

# Equivalence between limit theorems for lattice group-valued $k$ -triangular set functions

A. Boccuto<sup>\*</sup>      X. Dimitriou<sup>†</sup>

## Abstract

We investigate some main properties of lattice group-valued  $k$ -triangular set functions and prove some Brooks-Jewett, Nikodým, Vitali-Hahn-Saks and Schur-type theorems and their equivalence. A Drewnowski-type theorem on existence of continuous restrictions of  $(s)$ -bounded set functions is given. Furthermore we pose some open problems.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we deal with  $k$ -triangular lattice group-valued set functions. We continue the investigation started in [7, 10, 11], where some limit theorems were proved for  $k$ -subadditive, positive and monotone set functions. In particular we treat  $(s)$ -boundedness and continuity from above at  $\emptyset$ . Among the related literature, see for instance [17, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31]. Some examples of  $k$ -triangular set functions are the so-called “ $M$ -measures”, namely monotone set functions  $m$  with  $m(\emptyset) = 0$ , continuous from above and from below and compatible with respect to finite suprema and infima, which have several applications, for example to intuitionistic fuzzy sets and observables (see also [2, 27]). A class of 1-triangular set functions which are not necessarily monotone is that of the Saeki mesurooids (see also [28]). We investigate some main properties and prove some Brooks-Jewett, Nikodým, Vitali-Hahn-Saks and Schur-type theorem and their equivalence, by means of sliding hump-type techniques. Here the notions of (uniform)  $(s)$ -boundedness, continuity from above at  $\emptyset$  and continuity with respect to a suitable Fréchet-Nikodým topology  $\tau$ , as well as the concept of pointwise convergence of the involved set functions, are intended with respect to a single regulator. We deal with  $(D)$ -convergence and use the Fremlin theorem, a powerful tool which allows

---

<sup>\*</sup>Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, University of Perugia, via Vanvitelli 1, I-06123 Perugia, Italy; e-mail: antonio.boccuto@unipg.it, boccuto@yahoo.it (Corresponding author)

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Athens, Panepistimiopolis, Athens 15784, Greece; email: xenofon11@gmail.com, dxenof@math.uoa.gr

2010 A. M. S. Subject Classifications: Primary: 26E50, 28A12, 28A33, 28B10, 28B15, 40A35, 46G10, 54A20, 54A40. Secondary: 06F15, 06F20, 06F30, 22A10, 28A05, 40G15, 46G12, 54H11, 54H12.

Key words: lattice group,  $(D)$ -convergence,  $(O)$ -convergence,  $k$ -subadditive set function,  $k$ -triangular set function, continuous set function,  $(s)$ -bounded set function, Fremlin lemma, limit theorem, Brooks-Jewett theorem, Vitali-Hahn-Saks theorem, Nikodým theorem, Drewnowski theorem, Schur theorem.

to reduce a sequence of regulators to a single  $(D)$ -sequence. We prove a Drewnowski-type theorem about the existence of continuous restrictions of  $(s)$ -bounded  $k$ -triangular set functions, extending earlier results proved in [5, 6, 22]. Note that in our setting, differently from [6], it is possible to use a Drewnowski-type technique just because the involved  $(D)$ -convergence is always meant with respect to a single  $(D)$ -sequence, and so it is possible to prove that the Nikodým convergence theorem implies the Brooks-Jewett theorem, analogously as in [22], just by choosing a disjoint set sequence and considering the behavior of suitable subsequences. We use a sliding-hump type technique (see also [18, 19]) Furthermore, observe that here  $(s)$ -boundedness of the limit set function is proved as thesis, while in [25, Theorem 1] and [26, Theorem 11.10] it is assumed as hypothesis. Some other versions of limit theorems for lattice group-valued set functions in the recent literature are proved, for instance, in [1, 6, 13, 15, 20] (see also [8, 12] for an overview). Finally we pose some open problems.

## 2 Preliminaries

We begin with recalling the following main properties of lattice groups (see also [8, 12, 16]).

**Definitions 2.1** (a) A Dedekind complete lattice group  $R$  is said to be *super Dedekind complete* iff for every nonempty set  $A \subset R$ , bounded from above, there is a countable subset  $A'$ , with  $\bigvee A' = \bigvee A$ .

(b) A sequence  $(\sigma_p)_p$  in  $R$  is called an  $(O)$ -sequence iff it is decreasing and  $\bigwedge_p \sigma_p = 0$ .

(c) 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  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ .

(d) A lattice group  $R$  is *weakly  $\sigma$ -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  $R$ .

(e) 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  $(O) \lim_n x_n = x$ .

(f) 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  $(D) \lim_n x_n = x$ .

(g) 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  $R$ .

**Remark 2.2** Observe that in every Dedekind complete lattice group  $R$  any  $(O)$ -convergent sequence is  $(D)$ -convergent too, while the converse is true if and only if  $R$  is weakly  $\sigma$ -distributive (see also [12, 16]).

We now recall the Fremlin lemma, which has a fundamental importance in the setting of  $(D)$ -convergence, because it allows to replace a sequence of regulators with a single  $(D)$ -sequence.

**Lemma 2.3** (see also [23, Lemma 1C], [27, Theorem 3.2.3]) Let  $R$  be any Dedekind complete lattice 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

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

The following result links  $(O)$ -sequences and regulators.

