

## ON INTEGRATION WITH RESPECT TO OPERATOR VALUED MEASURES IN RIESZ SPACES

BELOSLAV RIEČAN — MARTA VRÁBELOVÁ

*Dedicated to the memory of Tibor Neubrunn*

ABSTRACT. An operator valued measure is considered assigning to every Borel set (in a compact space  $T$ ) a linear, positive, order continuous operator from a Riesz space  $X$  to another Riesz space  $Y$ . A Kurzweil type construction is used for integrating functions from  $T$  to  $X$ .

### Introduction

If  $X$ ,  $Y$  are linear spaces and  $L(X, Y)$  is a set of linear operators and  $(T, \mathcal{S})$  is a measurable space, then an operator valued measure is a mapping  $\mu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow L(X, Y)$  satisfying some conditions. If  $f : T \rightarrow X$  is a simple function

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{E_i} x_i,$$

then

$$\int f d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E_i)(x_i),$$

where  $\mu(E_i) \in L(X, Y)$ , hence  $\mu(E_i)(x_i)$  is the value of  $\mu(E_i)$  in the element  $x_i \in X$ . Therefore  $\int f d\mu \in Y$ . The problem is how to extend this integral to a larger family of functions  $f : T \rightarrow X$ .

The problem of operator valued measure has been studied in a series of papers by I. Dobrákov (see [1]) and for locally convex spaces by J. Haluška ([3]). In [4] J. Haluška considered the case of Banach lattices. The basic property is the weak  $\sigma$ -distributivity, which is a necessary and sufficient condition for extendability of  $Y$ -valued measures and integrals ([15]).

---

AMS Subject Classification (1991): 28B15.

Key words: Kurzweil integral, linear ordered spaces, operator valued measures.

To solve the problem stated above we shall use the Henson-Kurzweil construction of an integral. Of course, since we work with a Borel regular measure on the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{S}$  of subsets of a compact space  $T$ , the obtained integral is of the Lebesgue type. Another solution of the problem is contained in [11].

Special cases of the studied theory are the case of vector measure  $P$  with scalar functions  $f : T \rightarrow R$  (where  $X = R$ ,  $\mu(E)(x) = xP(E) \in Y$ ) and scalar measure  $P$  with vector functions  $f : T \rightarrow X$  (where  $X = Y$ ,  $\mu(E) = P(E)x$ ). As a special case some results of [9] and [13] can be received.

### Assumptions

A. Let  $T$  be a (Hausdorff) compact topological space and let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the family of all compact (all open) subsets of  $T$ .

Let  $U(T)$  be the set of all functions  $\delta : T \rightarrow 2^T$  such that  $\delta(t)$  is a neighbourhood of  $t$  for every  $t \in T$  and let  $A(\delta)$  be the set of all partitions  $D$  of  $T$  such that  $D = \{(E_1, t_1), (E_2, t_2), \dots, (E_n, t_n)\}$ , where  $E_i \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $t_i \in \overline{E_i}$ ,  $E_i \subset \delta(t_i)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ), and  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i = T$ .

**LEMMA 1.** *The set  $A(\delta)$  is non-empty for every  $\delta \in U(T)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\delta \in U(T)$ . Then for every  $t \in T$  there exists an open set  $U(t)$  ( $U(t) \in \mathcal{S}$ ) such that  $t \in U(t) \subset \delta(t)$ . The set  $\{U(t); t \in T\}$  is an open covering of  $T$ , hence there is a finite open covering  $U(t_1), U(t_2), \dots, U(t_n)$  chosen from  $\{U(t), t \in T\}$ .

Now, choose pairwise disjoint neighbourhoods  $F(t_i) \in \mathcal{S}$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) and put

$$F = \bigcup_{i=1}^n F(t_i),$$

$$E_1 = (U(t_1) \setminus F) \cup F(t_1),$$

$$E_i = \left( U(t_i) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} E_j \setminus F \right) \cup F(t_i) \quad \text{for } i = 2, 3, \dots, n.$$

Then  $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$  ( $i \neq j$ ),  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i = T$ ,  $E_i \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $E_i \subset U(t_i) \subset \delta(t_i)$  and  $t_i \in E_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . □

**Remark 2.** If  $E \subset T$ ,  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $\overline{E}$  is compact. Let  $U'(t_1), \dots, U'(t_n)$  be a finite covering of  $\overline{E}$  chosen from  $\{U'(t); U'(t) \subset \delta(t), t \in \overline{E}\}$  and let  $F'(t_i) \in \mathcal{S}$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) be pairwise disjoint neighbourhoods of  $t_i$ .

