the topological dual $\left(Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{*}$ (see [10, p. 29]). On the other hand, $Y_{1}=Y_{1}^{\prime \prime}$ as $Y_{1}$ has the Fatou property (see [10, p. 30]), and so by [8, Proposition 2.2] we have that $\left(Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}=Y_{2}^{Y_{1}^{\prime \prime}}=Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$. Then, applying the Hahn-Banach theorem, for each $\xi \in Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}$ there exists $\xi^{\prime} \in B_{Y_{2} Y_{1}}$ such that $\|\xi\|_{Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}}=\left\langle\xi^{\prime}, \xi\right\rangle=\int \xi \xi^{\prime} d \mu$.
Suppose ( $i$ ) holds for some $h \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$. For every $x_{1}, \ldots x_{n} \in X_{1}$ and $y_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, y_{n}^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$, we define the convex function $\phi: B_{Y_{2} Y_{1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
\phi(g)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int T\left(x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime} d \mu-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int g S\left(h x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime} d \mu
$$

for all $g \in B_{Y_{2}}{ }_{Y_{1}}$. Since $\left(Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{*}=Y_{2}{ }^{Y_{1}}$, considering the weak ${ }^{*}$ topology we have that $B_{Y_{2}{ }^{Y^{1}}}$ is a compact convex set and $\phi$ is continuous. Denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the family of all functions $\phi$ defined in this way, which is obviously concave. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ defined through $x_{1}, \ldots x_{n} \in X_{1}$ and $y_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, y_{n}^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$. As we have noted before, for $\sum_{i=1}^{n} S\left(h x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime} \in Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}$ there exists $g_{\phi} \in B_{Y_{2} Y_{1}}$ such that

$$
\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} S\left(h x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime}\right\|_{Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}}=\int g_{\phi} \sum_{i=1}^{n} S\left(h x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime} d \mu
$$

Then, from $(i)$ we have that $\phi\left(g_{\phi}\right) \leq 0$. By Ky Fan's lemma, there exists a function $g \in B_{Y_{2}}{ }_{Y_{1}}$ such that $\phi(g) \leq 0$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$. In particular,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int T(x) y^{\prime} d \mu \leq \int g S(h x) y^{\prime} d \mu \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every $x \in X_{1}$ and $y^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$. Since this holds for every $y^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$, by taking $-y^{\prime}$ we obtain also

$$
-\int T(x) y^{\prime} d \mu \leq-\int g S(h x) y^{\prime} d \mu
$$

Then

$$
\int T(x) y^{\prime} d \mu=\int g S(h x) y^{\prime} d \mu
$$

for every $x \in X_{1}$ and $y^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$. Since $Y_{1}$ is order continuous it follows that $T(x)=$ $g S(h x)$ for all $x \in X_{1}$, that is, (ii) holds.
Suppose now that (ii) holds for $f \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ and $g \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$. For every $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in X_{1}$ and $y_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, y_{n}^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$ we have that

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int T\left(x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime} d \mu=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int g S\left(f x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime} d \mu \leq\|g\|_{Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}} \cdot\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} S\left(f x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime}\right\|_{Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}}
$$

that is, ( $i$ ) holds for $h=\|g\|_{Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}} f$.
Note that the previous theorem requires conditions on the B.f.s.' $Y_{1}, Y_{2}$ and the operator $S$. The second characterization of when $T$ factorizes strongly through $S$ is a dual result of Theorem 4.1 in the sense that the conditions are required on $X_{1}, X_{2}$ and the transpose operator $S^{\prime}$ of $S$. For the proof we will use also the Radon-Nikodým theorem proved in Section 3.
Theorem 4.2. Suppose that $X_{1}, Y_{1}, X_{2}$ and $X_{1} \pi X_{2}^{\prime}$ are order continuous and $X_{2}$ has the Fatou property. The following statements are equivalent.
(i) There exists a function $h \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$ such that

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int T\left(x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime} d \mu \leq\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|S^{\prime}\left(h y_{i}^{\prime}\right) x_{i}\right|\right\|_{X_{1} \pi X_{2}^{\prime}}
$$

for every $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in X_{1}$ and $y_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, y_{n}^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$.
(ii) There exist functions $f \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ and $g \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$ such that $T(x)=g S(f x)$ for all $x \in X_{1}$.

Proof. Since $X_{1} \pi X_{2}^{\prime}$ is order continuous and $X_{2}$ has the Fatou property it follows that $\left(X_{1} \pi X_{2}^{\prime}\right)^{*}=X_{1}^{X_{2}}$.