**Theorem 2.4** (see also [3, Theorem 3.4]) *Given any Dedekind complete lattice group  $R$  and any  $(O)$ -sequence  $(\sigma_l)_l$  in  $R$ , the double sequence defined by  $a_{t,l} := \sigma_l$ ,  $t, l \in \mathbb{N}$ , is a  $(D)$ -sequence, and for every  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ ,*

$$\sigma_l \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $l = \varphi(1)$ . Conversely, if  $R$  is super Dedekind complete and weakly  $\sigma$ -distributive, then for any regulator  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  in  $R$  there is an  $(O)$ -sequence  $(\sigma_p)_p$  such that for each  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  there is  $\varphi_p \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  with

$$\bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi_p(t)} \leq \sigma_p. \quad (2)$$

We now deal with some fundamental properties of non-additive lattice group-valued set functions (see also [12, 26, 31] and the bibliographies therein).

From now on, when it is not indicated elsewhere explicitly,  $R$  denotes a Dedekind complete and weakly  $\sigma$ -distributive lattice group,  $R^+$  is the positive cone of  $R$ ,  $G$  is an infinite set,  $\mathcal{L}$  is an algebra of subsets of  $G$ ,  $m : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R$  is a positive bounded set function and  $k$  is a fixed positive integer.

**Definitions 2.5** (a) We say that  $m$  is  $k$ -subadditive on  $\mathcal{L}$  iff  $m(\emptyset) = 0$  and

$$m(A \cup B) \leq m(A) + k m(B) \quad \text{whenever } A, B \in \mathcal{L}, A \cap B = \emptyset; \quad (3)$$

$k$ -triangular on  $\mathcal{L}$ , iff  $m$  is  $k$ -subadditive and

$$m(A) - k m(B) \leq m(A \cup B) \quad \text{whenever } A, B \in \mathcal{L}, A \cap B = \emptyset. \quad (4)$$

(b) We call *semivariation* of  $m$ , shortly  $v(m)$ , the set function defined by

$$v(m)(A) := \bigvee \{m(B) : B \in \mathcal{L}, B \subset A\}, \quad A \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (5)$$

The following results will be useful in the sequel.

**Proposition 2.6** *If  $m : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R$  is  $k$ -subadditive, then  $v(m)$  is  $k$ -triangular.*

**Proof:** Pick any two disjoint sets  $A, B \in \mathcal{L}$ . Fix arbitrarily  $C \subset A \cup B$  and set  $C_1 := A \cap C$ ,  $C_2 := B \cap C$ . By  $k$ -subadditivity of  $m$  we get

$$m(C) \leq m(C_1) + k m(C_2),$$

and hence

$$m(C) \leq v(m)(A) + k v(m)(B) \tag{6}$$

By arbitrariness of  $C$ , from (6) we obtain  $k$ -subadditivity of  $v(m)$ . Relation (4) follows from monotonicity of  $v(m)$ , taking into account that  $v(m)(\emptyset) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.7** *Let  $m : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R$  be a  $k$ -triangular set function. Then for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n \geq 2$ , and for every pairwise disjoint sets  $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{L}$  it is*

$$m(E_1) - k \sum_{q=2}^n m(E_q) \leq m\left(\bigcup_{q=1}^n E_q\right) \leq m(E_1) + k \sum_{q=2}^n m(E_q). \tag{7}$$

In particular we have

$$m(E_1) \leq m\left(\bigcup_{q=1}^n E_q\right) + k \sum_{q=2}^n m(E_q). \tag{8}$$

**Proof:** Let us proceed by induction, and assume that (7) holds for  $n - 1$ . We get

$$\begin{aligned} m(E_1) - k \sum_{q=2}^n m(E_q) &= m(E_1) - k \sum_{q=2}^{n-1} m(E_q) - k m(E_n) \leq \\ &\leq m\left(\bigcup_{q=1}^{n-1} E_q\right) - k m(E_n) \leq m\left(\bigcup_{q=1}^n E_q\right) \leq m\left(\bigcup_{q=1}^{n-1} E_q\right) + k m(E_n) \leq \\ &\leq m(E_1) + k \sum_{q=2}^{n-1} m(E_q) + k m(E_n) = m(E_1) + k \sum_{q=2}^n m(E_q), \end{aligned}$$

obtaining the assertion.  $\square$

**Definitions 2.8** (a) A lattice  $\mathcal{E}$  of subsets of  $G$  is said to *satisfy property (E)* iff every disjoint sequence  $(C_h)_h$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  has a subsequence  $(C_{h_r})_r$ , such that  $\mathcal{E}$  contains the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the sets  $C_{h_r}$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , in the set  $\bigcup_{r=1}^{\infty} C_{h_r}$  (see also [29]).

From now on we assume that  $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{P}(G)$  is an algebra, satisfying property (E).

(b) A set function  $m : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R^+$  is *(s)-bounded* on  $\mathcal{L}$  iff there exists a  $(D)$ -sequence  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  such that, for every disjoint sequence  $(C_h)_h$  in  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $(D) \lim_h m(C_h) = 0$  with respect to  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ .

(c) We say that the set functions  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R^+$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , are *uniformly (s)-bounded* on  $\mathcal{L}$  iff there exists a  $(D)$ -sequence  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  such that, for every disjoint sequence  $(C_h)_h$  in  $\mathcal{L}$ ,

$$(D) \lim_h \left( \bigvee_j m_j(C_h) \right) = 0$$

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

(d) We say that a set function  $m : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R^+$  is *continuous from above at  $\emptyset$*  iff there is a  $(D)$ -sequence  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  with  $(D) \lim_n m(H_n) = 0$  with respect to  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  whenever  $(H_n)_n$  is a decreasing sequence in  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} H_n = \emptyset$ .