Put  $U(t_i) = U'(t_i) \cap E$ ,  $F(t_i) = F'(t_i) \cap E$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ). The partition  $D \in A(\delta/E)$  ( $\delta \in U(T)$  or  $\delta \in U(\overline{E})$ ) can be constructed by the same way as in the proof of the preceding lemma (now,  $t_i \in \overline{E}_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ )).

**B.** We shall assume that  $X$  and  $Y$  are linear lattices, the linear lattice  $X$  is boundedly  $\sigma$ -complete, i.e., every bounded sequence  $(a_i)_i \subset X$  has the supremum  $\bigvee_i a_i$ , the linear lattice  $Y$  is weakly  $\sigma$ -distributive, i.e.,  $Y$  is boundedly  $\sigma$ -complete and for every bounded double sequence  $(a_{ij})_{i,j} \subset Y$  such that  $a_{ij} \searrow 0$  ( $j \rightarrow \infty, i = 1, 2, \dots$ ) there is

$$\bigwedge_{\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}} \bigvee a_{i\varphi(i)} = 0.$$

**LEMMA 3.** Let  $Y$  be a boundedly  $\sigma$ -complete linear lattice,  $(a_{nij})_{n,i,j}$  be a triple bounded sequence of elements of  $Y$  such that  $a_{nij} \searrow 0$  ( $j \rightarrow \infty, n, i = 1, 2, \dots$ ). Then to every  $a \in X$ ,  $a > 0$  there is a bounded double sequence  $(a_{ij})_{i,j} \subset Y$  such that  $a_{ij} \searrow 0$ , ( $j \rightarrow \infty, i = 1, 2, \dots$ ) and for every  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$

$$a \wedge \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{ni\varphi(i+n)} \right) \leq \bigvee_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i\varphi(i)}.$$

**Proof.** See [2] and [12]. □

If  $x_n, x \in X$  then  $x_n \rightarrow x$  ( $x_n$  converges to  $x$  with respect to the ordering) iff there exists  $(a_n)_n \subset X$ ,  $a_n \searrow 0$  and  $|x_n - x| \leq a_n$  for all  $n$ .

It is possible to prove that a sequence  $(x_n)_n \subset X$  converges to  $x \in X$  iff  $(x_n)_n$  is bounded and

$$x = \bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{i=n}^{\infty} x_i = \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigwedge_{i=n}^{\infty} x_i.$$

We say that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly ( $f_n, f : T \rightarrow X$ ) iff there exists  $(a_n)_n \subset X$ ,  $a_n \searrow 0$  such that

$$|f_n(t) - f(t)| \leq a_n$$

for every  $t \in T$  and all  $n$ .

C. By  $L(X, Y)$  we shall denote the set of all  $\sigma$ -homomorphisms from  $X$  to  $Y$  i.e. such mappings  $h : X \rightarrow Y$  that

- (i)  $h(x_1 + x_2) = h(x_1) + h(x_2)$  for every  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ ;
- (ii)  $h(cx) = ch(x)$  for every  $x \in X$  and  $c \in R$ ;
- (iii) If  $(x_n)_n \subset X$ ,  $x_n \searrow 0$  then  $h(x_n) \searrow 0$ .

The properties (i) and (iii) imply  $h(0) = 0$  and  $h(x_1) \leq h(x_2)$  for  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ ,  $x_1 \leq x_2$  (that is  $h$  is a positive operator).

D. Let  $\mu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow L(X, Y)$  be an operator valued measure having the following properties:

- (i) If  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $x \in X$ ,  $x \geq 0$  then  $\mu(E)x \geq 0$ ;
- (ii) If  $E_n \in \mathcal{S}$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots, k$ ),  $E_i \cap E_j = 0$  ( $i \neq j$ ), then
 
$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^k E_n\right)x = \sum_{n=1}^k \mu(E_n)x$$
 for every  $x \in X$ .
- (iii)  $\mu$  is regular in the following sense:

For every set  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  and every  $x \in X$ ,  $x \geq 0$  there exists a bounded sequence  $(a_{nk})_{n,k} \subset Y$ ,  $a_{nk} \geq 0$ ,  $a_{nk} \searrow 0$  ( $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) and for every  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there exist a compact set  $F$  and open set  $U$ ,  $F \subset E \subset U$  such that

$$\mu(U \setminus F)x < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}.$$

**EXAMPLE.** Let  $\mu_1 : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow R$  be a regular Borel measure. Let  $X = Y$ . Put  $\mu(E)x = \mu_1(E) \cdot x$  for  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $x \in X$ . Then  $\mu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow L(X, X)$  is the regular operator valued measure. For  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $x \in X$ ,  $x \geq 0$  it is sufficient to put  $a_{ij} = \frac{1}{j}x$  ( $i, j = 1, 2, \dots$ ). Then for  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there exists a compact set  $F$  and an open set  $U$ ,  $F \subset E \subset U$  such that

$$\mu(U \setminus F)x = \mu_1(U \setminus F) \cdot x < \frac{1}{\min_i \varphi(i)} x = \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}.$$

The proof of the following lemma is evident.