Suppose ( $i$ ) holds for some $h \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$. It is direct to check that $Y_{2}^{Y_{1}} \subset Y_{1}^{\prime Y_{2}^{\prime}}$, then since $X_{2}$ is order continuous, we have that $S^{\prime}\left(h y^{\prime}\right) \in X_{2}^{\prime}$ for all $y^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$. For every $x_{1}, \ldots x_{n} \in X_{1}$ and $y_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, y_{n}^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$, we define the convex function $\phi: B_{X_{1} x_{2}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
\phi(f)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int T\left(x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime} d \mu-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int f\left|S^{\prime}\left(h y_{i}^{\prime}\right) x_{i}\right| d \mu
$$

for all $f \in B_{X_{1} x_{2}}$. Considering the weak* topology, $\phi$ is continuous on a compact convex set. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the concave family of all functions $\phi$ defined in this way. If $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ is defined through $x_{1}, \ldots x_{n} \in X_{1}$ and $y_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, y_{n}^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$, taking $f_{\phi} \in B_{X_{1} x_{2}}$ such that

$$
\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|S^{\prime}\left(h y_{i}^{\prime}\right) x_{i}\right|\right\|_{X_{1} \pi X_{2}^{\prime}}=\int f_{\phi} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|S^{\prime}\left(h y_{i}^{\prime}\right) x_{i}\right| d \mu
$$

from (i) we have that $\phi\left(f_{\phi}\right) \leq 0$. By Ky Fan's lemma, there exists a function $f \in B_{X_{1} X_{2}}$ such that $\phi(f) \leq 0$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$. In particular,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int T(x) y^{\prime} d \mu \leq \int f\left|S^{\prime}\left(h y^{\prime}\right) x\right| d \mu \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every $x \in X_{1}$ and $y^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$. We can assume that $f \geq 0$.
On the other hand, consider the continuous linear operator $R: X_{1} \rightarrow Y_{1}$ given by $R=M_{h} \circ S \circ M_{f}$ and the set function $m_{R}: \Sigma \rightarrow Y_{1}$ defined as $m_{R}(A)=R\left(\chi_{A}\right)$ for all $A \in \Sigma$. Since $X_{1}$ is order continuous we have that $m_{R}$ is a vector measure and for every $x \in X_{1}$ it follows that $x \in L^{1}\left(m_{R}\right)$ with $\int x d m_{R}=R(x)$, see for instance [3, Section 3]. For each $y^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$ and $A \in \Sigma$, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
y^{\prime} m_{R}(A) & =\left\langle y^{\prime}, R\left(\chi_{A}\right)\right\rangle=\int y^{\prime} h S\left(f \chi_{A}\right) d \mu \\
& =\left\langle y^{\prime} h, S\left(f \chi_{A}\right)\right\rangle=\left\langle S^{\prime}\left(y^{\prime} h\right), f \chi_{A}\right\rangle=\int_{A} S^{\prime}\left(y^{\prime} h\right) f d \mu
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the last inequality we have used that $X_{2}$ is order continuous and so $S^{\prime}: Y_{2}^{*} \rightarrow X_{2}^{*}=X_{2}^{\prime}$. Then,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|y^{\prime} m_{R}\right|(A)=\int_{A}\left|S^{\prime}\left(y^{\prime} h\right)\right| f d \mu \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, considering the vector measure $m_{T}: \Sigma \rightarrow Y_{1}$ given by $m_{T}(A)=T\left(\chi_{A}\right)$ for all $A \in \Sigma$ and applying (3) for $x=\chi_{A}$ and (4), we have that

$$
y^{\prime} m_{T}(A)=\int T\left(\chi_{A}\right) y^{\prime} d \mu \leq \int_{A} f\left|S^{\prime}\left(h y^{\prime}\right)\right| d \mu=\left|y^{\prime} m_{R}\right|(A)
$$

Hence, since $Y_{1}$ is order continuous, Theorem 3.1 provides a function $f_{1} \in L^{\infty}(\xi)$, where $\xi$ is a Rybakov control measure for $m_{R}$, such that

$$
m_{T}(A)=\int_{A} f_{1} d m_{R}
$$

for all $A \in \Sigma$. Since $X_{1} \subset L^{1}\left(m_{T}\right)$ and the integration operator with respect to $m_{T}$ restricted to $X_{1}$ coincides with $T$, considering a $m_{R}$-null set $Z$ such that $f_{2}=f_{1} \chi_{\Omega \backslash Z}$ is bounded in all $\Omega$, for each $x \in X_{1}$ it follows that

$$
T(x)=\int x d m_{T}=\int x f_{1} d m_{R}=\int x f_{2} d m_{R}
$$

Noting that $x f_{2} \in X_{1}$, we have that

$$
T(x)=R\left(x f_{2}\right)=h S\left(f x f_{2}\right)
$$

where $f f_{2} \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$. So (ii) holds.