(e) The set functions  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R^+$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , are said to be *uniformly continuous from above at  $\emptyset$*  iff there is a  $(D)$ -sequence  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  with

$$(D) \lim_n \left( \bigvee_j v(m_j)(H_n) \right) = 0$$

with respect to  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  for each decreasing sequence  $(H_n)_n$  of elements of  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} H_n = \emptyset$ .

(f) We say that the set functions  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , are *equibounded* on  $\mathcal{L}$  iff there is an element  $u \in R$  with  $|m_j(A)| \leq u$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{L}$ .

**Remark 2.9** Observe that continuity from above at  $\emptyset$  of a  $k$ -triangular set function with respect to a regulator  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  implies its  $(s)$ -boundedness with respect to the  $(D)$ -sequence  $((k+1)a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ . Otherwise there exist a disjoint sequence  $(C_h)_h$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  and an element  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  with

$$m(C_h) \not\leq (k+1) \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)} \quad \text{for every } h \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (9)$$

Since  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies property  $(E)$ , possibly passing to a suitable subsequence of  $(C_h)_h$ , without loss of generality we can suppose that

$$\bigcup_{h \in P} C_h \in \mathcal{L} \quad \text{for all } P \subset \mathbb{N}.$$

As  $m$  is  $k$ -triangular and continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  with respect to the  $(D)$ -sequence  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ , then for each  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there exists a positive integer  $h_0$  with

$$m(C_h) \leq m\left(\bigcup_{i=h}^{\infty} C_i\right) + k m\left(\bigcup_{i=h+1}^{\infty} C_i\right) \leq (k+1) \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)} \quad \text{for any } h \geq h_0,$$

getting a contradiction with (9). Analogously it is possible to check that uniform continuity from above at  $\emptyset$  implies uniform  $(s)$ -boundedness.

On the other hand, in general the converse implication is not true. For example observe that a real-valued measure  $m$  defined on a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{P}(G)$  is countably additive (resp.  $(s)$ -bounded) if and only if the set function  $A \mapsto |m(A)|$ ,  $A \in \Sigma$ , which is by construction 1-triangular on  $\Sigma$ , is continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  (resp.  $(s)$ -bounded) (see also [28, Example (a)]).

We now prove that the semivariation inherits both  $(s)$ -boundedness and continuity from above at  $\emptyset$ .

**Proposition 2.10** *Let  $m : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R^+$  be an  $(s)$ -bounded set function. Then  $v(m)$  is  $(s)$ -bounded too.*

**Proof:** Let  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  be a regulator related with  $(s)$ -boundedness of  $m$ . If the thesis of the proposition is not true, then we find a disjoint sequence  $(A_h)_h$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  and a  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  with

$$v(m)(A_h) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)} \quad \text{for every } h \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (10)$$

By (10) and the properties of the semivariation we find a sequence  $(B_h)_h$  in  $\mathcal{L}$ , with  $B_h \subset A_h$  for every  $h$  and

$$m(B_h) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)} \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (11)$$

Since  $B_h \subset A_h$  for every  $h$ , then the sequence  $(B_h)_h$  is disjoint, and so (11) contradicts  $(s)$ -boundedness of  $m$ . This ends the proof.  $\square$

Analogously as in Proposition 2.10 it is possible to demonstrate the following

**Proposition 2.11** *Let  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R^+$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , be a sequence of equibounded and uniformly  $(s)$ -bounded set functions. Then the set functions  $v(m_j) : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R^+$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , are equibounded and uniformly  $(s)$ -bounded too.*

The next result extends [28, Lemma 2 (b)] to the lattice group setting.

**Proposition 2.12** *Let  $m : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R^+$  be a  $k$ -triangular set function, continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ . Then  $v(m)$  is continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ .*

**Proof:** Let  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  be a regulator, associated with continuity from above at  $\emptyset$  of  $m$ . To get the assertion, it will be enough to prove that  $v(m)$  is continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  with respect to the  $(D)$ -sequence  $((k+1)a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ . If not, then there are a decreasing sequence  $(A_n)_n$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  and an element  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  with  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = \emptyset$  and

$$v(m)(A_n) \not\leq (k+1) \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}. \quad (12)$$

Now, proceeding by induction, similarly as in [28, Lemma 2 (b)], let  $D_0 = 0$ ,  $q_0 = 1$ , and suppose that  $q_1 < \dots < q_{n-1} \in \mathbb{N}$  and the pairwise disjoint sets  $D_1, \dots, D_{n-1} \in \mathcal{L}$  have been given. By (12) and the properties of the semivariation we find a set  $B_n \subset A_{q_{n-1}}$  with

$$m(B_n) \not\leq (k+1) \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}. \quad (13)$$

By continuity from above at  $\emptyset$  of  $m$ , for every  $\psi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there is  $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{N}$  (depending on  $\psi$  and  $n$ ) with

$$m(B_n \cap A_q) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\psi(t)} \quad \text{whenever } q \geq \bar{q},$$

and thus there exists  $q_n > q_{n-1}$  with

$$m(B_n \cap A_{q_n}) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\psi(t)}. \quad (14)$$

Let now  $D_n := B_n \setminus A_{q_n}$ . We get

$$m(D_n) \not\leq (k+1) \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}. \quad (15)$$

