KYBERNETIKA — VOLUME *55* (2019), NUMBER 2, PAGES 233–251

DIEUDONNÉ-TYPE THEOREMS FOR LATTICE GROUP-VALUED K-TRIANGULAR SET FUNCTIONS

Antonio Boccuto and Xenofon Dimitriou

Some versions of Dieudonné-type convergence and uniform boundedness theorems are proved, for k-triangular and regular lattice group-valued set functions. We use sliding hump techniques and direct methods. We extend earlier results, proved in the real case. Furthermore, we pose some open problems.

Keywords: lattice group, (D)-convergence, k-triangular set function, (s)-bounded set function, Fremlin lemma, limit theorem, Brooks–Jewett theorem, Dieudonné theorem, Nikodým boundedness theorem

Classification: 28A12, 28A33, 28B10, 28B15, 40A35, 46G10

1. INTRODUCTION

Dieudonné-type theorems (see [34]) are the object of several studies about convergence and uniform boundedness theorems for regular set functions and related topics about (weak) compactness of measures. A historical comprehensive survey can be found in [16]. Among the most important developments existing in the literature about these subjects, see for instance [2, 3, 30, 31, 32, 33, 38, 45], and in particular, concerning the setting of lattice group-valued measures, we quote [6, 9, 10, 12, 13]. In [14, 24] some Dieudonné-type theorems were proved for lattice group-valued finitely additive regular measures in the context of filter convergence, while some versions of uniform boundedness theorems in this setting are proved in [11, 25]. In [39, 40, 41, 47] some Dieudonné-type theorems were proved for k-triangular and non-additive regular set functions. Some examples of k-triangular set functions are the M*-measures*, that is monotone set functions m with $m(\emptyset) = 0$, continuous from above and from below and compatible with respect to supremum and infimum, which have several applications in various branches, among which intuitionistic fuzzy sets and observables (see also [1, 17, 27, 35, 42]). Some examples of non-monotone 1-triangular set functions are the Saeki measuroids (see [43]). In [17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23] some limit theorems were proved for lattice group-valued k-subadditive capacities and k-triangular set functions.

In this paper we prove some Dieudonné convergence theorems and a version of Nikodým boundedness theorem for regular and k-triangular lattice group-valued set functions, extending earlier results proved in the real case in [39, 40, 41] using some

DOI: 10.14736/kyb-2019-2-0233

diagonal matrix theorems. Our techniques are direct and inspired by sliding hump-type methods. We use the tool of (D)-convergence, because we can apply the powerful Fremlin lemma (see also [37, 42]), which replaces the $\frac{\varepsilon}{2^n}$-technique and allows to replace a sequence of regulators with a single (D)-sequence. Observe that, in the lattice group context, in the Nikodým boundedness theorem we assume the existence of a single increasing sequence of positive elements of the involved lattice group, with respect to which the set functions are supposed to be pointwise bounded on a suitable sublattice, playing a role similar to that of the class of all open subsets of a topological space. We see that in general this condition cannot be replaced by a simple setwise boundedness (see also [11, 25, 46]). Finally, some open problems are posed.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We begin with recalling the following basic facts on lattice groups (see also [16, 28]).

Definition 2.1. (a) A lattice group R is said to be *Dedekind complete* if every nonempty subset of R, bounded from above, has supremum in R.

(b) A Dedekind complete lattice group R is *super Dedekind complete* iff for every nonempty set $A \subset R$, bounded from above, there is a countable subset A', with $\bigvee A' = \bigvee A$.

(c) A nonempty subset S of a lattice group R is *bounded* iff there exists an element $u \in R$ with $|x| \leq u$ for each $x \in S$.

(d) Let $(t_n)_n$ be an increasing sequence of positive elements of R, and let $\emptyset \neq S \subset R$. We say that S is *bounded by* $(t_n)_n$ iff for every $x \in S$ there is $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x| \leq t_{n_*}$.

(e) A sequence $(\sigma_p)_p$ in a lattice group R is called an (O)-*sequence* iff it is decreasing and $\bigwedge_{p=1}^{\infty} \sigma_p = 0$.

(f) A bounded double sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ in R is a (D)-*sequence* or a *regulator* iff $(a_{t,l})_l$ is an (O)-sequence for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

(g) A lattice group R is *weakly σ-distributive* iff $\bigwedge_{\varphi\in\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}} \left(\bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}\right) = 0$ for every (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ in R.

(h) A sequence $(x_n)_n$ in R is said to be *order convergent* (or (O)-*convergent*) to x iff there exists an (O)-sequence $(\sigma_p)_p$ in R such that for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a positive integer n_0 with $|x_n - x| \leq \sigma_p$ for each $n \geq n_0$, and in this case we write $(O)\lim_n x_n = x$.

(i) We say that $(x_n)_n$ is (O)-*Cauchy* iff there is an (O)-sequence $(\tau_p)_p$ in R such that for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a positive integer n_0 with $|x_n - x_q| \leq \tau_p$ for each $n, q \geq n_0$.

(j) A sequence $(x_n)_n$ in R is (D)-*convergent* to x iff there is a (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ in R such that for every $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|x_n - x| \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$ whenever $n \geq n_0$, and we write $(D)\lim_n x_n = x$.

(k) We say that $(x_n)_n$ is (D)-*Cauchy* iff there exists a (D)-sequence $(b_{t,l})_{t,l}$ in R such that for each $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|x_n - x_q| \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} b_{t,\varphi(t)}$ whenever n, $q \geq n_0$.

(l) A lattice group R is said to be (O)-*complete* (resp. (D)-*complete*) iff every (O)-Cauchy (resp. (D)-Cauchy) sequence is (O)-convergent (resp. (D)-convergent).

(m) We call *sum* of a series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ in R the limit $(O)\lim_n \sum_{r=1}^{n} x_r$, if it exists in R.

(n) If R is a vector lattice, then we say that $(x_n)_n$ (r)-*converges* to x iff there exists $u \in R$, $u \geq 0$, such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|x_n - x| \leq \varepsilon u$ whenever $n \geq n_0$.

(o) A vector lattice R *satisfies property* (σ) iff for every sequence $(u_n)_n$ of positive elements of R there are a sequence $(a_n)_n$ of positive real numbers and an element $u \in R$ with $a_n u_n \leq u$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(p) A lattice $\mathcal{E}$ of subsets of an infinite set G *satisfies property* (E) iff for each disjoint sequence $(C_h)_h$ in $\mathcal{E}$ there is a subsequence $(C_{h_r})_r$, such that $\mathcal{E}$ contains the σ-algebra generated by the sets C_{h_r}, $r \in \mathbb{N}$ (see also [44]).