**LEMMA 4.** Let  $\mu : T \rightarrow L(X, Y)$  be a regular operator valued measure. Then

- (i)  $\mu$  is monotone i.e. if  $E, F \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $E \subset F$ , then
 
$$\mu(E)x \leq \mu(F)x$$
 for every  $x \in X$ ,  $x \geq 0$ ;
- (ii)  $\mu$  is subtractive, i.e., if  $E, F \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $E \subset F$ , then
 
$$\mu(F \setminus E)x = \mu(F)x - \mu(E)x$$
 for every  $x \in X$ .

### Integral

If  $\delta \in U(T)$  and  $D \in A(\delta)$ ,  $D = \{(E_1, t_1), \dots, (E_n, t_n)\}$  then for the function  $f : T \rightarrow X$  we define

$$S(f, D) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E_i) f(t_i),$$

where  $\mu(E_i) f(t_i)$  is the value of the operator  $\mu(E_i)$  in  $f(t_i)$ .

**DEFINITION 5.** The function  $f : T \rightarrow X$  is *integrable* if there exists  $y \in Y$  and a bounded double sequence  $(a_{nk})_{n,k} \subset Y$ ,  $a_{nk} \geq 0$ ,  $a_{nk} \searrow 0$  ( $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) such that for every  $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $\delta \in U(T)$  so that

$$|S(f, D) - y| < \bigvee_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i\varphi(i)} \quad \text{for any } D \in A(\delta).$$

**LEMMA 6.** *The integral of  $f$  is defined uniquely.*

**Proof.** Let  $y_1, y_2 \in Y$  be two elements satisfying the conditions of the preceding definition. Then there exist  $(a_{nk})_{n,k}, (b_{nk})_{n,k} \subset Y$ ,  $a_{nk} \geq 0$ ,  $b_{nk} \geq 0$ ,  $a_{nk} \searrow 0$ ,  $b_{nk} \searrow 0$  ( $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) and for  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there exist  $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in U(T)$  such that

$$|S(f, D_1) - y_1| < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i+1)}, \quad |S(f, D_2) - y_2| < \bigvee_i b_{i\varphi(i+2)}$$

for  $D_1 \in A(\delta_1)$ ,  $D_2 \in A(\delta_2)$ . Put  $\delta = \delta_1 \cap \delta_2$  ( $\delta(t) = \delta_1(t) \cap \delta_2(t)$  for  $t \in T$ ) and take  $D \in A(\delta)$  (then  $D \in A(\delta_1) \cap A(\delta_2)$ , too). Then

$$\begin{aligned} |y_1 - y_2| &\leq |y_1 - S(f, D)| + |S(f, D) - y_2| < \\ &< \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i+1)} + \bigvee_i b_{i\varphi(i+2)} \leq \bigvee_i c_{i\varphi(i)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $(c_{nk})_{n,k} \subset Y$  is bounded,  $c_{nk} \geq 0$ ,  $c_{nk} \searrow 0$  ( $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ). The sequence  $(c_{nk})_{n,k}$  exists by Lemma 3. From the weak  $\sigma$ -distributivity of  $Y$  we have

$$|y_1 - y_2| \leq \bigwedge_{\varphi} \bigvee_i c_{i\varphi(i)} = 0$$

and hence  $y_1 = y_2$  ( $= \int f d\mu$ ). □

**THEOREM 7.** *If  $f, g : T \rightarrow X$  are integrable and  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $\alpha f + \beta g$  is integrable and*

$$\int (\alpha f + \beta g) d\mu = \alpha \int f d\mu + \beta \int g d\mu.$$

**P r o o f.** We shall prove that if  $f, g$  are integrable and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $f + g, cf$  are integrable too and

$$\int (f + g) d\mu = \int f d\mu + \int g d\mu, \quad \int cf d\mu = c \int f d\mu.$$

If  $f$  is integrable, then there exist  $y_1 \in Y$  and bounded double sequence  $(a_{nk})_{n,k} \subset Y$ ,  $a_{nk} \geq 0$ ,  $a_{n,k} \searrow 0$  ( $k \rightarrow \infty, n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) such that for  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there exists  $\delta_1 \in U(T)$  such that

$$|y_1 - S(f, D_1)| < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i+1)}$$

for any  $D_1 \in A(\delta_1)$ . Similarly there are  $y_2 \in Y$ ,  $(b_{nk})_{n,k} \subset Y$  and  $\delta_2 \in U(T)$  such that

$$|y_2 - S(g, D_2)| < \bigvee_i b_{i\varphi(i+2)}$$

for any  $D_2 \in A(\delta_2)$ .