Indeed, if (15) is not true, then from (14),  $k$ -triangularity of  $m$  and weak  $\sigma$ -distributivity of  $R$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} m(B_n) &\leq m(D_n) + k m(B_n \cap A_{q_n}) \leq (k+1) \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)} + k \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\psi(t)} \leq \\ &\leq (k+1) \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)} + k \bigwedge_{\psi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}} \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\psi(t)} \right) = (k+1) \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

which contradicts (13). Since  $D_n \subset A_{q_{n-1}} \setminus A_{q_n}$ , then we obtain that the  $D_n$ 's are pairwise disjoint and satisfy (15). As  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies property (E), possibly taking a suitable subsequence of  $(D_n)_n$ , without loss of generality we can assume that  $\mathcal{L}$  contains the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the  $D_n$ 's. Since  $m$  is  $k$ -triangular and continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  with respect to the regulator  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ , then for every  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there is  $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}$  with

$$m(D_n) \leq m\left(\bigcup_{s=n}^{\infty} D_s\right) + k m\left(\bigcup_{s=n+1}^{\infty} D_s\right) \leq (k+1) \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$$

whenever  $n \geq \bar{n}$ , getting a contradiction with (15). This ends the proof.  $\square$ .

Analogously as in Proposition 2.12, it is possible to prove the following

**Proposition 2.13** *Let  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , be a sequence of equibounded  $k$ -triangular set functions, uniformly continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ . Then the set functions  $\mu_j := v(m_j)$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , are uniformly continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ .*

We now give an example of 1-triangular and not monotone set function.

**Example 2.14** Let  $R = \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\mu : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined as

$$\mu(A) := \sum_{n \in A} \frac{(-1)^n}{n^2}, \quad A \subset \mathbb{N}. \quad (17)$$

Since the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n^2}$  is absolutely convergent, then  $\mu$  is a countably additive measure (see also [9, Proposition 2.15]). From this and [28, Example (a) and Lemma 2 (b)] it follows that the set function  $m : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , defined as  $m(A) := |\mu(A)|$ , is continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ . Moreover, by construction,  $m$  is 1-triangular. However,  $m$  is not monotone: indeed,  $m(\{1, 3\}) = \frac{10}{9} > \frac{31}{36} = m(\{1, 2, 3\})$ .

**Definition 2.15** A topology  $\tau$  on  $\mathcal{L}$  is a *Fréchet-Nikodým topology* iff the functions  $(A, B) \mapsto A\Delta B$  and  $(A, B) \mapsto A \cap B$  from  $\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{L}$  (endowed with the product topology) to  $\mathcal{L}$  are continuous, and for any  $\tau$ -neighborhood  $V$  of  $\emptyset$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  there exists a  $\tau$ -neighborhood  $U$  of  $\emptyset$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  such that, if  $E \in \mathcal{L}$  is contained in some suitable element of  $U$ , then  $E \in V$  (see also [22]).

**Definitions 2.16** (a) Let  $\tau$  be a Fréchet-Nikodým topology. A set function  $m : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R^+$  is said to be  $\tau$ -*continuous* on  $\mathcal{L}$  iff it is (s)-bounded on  $\mathcal{L}$  and for each decreasing sequence  $(H_n)_n$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $\tau\text{-}\lim_n H_n = \emptyset$  we get  $(D)\lim_n m(H_n) = 0$  with respect to a single regulator (see also [22]).

(b) The set functions  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R^+$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , are *uniformly  $\tau$ -continuous* on  $\mathcal{L}$  iff they are uniformly (s)-bounded and for every decreasing sequence  $(H_n)_n$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $\tau\text{-}\lim_n H_n = \emptyset$  we get  $(D)\lim_n \left( \bigvee_j m_j(H_n) \right) = 0$  with respect to a single regulator.

### 3 The main results

We begin with the following proposition, which will be useful in the sequel.

**Proposition 3.1** *Let  $R$  be any Dedekind complete lattice group,  $x \in R$ ,  $(x_n)_n$  be any sequence in  $R$ , such that*

3.1.1) *every subsequence  $(x_{n_q})_q$  of  $(x_n)_n$  has a sub-subsequence  $(x_{n_{q_r}})_{r,}$  ( $D$ )-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  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ .*

**Proof:** If we deny the thesis, then there exist  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  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  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ . So any subsequence of  $(x_{n_q})_q$  does not ( $D$ )-converge to  $x$  with respect to  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ , getting a contradiction with 3.1.1). This ends the proof.  $\square$

**Remarks 3.2** (a) With similar techniques as in Proposition 3.1, it is possible to prove an analogous result also when it is dealt with ( $O$ )-convergence.

(b) Observe that, in general, Theorem 3.1 is not true without convergence of sub-subsequences with respect to a single regulator. Indeed, if  $\nu$  is the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra of all  $\nu$ -measurable subsets of  $[0, 1]$  and  $R = L^0([0, 1], \mathcal{M}, \nu)$  is the space of all  $\nu$ -measurable real-valued functions with identification up to  $\nu$ -null sets, then both order- and ( $D$ )-convergence coincide with convergence almost everywhere. Let  $(x_n)_n$  be a sequence in  $R$ , convergent in measure but not almost everywhere to 0: note that each subsequence  $(x_{n_q})_q$  of  $(x_n)_n$  has a sub-subsequence  $(x_{n_{q_r}})_{r,}$  convergent almost everywhere to 0 (see also [12]).