Suppose now that (ii) holds for $f \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ and $g \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$. For every $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in X_{1}$ and $y_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, y_{n}^{\prime} \in Y_{1}^{\prime}$ we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int T\left(x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime} d \mu & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int g S\left(f x_{i}\right) y_{i}^{\prime} d \mu \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int f x_{i} S^{\prime}\left(g y_{i}^{\prime}\right) d \mu \\
& \leq \int|f| \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|x_{i} S^{\prime}\left(g y_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right| d \mu \\
& \leq\|f\|_{X_{1}}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|x_{i} S^{\prime}\left(g y_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right|\right\|_{X_{1} \pi X_{2}^{\prime}}
\end{aligned}
$$

that is, $(i)$ holds for $h=g\|f\|_{X_{1}^{X_{2}}}$.
An easy example is given by the case when $X_{1}, X_{2}, Y_{1}, Y_{2}$ all coincide with an order continuous B.f.s. $X$ having the Fatou property and containing $L^{\infty}(\mu)$. By a classical Lozanovskii's result ( $\left[11\right.$, Theorem 6]) we have that $X \pi X^{\prime}=L^{1}(\mu)$ (with equal norms) is order continuous. Also note that $X^{X}=L^{\infty}(\mu)$ (with equal norms), see [12, Theorem 1]. Then, Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 produce the following result.

Corollary 4.3. The following statements are equivalent:
(i) $T$ factorizes strongly through $S$, i.e.

for some $f, g \in L^{\infty}(\mu)$.
(ii) There exists a function $h \in L^{\infty}(\mu)$ such that

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int T\left(x_{i}\right) x_{i}^{\prime} d \mu \leq \int\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} S\left(h x_{i}\right) x_{i}^{\prime}\right| d \mu
$$

for every $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in X$ and $x_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, x_{n}^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$.
(iii) There exists a function $h \in L^{\infty}(\mu)$ such that

$$
\int T(x) x^{\prime} d \mu \leq \int\left|S^{\prime}\left(h x^{\prime}\right) x\right| d \mu
$$

for every $x \in X$ and $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$.

Note that condition (iii) in Corollary 4.3 holds if there exists a constant $K>0$ such that

$$
\int T(x) x^{\prime} d \mu \leq K \int\left|S^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right) x\right| d \mu
$$

for every $x \in X$ and $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$.

## 5. Order continuity for product spaces

For convenient use of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2, it is desirable to know when a product space is order continuous. For particular cases, we can check this property through direct computations.

Example 5.1. (See for instance [8, p. 202]).
(a) If $1 \leq p, q<\infty$ are such that $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=\frac{1}{r} \leq 1$, then $L^{p}(\mu) \pi L^{q}(\mu)=L^{r}(\mu)$ is order continuous.
(b) For any B.f.s. $X$ it follows that $L^{\infty}(\mu) \pi X=X$ and so the order continuity depends on $X$.
(c) For any B.f.s. $X$, Lozanovskii's theorem ensures that $X \pi X^{\prime}=L^{1}(\mu)$ is order continuous.

The next result provides conditions under which a product space is order continuous.

Proposition 5.2. Let $X$ and $Y$ be two B.f.s.' containing $L^{\infty}(\mu)$ such that $X$ is order continuous, the simple functions are dense in $Y$ and $X^{Y^{\prime}}$ is saturated. Then $X \pi Y$ is order continuous.

Proof. Note that from [8, Proposition 2.2], the product space $X \pi Y$ is a saturated B.f.s. Let us prove that $(X \pi Y)^{*}=(X \pi Y)^{\prime}$ and so we will have that $X \pi Y$ is order continuous, see for instance [10, p. 29].

Let $0 \leq \phi \in(X \pi Y)^{*}$ and consider the finitely additive set function $\mu_{\phi}: \Sigma \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ defined by $\mu_{\phi}(A)=\phi\left(\chi_{A}\right)$ for all $A \in \Sigma$. Note that $\mu_{\phi}$ is well defined as for every $A \in \Sigma$ we have that $\chi_{A}=\chi_{A} \chi_{\Omega} \in X \pi Y$. Moreover, since

$$
\mu_{\phi}(A) \leq\|\phi\|_{(X \pi Y)^{*}}\left\|\chi_{A}\right\|_{X \pi Y} \leq\|\phi\|_{(X \pi Y)^{*}}\left\|\chi_{A}\right\|_{X}\left\|\chi_{\Omega}\right\|_{Y},
$$

and $X$ is order continuous, it follows that $\mu_{\phi}$ is countably additive. If $\mu(A)=0$ then $\left\|\chi_{A}\right\|_{X}=0$ and so $\mu_{\phi}(A)=0$, that is, $\mu_{\phi}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mu$. The scalar Radon-Nikodým theorem gives a function $0 \leq g \in L^{1}(\mu)$ such that $\mu_{\phi}(A)=\int_{A} g d \mu$ for all $A \in \Sigma$. Note that every simple function $h$ satisfies