Remark 2.2. Note that every Dedekind complete lattice group is both (O)- and (D)-complete. Moreover, observe that every (O)-convergent sequence is also (D)-convergent to the same limit in any lattice group, while the converse is true if and only if the involved (ℓ)-group is weakly σ-distributive. Furthermore, it is known that every (r)-convergent sequence in any vector lattice is (O)-convergent too (see also [28, 48]). The converse, in general, is not true. For example, let $\mathcal{B}$ be the σ-algebra of all Borel subsets of $[0,1]$, λ be the Lebesgue measure on $[0,1]$, $L^0 := L^0([0,1], \mathcal{B}, \lambda)$ be the space of all measurable real-valued functions defined on $[0,1]$, with the identification of λ-null sets, and $R := \{f \in L^0([0,1], \mathcal{B}, \lambda)\colon\ f \text{ is bounded}\}$. If $(u_n)_n$ is any sequence of positive elements of R, then there exists a sequence $(L_n)_n$ of positive real numbers such that $u_n \leq \underline{L_n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\underline{L_n}$ denotes the function which assumes the constant value L_n. Since $\mathbb{R}$ fulfils property (σ), there are a sequence $(a_n)_n$ of positive real numbers and a positive real number v with $a_n L_n \leq v$, and hence $a_n u_n \leq a_n \underline{L_n} \leq \underline{v}$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, R satisfies property (σ). It is known that in L^0 order and (r)-convergence coincide with almost everywhere convergence, while in R, order convergence coincides with the almost everywhere convergence dominated by a constant function, and (r)-convergence coincides with uniform convergence (see also [48]). Moreover, since L^0 is weakly σ-distributive (see also [8]), then in L^0 (O)- and (D)-convergence coincide in L^0, and so they coincide also in R. Hence, R is weakly σ-distributive too. Finally, observe that, in the space L^0, order, (D)- and (r)-convergence are equivalent (see also [8, 48]).

We now recall the following property of convergence in lattice groups (see also [22, Proposition 3.1]).

Proposition 2.3. Let R be a Dedekind complete lattice group, $x \in R$, and $(x_n)_n$ be a sequence in R, such that

2.3.1) for every subsequence $(x_{n_q})_q$ of $(x_n)_n$ there is a sub-subsequence $(x_{n_{q_r}})_r$, convergent to x with respect to a single (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$.

Then $(D)\lim_n x_n = x$ with respect to $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$.

P r o o f. Suppose by contradiction that there are $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and a strictly increasing sequence $(n_q)_q$ with $|x_{n_q} - x| \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$ for each $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus any subsequence of $(x_{n_q})_q$ does not (D)-converge to x with respect to $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$, obtaining a contradiction with 2.3.1). $\square$

Remark 2.4. An analogous of Proposition 2.3 holds, if (D)-convergence is replaced by (O)-convergence.

We now recall the Fremlin lemma, by means of which it is possible to replace a sequence of regulators with a single (D)-sequence, and which will be fundamental in the sequel, to prove our main results, because it has the same role as the $\frac{\varepsilon}{2^n}$-argument. This is one of the reasons for which we often prefer to deal with (D)-convergence rather than (O)-convergence.

Lemma 2.5. (see also Fremlin [37, Lemma 1C], Riečan and Neubrunn [42, Theorem 3.2.3]) Let R be any Dedekind complete (ℓ)-group and $(a_{t,l}^{(n)})_{t,l}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of regulators in R. Then for every $u \in R$, $u \geq 0$ there is a (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ in R with

$$u \wedge \Big(\sum_{n=1}^{q}\Big(\bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+n)}^{(n)}\Big)\Big) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)} \quad \text{for every } q \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

We now deal with the main properties of k-triangular lattice group-valued set functions. Let R be a Dedekind complete and weakly σ-distributive lattice group, G be an infinite set, $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{P}(G)$ be an algebra, $m : \mathcal{L} \to R$ be a bounded set function and k be a fixed positive integer.

Definition 2.6. (a) The *semivariation* of m is defined by setting

$$v(m)(A) := \bigvee\{|m(B)| : B \in \mathcal{L},\ B \subset A\}, \quad A \in \mathcal{L}.$$

If $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{L}$ is a lattice, then we put

$$v_{\mathcal{E}}(m)(A) := \bigvee\{|m(B)| : B \in \mathcal{E},\ B \subset A\}, \quad A \in \mathcal{L}.$$

The set function $v_{\mathcal{E}}(m)$ is called the *semivariation of m with respect to $\mathcal{E}$*.

(b) We say that m is

$$m(A) - k\, m(B) \leq m(A \cup B) \leq m(A) + k\, m(B) \text{ whenever } A, B \in \Sigma,\ A \cap B = \emptyset \quad (1)$$

and

$$0 = m(\emptyset) \leq m(A) \text{ for each } A \in \Sigma. \quad (2)$$

(c) Let $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{L}$ be a sublattice of $\mathcal{L}$. We say that a set function $m : \mathcal{L} \to R$ is $\mathcal{E}$-(s)-*bounded* iff there exists a (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ such that, for every disjoint sequence $(C_h)_h$ in $\mathcal{E}$, $(D) \lim_h v_{\mathcal{E}}(m)(C_h) = 0$ with respect to $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$. A set function m is (s)-*bounded* iff it is $\mathcal{L}$-(s)-bounded.

(d) We say that the set functions $m_j : \mathcal{L} \to R$ are $\mathcal{E}$-*uniformly* (s)-*bounded* iff there exists a (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ such that, for every disjoint sequence $(C_h)_h$ in $\mathcal{E}$,

$$(D) \lim_h \Big(\bigvee_j v_{\mathcal{E}}(m_j)(C_h) \Big) = 0$$

with respect to $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$. The m_j's are *uniformly* (s)-*bounded* iff they are $\mathcal{L}$-uniformly (s)-bounded.

(e) We say that the set functions $m_j : \mathcal{L} \to R$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, are *equibounded* on $\mathcal{L}$ iff there is $u \in R$ with $|m_j(A)| \le u$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A \subset \mathcal{L}$.

Now we recall the following

Proposition 2.7. (see also Boccuto and Dimitriou [22, Proposition 2.6]) If $m : \mathcal{L} \to R$ is k-triangular, then $v(m)$ is k-triangular too.

Proposition 2.8. (see also Boccuto and Dimitriou [22, Proposition 2.7]) Let $m : \mathcal{L} \to R$ be a k-triangular set function. Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \ge 2$, and for every pairwise disjoint sets $E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_n \in \mathcal{L}$ we have

$$m(E_1) - k \sum_{q=2}^{n} m(E_q) \le m\Big(\bigcup_{q=1}^{n} E_q \Big) \le m(E_1) + k \sum_{q=2}^{n} m(E_q), \tag{3}$$

and in particular

$$m(E_1) \le m\Big(\bigcup_{q=1}^{n} E_q \Big) + k \sum_{q=2}^{n} m(E_q). \tag{4}$$

We now turn to regular lattice group-valued set functions.

Definition 2.9. Let $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{H}$ be two sublattices of $\mathcal{L}$, such that $\mathcal{G}$ is closed under countable unions, and the complement of every element of $\mathcal{H}$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}$. A set function $m : \mathcal{L} \to R$ is said to be *regular* iff there exists a (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ such that

2.9.1) for every $E \in \mathcal{L}$ there are two sequences $(V_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{G}$ and $(K_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{H}$ with $V_n \supset E \supset K_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and such that for any $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$v(m)(V_n \setminus K_n) \le \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$$

whenever $n \ge n_0$, and

2.9.2) for every $W \in \mathcal{H}$ there are two sequences $(G_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{G}$ and $(F_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{H}$ with $W \subset F_{n+1} \subset G_n \subset F_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that for each $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there is $n^* \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$v(m)(G_n \setminus W) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$$

whenever $n \geq n^*$.

We now prove the following property of regular set functions.

Proposition 2.10. (see also Boccuto and Dimitriou [17, Theorem 3.10]) If G is a compact Hausdorff topological space, $\mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{H}$ are the classes of all Borel, open and compact subsets of G, respectively, and $m : \mathcal{L} \to R$ is a k-triangular, increasing and regular set function, then

$$(O) \lim_n m(I_n) = 0 \tag{5}$$

whenever $(I_n)_n$ is a decreasing sequence in $\mathcal{L}$ with $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n = \emptyset$, with respect to a single regulator independent of the choice of $(I_n)_n$.