Now, using the sliding hump technique, we prove the following Brooks-Jewett-type theorem, which extends [4, Theorem 5.4], [18, Theorem 2.6], [25, Theorem 1] and [26, Theorem 11.10].

**Theorem 3.3** (BJ) Let  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{L}$  be a lattice, satisfying property (E), and  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , be a sequence of equibounded  $k$ -triangular set functions, whose restrictions on  $\mathcal{E}$  are  $(s)$ -bounded on  $\mathcal{E}$ . If the limit  $m_0(E) := (D) \lim_j m_j(E)$  exists in  $R$  for every  $E \in \mathcal{E}$  with respect to a single regulator, then the  $m_j$ 's are uniformly  $(s)$ -bounded on  $\mathcal{E}$ , and  $m_0$  is  $k$ -triangular and  $(s)$ -bounded.

**Proof:** Let  $u := \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{N}} v(m_j)(G)$ . Note that  $u \in R$ , thanks to equiboundedness of the  $m_j$ 's. For each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $(a_{t,l}^{(j)})_{t,l}$  be a  $(D)$ -sequence related with  $(s)$ -boundedness of  $m_j$ . By the Fremlin lemma 2.3 there exist a  $(D)$ -sequence  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  with

$$u \wedge \left( \bigvee_q \left( \sum_{j=1}^q \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+j)}^{(j)} \right) \right) \right) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$$

and a regulator  $(\alpha_{t,l})_{t,l}$  with

$$u \wedge \left( \bigvee_q \left( \sum_{j=1}^q \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+j+1)} \right) \right) \right) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{t,\varphi(t)} \quad (18)$$

for every  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Let  $(b_{t,l})_{t,l}$  be a regulator associated with pointwise  $(D)$ -convergence of the  $m_j$ 's on  $\mathcal{E}$ . We now prove that the regulator  $(c_{t,l})_{t,l}$ , defined by  $c_{t,l} = 2(k+2)^2(a_{t,l} + b_{t,l})$ ,  $t, l \in \mathbb{N}$ , satisfies the condition of uniform  $(s)$ -boundedness of the  $m_j$ 's. Otherwise we find a disjoint sequence  $(C_n)_n$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  and a function  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  such that for each  $n$  there are  $q_n \geq n$  and  $j_n \in \mathbb{N}$  with

$$m_{j_n}(C_{q_n}) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} c_{t,\varphi(t)}. \quad (19)$$

We claim that both the  $q_n$ 's and the  $j_n$ 's can be taken strictly increasing. Indeed, if we have found  $q_1 < \dots < q_{n-1}$  and  $j_1 < \dots < j_{n-1}$  satisfying (19), then at the  $n$ -th step, by virtue of  $(s)$ -boundedness of the  $m_j$ 's, there is an integer  $i_n > q_{n-1}$  with

$$m_j(C_i) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} c_{t,\varphi(t)} \quad \text{for each } j = 1, \dots, j_{n-1} \text{ and } i \geq i_n. \quad (20)$$

By (19), in correspondence with  $i_n$  there are  $q_n > i_n$  and  $j_n \in \mathbb{N}$ , fulfilling (19). Since  $q_n > i_n$ , from (20) it follows that  $j_n > j_{n-1}$ , getting the claim.

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $H_n := C_{q_n}$ . By property (E), passing to subsequences, without loss of generality we can assume that  $\bigcup_{n \in P} H_n \in \mathcal{E}$  for every  $P \subset \mathbb{N}$ . By  $(s)$ -boundedness of  $m_{j_1}$ , we find

two sets  $P_1 \subset \mathbb{N}$  and  $F_1 \in \mathcal{E}$ , with  $F_1 = \bigcup_{l \in P_1} H_l$  and  $v(m_{j_1})(F_1) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+1)}$ . Put  $l_1 = \min P_1$ : in

correspondence with  $H_{l_1}$  there is  $n_1 > l_1$  with  $|m_i(H_{l_1}) - m_j(H_{l_1})| \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} 2b_{t,\varphi(t)}$  for each  $i, j \geq n_1$ .

By  $(s)$ -boundedness of  $m_{j_1}$ , there are an infinite set  $P_2 \subset P_1$ , with  $l_2 = \min P_2 > l_1$ , and a set  $F_2 \in \mathcal{E}$ , with  $F_2 = \bigcup_{l \in P_2} H_l$  and  $v(m_{j_1})(F_2) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+2)}$ . In correspondence with  $H_{l_2}$  there exists

a natural number  $n_2 > l_2$  with  $|m_i(H_{l_2}) - m_j(H_{l_2})| \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} 2b_{t,\varphi(t)}$  for any  $i, j \geq n_2$ . Proceeding by induction, we find two decreasing sequences  $(P_h)_h, (F_h)_h$  of infinite sets and two strictly increasing sequences  $(n_h)_h, (l_h)_h$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ , satisfying the following conditions, for every  $h \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$3.3.1.) \quad l_h = \min P_h, \quad n_h > l_h, \quad l_{h+1} > n_h + l_h;$$

$$3.3.2.) \quad F_h = \bigcup_{l \in P_h} H_l;$$

$$3.3.3.) \quad v(m_{j_{l_h}})(F_{h+1}) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+h+1)} \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{t,\varphi(t)};$$

$$3.3.4.) \quad |m_i(H_{j_{l_h}}) - m_j(H_{j_{l_h}})| \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} 2b_{t,\varphi(t)} \text{ for each } i, j \geq n_h.$$