$$
\phi(h)=\int h d \mu_{\phi}=\int h g d \mu .
$$

Let $f \in X \pi Y$ and take a sequence of simple functions $\left(h_{n}\right)$ such that $0 \leq h_{n} \uparrow|f|$ $\mu$-a.e. Then, since $0 \leq h_{n} g \uparrow|f| g \mu$-a.e., applying the monotone convergence
theorem, it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int|f| g d \mu & =\lim _{n} \int h_{n} g d \mu=\lim _{n} \phi\left(h_{n}\right) \\
& \leq\|\phi\|_{(X \pi Y)^{*}} \lim _{n}\left\|h_{n}\right\|_{X \pi Y} \leq\|\phi\|_{(X \pi Y)^{*}}\|f\|_{X \pi Y} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, $g \in(X \pi Y)^{\prime}$. Denote by $\phi_{g}$ the functional on $X \pi Y$ defined via $g$ as $\phi_{g}(f)=$ $\int f g d \mu$. We will finish the proof if we show that $\phi=\phi_{g}$. We have already seen that $\phi(h)=\phi_{g}(h)$ for all simple function $h$.
Note that $X \subset X \pi Y$ as $f=f \chi_{\Omega} \in X \pi Y$ for all $f \in X$. Let us see that $\phi=\phi_{g}$ on $X$. Take $0 \leq f \in X$ and a sequence of simple functions $\left(h_{n}\right)$ such that $0 \leq h_{n} \uparrow f$. Since $X$ is order continuous, $\left(h_{n}\right)$ also converges to $f$ in $X$ and so in $X \pi Y$, as the inclusion between Banach lattices is always continuous (see [10, p. 2]). Then,

$$
\phi(f)=\lim _{n} \phi\left(h_{n}\right)=\lim _{n} \phi_{g}\left(h_{n}\right)=\lim _{n} \int h_{n} g d \mu=\int f g d \mu=\phi_{g}(f) .
$$

For a general $f \in X$, we only have to consider the positive and negative parts of $f$.

Let now $f \in X \pi Y$. Given $\varepsilon>0$, there are two sequences $\left(x_{i}\right) \subset X$ and $\left(y_{i}\right) \subset Y$ such that $f=\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_{i} y_{i}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left\|x_{i}\right\|_{X}\left\|y_{i}\right\|_{Y} \leq\|f\|_{X \pi Y}+\varepsilon$, see [8, Remark 2.3]. Take $n_{\varepsilon}$ such that $\sum_{i>n_{\varepsilon}}\left\|x_{i}\right\|_{X}\left\|y_{i}\right\|_{Y} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and for each $i$ take a simple function $y_{i, \varepsilon} \in Y$ such that $\left\|y_{i}-y_{i, \varepsilon}\right\|_{Y} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{i+1}\left\|x_{i}\right\|_{X}}$. Noting that $\sum_{i=1}^{n_{\varepsilon}} x_{i} y_{i, \varepsilon} \in X$, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\left|\phi(f)-\phi_{g}(f)\right| \leq \mid \phi(f)-\phi \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\varepsilon}} x_{i} y_{i, \varepsilon}\right)|+| \begin{array}{ll}
\phi_{g} & \left.\sum_{i=1}^{n_{\varepsilon}} x_{i} y_{i, \varepsilon}\right)-\phi_{g}(f) \mid
\end{array} \\
& \leq K\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n_{\varepsilon}} x_{i}\left(y_{i}-y_{i, \varepsilon}\right)+\sum_{i>n_{\varepsilon}} x_{i} y_{i}\right\|_{X \pi Y} \\
& \left.\leq K \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\varepsilon}}\left\|x_{i}\right\|_{X}\left\|y_{i}-y_{i, \varepsilon}\right\|_{Y}+\sum_{i>n_{\varepsilon}}\left\|x_{i}\right\|_{X}\left\|y_{i}\right\|_{Y}\right) \leq K \varepsilon
\end{aligned}
$$

where $K=\|\phi\|_{(X \pi Y)^{*}}+\left\|\phi_{g}\right\|_{(X \pi Y)^{*}}$. Since $\varepsilon$ is arbitrary, it follows that $\phi(f)=$ $\phi_{g}(f)$.

Taking into account that the simple functions are dense in every order continuous B.f.s. and that $L^{\infty}(\mu) \subset X^{Y}$ whenever $X \subset Y$, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 5.3. If $X$ and $Y$ are two order continuous B.f.s.' containing $L^{\infty}(\mu)$ such that $X \subset Y^{\prime}$, then $X \pi Y$ is order continuous.

From the previous corollary and noting that $X \subset X^{\prime \prime}$ for every B.f.s. $X$, in Section 4 we get that $Y_{2} \pi Y_{1}^{\prime}$ is order continuous if $Y_{2}, Y_{1}^{\prime}$ are order continuous and $L^{\infty}(\mu) \subset$ $Y_{1}^{\prime}$ (equivalently, $\left.Y_{1} \subset L^{1}(\mu)\right)$. Similarly for $X_{1} \pi X_{2}^{\prime}$.