Proof. Let $(I_n)_n$ be as in (5). Let $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ be a (D)-sequence satisfying 2.9.1). For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $K_n \in \mathcal{H}$ with $K_n \subset I_n$ and $m(I_n \setminus K_n) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+n)}$. By virtue of Lemma 2.5, there is a (D)-sequence $(\alpha_{t,l})_{t,l}$ with

$$m(G) \wedge \Big(\sum_{n=1}^{q} \Big(\bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+n)}\Big)\Big) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{t,\varphi(t)} \text{ for each } q \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

Let $O_n := G \setminus K_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $O_n \in \mathcal{G}$ for every n and $G = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} O_n$, since $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n = \emptyset$. As G is compact, there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $G = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} O_i$, and hence $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} K_i = \emptyset$, whenever $n \geq n_0$. For such n's, taking into account (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} m(I_n) &\leq m(G) \wedge \Big(m(I_n \setminus \Big(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} K_i\Big)\Big) \\ &\leq m(G) \wedge \Big(m\Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} (I_i \setminus K_i)\Big)\Big) \\ &\leq m(G) \wedge \Big(k \sum_{i=1}^{n} m(I_i \setminus K_i)\Big) \leq k \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{t,\varphi(t)} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

(see also [39, Lemma 1]). Thus the assertion follows. □

Remark 2.11. Observe that, if $\mathcal{L}$ is an algebra with property (E) and $m : \mathcal{L} \to R$ is positive, increasing and satisfies (5), then m is also (s)-bounded (with respect to a single regulator). To prove this, let $(A_n)_n$ be any disjoint sequence in $\mathcal{L}$ and $(B_n)_n$ be any subsequence of $(A_n)_n$. By property (E), there is a subsequence $(C_n)_n$ of $(B_n)_n$, such that $\bigcup_{n \in P} C_n \in \mathcal{L}$ for every $P \subset \mathbb{N}$. Since m is increasing and $m(\emptyset) = 0$, we get

$$0 \leq m(C_n) \leq m\Big(\bigcup_{i=n}^{\infty} C_i\Big).$$

From (5) and (7) we get $(O)\lim_n m(C_n) = 0$ with respect to a single regulator (independent of $(A_n)_n$, $(B_n)_n$ and $(C_n)_n$). By arbitrariness of the sequence $(B_n)_n$ and Proposition 2.3 it follows that $(D)\lim_n m(C_n) = 0$ with respect to a single regulator, and this proves the claim.

The converse, in general, is not true (see also [22, Remark 2.12]). □

Proposition 2.12. (see also Boccuto and Dimitriou [17, Proposition 3.4]) If $m : \mathcal{L} \to R$ is a k-triangular and increasing set function satisfying (5), then we get

$$m\Big(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n\Big) \le m(E_1) + k \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} m(E_n) \tag{7}$$

for every sequence $(E_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{L}$, such that $\bigcup_{n\in A} E_n \in \mathcal{L}$ whenever $A \subset \mathbb{N}$.

The following proposition will be useful in proving our Dieudonné convergence theorem (see also [10, Lemma 3.1]).

Proposition 2.13. With the same notations and assumptions as above, let $m : \mathcal{L} \to R$ be a regular and k-triangular set function. Then for each $V \in \mathcal{G}$ we get

$$v_{\mathcal{L}}(m)(V) = v_{\mathcal{G}}(m)(V). \tag{8}$$

Proof. Pick arbitrarily $V \in \mathcal{G}$, and let $(\gamma_{t,l})_{t,l}$ be a (D)-sequence related to regularity of m. Choose $B \in \mathcal{L}$ with $B \subset V$, and fix arbitrarily $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$. By regularity of m, there is $O \in \mathcal{G}$, $O \supset B$, with

$$v_{\mathcal{L}}(m)(O \setminus B) \le \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma_{t,\varphi(t)}. \tag{9}$$

Let $U := O \cap V$, then $U \supset B$. From (9) and k-triangularity of m we get

$$\begin{aligned} m(B) &\le m(U) + k\, m(U \setminus B) \\ &\le v_{\mathcal{G}}(m)(V) + k\, v_{\mathcal{L}}(m)(O \setminus B) \\ &\le v_{\mathcal{G}}(m)(V) + k \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma_{t,\varphi(t)}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Taking in (10) the supremum as $B \in \mathcal{L}$, $B \subset V$, we obtain

$$v_{\mathcal{L}}(m)(V) \le v_{\mathcal{G}}(m)(V) + k \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma_{t,\varphi(t)}. \tag{11}$$

From (11) and weak σ-distributivity of R we deduce

$$v_{\mathcal{L}}(m)(V) \le v_{\mathcal{G}}(m)(V) + k \bigwedge_{\varphi\in\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}} \Big(\bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma_{t,\varphi(t)}\Big) = v_{\mathcal{G}}(m)(V). \tag{12}$$

Since the converse inequality is straightforward, then (8) follows from (12). This ends the proof. □

Definition 2.14. A sequence $m_j : \mathcal{L} \to R$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, of set functions is said to be (RD)-*regular* on $\mathcal{L}$ iff there is a (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ such that

2.14.1) for every $E \in \mathcal{L}$ there are two sequences $(V_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{G}$ and $(K_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{H}$ such that for every $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $v(m_j)(V_n \setminus K_n) \le \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$ for every $n \ge n_0$, and

2.14.2) for every disjoint sequence $(H_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{L}$ there is a sequence $(O_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{G}$ such that $O_n \supset H_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(D) \lim_n v(m_j)\Big(\bigcup_{i=n}^{\infty} O_i\Big) = 0$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with respect to $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$.

We now recall the following

Proposition 2.15. (see also Boccuto and Candeloro [10, Proposition 2.6]) Let R be any Dedekind complete and weakly σ-distributive lattice group, and $m_j : \mathcal{L} \to R$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of regular equibounded set functions. Then they satisfy 2.14.1) and the following property:

2.15.1) there exists a regulator $(\beta_{t,l})_{t,l}$ such that for every $W \in \mathcal{H}$ there are two sequences $(G_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{G}$ and $(F_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{H}$, with $W \subset F_{n+1} \subset G_n \subset F_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and such that for each $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $n^* \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$v_{\mathcal{L}}(m_j)(G_n \setminus W) \le \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta_{t,\varphi(t)}$$

for every $n \ge n^*$.

Definition 2.16. Let $\mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{H}$ be as in Definition 2.9. The set functions $m_j : \mathcal{L} \to R$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, are *uniformly regular* iff there exists a (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ such that

2.16.1) for each $E \in \mathcal{L}$ there exist two sequences $(V_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{G}$ and $(K_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{H}$ with $V_n \supset E \supset K_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and such that for each $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\bigvee_j v(m_j)(V_n \setminus K_n) \le \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$$

for all $n \ge n_0$, and

2.16.2) for any $W \in \mathcal{H}$ there are two sequences $(G_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{G}$ and $(F_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{H}$ with $W \subset F_{n+1} \subset G_n \subset F_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that for every $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there exists $n^* \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\bigvee_j v(m_j)(G_n \setminus W) \le \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$$

whenever $n \ge n^*$.

