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Abstract
Locally convex cones are generalization of locally convex spaces. The assertion, whether a barreled cone is an upper-barreled cone or not, was posed as a question in [A. Ranjbari, H. Saiflu, Projective and inductive limits in locally convex cones, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 332 (2) (2007) 1097-1108]. In this paper, we show that a barreled locally convex cone is not necessarily upper-barreled.

Keywords: Locally convex cone, Barrel, Barreled cone, Upper-barreled cone.

2010 MSC: 46A03, 46A08

1. Introduction

A cone is defined to be a commutative monoid \( \mathcal{P} \) together with a scalar multiplication by nonnegative real numbers satisfying the same axioms as for vector spaces; that is, \( \mathcal{P} \) is endowed with an addition \( (x, y) \mapsto x + y : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P} \) which is associative, commutative and admits a neutral element 0, i.e. it satisfies:

\[
\begin{align*}
  x + (y + z) &= (x + y) + z, \\
  x + y &= y + x, \\
  x + 0 &= x,
\end{align*}
\]
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for all \( x, y, z \in \mathcal{P} \), and with a scalar multiplication \((r, x) \mapsto r \cdot x : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}\) satisfying for all \( x, y \in \mathcal{P} \) and \( r, s \in \mathbb{R}_+ \):

\[
\begin{align*}
    r \cdot (x + y) &= r \cdot x + r \cdot y, \\
    (r + s) \cdot x &= r \cdot x + s \cdot x, \\
    (rs) \cdot x &= r \cdot (s \cdot x), \\
    1 \cdot x &= x, \\
    0 \cdot x &= 0.
\end{align*}
\]

The theory of locally convex cones developed in [4] uses an order theoretical concept or a convex quasi-uniform structure on a cone. In this paper, we use the former. We review some of the main concepts. For more details refer [4] or [7], and for some recent researches see [1, 2, 3, 8].

A preordered cone (ordered cone) is a cone \( \mathcal{P} \) endowed with a preorder (reflexive transitive relation) \( \leq \) such that addition and multiplication by fixed scalars \( r \in \mathbb{R}_+ \) are order preserving, that is \( x \leq y \) implies \( x + z \leq y + z \) and \( r \cdot x \leq r \cdot y \) for all \( x, y, z \in \mathcal{P} \) and \( r \in \mathbb{R}_+ \). Every ordered vector space is an ordered cone. The cones \( \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \) and \( \mathbb{R}_+ = \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\} \), with the usual order and algebraic operations (especially \( 0 \cdot (+\infty) = 0 \)), are ordered cones that are not embeddable in vector spaces.

Let \( \mathcal{P} \) be a preordered cone. A subset \( \mathcal{V} \) of \( \mathcal{P} \) is called an (abstract) 0-neighborhood system, if \( \mathcal{V} \) is a subcone of \( \mathcal{P} \) without zero directed towards 0, i.e.: (i) \( 0 < v \) for all \( v \in \mathcal{V} \); (ii) for all \( u, v \in \mathcal{V} \) there is a \( w \in \mathcal{V} \) with \( w \leq u \) and \( w \leq v \); (iii) \( u + v \in \mathcal{V} \) and \( \alpha v \in \mathcal{V} \) whenever \( u, v \in \mathcal{V} \) and \( \alpha > 0 \).

Let \( a \in \mathcal{P} \) and \( v \in \mathcal{V} \). We define \( v(a) = \{ b \in \mathcal{P} \mid b \leq a + v \} \), resp. \( (a)v = \{ b \in \mathcal{P} \mid a \leq b + v \} \), to be a neighborhood of \( a \) in the upper, resp. lower topologies on \( \mathcal{P} \). The common refinement of the upper and lower topologies is called symmetric topology. We denote the neighborhoods of \( a \) in the symmetric topology by \( v(a) \cap (a)v \) or \( v(a)v \). We call that \((\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{V})\) is a full locally convex cone if the elements of \( \mathcal{P} \) to be bounded below, i.e. for every \( a \in \mathcal{P} \) and \( v \in \mathcal{V} \) we have \( 0 \leq a + \rho v \) for some \( \rho > 0 \). Each subcone of \( \mathcal{P} \), not necessarily containing \( \mathcal{V} \), is called a locally convex cone.