Remark 5.4. In Proposition 5.2 we have proved that $\phi=\phi_{g}$ on $X$ without using the condition of the density of the simple functions in $Y$. We obtain the same conclusion if we replace this condition by any of the following ones:
(i) $X$ is dense in $X \pi Y$.
(ii) $X \cap B_{X \pi Y}$ is norming for $(X \pi Y)^{*}$, i.e. $\|\phi\|_{(X \pi Y)^{*}}=\sup _{f \in X \cap B_{X \pi Y}}|\phi(f)|$ for every $\phi \in(X \pi Y)^{*}$.

## 6. Particular cases

As in Section 4, let $X_{1}, X_{2}, Y_{1}, Y_{2}$ be B.f.s.' related to a finite measure space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ such that $L^{\infty}(\mu) \subset X_{1} \subset X_{2}$ and $L^{\infty}(\mu) \subset Y_{2} \subset Y_{1}$ and let $T: X_{1} \rightarrow Y_{1}$ be a continuous linear operator. In this section we study the strong factorization of $T$ through two particular classes of operators, namely, the composition operators and the kernel operators.

### 6.1. Strong factorization through a composition operator

Consider a measure-preserving transformation $\sigma: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$, that is, a measurable function such that $\mu\left(\sigma^{-1}(A)\right)=\mu(A)$ for all $A \in \Sigma$. Then, the composition operator $S_{\sigma}: L^{0}(\mu) \rightarrow L^{0}(\mu)$ given by $S_{\sigma}(f)=f \circ \sigma$ is well defined and positive. Suppose that $S_{\sigma}: X_{2} \rightarrow Y_{2}$ is well defined and so automatically continuous as it is a positive operator between Banach lattices.
Under conditions of Theorem 4.1 (or 4.2), statement $(i)$ holds if and only if $T$ factorizes strongly through $S_{\sigma}$, that is, there exist $f \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ and $g \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$ such that

$$
T(x)(\omega)=g(\omega) f(\sigma(\omega)) x(\sigma(\omega))
$$

for all $x \in X_{1}$ and $\mu$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.
We will give a new equivalent condition for $T$ to be strongly factorized through $S_{\sigma}$, in which the following concept is involved. Given $Q: X \rightarrow Y$ and $R: X \rightarrow Z$ two continuous linear operators between B.f.s.' related to $\mu$, we will say that $Q$ is $R$-local if for each $x \in X$ it follows that $Q(x)(w)=0 \mu$-a.e. on $\{w \in \Omega: R(x)(w)=0\}$, that is, $\operatorname{Supp}(Q(x)) \subset \operatorname{Supp}(R(x)) \cup N$ for some $\mu$-null set $N$. In the case when $X=Y=Z$ and $R$ is the identity map, $Q$ will be said to be local.
Theorem 6.1. If the simple functions are dense in $X_{1}$ and $T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$, then the following statements are equivalent:
(i) $T$ factorizes strongly through $S_{\sigma}$.
(ii) There exists $h \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ such that $T$ is $S_{\sigma} \circ M_{h}$-local.

Proof. If ( $i$ ) holds for some $f \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ and $g \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$, since $T(x)=M_{g} \circ S_{\sigma} \circ M_{f}(x)$ for all $x \in X_{1}$, then $T$ is clearly $S_{\sigma} \circ M_{f}$-local.
Suppose that (ii) holds. Then, for every $A \in \Sigma$ we have that

$$
\operatorname{Supp}\left(T\left(\chi_{A}\right)\right) \subset \operatorname{Supp}\left(S_{\sigma} \circ M_{h}\left(\chi_{A}\right)\right) \cup N \subset \sigma^{-1}(A) \cup N
$$

for some $\mu$-null set $N$. So,

$$
T\left(\chi_{A}\right)=T\left(\chi_{A}\right) \cdot \chi_{\sigma^{-1}(A)}=T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) \cdot \chi_{\sigma^{-1}(A)},
$$

where in the last equality we use again that $\operatorname{Supp}\left(T\left(\chi_{\Omega \backslash A}\right)\right) \subset \sigma^{-1}(\Omega \backslash A) \cup \tilde{N}$ for some $\mu$-null set $\tilde{N}$. Hence, for a simple function $x=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i} \chi_{A_{i}}$ it follows that

$$
\left.T(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i} T\left(\chi_{A_{i}}\right)=T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i} \chi_{\sigma^{-1}\left(A_{i}\right)}\right)=T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) S_{\sigma}(x) .
$$

Let $x \in X_{1}$ and take a sequence $\left(x_{n}\right)$ of simple functions converging to $x$ in $X_{1}$. Then,

$$
T(x)=\lim T\left(x_{n}\right)=\lim T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) S_{\sigma}\left(x_{n}\right) .
$$

Since $X_{1}$ is continuously included in $X_{2}$, we have that $S_{\sigma}\left(x_{n}\right) \rightarrow S_{\sigma}(x)$ in $Y_{2}$, and since $T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$, it follows that $T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) S_{\sigma}\left(x_{n}\right) \rightarrow T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) S_{\sigma}(x)$ in $Y_{1}$. So, $T(x)=T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) S_{\sigma}(x)$ and $(i)$ holds for $g=T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right)$ and $f=\chi_{\Omega}$.