Put  $\delta = \delta_1 \cap \delta_2$  and take  $D \in A(\delta)$ . Then  $D \in A(\delta_1) \cap A(\delta_2)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} |S(f + g, D) - y_1 - y_2| &= |S(f, D) + S(g, D) - y_1 - y_2| \leq \\ &\leq |S(f, D) - y_1| + |S(g, D) - y_2| < \\ &< \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i+1)} + \bigvee_i b_{i\varphi(i+2)} \leq \bigvee_i c_{i\varphi(i)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $(c_{nk})_{n,k}$  exists by Lemma 3. Hence  $f + g$  is integrable and

$$\int (f + g) d\mu = \int f d\mu + \int g d\mu.$$

For  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  we have  $|c|a_{nk} \geq 0$ ,  $|c|a_{n,k} \searrow 0$  ( $k \rightarrow \infty, n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) and

$$\begin{aligned} |S(cf, D) - cy_1| &= |c \cdot S(f, D) - cy_1| \leq |c| |S(f, D) - y_1| < \\ &< |c| \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)} = \bigvee_i |c| a_{i\varphi(i)} \end{aligned}$$

for  $D \in A(\delta_1)$ . This implies that  $cf$  is integrable and  $\int cf d\mu = c \int f d\mu$ .  $\square$

**THEOREM 8.** *If  $f : T \rightarrow X$  is integrable and  $f(t) \geq 0$  for every  $t \in T$ , then  $\int f d\mu \geq 0$ .*

*Proof.* By the positivity of operators  $\mu(E_i)$  we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E_i) f(t_i) = S(f, D) \geq 0$$

for any  $D \in A(\delta)$ , any  $\delta \in U(T)$  and every positive function  $f$ .

Let  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  and  $\delta \in U(T)$  such that

$$\left| \int f d\mu - S(f, D) \right| < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}$$

for any  $D \in A(\delta)$ . Hence

$$-\bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)} \leq S(f, D) - \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)} < \int f d\mu$$

and

$$\bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)} > - \int f d\mu$$

for all  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . From the weak  $\sigma$ -distributivity of  $Y$  we have

$$- \int f d\mu \leq \bigwedge_{\varphi} \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)} = 0$$

and then

$$\int f d\mu \geq 0.$$

□

**DEFINITION 9.** *A function  $f : T \rightarrow X$  is integrable on a set  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ , if there exist  $y \in Y$  and a bounded double sequence  $(a_{nk})_{n,k} \subset Y$ ,  $a_{nk} \geq 0$ ,  $a_{nk} \searrow 0$  ( $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) and for every  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there exists  $\delta \in U(\overline{E})$  such that*

$$|S_E(f, D) - y| < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}$$

for any  $D \in A(\delta/E)$ , where  $S_E(f, D) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E_i) f(t_i)$  and  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i = E$ ,  $E_i \cap$

$E_j = \emptyset$  ( $i \neq j$ ),  $E_i \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $t_i \in \overline{E}_i$ ,  $E_i \subset \delta(t_i)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ).

The element  $y$  will be denoted by  $\int_E f d\mu$ .

**Remark 10.** The definition 9 is correct. By Remark 2  $A(\delta/E) \neq \emptyset$  for  $\delta \in U(\overline{E})$  and  $\int f d\mu$  is defined uniquely (see Lemma 6).

**LEMMA 11.** *Let  $Y$  be boundedly complete (i.e. every bounded subset of  $Y$  has a supremum). Then a function  $f : T \rightarrow X$  is integrable on  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  if and only if the following condition is satisfied:*

*There exists a bounded sequence  $(a_{nk})_{n,k} \subset Y$ ,  $a_{nk} \geq 0$ ,  $a_{nk} \searrow 0$  ( $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) and for every  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there is  $\delta \in U(\overline{E})$  such that*

$$|S_E(f, D_1) - S_E(f, D_2)| < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}$$

for all  $D_1, D_2 \in A(\delta/E)$ .