For cones \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( \mathcal{Q} \), a mapping \( t : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{Q} \) is called a linear operator if \( t(a + b) = t(a) + t(b) \) and \( t(\alpha a) = \alpha t(a) \) hold for \( a, b \in \mathcal{P} \) and \( \alpha \geq 0 \).

A linear functional on a cone \( \mathcal{P} \) is a linear mapping \( \mu : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R} \).

Let \((\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{V})\) and \((\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W})\) be two locally convex cones. The linear operator \( t : (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{V}) \to (\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W}) \) is called (uniformly) continuous or simply continuous
if for every $w \in \mathcal{W}$ one can find a $v \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $a \leq b + v$ implies $t(a) \leq t(b) + w$. It is easy to see that the (uniform) continuity implies continuity with respect to the upper, lower and symmetric topologies on $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$.

According to the definition of (uniform) continuity, a linear functional $\mu$ on $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{V})$ is (uniformly) continuous if there is a $v \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $a \leq b + v$ implies $\mu(a) \leq \mu(b) + 1$. The continuous linear functionals on a locally convex cone $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{V})$ (into $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$) form a cone with the usual addition and scalar multiplication of functions. This cone is called the dual cone of $\mathcal{P}$ and denoted by $\mathcal{P}^*$.

For a locally convex cone $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{V})$, the polar $\nu^o$ of $v \in \mathcal{V}$ consists of all linear functionals $\mu$ on $\mathcal{P}$ satisfying $\mu(a) \leq \mu(b) + 1$ whenever $a \leq b + v$ for $a, b \in \mathcal{P}$. We have $\bigcup \{v^o : v \in \mathcal{V}\} = \mathcal{P}^*$. The cone $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+ = \{a \in \bar{\mathbb{R}} : a \geq 0\}$ with (abstract) 0-neighborhood $\mathcal{V} = \{\varepsilon > 0 : \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a locally convex cone. The dual cone of $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$ under $\mathcal{V}$ consists of all nonnegative reals and the functional $\bar{0}$ such that $\bar{0}(a) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{0}(+\infty) = +\infty$.

2. Some results on barreledness

Barreledness plays an important role in Functional Analysis to establish some important theorems as Uniform Boundedness and Open Mapping theorems. A barrel and a barreled cone were defined in [9] for verifying the Uniform Boundedness Theorem in locally convex cones. In this section, we prove some results about barreledness which we will need next.

**Definition 2.1 ([9]).** Let $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{V})$ be a locally convex cone. A barrel is a convex subset $B$ of $\mathcal{P}^2$ with the following properties:

1. **(B1)** For every $b \in \mathcal{P}$ one can find a $v \in \mathcal{V}$ such that for every $a \in v(b)v$ there is a $\lambda > 0$ such that $(a, b) \in \lambda B$.
2. **(B2)** For all $a, b \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $(a, b) \notin B$ there is a $\mu \in \mathcal{P}^*$ such that $\mu(a) > \mu(b) + 1$ and $\mu(c) \leq \mu(d) + 1$ for all $(c, d) \in B$.

A locally convex cone $\mathcal{P}$ is said to be **barreled** if for every barrel $B \subseteq \mathcal{P}^2$ and every $b \in \mathcal{P}$ there is a $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and a $\lambda > 0$ such that $(a, b) \in \lambda B$ for all $a \in v(b)v$ (see [9]).

An upper-barreled cone defined in [6] for verifying inductive and projective limits in locally convex cone:
Definition 2.2 ([6]). Let $\mathcal{P}, V$ be a locally convex cone. The cone $\mathcal{P}$ is called upper-barreled if for every barrel $B \subseteq \mathcal{P}^2$, there is $v \in V$ such that $\tilde{v} \subseteq B$, where

$$\tilde{v} = \{(a, b) \in \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P} : a \leq b + v\}.$$ 

In [5] it was proved that under some conditions, the strict inductive limit of barreled locally convex cones is upper-barreled. As mentioned in [6], Example 4.7, a full locally convex cone is upper-barreled. Also the cone $\mathcal{C} = \{0, \infty\}$ is upper-barreled with each (abstract) 0-neighborhood system. An upper-barreled cone is barreled. But the question whether a barreled cone is upper-barreled or not, was posed as a question in [6] (page 1107). Now, we show that it is not true. First we prove some general results.

Lemma 2.3. Let $\mathcal{P}, V$ be a locally convex cone and $B$ be a barrel in $\mathcal{P}$. If $(a, b) \in \lambda a B$, $(c, b) \in \lambda c B$ and $a \leq c$, then $(a, b) \in \lambda c B$.