Unfortunately, Theorem 6.1 works because of the particular composition operator $S_{\sigma}$. For a general operator $S$, if there exist $f \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ and $g \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$ such that $T(x)=M_{g} \circ S \circ M_{f}(x)$ for all $x \in X_{1}$, then $T$ is clearly $S \circ M_{f}$-local, but the converse may fail.
Example 6.2. Let $X$ be a B.f.s.' containing $L^{\infty}(\mu)$ and consider two functions $h_{T}>0$ and $h_{S}>0$ in $L^{\infty}(\mu)$ such that $\frac{h_{T}}{h_{S}} \notin L^{\infty}(\mu)$. Take an element $0 \neq x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$ and define the operators $T: X \rightarrow X$ and $S: X \rightarrow X$ as $T(x)=\left\langle x^{\prime}, x\right\rangle h_{T}$ and $S(x)=\left\langle x^{\prime}, x\right\rangle h_{S}$. Then $T$ is $S$-local. However, if there exist $f, g \in L^{\infty}(\mu)$ such that $T(x)=g S(f x)$ for all $x \in X$, by taking $x \in X$ such that $\left\langle x^{\prime}, x\right\rangle \neq 0$ we have that $\frac{h_{T}}{h_{S}}=g \frac{\left\langle x^{\prime}, f x\right\rangle}{\left\langle x^{\prime}, x\right\rangle} \in L^{\infty}(\mu)$ which is a contradiction.

Consider now the case when $X_{1}, X_{2}, Y_{1}, Y_{2}$ all coincide with an order continuous B.f.s. $X$ having the Fatou property and containing $L^{\infty}(\mu)$. Suppose that $\sigma$ is bijective with measurable inverse $\sigma^{-1}$. Note that in this case $\sigma^{-1}$ is a measurepreserving transformation and $S_{\sigma^{-1}}: X^{\prime} \rightarrow X^{\prime}$ is well defined. Indeed, $S_{\sigma^{-1}}=S_{\sigma}^{\prime}$, since for every $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$ and $x \in X$ we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle S_{\sigma}^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right), x\right\rangle & =\left\langle x^{\prime}, S_{\sigma}(x)\right\rangle=\int x^{\prime}(\omega) x(\sigma(\omega)) d \mu(\omega) \\
& =\int x^{\prime}\left(\sigma^{-1}(\omega)\right) x(\omega) d \mu(\omega)=\left\langle S_{\sigma^{-1}}\left(x^{\prime}\right), x\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

Corollary 6.3. The following statements are equivalent:
(i) $T$ factorizes strongly through $S_{\sigma}$.
(ii) There exists $h \in L^{\infty}(\mu)$ such that

$$
\int T(x)(\omega) x^{\prime}(\omega) d \mu(\omega) \leq \int\left|h(\omega) x^{\prime}(\omega) x(\sigma(\omega))\right| d \mu(\omega)
$$

for all $x \in X$ and $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$.
(iii) There exists $h \in L^{\infty}(\mu)$ such that

$$
\left|T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(\omega)\right| \leq\left|h\left(\sigma^{-1}(\omega)\right) x^{\prime}\left(\sigma^{-1}(\omega)\right)\right| \quad \mu \text {-a.e. }(\omega)
$$

for all $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$.
Proof. The equivalence between $(i)$ and (ii) is just the equivalence between (i) and (iii) in Corollary 4.3, as $S_{\sigma}^{\prime}=S_{\sigma^{-1}}$.
Suppose (ii) holds. Given $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$ we take $B^{+}=\left\{\omega \in \Omega: T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(\omega) \geq 0\right\}$ and $B^{-}=\left\{\omega \in \Omega: T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(\omega)<0\right\}$. For every $A \in \Sigma$, considering the element $x_{0}=\chi_{A}\left(\chi_{B^{+}}-\chi_{B^{-}}\right)$, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{A}\left|T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(\omega)\right| d \mu(\omega) & =\int T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(\omega) x_{0}(\omega) d \mu(\omega)=\left\langle T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right), x_{0}\right\rangle \\
& =\left\langle x^{\prime}, T\left(x_{0}\right)\right\rangle=\int T\left(x_{0}\right)(\omega) x^{\prime}(\omega) d \mu(\omega) \\
& \leq \int\left|h(\omega) x^{\prime}(\omega) x_{0}(\sigma(\omega))\right| d \mu(\omega) \\
& =\int\left|h\left(\sigma^{-1}(\omega)\right) x^{\prime}\left(\sigma^{-1}(\omega)\right) x_{0}(\omega)\right| d \mu(\omega) \\
& \leq \int_{A}\left|h\left(\sigma^{-1}(\omega)\right) x^{\prime}\left(\sigma^{-1}(\omega)\right)\right| d \mu(\omega)
\end{aligned}
$$