**Proof.** The necessity of the condition is evident. We shall prove that this condition is sufficient. Let  $(a_{nk})_{n,k} \subset Y$  be such a sequence that for every  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there is  $\delta(\varphi) \in U(\overline{E})$  such that

$$|S_E(f, D_1) - S_E(f, D_2)| < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}$$

for all  $D_1, D_2 \in A(\delta(\varphi)/E)$ . Denote

$$I = \{\delta \in U(\overline{E}); \exists \varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}, \delta = \delta(\varphi)\}.$$

Then for  $\delta \in I$  the set

$$\{S_E(f, D); D \in A(\delta/E)\}$$

is bounded. Since  $Y$  is boundedly complete, there exists

$$a_\delta = \bigwedge_{D \in A(\delta/E)} S_E(f, D); \quad b_\delta = \bigvee_{D \in A(\delta/E)} S_E(f, D).$$

For  $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in I$  put  $\delta = \delta_1 \cap \delta_2$ . Then  $A(\delta/E) \subset A(\delta_1/E) \cap A(\delta_2/E)$  and hence  $\{S_E(f, D); D \in A(\delta/E)\}$  is bounded, too, and

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\delta_1} &= \bigwedge_{D \in A(\delta_1/E)} S_E(f, D) \leq \bigwedge_{D \in A(\delta/E)} S_E(f, D) \leq S_E(f, D) \leq \\ &\leq \bigvee_{D \in A(\delta/E)} S_E(f, D) \leq \bigvee_{D \in A(\delta_2/E)} S_E(f, D) = b_{\delta_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\bigvee_{\delta \in I} a_\delta \leq \bigwedge_{\delta \in I} b_\delta$ , hence there exists  $y \in Y$  such that

$$a_\delta \leq y \leq b_\delta$$



INTEGRATION WITH RESPECT TO OPERATOR VALUED MEASURES IN RIESZ SPACES

for all  $\delta \in I$ . Now let  $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . Then there is  $\delta(\varphi) \in U(\overline{E})$  such that

$$S_E(f, D) \leq S_E(f, D_2) + \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}$$

for all  $D_1, D_2 \in A(\delta(\varphi)/E)$ . Fix  $D_2$ . Then

$$b_{\delta(\varphi)} \leq S_E(f, D_2) + \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}.$$

Since the inequality holds for every  $D_2 \in A(\delta(\varphi)/E)$ , we have

$$b_{\delta(\varphi)} \leq a_{\delta(\varphi)} + \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}.$$

By the weak  $\sigma$ -distributivity of  $Y$  we obtain  $\bigwedge_{\varphi} \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)} = 0$  and so

$$\bigwedge_{\varphi} b_{\delta(\varphi)} - \bigvee_{\varphi} a_{\delta(\varphi)} = \bigwedge_{\varphi} (b_{\delta(\varphi)} - a_{\delta(\varphi)}) = 0$$

hence

$$y = \bigwedge_{\varphi} b_{\delta(\varphi)} = \bigvee_{\varphi} a_{\delta(\varphi)}$$

Then for every  $D \in A(\delta(\varphi)/E)$

$$S_E(f, D) - y \leq b_{\delta(\varphi)} - a_{\delta(\varphi)} \leq \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}$$

and similarly

$$y - S_E(f, D) \leq b_{\delta(\varphi)} - a_{\delta(\varphi)} \leq \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)},$$

so that

$$|S_E(f, D) - y| \leq \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}$$

and the proof is complete. □

**THEOREM 12.** *If  $E, F, G \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $E = F \cup G$ ,  $F \cap G = \emptyset$  and  $f : T \rightarrow X$  is integrable on  $E$ , then  $f$  is integrable on  $F$  and  $G$ , too and*

$$\int_E f d\mu = \int_F f d\mu + \int_G f d\mu.$$

**Proof.** By Lemma 11 there is  $(a_{nk})_{n,k} \subset Y$  such that for every  $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  there is  $\delta \in U(\overline{E})$  such that

$$|S_E(f, D_1) - S_E(f, D_2)| < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}$$

for every  $D_1, D_2 \in A(\delta/E)$ . Take  $D, D' \in A(\delta/F)$  and  $D_0 \in A(\delta/E \setminus F)$ . Put  $D_1 = D \cup D_0$ ,  $D_2 = D' \cup D_0$ . Then  $D_1, D_2 \in A(\delta/E)$  and so

$$|S_E(f, D_1) - S_E(f, D_2)| < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}.$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} |S_F(f, D) - S_F(f, D')| &= |S_F(f, D) + S_{E \setminus F}(f, D_0) - S_{E \setminus F}(f, D_0) - \\ &- S_F(f, D')| = |S_E(f, D_1) - S_E(f, D_2)| < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $D, D' \in A(\delta/F)$ . Hence  $f$  is integrable on  $F$  by Lemma 11. Similarly,  $f$  is integrable on  $G$ , too.