Put  $m'_h = m_{j_{l_h}}$  and  $H'_h = H_{l_h}$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $h_r := 2r$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $F := \bigcup_{r=1}^{\infty} H'_{h_r}$ . Note that

$\bigcup_{s=r+1}^{\infty} H'_{h_s} \subset F_{h_r+1}$  and  $l_{h_r-1} > n_{h_r-2} \geq n_{h_r-1}$  for each  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  (see also [18]). So we have

$$|m'_{h_r}(H'_{h_s}) - m'_{h_r-1}(H'_{h_s})| \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} 2b_{t,\varphi(t)} \quad \text{for every } s = 1, \dots, r-1.$$

By pointwise convergence of the  $m_j$ 's with respect to the regulator  $(b_{t,l})_{t,l}$ , we find a positive integer  $\bar{r}$  with

$$m'_{h_r}(F) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} b_{t,\varphi(t)} \quad \text{whenever } r \geq \bar{r}.$$

Since  $F_{h_r} \subset F_{h_r-1}$ , we have

$$m'_{h_r} \left( \bigcup_{s=r+1}^{\infty} H'_{h_s} \right) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{t,\varphi(t)} \text{ and } m'_{h_r-1} \left( \bigcup_{s=r+1}^{\infty} H'_{h_s} \right) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{t,\varphi(t)}.$$

From this and Proposition 2.7 we get

$$\begin{aligned} m'_{h_r} \left( \bigcup_{s=1}^{r-1} H'_{h_s} \right) &\leq m'_{h_r}(H'_{h_1}) + k \sum_{s=2}^{r-1} m'_{h_r}(H'_{h_s}) \leq \\ &\leq k \left( u \wedge \left( \bigvee_q \left( \sum_{h=1}^q \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+h)} \right) \right) \right) \right) \leq k \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{t,\varphi(t)}, \\ m'_{h_r-1} \left( \bigcup_{s=1}^{r-1} H'_{h_s} \right) &\leq m'_{h_r-1}(H'_{h_1}) + k \sum_{s=2}^{r-1} m'_{h_r-1}(H'_{h_s}) \leq \\ &\leq k \left( u \wedge \left( \bigvee_q \left( \sum_{h=1}^q \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+h)} \right) \right) \right) \right) \leq k \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{t,\varphi(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

From this and (8) used with  $q = 3$ ,  $E_1 = H'_{h_r}$ ,  $E_2 = \bigcup_{s=r+1}^{\infty} H'_{h_s}$ ,  $E_3 = \bigcup_{s=1}^{r-1} H'_{h_s}$ , since  $F = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$  and the  $m_j$ 's are  $k$ -triangular, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m'_{h_r}(H'_{h_r}) &\leq k(k+2) \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_{t,\varphi(t)} + b_{t,\varphi(t)}) \right), \\ m'_{h_r-1}(H'_{h_r}) &\leq k(k+2) \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_{t,\varphi(t)} + b_{t,\varphi(t)}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$|m'_{h_r}(H'_{h_r}) - m'_{h_r-1}(H'_{h_r})| \leq 2k(k+2) \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_{t,\varphi(t)} + b_{t,\varphi(t)}) \right). \quad (21)$$

Furthermore, thanks to 3.3.3.), we get

$$m'_{h_r-1}(H'_{h_r}) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{t,\varphi(t)}. \quad (22)$$

From (21) and (22) we obtain

$$m'_{h_r}(H'_{h_r}) \leq 2(k+2)^2 \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_{t,\varphi(t)} + b_{t,\varphi(t)}) \right),$$

which contradicts (19). Thus the  $m_j$ 's are uniformly  $(s)$ -bounded on  $\mathcal{E}$ . From this it is not difficult to deduce that  $m_0$  is  $k$ -triangular and  $(s)$ -bounded on  $\mathcal{E}$ .  $\square$

The following result will be useful to prove our versions of the Vitali-Hahn-Saks and Nikodým theorem, and extends [4, Corollaries 3.5 and 5.5] and [19, Lemma 3.13].

**Lemma 3.4** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  be two sublattices of  $\mathcal{L}$ , such that the complement of every element of  $\mathcal{H}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , be a sequence of  $k$ -triangular set functions, uniformly  $(s)$ -bounded on  $\mathcal{G}$ . 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*

$$(D) \lim_n \left( \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{G}, A \subset H_n \setminus W} m_j(A) \right) = \bigwedge_n \left( \bigvee_{A \in \mathcal{G}, A \subset H_n \setminus W} m_j(A) \right) = 0 \text{ for every } j \in \mathbb{N} \quad (23)$$

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

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

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

**Proof:** Put  $\mathcal{W} := \{A \in \mathcal{G} : A \cap W = \emptyset\}$ . By  $k$ -triangularity of  $m_j$ , for any  $A \in \mathcal{W}$ ,  $j, q \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_j(A \setminus H_q) &\leq k m_j(A \cap H_q) + m_j(A), \\ m_j(A) &\leq m_j(A \setminus H_q) + k m_j(A \cap H_q), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq |m_j(A) - m_j(A \setminus H_q)| = \\ &= (m_j(A) - m_j(A \setminus H_q)) \vee (m_j(A \setminus H_q) - m_j(A)) \leq k m_j(A \cap H_q). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

From (23) and (24), since  $A \cap H_q \subset H_{q-1} \setminus W$  for every  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ , we get

$$m_j(A) = (D) \lim_q m_j(A \setminus H_q) \quad \text{for each } A \in \mathcal{W} \text{ and } j \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (25)$$

If we deny the thesis of the lemma, then there is a  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  there are  $j, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n > r$  and  $A \in \mathcal{G}$  with  $A \subset H_n \setminus W$ ,  $m_j(A) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$ , and thus, thanks to (25),

$$m_j(A \setminus H_q) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$$

for  $q$  large enough.