3. THE MAIN RESULTS

In this section we prove a Dieudonné convergence-type theorem and a Dieudonné-Nikodým boundedness theorem for regular and k-triangular lattice group-valued set functions. Let R be a Dedekind complete and weakly σ-distributive lattice group. We begin with recalling the following Brooks–Jewett–type theorem for k-triangular set functions.

Theorem 3.1. (see Boccuto and Dimitriou [22, Theorem 3.3]) Let G be any infinite set, $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{P}(G)$ be an algebra, $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{L}$ be a lattice, satisfying property (E), $m_j : \mathcal{L} \to R$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of equibounded, k-triangular and $\mathcal{E}$-(s)-bounded set functions. If the limit $m_0(E) := \lim_j m_j(E)$ exists in R for every $E \in \mathcal{E}$ with respect to a single regulator, then the m_j's are $\mathcal{E}$-uniformly (s)-bounded, and m_0 is k-triangular and (s)-bounded.

The following technical lemma will be useful in the sequel.

Lemma 3.2. (see Boccuto and Dimitriou [22, Lemma 3.4]) Let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{P}(G)$ be an algebra, $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be two sublattices of $\mathcal{L}$, such that the complement of every element of $\mathcal{H}$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}$, $m_j : \mathcal{L} \to R$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of k-triangular and $\mathcal{G}$-uniformly (s)-bounded set functions. Fix $W \in \mathcal{H}$ and a decreasing sequence $(H_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{G}$, with $W \subset H_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If

$$(D) \lim_n \Big(\bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{G}, A \subset H_n \setminus W} m_j(A) \Big) = \bigwedge_n \Big(\bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{G}, A \subset H_n \setminus W} m_j(A) \Big) = 0 \text{ for every } j \in \mathbb{N} \tag{13}$$

with respect to a single (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$, then

$$(D) \lim_n \Big(\bigvee_j \Big(\bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{G}, A \subset H_n \setminus W} m_j(A) \Big) \Big) = \bigwedge_n \Big(\bigvee_j \Big(\bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{G}, A \subset H_n \setminus W} m_j(A) \Big) \Big) = 0$$

with respect to $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$.

The next step is to prove a Dieudonné-type theorem for k-triangular lattice group-valued set functions, which extends [10, Lemma 3.2].

Theorem 3.3. Let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{P}(G)$ be an algebra, $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be two sublattices of $\mathcal{L}$, such that $\mathcal{G}$ is closed under countable unions and the complement of every element of $\mathcal{H}$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}$, $m_j : \mathcal{L} \to R$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of equibounded, regular, k-triangular and $\mathcal{G}$-uniformly (s)-bounded set functions. Then the m_j's are $\mathcal{L}$-uniformly (s)-bounded and uniformly regular on $\mathcal{L}$.

Proof. Let $(H_n)_n$ be a disjoint sequence of elements of $\mathcal{L}$, $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ be a (D)-sequence, satisfying 2.14.1), $u = \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{N}, A \in \mathcal{L}} m_j(A)$, and according to Lemma 2.5, let $(b_{t,l})_{t,l}$ be a regulator in R, with

$$u \wedge \Big(\sum_{h=1}^{q} \Big(\bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+h)} \Big) \Big) \le \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} b_{t,\varphi(t)} \quad \text{for every } \varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \text{ and } q \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{14}$$

Let $(c_{t,l})_{t,l}$ be a (D)-sequence associated with $\mathcal{G}$-uniform (s)-boundedness, and set $d_{t,l} = (k+1)(b_{t,l} + c_{t,l})$, $e_{t,l} = (k+1)(a_{t,l} + d_{t,l})$, for every t, $l \in \mathbb{N}$. We prove that the m_j's are $\mathcal{L}$-uniformly (s)-bounded with respect to the regulator $(e_{t,l})_{t,l}$. Otherwise, there is $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the property that for every $h \in \mathbb{N}$ there are j_h, $n_h \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_h \geq h$ and $B_h \in \mathcal{L}$ with $B_h \subset H_{n_h}$ and

$$m_{j_h}(B_h) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1} e_{t,\varphi(t)}. \tag{15}$$

By 2.14.1), for every $h \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $A_h \in \mathcal{H}$, $A_h \subset B_h$, with

$$m_{j_h}(B_h \setminus A_h) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}. \tag{16}$$

From (15) and (16) it follows that

$$m_{j_h}(A_h) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} d_{t,\varphi(t)} : \tag{17}$$

otherwise, thanks to k-triangularity of m_{j_h}, we should get

$$m_{j_h}(B_h) \leq m_{j_h}(A_h) + k\, m_{j_h}(B_h \setminus A_h) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} d_{t,\varphi(t)},$$

which contradicts (15). Moreover, observe that from 2.14.1), in correspondence with φ, for every h there are $G_h \in \mathcal{G}$ and $F_h \in \mathcal{H}$, with $A_h \subset G_h \subset F_h$ and

$$[v(m_1) \vee \ldots \vee v(m_{j_h})](F_h \setminus A_h) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+h)}.$$

Set now $G_1^* = G_1$, $G_{h+1}^* = G_{h+1} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{r=1}^{h} F_r\right)$, $h \geq 2$. Since the G_h^*'s are disjoint elements of $\mathcal{G}$, then, thanks to $\mathcal{G}$-uniform (s)-boundedness and taking into account Proposition 2.13, we find a positive integer h_0 with

$$\bigvee_j v_{\mathcal{L}}(m_j)(G_h^*) = \bigvee_j v_{\mathcal{G}}(m_j)(G_h^*) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} c_{t,\varphi(t)}$$

whenever $h \geq h_0$. Since for every h we get $A_{h+1} \setminus G_{h+1}^* \subset \bigcup_{r=1}^{h}(F_r \setminus A_r)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & m_{j_h}(A_h) \leq m_{j_h}(A_h \cap G_h^*) + m_{j_h}(A_h \setminus G_h^*) \\ \leq \quad & \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} c_{t,\varphi(t)} + k \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} b_{t,\varphi(t)} \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} d_{t,\varphi(t)} \text{ for every } h \geq h_0, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (17), getting $\mathcal{L}$-uniform (s)-boundedness of the m_j's. Conditions 2.16.2) and 2.16.1) on uniform regularity of the m_j's follow easily from Proposition 2.15 and Lemma 3.2 used with $H_n = G_n \setminus W$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $H_n = V_n \setminus K_n$, $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L}$, $W = \emptyset$ respectively, where G_n is as in 2.15.1), V_n and K_n are as in 2.14.1). □

Now we are in position to prove the following theorem, which extends [10, Theorem 3.3].

Theorem 3.4. Let G, R, $\mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{H}$ be as above, and suppose that $m_j : \mathcal{L} \to R$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, is a sequence of equibounded, regular, k-triangular and (s)-bounded set functions, such that there exists

$$m_0(E) := (D) \lim_j m_j(E) \text{ for every } E \in \mathcal{G}$$

with respect to a single regulator. Then,

3.4.1) the measures m_j, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, are $\mathcal{L}$-uniformly (s)-bounded and uniformly regular;

3.4.2) there exists in R the limit $m_0(E) = (D) \lim_j m_j(E)$ for each $E \in \mathcal{L}$ with respect to a single regulator;

3.4.3) the set function m_0 is regular, k-triangular and (s)-bounded.

Proof. 3.4.1) is a consequence of Theorems 3.1 and 3.3.