Then for  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there exist  $\delta_1 \in U(\overline{E})$ ,  $\delta_2 \in U(\overline{F})$ ,  $\delta_2 \subset \delta_1/\overline{F}$  and  $\delta_3 \in U(\overline{G})$ ,  $\delta_3 \subset \delta_1/\overline{G}$  such that

$$|S_E(f, D_1) - \int_E f d\mu| < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i+1)}$$

for all  $D_1 \in A(\delta_1/E)$ ,

$$|S_F(f, D_2) - \int_F f d\mu| < \bigvee_i b_{i\varphi(i+2)}$$

for all  $D_2 \in A(\delta_2/F)$ ,

$$|S_G(f, D_3) - \int_G f d\mu| < \bigvee_i c_{i\varphi(i+3)}$$

for all  $D_3 \in A(\delta_3/G)$ . We have  $D_2 \cup D_3 \in A(\delta_1/E)$  and so

$$|S_E(f, D_2 \cup D_3) - \int_E f d\mu| < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i+1)}.$$

Since  $S_E(f, D_2 \cup D_3) = S_F(f, D_2) + S_G(f, D_3)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_E f d\mu - \int_F f d\mu - \int_G f d\mu \right| &\leq \left| \int_E f d\mu - S_E(f, D_2 \cup D_3) \right| + \\ &+ \left| S_F(f, D_2) - \int_F f d\mu \right| + \left| S_G(f, D_3) - \int_G f d\mu \right| < \\ &< \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i+1)} + \bigvee_i b_{i\varphi(i+2)} + \bigvee_i c_{i\varphi(i+3)} < \bigvee_i d_{i\varphi(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

The sequence  $(d_{ij})_{i,j}$  exists by Lemma 3. Using the weak  $\sigma$ -distributivity of  $Y$  we get

$$\int_E f d\mu = \int_F f d\mu + \int_G f d\mu.$$

□

**THEOREM 13.** If  $f: T \rightarrow X$  is a simple measurable function,  $f = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \chi_{E_i}$ , where  $x_i \in X$ ,  $E_i \in \mathcal{S}$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ),  $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$  ( $i \neq j$ ),  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i = T$ , and  $\mu: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow L(X, Y)$  is a regular operator valued measure, then  $f$  is integrable and  $\int f d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E_i)x_i$ .

**Proof.** By Theorem 7 it is sufficient to prove that  $x \chi_E$  ( $E \in \mathcal{S}, x \in X$ ) is integrable and

$$\int x \chi_E d\mu = \mu(E)x.$$

First we suppose that  $x \geq 0$ . The regularity of the measure  $\mu$  implies that for  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $x \in X$ ,  $x \geq 0$  there exists a bounded sequence  $(a_{nk})_{n,k} \subset Y$ ,  $a_{nk} \geq 0$ ,  $a_{nk} \searrow 0$  ( $k \rightarrow \infty, n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) such that for every  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there exist an open set  $U \in \mathcal{S}$  and a compact set  $C \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $C \subset E \subset U$  so that

$$\mu(U \setminus C)x < \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}.$$

Since  $C$  is compact and  $U$  is open there exists  $\delta \in U(T)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}\delta(t) &\subset U \quad \text{for } t \in C, \\ \delta(t) &\subset U \setminus C \quad \text{for } t \in U \setminus C, \\ \delta(t) \cap C &= \emptyset \quad \text{for } t \notin U.\end{aligned}$$

Take  $D \in A(\delta)$ ,  $D = \{(E_i, t_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . By Lemma 4 we have

$$\mu(C)x \leq \mu(E)x \leq \mu(U)x$$

and

$$\mu(U \setminus C)x = \mu(U)x - \mu(C)x.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(E)x - \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)} &\leq \mu(U)x - \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)} < \mu(C)x \leq \\ &\leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{t_i \in C} E_i\right)x = \sum_{t_i \in C} \mu(E_i)x = \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_C(t_i)\mu(E_i)x \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_E(t_i)\mu(E_i)x = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E_i)(x\chi_E(t_i)) = \\ &= S(x\chi_E, D) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E_i)(x\chi_U(t_i)) = \sum_{t_i \in U} \mu(E_i)x = \\ &= \mu\left(\bigcup_{t_i \in U} E_i\right)x \leq \mu(U)x \leq \mu(C)x + \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)} \leq \\ &\leq \mu(E)x + \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}.\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$-\bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)} \leq S(x\chi_E, D) - \mu(E)x \leq \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}$$

and hence

$$|S(x\chi_E, D) - \mu(E)x| \leq \bigvee_i a_{i\varphi(i)}$$

for any  $D \in A(\delta)$ . In the general case for  $x \in X$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int x \chi_E d\mu &= \int (x^+ - x^-) \chi_E d\mu = \int x^+ \chi_E d\mu - \int x^- \chi_E d\mu = \\ &= \mu(E)x^+ - \mu(E)x^- = \mu(E)x. \end{aligned}$$

□

### Limit Theorem

**LEMMA 14.** *If  $f_n: T \rightarrow X$  is integrable for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ,  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly and  $f$  is bounded, then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$  exists.*

*Proof.* It is sufficient to show that the sequence  $(\int f_n d\mu)_n$  is bounded and

$$\bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{i=n}^{\infty} \int f_i d\mu \leq \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigwedge_{j=n}^{\infty} \int f_j d\mu.$$

Since the function  $f$  is bounded, there exists  $h \in X$ ,  $h \geq 0$ , such that  $|f(t)| \leq h$  for all  $t \in T$ .

