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Abstract. We characterize vector lattices in which unbounded order convergence is eventually order bounded. Among other things, the characterization provides a solution to [3, Probl. 23].

1. Preliminaries

Throughout the paper, $X$ stands for a vector lattice and all vector lattices are assumed to be real and Archimedean. We refer to [2, 7, 5] for unexplained terminology and standard facts on vector lattice theory.

We recall a few standard definitions and results related to vector lattices. $X$ is said to be Dedekind ($\sigma$-Dedekind) complete if every order bounded (countable) subset of $X$ has a supremum. A Dedekind complete ($\sigma$-Dedekind complete) $X$ is said to be universally ($\sigma$-universally) complete if every pairwise disjoint (countable) subset of $X_+$ has a supremum. Every universally complete vector lattices has a weak unit. It is well known that $X$ possesses a unique up to lattice isomorphism Dedekind (universal) completion, which will be denoted by $X^\delta$ (by $X^u$). Dealing with the completions, we always suppose that $X \subseteq X^\delta \subseteq X^u$, whereas $X^\delta$ sits as an ideal in $X^u$.

A sublattice $Y$ of $X$ is called regular if $y_\alpha \downarrow 0$ in $Y$ implies $y_\alpha \downarrow 0$ in $X$. $Y$ is said to be order dense if for every $0 \neq x \in X_+$ there exists $0 \neq y \in Y_+$ such that $y \leq x$. It is well known that ideals and order dense sublattices are regular. Furthermore, $X$ is atomic iff it is lattice isomorphic to an order dense sublattice of $\mathbb{R}^A$ (cf. [2, Thm. 1.78]).

A net $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ in $X$ $o$-converges to $x$ if there exists a net $(y_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ in $X$ satisfying $y_\gamma \downarrow 0$ and for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$ there is $\alpha_\gamma \in A$ with $|x_\alpha - x| \leq y_\gamma$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_\gamma$. In this case we write $x_\alpha \stackrel{a}{\to} x$. This definition is used e.g. in [7, 5]. In some of the literature (cf. [2]) a slightly different definition of the order convergence is used, namely a net $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ in $X$ is said to be $o$-convergent to $x$ if there exists a net $(z_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ in $X$ such that $z_\alpha \downarrow 0$ and $|x_\alpha - x| \leq z_\alpha$ for all $\alpha$. Notice that both notions coincide in the case of order bounded nets in a Dedekind complete vector lattice (cf. [5, Rem. 2.2]). We refer to [1] for further discussion of definitions of $o$-convergence. It should be noted that
o-convergence in $X$ is never topological unless $\dim(X) < \infty$ [4 Thm.1] (cf. also [5 Thm.2]).

A net $x_\alpha$ is $X$ is unbounded order convergent (shortly, $uo$-convergent) to $x \in X$ if $|x_\alpha - x| \wedge y \xrightarrow{o} 0$ for every $y \in X^\perp$. In this case we, write $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{uo} x$. Following Nakano [9], $uo$-convergence is considered as a natural generalization of convergence almost everywhere (see [5, 8, 3, 10] and references therein). Clearly, $o$-convergence agrees with eventually order bounded $uo$-convergence. By [5 Thm.3.2], $uo$-convergence passes freely between $X$, $X^\delta$, and $X^u$. It was shown in [5 Cor.3.5] that if $X$ has a weak unit $u$, then for a net $x_\alpha$ in $X$, $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{uo} x \iff |x_\alpha - x| \wedge u \xrightarrow{o} 0$. It was also proved in [5 Cor.3.12] that any $uo$-null sequence in $X$ is $o$-null in $X^u$. Accordingly to [8, Ex.2.6], it is no longer true for nets in $\ell_\infty$. 

**Example 1.** A net $(x_{(n,m)})_{(n,m)\in \mathbb{N}^2}$ in $X = c_{00}$ is defined by

$$x_{(n,m)}(k) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \neq n \land m, \\ n \lor m & \text{if } k = n \land m. \end{cases}$$

Shortly, $x_{(n,m)} = (n \lor m) \cdot 1_{\{n \land m\}}$. Since $\lim_{(n,m) \to \infty} x_{(n,m)}(k) = 0$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x_{(n,m)} \xrightarrow{uo} 0$ (e.g., by [4 Prop.1.]). Suppose $x_{(n,m)}$ is eventually order bounded by some $y \in \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}$. Then there exists $(n_0, m_0) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ such that

$$y \geq x_{(n,m)} \quad (\forall (n,m) \geq (n_0, m_0)).$$

Since $n \land m = m_0$ and $(n, m_0) \geq (n_0, m_0)$ for $n \geq n_0 \lor m_0$, then

$$y(m_0) \geq x_{(n,m_0)}(m_0) = n \lor m_0 = n \quad (\forall n \geq n_0 \lor m_0)$$

which is impossible. Therefore, the $uo$-null net $x_{(n,m)}$ is not eventually order bounded in $\mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}$ and hence is not $o$-convergent in $X^u = (c_{00})^u = \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}$.

Although the $uo$-convergence is not topological in most of important cases (e.g., in $L_1[0,1]$ and in $C[0,1]$), it is topological in all atomic vector lattices [4 Thm.2].