3.4.2). Choose arbitrarily $E \in \mathcal{L}$, and let $(y_{t,l})_{t,l}$ be a (D)-sequence associated with uniform regularity. For each $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there is $U \in \mathcal{G}$ with $U \supset E$ and $v_{\mathcal{L}}(m_j)(U \setminus E) \le \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} y_{t,\varphi(t)}$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, in correspondence with U there is $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$|m_j(U) - m_{j+p}(U)| \le \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{t,\varphi(t)}$$

for every $j \ge j_0$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$, where $(\alpha_{t,l})_{t,l}$ is a regulator related to (D)-convergence on $\mathcal{G}$. By k-triangularity of m_j and m_{j+p} we get

$$\begin{aligned} m_j(E) - m_{j+p}(E) &\le m_j(U) - m_{j+p}(U) + k\, m_j(U \setminus E) + k\, m_{j+p}(U \setminus E), \\ m_{j+p}(E) - m_j(E) &\le m_{j+p}(U) - m_j(U) + k\, m_j(U \setminus E) + k\, m_{j+p}(U \setminus E), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} |m_j(E) - m_{j+p}(E)| &\le |m_j(U) - m_{j+p}(U)| + k\, m_j(U \setminus E) + k\, m_{j+p}(U \setminus E) \\ &\le \bigvee_{i=1}^{\infty} (2\,k+1)(y_{i,\varphi(i)} + \alpha_{i,\varphi(i)}) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

for every $j \ge j_0$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. From (18) it follows that the sequence $(m_j(E))_j$ is (D)-Cauchy in R. Since R is a Dedekind complete lattice group, then the sequence $(m_j(E))_j$ is (D)-convergent, with respect to a regulator independent of E (see also [7, 28]). Thus 3.4.2) is proved.

3.4.3). Straightforward. □

The next step is to prove a uniform boundedness theorem for k-triangular regular lattice group-valued set functions. We begin with the following result, which extends [11, Proposition 4.5].

Proposition 3.5. Let $m_h : \mathcal{L} \to R$, $h \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of k-triangular set functions, and let $(t_n)_n$ be an increasing sequence of positive elements of R. Suppose also that

3.5.1) for every disjoint sequence $(H_j)_j$ in $\mathcal{L}$, the set $\{m_h(H_j)\colon h, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded by $(t_n)_n$.

Then the set $\{m_h(A) : h \in \mathbb{N}, A \in \mathcal{L}\}$ is bounded in R.

P r o o f. First of all observe that, thanks to 3.5.1), for every fixed element $A \in \mathcal{L}$ there is $n = n(A) \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 \le m_h(A) \le t_{n(A)}$ for every $h \in \mathbb{N}$. We now prove that the set $\{m_h(A) : h \in \mathbb{N},\ A \in \mathcal{L}\}$ is bounded by the sequence $((k+1)t_n)_n$. Suppose, by contradiction, that this is not true. By hypothesis, there is $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m_h(G) \le t_{n_1}$ for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$, where G is as in Theorem 3.1. Moreover, there exist $A_1 \in \mathcal{L}$ and $h_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m_{h_1}(A_1) \not\le (k+1)t_{n_1}$. We have also $m_{h_1}(G \setminus A_1) \not\le t_{n_1}$: otherwise, by k-triangularity of m_{h_1} and (4) used with $q = 2$, $E_1 = A_1$, $E_2 = G \setminus A_1$, we get

$$m_{h_1}(A_1) \le m_{h_1}(G) + k\, m_{h_1}(G \setminus A_1) \le t_{n_1} + k\, t_{n_1} = (k+1)t_{n_1}.$$

It is not difficult to check that either $\{m_h(A \cap A_1)\colon A \in \mathcal{L},\ h \in \mathbb{N}\}$, or $\{m_h(A \setminus A_1)\colon A \in \mathcal{L},\ h \in \mathbb{N}\}$ (or both, possibly) is not bounded in R: otherwise, if

$$u_1 = \bigvee\{m_h(A \cap A_1) : A \in \mathcal{L}, h \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

$$u_2 = \bigvee\{m_h(A \setminus A_1) : A \in \mathcal{L}, h \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

then, thanks to triangularity of the m_h's, we have

$$0 \le m_h(A) \le m_h(A \cap A_1) + k\, m_h(A \setminus A_1) \le u_1 + k\, u_2$$

for each $A \in \mathcal{L}$ and $h \in \mathbb{N}$, and hence the set $\{m_h(A)\colon A \in \mathcal{L},\ h \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded in R, getting a contradiction. In the first case, set $C_1 := A_1$, otherwise put $C_1 := G \setminus A_1$. Then, set $D_1 := G \setminus C_1$. Now we use the same argument as above, by replacing G by C_1: so we find a set $A_2 \subset C_1$, $A_2 \in \mathcal{L}$ and two integers $n_2 > n_1$, $h_2 > h_1$, with $m_{h_2}(A_2) \not\le (k+1)t_{n_2}$ and $m_{h_2}(C_1 \setminus A_2) \not\le t_{n_2}$. Put $C_2 := A_2$ or $C_2 := C_1 \setminus A_2$ according as the $\{m_h(A \cap A_2) : A \in \mathcal{L}, h \in \mathbb{N}\}$ or $\{m_h(A \setminus A_2) : A \in \mathcal{L}, h \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded, set $D_2 := C_1 \setminus C_2$, and let us repeat the same argument as above. Proceeding by induction, we find a disjoint sequence $(D_j)_j$ and two strictly increasing sequences $(n_j)_j$, $(h_j)_j$ in $\mathbb{N}$ with $m_{h_j}(D_j) \not\le t_{n_j}$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, obtaining a contradiction with 3.5.1). This ends the proof. □

We now turn to our main uniform boundedness theorem for regular and k-triangular lattice group-valued set functions, which extends [11, Theorem 4.6].

Theorem 3.6. Let $\mu_j : \mathcal{L} \to R$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, be a (RD)-regular sequence of k-triangular set functions, and suppose that there is an increasing sequence $(t_n)_n$ of positive elements of R such that for every $U \in \mathcal{G}$ the set $\{\mu_j(U)\colon j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded by $(t_n)_n$.

Then the set $\{\mu_j(E) : j \in \mathbb{N},\ E \in \mathcal{L}\}$ is bounded in R.

P r o o f. Choose arbitrarily $E \in \mathcal{L}$. By 2.14.1), there are a (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$, which can be taken independently of E, and a set $U \in \mathcal{G}$, $U \supset E$, with

$$v(\mu_j)(U \setminus E) \le \bigvee_{t,l=1}^{\infty} a_{t,l} \quad \text{for every } j \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{19}$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, put $w_n := t_n + \bigvee_{t,l=1}^{\infty} a_{t,l}$. Taking into account k-triangularity of μ_j, in correspondence with U there is $\overline{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\mu_j(E) \le \mu_j(U) + k\, v(\mu_j)(U \setminus E) \le w_{\overline{n}},$$

$$-\mu_j(E) \le -\mu_j(U) + k\, v(\mu_j)(U \setminus E) \le w_{\overline{n}}$$

for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus the set $\{\mu_j(E) : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded by the sequence $(w_n)_n$.