From the uniform convergence of  $f_n$  there exists a sequence  $(a_n)_n \subset X$ ,  $a_n \searrow 0$  ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) and for any  $t \in T$

$$|f_n(t) - f(t)| \leq a_n$$

for all  $n$ . Hence

$$-h - a_1 \leq f(t) - a_1 \leq f(t) - a_n \leq f_n(t) \leq f(t) + a_n \leq h + a_1$$

and

$$|f_i(t) - f_j(t)| \leq |f_i(t) - f(t)| + |f_j(t) - f(t)| \leq a_i + a_j \leq 2a_n$$

for any  $t \in T$  and  $i, j \geq n$ . It is evident that if for  $f: T \rightarrow X$ ,  $f(t) = a$  for all  $t \in T$ , then

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mu(E_j) f(t_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(E_j) a = \mu(T) a$$

for any  $D \in A(\delta)$  and any  $\delta$ . By Theorems 7 and 8 for any  $n$  we have

$$\mu(T)(-h - a_1) \leq \int f_n d\mu \leq \mu(T)(h + a_1)$$

and

$$\mu(T)(-2a_n) \leq \int (f_i - f_j) d\mu = \int f_i d\mu - \int f_j d\mu \leq \mu(T)(2a_n) \quad \text{for } i, j \geq n.$$

Then the sequence  $(\int f_n d\mu)_n$  is bounded and

$$\mu(T)(-2a_n) + \int f_j d\mu \leq \int f_i d\mu \leq \int f_j d\mu + \mu(T)(2a_n)$$

for  $i, j \geq n$ , which implies

$$\bigvee_{i=n}^{\infty} \int f_i d\mu \leq \bigwedge_{j=n}^{\infty} \int f_j d\mu + \mu(T)(2a_n)$$

for all  $n$ , and hence from continuity of  $\mu(T)$  we get

$$\bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{i=n}^{\infty} \int f_i d\mu \leq \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigwedge_{j=n}^{\infty} \int f_j d\mu.$$

□

**THEOREM 15.** *Let  $f_n : T \rightarrow X$  be integrable for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ,  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly and  $f$  is bounded. Then  $f$  is integrable and  $\int f d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 14  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu = c$  exists and hence there exists a sequence  $(c_n)_n \subset Y$ ,  $c_n \searrow 0$  ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) and

$$\left| \int f_n d\mu - c \right| \leq c_n$$

for any  $n$ . The function  $f_n$  is integrable and then there exists a bounded double sequence  $(a_{nij})_{i,j} \subset Y$  such that  $a_{nij} \searrow 0$  ( $j \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $i, n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) and for every  $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $\delta_n \in U(T)$  such that for every  $D \in A(\delta_n)$

$$\left| \int f_n d\mu - S(f_n, D) \right| < \bigvee_i a_{ni\varphi(i+n+1)}.$$

Since  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly, there exists a sequence  $(b_n)_n \subset X$ ,  $b_n \searrow 0$  and  $|f_n(t) - f(t)| \leq b_n$  for any  $t \in T$  and all  $n$ .

Let  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Put  $k = \min_j \varphi(j+1)$  and take  $D \in A(\delta_k)$

$$D = \{(E_1, t_1), (E_2, t_2), \dots, (E_r, t_r)\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |S(f, D) - c| &\leq |S(f, D) - S(f_k, D)| + \left| S(f_k, D) - \int f_k d\mu \right| + \left| \int f_k d\mu - c \right| < \\ &< \sum_{i=1}^r \mu(E_i) (|f(t_i) - f_k(t_i)|) + \bigvee_i a_{ki\varphi(i+k+1)} + c_k \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r \mu(E_i) b_k + \bigvee_i a_{ki\varphi(i+k+1)} + c_k \leq \\ &\leq \mu(T) b_k + c_k + \bigvee_i a_{ki\varphi(i+k+1)} = d_k + \bigvee_i a_{ki\varphi(i+k+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} d_j &= \mu(T) b_j + c_j \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, (d_j)_j \subset Y, \\ d_j &\searrow 0 \quad (j \rightarrow \infty), \quad \text{since } \mu(T) b_j \searrow 0, \quad (j \rightarrow \infty), \\ d_k &= d_{\min_j \varphi(j+1)} = \bigvee_i d_{\varphi(i+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Put  $b_{1ij} = d_j$  for  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $b_{m+1ij} = a_{nij}$  for  $n, i, j, m = 1, 2, \dots$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} |S(f, D) - c| &< \bigvee_i d_{\varphi(i+1)} + \bigvee_i a_{ki\varphi(i+k+1)} = \\ &= \bigvee_i b_{1i\varphi(i+1)} + \bigvee_i b_{k+1i\varphi(i+k+1)} \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_i b_{ni\varphi(i+n)}. \end{aligned}$$