At the first step, we find a set  $A_1 \in \mathcal{G}$  and three integers  $n_1 > 1$ ,  $j_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $q_1 > \max\{j_1, n_1\}$ , with  $A_1 \subset H_{n_1} \setminus W$ ,  $m_{j_1}(A_1) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$  and  $m_{j_1}(A_1 \setminus H_{q_1}) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$ . From (23), in correspondence with  $j = 1, 2, \dots, j_1$  there exists  $h_1 > q_1$  with

$$m_j(A) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)} \quad (26)$$

whenever  $n \geq h_1$  and  $A \subset H_n \setminus W$ .

At the second step, there are  $A_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $n_2 > h_1$ ,  $j_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $q_2 > \max\{j_2, n_2\}$ , with  $A_2 \subset H_{n_2} \setminus W$  and

$$m_{j_2}(A_2) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}; \quad m_{j_2}(A_2 \setminus H_{q_2}) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}. \quad (27)$$

From (26) and (27) it follows that  $j_2 > j_1$ .

Proceeding by induction, we find a sequence  $(A_r)_r$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  and three strictly increasing sequences in  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $(h_r)_r$ ,  $(j_r)_r$ ,  $(q_r)_r$ , with  $q_r > n_r > q_{r-1}$  for any  $r \geq 2$ ;  $q_r > j_r$ ,  $A_r \subset H_{n_r} \setminus W$ ,  $m_{j_r}(A_r \setminus H_{q_r}) \not\leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}$  for each  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . But this is impossible, since the sets  $A_r \setminus H_{q_r}$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , are disjoint elements of  $\mathcal{G}$  and the measures  $m_j$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , are globally uniformly (s)-bounded on  $\mathcal{G}$  with respect to  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ . This ends the proof.  $\square$

As a consequence of Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, we deduce the following Nikodým-type theorem.

**Theorem 3.5** (N) *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfy property (E),  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , be a sequence of equibounded  $k$ -triangular set functions, continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ . Suppose that the limit  $m_0(E) := (D) \lim_j m_j(E)$  exists in  $R$  for each  $E \in \mathcal{L}$  with respect to a single regulator.*

*Then the  $m_j$ 's are uniformly continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ , and  $m_0$  is  $k$ -triangular and continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  on  $\mathcal{L}$ .*

**Proof:** First of all, observe that the  $m_j$ 's are  $(s)$ -bounded on  $\mathcal{L}$ : indeed, if  $(C_h)_h$  is any disjoint sequence in  $\mathcal{L}$ , then we have

$$0 \leq v(m_j)(C_h) \leq v(m_j)\left(\bigcup_{n=h}^{\infty} C_n\right) \quad \text{for every } j, h \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (28)$$

From (28), continuity from above at  $\emptyset$  of  $m_j$  and monotonicity of  $v(m_j)$  we get  $(D) \lim_h v(m_j)(C_h) = 0$ , namely  $(s)$ -boundedness of  $m_j$ . From this and Theorem 3.3 used with  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{L}$  we deduce uniform  $(s)$ -boundedness of the  $m_j$ 's.

Choose arbitrarily  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and a decreasing sequence  $(H_n)_n$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} H_n = \emptyset$ . Since  $m_j$  is continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ , we have

$$(D) \lim_n v(m_j)(H_n) = \bigwedge_n v(m_j)(H_n) = 0.$$

By Lemma 3.4 used with  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L}$  and  $W = \emptyset$  and taking into account uniform  $(s)$ -boundedness of the  $m_j$ 's, we have

$$(D) \lim_n \left( \bigvee_j v(m_j)(H_n) \right) = \bigwedge_n \left( \bigvee_j v(m_j)(H_n) \right) = 0.$$

By arbitrariness of the sequence  $(H_n)_n$ , we get uniform continuity from above at  $\emptyset$  of the  $m_j$ 's. From this it follows easily that  $m_0$  is  $k$ -triangular and continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ .  $\square$

Analogously as Theorem 3.5, it is possible to prove the following Vitali-Hahn-Saks-type theorem.

**Theorem 3.6 (VHS)** *Let  $R, G, \mathcal{L}$  be as in Theorem 3.5,  $\tau$  be a Fréchet-Nikodým topology on  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R, j \in \mathbb{N}$ , be a sequence of equibounded  $\tau$ -continuous  $k$ -triangular set functions. Let  $m_0(E) := (D) \lim_j m_j(E)$  exist in  $R$  for every  $E \in \mathcal{L}$  with respect to a single regulator.*

*Then the  $m_j$ 's are uniformly  $\tau$ -continuous on  $\mathcal{L}$ , and  $m_0$  is  $k$ -triangular and  $\tau$ -continuous on  $\mathcal{L}$ .*

We now prove a Schur-type theorem, which extends [4, Corollary 5.6].