By virtue of Proposition 3.5, it will be enough to prove that, for every disjoint sequence $(H_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{L}$, the set $\{\mu_j(H_n)\colon j, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded by the sequence $(y_n)_n$, where $y_n = k\, n\, w_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proceeding by contradiction, assume that there is a disjoint sequence $(H'_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{L}$, such that the set $\{\mu_j(H'_n)\colon j, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is not bounded by $(y_n)_n$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there are $i(n)$, $h(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\mu_{h(n)}(H'_{i(n)}) \not\le (k\, n + 1) w_n. \tag{20}$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set $m_n = \mu_{h(n)}$, $H_n = H'_{i(n)}$. By 2.14.2), the (D)-sequence $(a_{t,l})$ in (19) has the property that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a set $O_n \in \mathcal{G}$ with

$$O_n \supset H_n \text{ for each } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } (D) \lim_n v(m_j)\Big(\bigcup_{i=n}^{\infty} O_i\Big) = 0 \text{ for every } j \in \mathbb{N} \tag{21}$$

with respect to $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$. Hence, there is an integer $n_1 > 1$ with $m_1(E) \le \bigvee_{t,l=1}^{\infty} a_{t,l}$ for every $E \in \mathcal{L}$, $E \subset \bigcup_{i=n_1}^{\infty} O_i$, and a fortiori for each $E \in \mathcal{L}$, $E \subset \bigcup_{i=n_1}^{\infty} H_i$. We get

$$m_1(E \cup H_1) \not\le w_1 \text{ for each } E \in \mathcal{L}, E \subset \bigcup_{i=n_1}^{\infty} H_i :$$

otherwise, by k-triangularity of m_1 and (4) used with $q = 2$, $E_1 = H_1$, $E_2 = E$, we have

$$m_1(H_1) \le m_1(E \cup H_1) + k\, m_1(E) \le w_1 + k \bigvee_{t,l=1}^{\infty} a_{t,l} \le (k+1) w_1,$$

which contradicts (20). Let $j_2 > n_1$ be an integer such that

$$\bigvee \{m_n(H_1) : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \le t_{j_2}.$$

By 2.14.2), in correspondence with m_{j_2} there is an integer $n_2 > j_2$ such that $m_{j_2}(E) \le \bigvee_{t,l=1}^{\infty} a_{t,l}$ for any $E \in \mathcal{L}$, $E \subset \bigcup_{i=n_2}^{\infty} H_i$. For such E's we have

$$m_{j_2}(E \cup H_1 \cup H_{j_2}) \not\le w_{j_2} :$$

otherwise, by k-triangularity of m_{j_2} and (4) used with $q = 3$, $E_1 = H_{j_2}$, $E_2 = E$, $E_3 = H_1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} m_{j_2}(H_{j_2}) &\le m_{j_2}(E \cup H_1 \cup H_{j_2}) + k\, m_{j_2}(E) + k\, m_{j_2}(H_1) \\ &\le w_{j_2} + k \bigvee_{t,l=1}^{\infty} a_{t,l} + k\, w_{j_2} \le 3\, k\, w_{j_2} \le (k\, j_2 + 1) w_{j_2}, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (20). Let $j_3 > n_2$ be an integer such that

$$\bigvee \{m_n(H_{j_2}) : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \leq w_{j_3}.$$

By 2.14.2), in correspondence with m_{j_3} there is $n_3 > j_3$ with $m_{j_3}(E) \leq \bigvee_{t,l=1}^{\infty} a_{t,l}$ for every $E \in \mathcal{L}$, $E \subset \bigcup_{i=n_3}^{\infty} H_i$. For such E's we have

$$m_{j_3}(E \cup H_1 \cup H_{j_2} \cup H_{j_3}) \not\leq w_{j_3} :$$

otherwise, by k-triangularity of m_{j_3} and (4) used with $q = 4$, $E_1 = H_{j_3}$, $E_2 = E$, $E_3 = H_1$, $E_4 = H_{j_2}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} m_{j_3}(H_{j_3}) &\leq m_{j_3}(E \cup H_1 \cup H_{j_2} \cup H_{j_3}) + k\, m_{j_3}(E) + k\, m_{j_3}(H_1) + k\, m_{j_3}(H_{j_2}) \\ &\leq w_{j_3} + k \bigvee_{t,l=1}^{\infty} a_{t,l} + k\, w_{j_2} + k\, w_{j_3} \\ &\leq 4\, k\, w_{j_3} \leq (k\, j_3 + 1) w_{j_3}, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (20). Proceeding by induction, it is possible to construct two strictly increasing sequences $(j_h)_h$, $(n_h)_h$, such that $n_h > j_h \geq h$ for every $h \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$m_{j_h}(E \cup H_1 \cup H_{j_2} \cup \ldots \cup H_{j_h}) \not\leq w_{j_h}$$

whenever $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and $E \in \mathcal{L}$ with $E \subset \bigcup_{i=n_h}^{\infty} H_i$.

Set $j_1 = 1$ and $H = \bigcup_{h=1}^{\infty} H_{j_h}$. Note that $H \in \mathcal{G}$ and $m_{j_h}(H) \not\leq w_{j_h}$ for every $h \in \mathbb{N}$. But the set $\{m_h(H) : h \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded by the sequence $(w_n)_n$, and so we get a contradiction. This ends the proof. □

Remark 3.7. Now we show that, under certain hypotheses, regular and k-triangular set functions, with values in spaces of type L^0 as in Remark 2.2, are (RD)-regular too. Note that, by means of techniques analogous to those used below, this result can be proved for finite dimensional space-valued set functions, extending to the k-triangular context some classical theorems proved in the finitely additive setting (see for instance [29, Theorem 2]).

Let $R = L^0 = L^0([0, 1], \mathcal{B}, \lambda)$ be as in Remark 2.2, G be a compact Hausdorff topological space, $\mathcal{L}$ be the σ-algebra of all Borel subsets of G, $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be the classes of all open and of all compact subsets of G, respectively. First of all, observe that 2.9.2) is a consequence of 2.9.1). Indeed, pick arbitrarily $W \in \mathcal{H}$ and let $(V_n)_n$ be a sequence of elements of $\mathcal{G}$, satisfying 2.9.1). Since G is compact and Hausdorff, G is also normal (see also [36, Theorem XI.1.2]). As G is normal, thanks to [36, Proposition VII.3.2], in correspondence with W and V_1 there is a set $U_1 \in \mathcal{G}$ with $W \subset U_1 \subset \overline{U_1} \subset V_1$, where $\overline{U_1}$ denotes the topological closure of U_1 in G. Analogously, we can associate to W and $U_1 \cap V_2$ a set $U_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ with $W \subset U_2 \subset \overline{U_2} \subset U_1 \cap V_2$. Proceeding by induction, we construct a decreasing sequence $(U_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{G}$, with $W \subset U_{n+1} \subset \overline{U_{n+1}} \subset U_n \cap V_{n+1}$. Since the sequence $(V_n)_n$ satisfies 2.9.1), it is not difficult to see that the sequences $(U_n)_n$ and $(\overline{U_n})_n$ fulfil 2.9.2).