so (iii) holds. Conversely, if (iii) holds, for every $x \in X$ and $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$, it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int T(x)(\omega) x^{\prime}(\omega) d \mu(\omega) & =\int T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(\omega) x(\omega) d \mu(\omega) \leq \int\left|T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(\omega) x(\omega)\right| d \mu(\omega) \\
& \leq \int\left|h\left(\sigma^{-1}(\omega)\right) x^{\prime}\left(\sigma^{-1}(\omega)\right) x(\omega)\right| d \mu(\omega)
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover, if $S_{\sigma^{-1}}: X \rightarrow X$ is well defined, then conditions $(i)-(i i i)$ in Corollary 6.3 are equivalent to
(iv) There exists $h \in L^{\infty}(\mu)$ such that $T$ is $S_{\sigma} \circ M_{h}$-local.

Indeed, if $(i v)$ holds, in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 6.1 we obtain that $T(x)=T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) S_{\sigma}(x)$ for all simple function $x$. By taking $x \circ \sigma^{-1}$ which is also a simple function, it follows that $T\left(x \circ \sigma^{-1}\right)=T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) x$. Note that $T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) x \in X$ for every simple function $x$. Let us prove that this holds for every $x \in X$, so we will have that $T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) \in X^{X}$ and we can follow the proof of Theorem 6.1 to obtain that $(i)$ holds. Let $0 \leq x \in X$ and take a sequence $\left(x_{n}\right)$ of simple functions such that $0 \leq x_{n} \uparrow x \mu$-a.e. Then, $0 \leq\left|T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right)\right| x_{n} \uparrow\left|T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right)\right| x \mu$-a.e. and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup _{n}\left\|\left|T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right)\right| x_{n}\right\|_{X} & =\sup _{n}\left\|T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) x_{n}\right\|_{X}=\sup _{n}\left\|T\left(x_{n} \circ \sigma^{-1}\right)\right\|_{X} \\
& \leq\|T\| \sup _{n}\left\|x_{n} \circ \sigma^{-1}\right\|_{X} \leq\|T\|\left\|x \circ \sigma^{-1}\right\|_{X}<\infty .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $X$ has the Fatou property, we have that $\left|T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right)\right| x \in X$ and so $T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) x \in X$. For a general $x \in X$, considering $x^{+}$and $x^{-}$the positive and negative parts of $x$, we have that $T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) x=T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) x^{+}-T\left(\chi_{\Omega}\right) x^{-} \in X$.
In the particular case when $\sigma$ is the identity map, the equivalence between $(i)$ and (iv) in Corollary 6.3 is a known result saying that $T$ is local if and only if it is a multiplication operator, see [1, Proposition 1.7] and [18, Theorem 8].
Example 6.4. Let $([0,1], \mathcal{B}[0,1], \lambda)$ be the measure space with $\mathcal{B}[0,1]$ being the Borel $\sigma$-algebra of $[0,1]$ and $\lambda$ the Lebesgue measure. For the measure-preserving transformation $\sigma:[0,1] \rightarrow[0,1]$ given by $\sigma(s)=1-s$ for all $s \in[0,1]$, the composition operator $S_{\sigma}: L^{p}[0,1] \rightarrow L^{p}[0,1](1 \leq p<\infty)$ is well defined. The continuous linear operators $T: L^{p}[0,1] \rightarrow L^{p}[0,1]$ which factorize strongly through $S_{\sigma}$ are characterized by conditions (ii)-(iv) of Corollary 6.3.

### 6.2. Strong factorization through a kernel operator

Consider a measurable function $K: \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ such that the operator $S_{K}: X_{2} \rightarrow Y_{2}$ given by

$$
S_{K}(f)(s)=\int f(t) K(s, t) d \mu(t)
$$

for all $f \in X_{2}$ and $s \in \Omega$, is well defined and so continuous.
Under conditions of Theorem 4.1 (or 4.2), statement ( $i$ ) holds if and only if $T$ factorizes strongly through $S_{K}$, that is, there exist $f \in X_{1}^{X_{2}}$ and $g \in Y_{2}^{Y_{1}}$ such that