A net $x_\alpha$ in $X$ is called $o$-Cauchy (uo-Cauchy) if the double net $(x_\alpha - x_\beta)_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ $o$-converges ($uo$-converges) to 0. It was noticed in [8 Lm.2.1] with a reference to [5 Prop.5.7] that every order bounded positive increasing net in $X$ is $o$-Cauchy. A net $x_\alpha$ in a Dedekind complete vector lattice with a weak unit $u$ is $uo$-Cauchy iff $\inf_\alpha \sup_{\beta,\gamma \geq \alpha} |x_\beta - x_\gamma| \wedge u = 0$ [8 Lm.2.7]. It is well known that the completeness with respect to the $o$-convergence is equivalent to the Dedekind completeness. By [5 Cor.3.12], a sequence $x_n$ in $X$ is $uo$-Cauchy in $X$ iff it is $o$-convergent in $X^u$. In the same paper, authors proved that a sequence in a $\sigma$-universally complete vector lattice is $uo$-Cauchy iff it is $o$-convergent [5 Thm.3.10]. Theorem [4] shows that there is no net-version of [5 Thm.3.10] unless $\dim(X) < \infty$. 
In [10, Thm.3.9] (see, also [3, Thm.28]), it was shown that a vector lattice is σ-universally complete if and only if it is sequentially $uo$-complete. It was also proved in [3, Thm.17] that the $uo$-completeness is equivalent to the universal completeness. Therefore, there is no need in considering $uo$-completions (sequential $uo$-completions) of vector lattices.

2. Main result

We begin with the following generalization of Example[1]. Given a nonempty subset $A \subset X$, $pr_A$ stands for the band projection in $X^u$ onto the band in $X^u$ generated by $A$.

Example 2. In any infinite-dimensional Archimedean vector lattice $X$ there exists a $uo$-null net which is not eventually order bounded in $X^u$.

As $\dim(X) = \infty$, there is a sequence $e_n$ of pairwise disjoint positive nonzero elements of $X$. Let $\mathbb{N}^2$ be the coordinatewise directed set of pairs of naturals. A net in $X$ is defined via $x_{(n,m)} = (n \lor m) \cdot e_{n \land m}$. Since 

$$\lim_{(n,m) \to \infty} pr_{(e_k)}(x_{(n,m)}) = \lim_{(n,m) \to \infty} (n \lor m) pr_{(e_k)}(e_{n \land m}) = 0 \quad (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}),$$

then $x_{(n,m)} \xrightarrow{uo} 0$ as $(n,m) \to \infty$ (e.g., it can be seen by use of [5, Cor.3.5.], for a weak unit $u$ in $X_u$ s.t. $u \land e_k = e_k$ for all $k$). If $x_{(n,m)}$ is eventually order bounded by some $y \in X^u$, then for some $(n_0,m_0) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ we have

$$y \geq x_{(n,m)} \quad (\forall (n,m) \geq (n_0,m_0)),$$

Since $n \land m_0 = m_0$ and $(n,m_0) \geq (n_0,m_0)$ for $n \geq n_0 \lor m_0$, then

$$y \geq x_{(n,m_0)} = (n \lor m_0) \cdot e_{n \land m_0} = (n \lor m_0) \cdot e_{m_0} = n \cdot e_{m_0} > 0 \quad (\forall n \geq n_0 \lor m_0)$$

which is impossible. Therefore, the net $x_{(n,m)}$ is not eventually order bounded in $X^u$.

Theorem 1. Let $X$ be an Archimedean vector lattice. TFAE:

(1) $\dim(X) < \infty$;
(2) every $uo$-Cauchy net in $X$ is eventually order bounded in $X^u$;
(3) every $uo$-Cauchy net in $X$ is $o$-convergent in $X^u$;
(4) every $uo$-null net in $X$ is $o$-null in $X^u$;
(5) every $uo$-null net in $X$ is eventually order bounded in $X^u$;
(6) every $uo$-convergent net in $X$ is eventually order bounded in $X^u$;
(7) every $uo$-convergent net in $X$ is eventually order bounded in $X$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2), (4) $\Rightarrow$ (5) $\Leftrightarrow$ (6), and (7) $\Rightarrow$ (6) are trivial.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Suppose $x_\alpha$ is $uo$-Cauchy in $X$. Then $x_\alpha$ is $uo$-Cauchy in $X^u$ by [5, Thm.3.2], because $X$ is regular in $X^u$. It follows from [3, Thm.17] that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{uo} y$ for some $y \in X^u$. Since $x_\alpha$ is eventually order bounded in $X^u$ by the assumption, then $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{o} y$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) follows since every $uo$-null net is $uo$-Cauchy, $o$-convergent implies
uo-convergent, and the uo-limit of any uo-convergent net is unique.

(5) ⇒ (1) is Example 2.

(6) ⇒ (7) follows from the equivalence (6) ⇔ (1) because (1) ⇒ (7) is obvious.

The equivalence (1) ⇔ (7) of Theorem 1 justifies use of term “unbounded order convergence” for the uo-convergence because the uo-convergence for nets in \( X \) is automatically eventually order bounded only if \( X \) is finite-dimensional.

The following question “suppose that \( X \) is an arbitrary Dedekind complete but not universally complete vector lattice. Is there a uo-Cauchy net in \( X \) that fails to be \( o \)-convergent in \( X \)?” was asked in [3, Prob.23]. Since \( X \neq X^u \) implies \( \dim(X) = \infty \), the equivalence (1) ⇔ (3) of Theorem 1 gives a positive answer to this question for an arbitrary non-universally complete Archimedean vector lattice \( X \).
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