Proof. By the hypothesis, we have

$$(\frac{a}{\lambda a}, \frac{b}{\lambda a}), (\frac{c}{\lambda c}, \frac{b}{\lambda c}) \in B.$$ 

Suppose $a \leq c$ and $(\frac{a}{\lambda c}, \frac{b}{\lambda c}) \notin B$. By (B2) of Definition 2.1, there exits $\mu \in \mathcal{P}^*$ such that $\mu(\frac{a}{\lambda a}) \leq \mu(\frac{b}{\lambda a}) + 1$ and $\mu(\frac{c}{\lambda c}) > \mu(\frac{b}{\lambda c}) + 1$. Since $a \leq c$, so $\mu(\frac{a}{\lambda a}) \leq \mu(\frac{c}{\lambda c})$ and then $\mu(\frac{c}{\lambda c}) > \mu(\frac{b}{\lambda c}) + 1$. This contradiction shows that $(\frac{a}{\lambda c}, \frac{b}{\lambda c}) \in B$. 

□

Theorem 2.4. Let $\mathcal{P}, V$ be a locally convex cone. If for each $b \in \mathcal{P}$ and $v \in V$ there exits $c \in v(b)v$ such that $a \leq c$ for all $a \in v(b)v$, then $\mathcal{P}, V$ is barreled.

Proof. Let $B$ be a barrel in $\mathcal{P}$ and $b \in \mathcal{P}$. There exits $v \in V$ which satisfies in (B1) and by the hypothesis, there is $c \in v(b)v$ such that $a \leq c$ for all $a \in v(b)v$. By (B1), there is $\lambda_c > 0$ such that $(c, b) \in \lambda_c B$. Then the conditions of Lemma 2.3 hold and $\lambda_c > 0$ is the same $\lambda > 0$ which we need in the definition of barreled cone. 

□
3. A barreled cone which is not upper-barreled

Now, we construct an example which shows that a barreled locally convex cone is not necessarily upper-barreled. Consider the set

\[ \mathcal{P} = \{ a_i \mid a \in (0, +\infty), i \in \mathbb{N} \} \cup \{0, \infty\}. \]  

(1)

**Remark 3.1.** Note that \( i = 0 \) if and only if \( a_i = 0 \), and \( j = \infty \) if and only if \( b_j = \infty \).

We define addition and scalar multiplication on \( \mathcal{P} \) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\quad a_i + b_j & :=
\begin{cases}
(a + b)_i & \text{if } i = j, \\
a_i & \text{if } b_j = 0, \\
b_j & \text{if } a_i = 0, \\
\infty & \text{if } i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j,
\end{cases} \\
\lambda \cdot a_i & := (\lambda a)_i, \\
0 \cdot a_i & = 0,
\end{align*}
\]

for all \( a_i, b_j \in \mathcal{P} \) and positive reals \( \lambda \).

Also we consider the preorder \( \preceq \) on \( \mathcal{P} \) as follows:

\[ a_i \preceq b_j \iff i = j \text{ and } a \leq b. \]

The set \( \mathcal{P} \) with the mentioned addition, scalar multiplication and preorder is a preordered cone with \( 0_0 \) as the neutral element. The set \( \mathcal{V} = \{ v \in \mathbb{R} \mid v > 0 \} \) with the following property is an (abstract) 0-neighborhood system:

\[ a_i \preceq b_j + v \iff (i = j, a \leq b + jv) \text{ or } i = 0 \text{ or } j = \infty, \]  

(2)

(see Remark 3.1).

Clearly \( \mathcal{P} \) with the neighborhood system \( \mathcal{V} \) is a locally convex cone.

**Proposition 3.2.** In the locally convex cone \( (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{V}) \) constructed above, the indices of members of any symmetric neighborhood of an element is equal to the index of that element.
Proof.

Let $v \in V$ be arbitrary. It is easy to see that $v(0_0) = \{0_0\}$ and $(\infty, \infty)v = \{\infty, \infty\}$ and then $v(0_0)v = \{0_0\}$ and $v(\infty, \infty)v = \{\infty, \infty\}$. For $j \neq 0, \infty$ (see Remark 3.1), $v(b_j) = \{a_j | a \leq b + jv\} \cup \{0_0\}$ and $(b_j)v = \{a_j | b \leq a + jv\} \cup \{\infty, \infty\}$.