$$
T(x)(s)=g(s) \int f(t) x(t) K(s, t) d \mu(t)
$$

for all $x \in X_{1}$ and $s \in \Omega$. In this case, $T$ is also a kernel operator with kernel $\widetilde{K}(s, t)=g(s) f(t) K(s, t)$.
In the case when $X_{1}, X_{2}, Y_{1}, Y_{2}$ all coincide with an order continuous B.f.s. $X$ having the Fatou property and containing $L^{\infty}(\mu)$, using the equivalence between (i) and (iii) in Corollary 4.3, we obtain that $T$ factorizes strongly through $S_{K}$ if and only if there exists $h \in L^{\infty}(\mu)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int T(x)(t) x^{\prime}(t) d \mu(t) \leq \int\left|x(t) \int h(s) x^{\prime}(s) K(s, t) d \mu(s)\right| d \mu(t) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $x \in X$ and $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$. Indeed, $S_{K}^{\prime}: X^{\prime} \rightarrow X^{\prime}$ satisfies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle S_{K}^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right), x\right\rangle & =\left\langle x^{\prime}, S_{K}(x)\right\rangle=\int x^{\prime}(s) \int x(t) K(s, t) d \mu(t) d \mu(s) \\
& =\int x(t) \int x^{\prime}(s) K(s, t) d \mu(s) d \mu(t) \\
& =\left\langle\int x^{\prime}(s) K(s, \cdot) d \mu(s), x\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$ and $x \in X$.

Example 6.5. Consider the measure space given by the interval [ 0,1 ], its Borel $\sigma$-algebra and the Lebesgue measure. Let $K$ be the kernel given by $K(s, t)=$ $\chi_{[0, s]}(t)$ for all $s, t \in[0,1]$. Then, $S_{K}$ is just the Volterra operator. Suppose that $S_{K}: X \rightarrow X$ is well defined and continuous (e.g. $X=L^{p}[0,1]$ with $1 \leq p<\infty$ ). The following statements are equivalent:
(i) There exist $g, f \in L^{\infty}[0,1]$ such that

$$
T(x)(s)=g(s) \int_{0}^{s} f(t) x(t) d t \text { a.e. }(s)
$$

for all $x \in X$.
(ii) There exists $h \in L^{\infty}[0,1]$ such that

$$
\int_{0}^{1} T(x)(t) x^{\prime}(t) d t \leq \int_{0}^{1}\left|x(t) \int_{t}^{1} h(s) x^{\prime}(s) d s\right| d t
$$

for all $x \in X$ and $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$.
(iii) There exists $h \in L^{\infty}[0,1]$ such that

$$
\left|T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(t)\right| \leq\left|\int_{t}^{1} h(s) x^{\prime}(s) d s\right| \text { a.e. }(t)
$$

for all $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$.
Note that the equivalence between (i) and (ii) follows from applying (5). If (ii) holds, given $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$ we consider the sets $B^{+}=\left\{t \in[0,1]: T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right) \geq 0\right\}$ and $B^{-}=$ $\left\{t \in[0,1]: T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)<0\right\}$. For each measurable set $A$, taking $x=\chi_{A}\left(\chi_{B^{+}}-\chi_{B^{-}}\right)$, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{A}\left|T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(t)\right| d t & =\int_{0}^{1} T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(t) x(t) d t=\left\langle T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right), x\right\rangle=\left\langle x^{\prime}, T(x)\right\rangle \\
& =\int_{0}^{1} T(x)(t) x^{\prime}(t) d t \leq \int_{0}^{1}\left|x(t) \int_{t}^{1} h(s) x^{\prime}(s) d s\right| d t \\
& \leq \int_{A}\left|\int_{t}^{1} h(s) x^{\prime}(s) d s\right| d t
\end{aligned}
$$

so (iii) holds. Conversely, if (iii) holds, for every $x \in X$ and $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$, it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{0}^{1} T(x)(t) x^{\prime}(t) d t & =\int_{0}^{1} T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(t) x(t) d t \leq \int_{0}^{1}\left|T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(t) x(t)\right| d t \\
& \leq \int_{0}^{1}\left|x(t) \int_{t}^{1} h(s) x^{\prime}(s) d s\right| d t
\end{aligned}
$$

If we consider now the Hardy operator which is given by the kernel $K(s, t)=$ $\frac{1}{s} \chi_{[0, s]}(t)$ for all $s, t \in[0,1]$ and suppose that $S_{K}: X \rightarrow X$ is well defined and continuous (e.g. $X=L^{p}[0,1]$ with $1<p<\infty$ ), in a similar way we obtain that the following statements are equivalent:
(i) There exist $g, f \in L^{\infty}[0,1]$ such that

$$
T(x)(s)=\frac{g(s)}{s} \int_{0}^{s} f(t) x(t) d t \text { a.e. }(s)
$$

for all $x \in X$.
(ii) There exists $h \in L^{\infty}[0,1]$ such that

$$
\int_{0}^{1} T(x)(t) x^{\prime}(t) d t \leq \int_{0}^{1}\left|x(t) \int_{t}^{1} \frac{h(s) x^{\prime}(s)}{s} d s\right| d t
$$

for all $x \in X$ and $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$.
(iii) There exists $h \in L^{\infty}[0,1]$ such that

$$
\left|T^{\prime}\left(x^{\prime}\right)(t)\right| \leq\left|\int_{t}^{1} \frac{h(s) x^{\prime}(s)}{s} d s\right| \text { a.e. }(t)
$$

for all $x^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$.
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