There exists  $h \in X$ ,  $h \geq 0$  such that  $|f(t)| \leq h$  for any  $t \in T$ , since  $f$  is bounded. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |S(f, D) - c| &\leq |S(f, D)| + |c| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^r \mu(E_i) f(t_i) \right| + |c| \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r \mu(E_i) |f(t_i)| + |c| \leq \mu(T) h + |c| \leq a, \end{aligned}$$

where  $a \in X, a > 0$  and

$$|S(f, D) - c| \leq a \wedge \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_i b_{ni\varphi(i+n)} \right).$$

By Lemma 3 there exists a bounded double sequence  $(a_{ij})_{i,j} \subset Y, a_{ij} \searrow 0$  ( $j \rightarrow \infty, i = 1, 2, \dots$ ) and

$$a \wedge \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{i=1}^{\infty} b_{ni\varphi(i+1)} \right) \leq \bigvee_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i\varphi(i)}.$$

Therefore there exists  $c \in Y, c = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$  and the bounded double sequence  $(a_{ij})_{i,j} \subset Y, a_{ij} \searrow 0$  ( $j \rightarrow \infty, i = 1, 2, \dots$ ) and for every  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there exists  $\delta \in U(T)$  ( $\delta = \delta_{\min \varphi(j+1)}$ ) such that

$$|S(f, D) - c| \leq \bigvee_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i\varphi(i)}$$

for any  $D \in A(\delta)$ . Hence  $f$  is integrable and

$$\int f d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu.$$

□

## REFERENCES

- [1] DOBRAKOV, I.: *On integration in Banach spaces, VII. Polymeasures*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **37** (112) (1987), 487–506.
- [2] FREMLIN, D. H.: *A direct proof of the Mathes-Wright integral extension theorem*, J. London Math. Soc. **11** (1975), 276–284.
- [3] HALUŠKA, J.: *On integration in locally convex spaces*, In: Proc. First Winter School on Measure Theory (Liptovský Ján 1988), 30–36.
- [4] HALUŠKA, J.: *On the Kurzweil-type integration in Banach lattices*, Radovi matematički (to appear.).
- [5] KURZWEIL, J.: *Nicht absolut Konvergente Integrale*, Teubner, Leipzig, 1980.
- [6] LUXEMBURG, W. A.—ZAAANEN, A. C.: *Riesz Spaces*, North-Holland, 1971.
- [7] MALIČKÝ, P.: *The monotone limit convergence theorem for elementary functions with values in a vector lattice.*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **27**, 1 (1986), 53–67.



INTEGRATION WITH RESPECT TO OPERATOR VALUED MEASURES IN RIESZ SPACES

- [8] PFEFFER, W. F.—AHMED, S. I.: *A Riemann integral in a locally compact Hausdorff space*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A **41** (1986), 115–137.
- [9] RIEČAN, B.: *On the Kurzweil integral for functions with values in ordered spaces I*, Acta Math. Univ. Comenian **56–57** (1990), 75–83.
- [10] RIEČAN, B.: *On the Kurzweil integral in compact topological spaces*, Radovi Matematički **2** (1986), 151–163.
- [11] RIEČAN, B.: *On operator valued measures in lattice ordered groups*, Atti Sem. Mat.Fis. Univ. Modena (to appear).
- [12] RIEČAN, B.—VOLAUF, P.: *On a technical lemma in lattice ordered groups*, Acta Math. Univ. Comenian **44–45** (1984), 31–35.
- [13] RIEČAN, B.—VRÁBELOVÁ, M.: *On the Kurzweil integral for functions with values in ordered spaces II.*, Math. Slovaca (to appear).
- [14] WRIGHT, J.D.M.: *The measure extension problem for vector lattices*, Ann. Inst. Fourier Grenoble **27** (1971), 65–85.
- [15] WRIGHT, J. D. M.: *An extension problem*, J. London Math. Soc. **7** (1973), 531–539.

Received September 3, 1992

*Mathematical Institute  
Slovak Academy of Sciences  
Štefánikova 49  
814 73 Bratislava  
SLOVAKIA*

*Department of Mathematics  
Faculty of Sciences  
Pedagogical University  
Farská 3  
947 74 Nitra  
SLOVAKIA*