For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $Q_j = \{b_j \in P\} \cup \{0_0, \infty, \infty\}$.

Clearly, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $Q_j$ is a subcone of $P$, $P = \cup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} Q_j$ and by Proposition 3.2, $v(b_j)v \subseteq Q_j$ for all $v \in V$ and all $b_j \in P$.

Remark 3.3.

(i) For every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $Q_j$ is isomorphic to $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$. Indeed, $\Lambda : Q_j \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+, \Lambda(a_j) = \frac{a_j}{j}$ is a bijective linear (uniformly) continuous monotone order preserving mapping. We note that the inverse of $\Lambda$ is not (uniformly) continuous.

(ii) The upper (and then the symmetric) neighborhoods of $0$ in $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$ and $0_0$ in $Q_j$ are different. Indeed, for each $v \in V$ we have $v(0) = [0, v]$ and $v(0_0) = \{0_0\}$.

(iii) The locally convex cone $(\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+, V)$ is full ($V \subset \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$), but $(Q_j, V)$ is not so.

Lemma 3.4. For each $a_j \in P$ and $\mu \in P^*$, $\mu(a_j) \geq 0$.

Proof. Let $v \in V$ such that $\mu \in v^\circ$. By the definition of the preorder in $P$, $0_0 \leq a_j + \lambda v$ for all $\lambda > 0$. So $\mu(0_0) \leq \mu(a_j) + \lambda$ for all $\lambda > 0$, then $0 \leq \mu(a_j)$. □

For investigation of barreledness in locally convex cones, we need to know duals of cones.

Let $\mu \in Q_j^*$ be an arbitrary nonzero element. We have $\mu(0_0) = 0$ (since $\mu$ is linear). Also for all $a_j \in Q_j$, we have $a_j = a \cdot 1_j$ (note that since $j \in \mathbb{N}$, then $a_j \neq 0_0, \infty, \infty$). Then $\mu(a_j) = \mu(a_1)$. Set $\lambda = \mu(1_j)$. We have $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mu(a_j) = \lambda a_j$. Since $\mu$ is (uniformly) continuous, there exists $v \in V$ such that $x \leq y + v$ implies $\mu(x) \leq \mu(y) + 1$ for all $x, y \in Q_j$. We know that $0_0 \leq a_j + v$ for all $a_j \in (0, +\infty)$. Then $0 \leq \lambda a_j + 1$ for all $a_j \in \mathbb{R}_+$. This yields
that \( \lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+ \). Linearity of \( \mu \) implies that \( \mu(\infty) = 0 \) or \( \infty \). On the other hand \( a_j \leq \infty + v \) for all \( a \in (0, +\infty) \). We conclude that \( \lambda a \leq \mu(\infty) + 1 \) for all \( a \in (0, +\infty) \). This yields that \( \lambda = 0 \) or \( \mu(\infty) = \infty \). But \( \lambda = 0 \) implies \( \mu(\infty) = \infty \) again, since \( \mu \) is nonzero. Hence the elements of \( Q_j^* \) are exactly \( \lambda_j \), by

\[
\lambda_j(a_i) := \begin{cases} 0 & i = 0, \\ \lambda a & i = j, \\ +\infty & i = \infty, \end{cases}
\]

for all \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+ \), \( \bar{0}_j \), by

\[
\bar{0}_j(a_i) := \begin{cases} 0 & i = 0 \text{ or } i = j, \\ +\infty & i = \infty, \end{cases}
\]

and \( \infty \) by

\[
\infty(a_i) := \begin{cases} 0 & i = 0, \\ +\infty & \text{els.} \end{cases}
\]

In fact \( Q_j^* = \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\bar{0}_j, \infty\} \).

Note that \( \infty \) as a linear functional is not (uniformly) continuous from \( \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+ \) to \( \bar{\mathbb{R}} \). It is not even linear from \( \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+ \) to \( \bar{\mathbb{R}} \).

**Lemma 3.5.** Let \((Q_k, V)\) be the locally convex cone constructed above. Then

(i) The polar \( v^o \) contains the functionals \( 0_k, \bar{0}_k, \infty \) for each \( v \in V \).

(ii) For each \( w \in V \), \( \left(\frac{1}{w}\right)_k \in (\frac{w}{k})^o \).