Let $m_j : \mathcal{L} \to R$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of k-triangular and regular set functions. We will prove that $(m_j)_j$ satisfies 2.14.1) and 2.14.2). Since in L^0 the (r)-, (O)- and (D)-convergences coincide (see Remark 2.2), then for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $u_j \in R$, $u_j \geq 0$, such that for every $E \in \mathcal{L}$ there are two sequences $(V_n^{(j)})_n$ in $\mathcal{G}$ and $(K_n^{(j)})_n$ in $\mathcal{H}$, with $V_n^{(j)} \supset E \supset K_n^{(j)}$ for each n and such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a positive integer $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon, j, E)$ with

$$v(m_j)(V_n^{(j)} \setminus K_n^{(j)}) \leq \varepsilon\, u_j \quad \text{whenever } n \geq n_0. \tag{22}$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set $V_n := \bigcap_{j=1}^n V_n^{(j)}$, $K_n := \bigcup_{j=1}^n K_n^{(j)}$: note that $V_n \in \mathcal{G}$, $K_n \in \mathcal{H}$ and $V_n \supset E \supset K_n$ for every n. Since R satisfies property (σ), in correspondence with the sequence $(u_j)_j$ there exist a sequence $(a_j)_j$ of positive real numbers and an element $u \in R$, $u \geq 0$, with $0 \leq a_j\, u_j \leq u$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that u does not depend on the choice of $E \in \mathcal{L}$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $E \in \mathcal{L}$, let $n_* = n_*(\varepsilon, j, E) = n_0(\varepsilon\, a_j, j, E)$, where n_0 is as in (22). We get

$$v(m_j)(V_n \setminus K_n) \leq v(m_j)(V_n^{(j)} \setminus K_n^{(j)}) \leq \varepsilon\, a_j\, u_j \leq \varepsilon\, u \tag{23}$$

for each $n \geq n_*$. If we take $\sigma_p = \frac{1}{p} u$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$, then it is not difficult to check that 2.14.1) is satisfied.

We now prove 2.14.2). Choose any disjoint sequence $(H_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{L}$ and let u be as in (23). In correspondence with j, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\frac{1}{k\,2^{n+j+1}}$ set $O_n^{(j)} = O_n^{(j)}\Big(\frac{1}{k\,2^{n+j+1}}\Big) = V_{n_*(\frac{1}{k\,2^{n+j+1}}, j, H_n)}$ and $F_n^{(j)} = F_n^{(j)}\Big(\frac{1}{k\,2^{n+j+1}}\Big) = K_{n_*(\frac{1}{k\,2^{n+j+1}}, j, H_n)}$, where n_* is as in (23). For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, put $O_n = \bigcap_{j=1}^n O_n^{(j)}$ and $F_n = \bigcup_{j=1}^n F_n^{(j)}$. Note that $O_n \in \mathcal{G}$, $F_n \in \mathcal{H}$ and $O_n \supset H_n \supset F_n$ for each n. Moreover, from (23) we get

$$v(m_j)(O_n \setminus F_n) \leq v(m_j)(O_n^{(j)} \setminus F_n^{(j)}) \leq \frac{1}{k\,2^{n+j+1}}\, u \quad \text{for every } j, n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{24}$$

Now, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ set $U_n := \bigcup_{i=n}^\infty O_i$, $C_n := \bigcap_{i=n}^\infty F_i$. Since the sequence $(H_n)_n$ is disjoint and $F_n \subset H_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $C_n = \emptyset$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Taking into account (7), from (24) we get

$$\begin{aligned} v(m_j)(U_n) &= v(m_j)(U_n \setminus C_n) = v(m_j)\Big(\Big(\bigcup_{i=n}^\infty O_i\Big) \setminus \Big(\Big(\bigcap_{i=n}^\infty F_i\Big)\Big) \qquad (25)\\ &= v(m_j)\Big(\bigcup_{i=n}^\infty (O_i \setminus F_i)\Big) \leq k \sum_{i=n}^\infty v(m_j)(O_i \setminus F_i) \leq k \sum_{i=n}^\infty \frac{1}{k\,2^{i+j+1}}\, u = \frac{1}{2^{n+j}}\, u \end{aligned}$$

(see also [39, Lemma 1]). Thus 2.14.2) is proved. □

The following example shows that, in Theorem 3.5, in general the condition 3.5.1) cannot be replaced by the boundedness of the set $\{m_j(U) : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Example 3.8. (see also Schwartz [46, Example 5] Let R be the vector lattice c_0 of all real sequences convergent to 0, endowed with the usual ordering, $\mathcal{B}$ be the σ-algebra of all Borel subsets of $[0,1]$. Note that c_0 is Dedekind complete and weakly σ-distributive, and that in c_0 order, (D)- and (r)-convergence coincide with coordinatewise convergence dominated by an element of c_0 (see also [28, 46, 48]). For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $E \in \mathcal{B}$ set $m_n(E) = (\mu_1(E), \ldots, \mu_n(E), 0, \ldots, 0, \ldots)$, where $\mu_n(E) = \int_E \sin(n\,\pi\,x)\,dx$. It is known (see [46]) that every m_n is a σ-additive measure and the set $\{m_n(E) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded in c_0 for every $E \in \mathcal{B}$. However, it is not possible to find a positive increasing sequence $(t_n)_n$ satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 3.6, since $\sup\{\mu_n(A) : A \in \mathcal{B}\} = 1$ for each n. Moreover, from this it follows that the set $\{m_n(E) : n \in \mathbb{N},\, E \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is not bounded in c_0.

Open problems:

(a) Prove similar results with respect to other kinds of (s)-boundedness, boundedness and/or convergence, and relatively to different types of variations in the setting of non-additive lattice-group valued set functions (see also [21, 41]).

(b) Find some other conditions under which 2.14.1) and/or 2.14.2) hold.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

(a) Our thanks go to the referees for their helpful suggestions, which improved the presentation of the paper.

(b) This work was partially supported by the projects "Ricerca di Base 2017" (Metodi di Teoria dell'Approssimazione e di Analisi Reale per problemi di approssimazione ed applicazioni) and "Ricerca di Base 2018" (Metodi di Teoria dell'Approssimazione, Analisi Reale, Analisi Nonlineare e loro applicazioni), and the G.N.A.M.P.A. (Italian National Group of Mathematical Analysis, Probability and their Applications).

(Received June 25, 2018)

REFERENCES

[1] K. Atanassov: Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets: Theory and Applications. Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg 1999.

[2] G. Barbieri: On Dieudonné's boundedness theorem. Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. II *9* (2009), 343–348.

[3] G. Barbieri: On the Dieudonné theorem. Sci. Math. Japon. *44* (2009), 403–408. DOI:10.1007/bf00966618

[4] G. Barbieri and A. Boccuto: On extensions of k-subadditive lattice group-valued capacities. Italian J. Pure Appl. Math. *37* (2017), 387–408.

[5] G. Barbieri and A. Boccuto: On some properties of k-subadditive lattice group-valued capacities. Math. Slovaca *67* (2017), 1387–1408. DOI:10.1515/ms-2017-0059

[6] A. Boccuto: Dieudonné-type theorems for means with values in Riesz spaces. Tatra Mt. Math. Publ. *8* (1996), 29–42.

[7] A. Boccuto: Integration in Riesz spaces with respect to (D)-convergence. Tatra Mt. Math. Publ. *10* (1997), 33–54.

[8] A. Boccuto: Egorov property and weak σ-distributivity in Riesz spaces. Acta Math. (Nitra) *6* (2003), 61–66.

[9] A. Boccuto and D. Candeloro: Uniform (s)-boundedness and convergece results for measures with values in complete (ℓ)-groups. J. Math. Anal. Appl. *265* (2002), 170–194. DOI:10.1006/jmaa.2001.7715

[10] A. Boccuto and D. Candeloro: Dieudonné-type theorems for set functions with values in (ℓ)-groups. Real Anal. Exchange *27* (2002), 473–484. DOI:10.14321/realanalexch.27.2.0473

[11] A. Boccuto and D. Candeloro: Uniform boundedness theorems in Riesz spaces. Atti Semin. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena Reggio Emilia *52* (2004), 369–382.