**Proof.** The proof of (i) is clear. For (ii), let \( a_i, b_j \in Q_k \), \( a_i \leq b_j + \frac{w}{k} \) and \( \mu = \left(\frac{1}{w}\right)_k \). It is easy to that if \( i = 0 \) or \( j = \infty \), then \( \mu(a_i) \leq \mu(b_j) + 1 \). Otherwise, we have \( i = j = k \). Then \( a \leq b + k\frac{w}{k} \) and so \( \frac{1}{w}a \leq \frac{1}{w}b + 1 \) i.e. \( \mu(a_i) \leq \mu(b_j) + 1 \). \( \square \)

Now, we investigate the dual of \( P \). Let \( \tilde{\mu} : P \to \bar{\mathbb{R}} \) be a nonzero linear mapping. Let \( i, j \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( i \neq j \). So by the definition of the additivity \( a_i + b_j = \infty \). We have \( \tilde{\mu}(a_i) + \tilde{\mu}(b_j) = \infty \). Then \( \tilde{\mu}(a_i) = \infty \) or \( \tilde{\mu}(b_j) = \infty \). Suppose \( \tilde{\mu}(a_i) < \infty \). Then \( \tilde{\mu}(a'_j) < \infty \) for all \( a'_j \in Q_i \) (since \( i \neq 0, \infty \), so \( a'_j = \frac{w}{a}a_i \)). Hence, by the same implication, \( \tilde{\mu}(b_j) = \infty \) for all \( b_j \in Q_j \) (and so for all \( b_j \in P \setminus Q_i \)). This yields that if \( \tilde{\mu} \in P^* \) is nonzero element and \( \mu \) is the restriction of \( \tilde{\mu} \) on \( Q_i \), then \( \tilde{\mu} \) can be uniquely written as follows:

\[
\tilde{\mu}(x) = \begin{cases} \mu(x) & x \in Q_i, \\ \infty & x \not\in Q_i. \end{cases}
\]
By (3), (4) and (5), the elements of $P^*$ are: the linear functional $0$,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_i(x) = \begin{cases} 
\lambda_i(x) & x \in Q_i, \\
\infty & x \notin Q_i,
\end{cases}$$

(7)

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\tilde{0}_i(x) = \begin{cases} 
0 & x \in Q_i \setminus \{\infty\}, \\
\infty & x \notin Q_i \setminus \{\infty\},
\end{cases}$$

(8)

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\tilde{\infty}(x) := \begin{cases} 
0 & x = 0, \\
+\infty & \text{els.}
\end{cases}$$

(9)

**Lemma 3.6.** Let $(P, V)$ be the locally convex cone constructed in the above. Then

(i) The polar $v^\circ$ contains the functionals $0$, $\tilde{0}_k$, $\tilde{\infty}$ for each $v \in V$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) For each $w \in V$ and each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\frac{1}{w})_k \in (\frac{w}{k})^\circ$.

(iii) If $a_i, b_j \in P$, $a_i \preceq b_j + v$ and $j \notin \{0, k\}$, then $(\frac{1}{w})_k(a_i) \leq (\frac{1}{w})_k(b_j) + 1$ for all $v, w \in V$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

**Proof.** The proofs of (i) and (ii) are similar to Lemma 3.5. For (iii), we have $(\frac{1}{w})_k(b_j) = \infty$ and so the proof is complete. □

**Proposition 3.7.** The cones $Q_j$ and $P$ with $V$ as an (abstract) 0-neighborhood system are barreled for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

**Proof.** We prove that $P$ is barreled. Let $B$ be a barrel in $P$ and let $b_i \in P$. For $i = 0, \infty$, by Proposition 3.2 all $v \in V$ and all $\lambda > 0$ satisfy in the definition of barreled cones. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$. By the definition of the barrel (B1), there exits $v \in V$ such that for each $a_j \in v(b_j)v$, there is $\lambda_{a_j} > 0$ such that $(a_j, b_j) \in \lambda_{a_j}B$ (see Proposition 3.2). Let $c := b + jv$. By Theorem 2.4 $P$ is barreled. For $Q_j$, the proof is similar. □

**Theorem 3.8.** The locally convex cone $(P, V)$ constructed in the above is not upper-barreled.
Proof. Let \( w \in \mathcal{V} \) be a fixed element. For each \( j \in \mathbb{N} \), we define

\[
B_j := \{(a_i, b_k) \mid a_i, b_k \in \mathcal{Q}_j \text{ and } a_i \leq b_k + \frac{w}{j}\}.
\] (10)

We show that \( B_j \) is a barrel in \( \mathcal{Q}_j \):

For (B1), it is enough to consider the same \( \frac{w}{j} \) and \( \lambda = 1 \). For (B2), let \((c_n, d_m) \notin B_j\). So \( c_n \notin d_m + \frac{w}{j} \). By (2), we have two cases:

Case (i): \( n = m = j \) \((c_n, d_m) \in \mathcal{Q}_j^* \) and \( c > d + w \). For \( \mu = \frac{1}{w} \in \mathcal{Q}_j^* \), we have \( \mu(c_n) > \mu(d_m) + 1 \), and \( \mu(a_i) \leq \mu(b_k) + 1 \) for all \((a_i, b_k) \in B_j\).

Case (ii): \( m = 0 \) and \( n \neq 0 \). We consider the functional \( \mu = \infty \). We have \( \mu(c_n) = +\infty \) and \( \mu(d_m) = 0 \). So \( \mu(c_n) > \mu(d_m) + 1 \), and \( \mu(a_i) \leq \mu(b_k) + 1 \) for all \((a_i, b_k) \in B_j\).

Now, we define

\[
B := \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} B_j.
\] (11)

We show that \( B \) is a barrel in \( \mathcal{P} \).

(B1): Let \( b_i \in \mathcal{P} \) be arbitrary. Then \( b_i \in \mathcal{Q}_j \) form some \( j \in \mathbb{N} \). Note that \( i \in \{0, j, \infty\} \). The set \( B_j = B \cap (\mathcal{Q}_j \times \mathcal{Q}_j) \) is a barrel in \( \mathcal{Q}_j \). So by considering \( v = \frac{w}{j} \in \mathcal{V} \) and \( \lambda = 1 \), \((a_k, b_i) \in \lambda B_j \subseteq \lambda B \) for all \( a_k \in v(b_i)v \).

Proposition 3.2 yields that \( k = i \), i.e., \((a_i, b_i) \in \lambda B_j \subseteq \lambda B \) for all \( a_i \in v(b_i)v \).

(B2): Let \((a_i, b_j) \notin B \). Then \( a_i \neq 0 \) and \( b_j \neq \infty \) (see (10) and (11)). We consider three cases:

Case I: \( b_j = 0 \). In this case \( a_i \neq 0 \), since \((0, 0, 0) \in B \). Choose \( \mu = \tilde{0} \).

Then \( \mu(a_j) = +\infty \) and then \( \mu(a_i) > \mu(b_j) + 1 \). Also \( \mu(c_m) \leq \mu(d_m) + 1 \) for all \((c_n, d_m) \in B \) by (10), (11) and Lemma 3.6 (i).

Case II: \( i = j \). Then \( i \neq 0, \infty \) since \((0, 0, 0, \infty, \infty, \infty) \in B \). By the hypothesis, \((a_i, b_i) \notin B_i \) and so \( a_i \notin b_i + \frac{w}{j} \). Then \( a > b + w \). By setting \( \mu = \frac{1}{w} \), we have \( \mu(a_i) > \mu(b_j) + 1 \) and \( \mu(c_m) \leq \mu(d_m) + 1 \) for all \((c_n, d_m) \in B \), by (10), (11) and Lemma 3.6 (ii), (iii).

Case III: \( i \neq j, i, j \neq 0 \) and \( j \neq \infty \) (note that \((0, 0, 0, 0, \infty, \infty) \in B \)). Choose \( \mu = \frac{1}{w} \).

We have \( \mu(a_i) > \mu(b_j) + 1 \) (in fact \( \mu(a_i) = \infty \) and \( \mu(b_j) = \frac{1}{w} < \infty \)).

If \((c_m, d_n) \in B_j, \mu(c_m) \leq \mu(d_n) + 1 \) by (10), (11) and Lemma 3.6 (ii), (iii).

Let \( u \in \mathcal{V} \) be arbitrary. We show that \( \tilde{u} \notin B \). Suppose \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( w < j u \), and \( a, b \in \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that \( w < a - b < j u \). Then \( a_j \leq b_j + u \) \((a \leq b + ju)\) and \( a_j \neq b_j + \frac{w}{j} (w + b < a) \). Hence \((a_j, b_j) \notin \tilde{u} \) and \((a_j, b_j) \notin B \).

This shows that \( \mathcal{P} \) is not upper-barreled. \( \square \)
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