[12] A. Boccuto and D. Candeloro: Some new results about Brooks-Jewett and Dieudonné-type theorems in (ℓ)-groups. Kybernetika *46* (2010), 1049–1060.

[13] A. Boccuto and D. Candeloro: Uniform (s)-boundedness and regularity for (ℓ)-group-valued measures. Cent. Eur. J. Math. *9* (2) (2011), 433–440. DOI:10.2478/s11533-010-0097-1

[14] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou: Ideal limit theorems and their equivalence in (ℓ)-group setting. J. Math. Research *5* (2013), 43–60. DOI:10.5539/jmr.v5n2p42

[15] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou: Limit theorems for topological group-valued maesures. Acta Math. (Nitra) *16* (2013), 37–43.

[16] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou: Convergence Theorems for Lattice Group-Valued Measures. Bentham Science Publ., Sharjah 2015. DOI:10.2174/97816810800931150101

[17] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou: Limit theorems for k-subadditive lattice group-valued capacities in the filter convergence setting Tatra Mt. Math. Publ. *65* (2016), 1–21. DOI:10.1515/tmmp-2016-0001

[18] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou: Matrix theorems and interchange for lattice group-valued series in the filter convergence setting. Bull. Hellenic Math. Soc. *59* (2016), 39–55.

[19] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou: Limit theorems for lattice group-valued k-triangular set functions. In: Proc. 33rd PanHellenic Conference on Mathematical Education, Chania 2016, pp. 1–10.

[20] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou: Schur-type theorems for k-triangular lattice group-valued set functions with respect to filter convergence. Appl. Math. Sci. *11* (2017), 2825–2833. DOI:10.12988/ams.2017.710298

[21] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou: Non-Additive Lattice Group-Valued Set Functions And Limit Theorems. Lambert Acad. Publ., Mauritius 2017.

[22] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou: Equivalence between limit theorems for lattice group-valued k-triangular set functions. Mediterranean J. Math. *15* (2018), 1–20. DOI:10.1007/s00009-018-1222-9

[23] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou: Filter exhaustiveness and filter limit theorems for k-triangular lattice group-valued set functions. Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl. (2019), in press.

[24] A. Boccuto, X. Dimitriou, and N. Papanastassiou: Some versions of limit and Dieudonné-type theorems with respect to filter convergence for (ℓ)-group-valued measures. Cent. Eur. J. Math. *9* (2011), 1298–1311. DOI:10.2478/s11533-011-0083-2

[25] A. Boccuto, X. Dimitriou, and N. Papanastassiou: Uniform boundedness principle, Banach-Steinhaus and approximation theorems for filter convergence in Riesz spaces. In: Proc. International Conference on Topology and its Applications ICTA 2011, Cambridge Sci. Publ. 2012, pp. 45–58.

[26] A. Boccuto, X. Dimitriou, and N. Papanastassiou: Schur lemma and limit theorems in lattice groups with respect to filters. Math. Slovaca *62* (2012), 1145–1166.

[27] A. Boccuto, B. Riečan, and A. R. Sambucini: On the product of M-measures in (ℓ)-groups. Australian J. Math. Anal. Appl. *7* (2010), 9, 1–8.

[28] A. Boccuto, B. Riečan, and M. Vrábelová: Kurzweil–Henstock Integral in Riesz Spaces. Bentham Science Publ., Sharjah 2009. DOI:10.2174/97816080500311090101

[29] J. K. Brooks and R. V. Chacon: Continuity and compactness of measures. Adv. Math. *37* (1980), 16–26. DOI:10.1016/0001-8708(80)90023-7

[30] D. Candeloro: On the Vitali–Hahn–Saks, Dieudonné and Nikodým theorems. (In Italian). Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo Ser. II Suppl. *8* (1985), 439–445.

[31] D. Candeloro and G. Letta: On Vitali–Hahn–Saks and Dieudonné theorems. (In Italian) Rend. Accad. Naz. Sci. XL Mem. Mat. *9* (1985), 203–213.

[32] D. Candeloro and A. R. Sambucini: Filter convergence and decompositions for vector lattice-valued measures. Mediterranean J. Math. *12* (2015), 621–637. DOI:10.1007/s00009-014-0431-0

[33] P. Cavaliere and P. de Lucia: Regularity and exhaustivity for finitely additive functions. The Dieudonné's convergence theorem. Sci. Math. Japan. *66* (2007), 313–323.

[34] J. Dieudonné: Sur la convergence des suites de mesures de Radon. An. Acad. Brasil. Ci. *23* (1951), 21–38.

[35] I. Dobrakov: On submeasures I. Dissertationes Math. *112* (1974), 5–35.

[36] J. Dugundji: Topology. Allyn and Bacon Inc., Boston 1966.

[37] D. H. Fremlin: A direct proof of the Matthes-Wright integral extension theorem. J. London Math. Soc. *11* (1975), 276–284. DOI:10.1112/jlms/s2-11.3.276

[38] E. Guariglia: On Dieudonné's boundedness theorem. J. Math. Anal. Appl. *145* (1990), 447–454. DOI:10.1016/0022-247x(90)90412-9

[39] E. Pap: A generalization of a Dieudonné theorem for k-triangular set functions. Acta Sci. Math. *50* (1986), 159–167. DOI:10.1007/bf01874617

[40] E. Pap: The Vitali–Hahn–Saks Theorems for k-triangular set functions. Atti Sem. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena *35* (1987), 21–32.

[41] E. Pap: Null-Additive Set Functions. Kluwer Acad. Publishers/Ister Science, Dordrecht/Bratislava 1995.

[42] B. Riečan and T. Neubrunn: Integral, Measure, and Ordering. Kluwer Acad. Publ./Ister Science, Dordrecht/Bratislava 1997. DOI:10.1007/978-94-015-8919-2

[43] S. Saeki: The Vitali–Hahn–Saks theorem and measuroids. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. *114* (1992), 775–782. DOI:10.1090/s0002-9939-1992-1088446-8

[44] W. Schachermayer: On some classical measure-theoretic theorems for non-sigma-complete Boolean algebras. Dissertationes Math. *214* (1982), 1–33.

[45] J. D. Stein, Jr.: A uniform-boundedness theorem for measures. Michigan Math. J. *19* (1972), 161–165.

[46] C. Swartz: The Nikodým boundedness Theorem for lattice-valued measures. Arch. Math. *53* (1989), 390–393. DOI:10.1007/bf01195219

[47] F. Ventriglia: Dieudonné's theorem for non-additive set functions. J. Math. Anal. Appl. *367* (2010), 296–303. DOI:10.1016/j.jmaa.2010.01.017

[48] B. Z. Vulikh: Introduction to the Theory of Partially Ordered Spaces. Wolters–Noordhoff Sci. Publ., Groningen 1967.

Antonio Boccuto, Corresponding author. Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, University of Perugia, via Vanvitelli 1, I-06123 Perugia. Italy.
e-mail: antonio.boccuto@unipg.it

Xenofon Dimitriou, Department of Mathematics, University of Athens, Panepistimiopolis, GR-15784 Athens. Greece.
e-mail: dxenof@math.uoa.gr