**Theorem 3.7 (S)** *Let  $R$  be any Dedekind complete and weakly  $\sigma$ -distributive lattice group,  $m_j : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow R^+, j \in \mathbb{N}$ , be a sequence of equibounded, continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  and  $k$ -triangular set functions, and let there exist a set function  $m_0 : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow R$  with  $(D) \lim_j m_j(E) = m_0(E)$  for every  $E \subset \mathbb{N}$  with respect to a single  $(D)$ -sequence.*

*Then the  $m_j$ 's are uniformly continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  and  $m_0$  is  $k$ -triangular and continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ . Furthermore we get*

$$(D) \lim_j \left( \bigvee_{E \subset \mathbb{N}} |m_j(E) - m_0(E)| \right) = 0. \quad (29)$$

**Proof:** Uniform continuity from above at  $\emptyset$  of the  $m_j$ 's,  $k$ -triangularity and continuity from above at  $\emptyset$  of  $m_0$  follow from Theorem 3.5. In particular, there exists a regulator  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  such that for each

$\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  there is  $h_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  with

$$m_j(E \cap [h_0, +\infty]) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t, \varphi(t)} \quad (30)$$

for any  $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  and  $E \subset \mathbb{N}$ . Let now  $(b_{t,l})_{t,l}$  be a  $(D)$ -sequence associated with (pointwise) convergence of  $(m_j)_j$  to  $m_0$ . We will prove that the regulator  $((2k+2)(a_{t,l} + b_{t,l}))_{t,l}$ ,  $t, l \in \mathbb{N}$ , satisfies the condition of  $(D)$ -limit in (29). In correspondence with  $\varphi$  and  $h_0$  as in (30) there exists a positive integer  $j_0$  with

$$|m_j(E \cap [1, h_0 - 1]) - m_0(E \cap [1, h_0 - 1])| \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t, \varphi(t)} \quad (31)$$

whenever  $j \geq j_0$  and  $E \subset \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $m_j$  is  $k$ -triangular for every  $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & -k m_j(E \cap [h_0, +\infty]) - k m_0(E \cap [h_0, +\infty]) \leq \\ & \leq m_j(E) - m_0(E) - m_j(E \cap [1, h_0 - 1]) + m_0(E \cap [1, h_0 - 1]) \leq \\ & \leq k m_j(E \cap [h_0, +\infty]) + k m_0(E \cap [h_0, +\infty]), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} & |m_j(E) - m_0(E)| \leq |m_j(E \cap [1, h_0 - 1]) + m_0(E \cap [1, h_0 - 1])| + \\ & + k m_j(E \cap [h_0, +\infty]) + k m_0(E \cap [h_0, +\infty]) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} (2k+2)(a_{t, \varphi(t)} + b_{t, \varphi(t)}) \end{aligned}$$

for every  $j \geq j_0$  and  $E \subset \mathbb{N}$ , getting the assertion.  $\square$

We now prove the following Drewnowski-type theorem, which extends [19, Lemma 2.3] and [5, Theorem 5.3] to non-additive lattice group-valued set functions.

**Theorem 3.8** *Let  $R$  be a super Dedekind complete and weakly  $\sigma$ -distributive lattice group,  $G, \mathcal{L}$  be as in Theorem 3.5, and  $m : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R$  be any positive  $(s)$ -bounded set function. Then for every disjoint sequence  $(C_n)_n$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  there exists a subsequence  $(C_{n_h})_h$  such that  $m$  is continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  on the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $(C_{n_h})_h$  in the set  $\bigcup_{h=1}^{\infty} C_{n_h}$ .*

**Proof:** Let  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  be a regulator associated with  $(s)$ -boundedness of  $m$ , and set

$$\Phi := \left\{ \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t, \varphi(t)} : \varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \right\}.$$

Since  $R$  is weakly  $\sigma$ -distributive, we get  $\bigwedge \Phi = 0$ . By super Dedekind completeness of  $R$  there is a sequence  $(\varphi_l)_l$  in  $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  (which without loss of generality we can take increasing, similarly as in [5, Theorem 5.3]), with

$$0 = \bigwedge \Phi = \bigwedge \left\{ \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t, \varphi_l(t)} : l \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Set  $b_l := \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t, \varphi_l(t)}$ ,  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ . It is not difficult to see that  $(b_l)_l$  is an  $(O)$ -sequence in  $R$ . Put now  $b_{t,l} := b_l$ ,  $t, l \in \mathbb{N}$ . It is readily seen that  $(b_{t,l})_{t,l}$  is a regulator (see also [3]): we will show that it satisfies the assertion.

Choose arbitrarily any disjoint sequence  $(C_n)_n$  in  $\mathcal{L}$ . By property  $(E)$ , there is a subsequence  $(H_n)_n$  of  $(C_n)_n$ , such that  $\mathcal{L}$  contains the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the  $H_n$ 's in the set  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} H_n$ . Choose any disjoint sequence  $(P_r^1)_r$  of infinite subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ , and for each  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  define  $H_r^1 := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{H_n : n \in P_r^1\}$ . The sequence  $(H_r^1)_r$  is a disjoint sequence in  $\mathcal{L}$ , and by  $(s)$ -boundedness of  $m$  we find  $r_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  with

$$v(m)(H_{r_1}^1) \leq \bigvee_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i, \varphi_1(i)} = b_1$$

for all  $r \geq r_1$ . We now consider  $P_{r_1}^1$ , and choose any infinite partition of it into a sequence of disjoint infinite subsets  $(P_r^2)_r$ . For each  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  set  $H_r^2 := \bigcup \{H_n : n \in P_r^2\}$ . Note that the  $H_r^2$ 's are pairwise disjoint, and each of them is contained in  $H_{r_1}^1$  by construction. Again by  $(s)$ -boundedness of  $m$ , there exists an integer  $r_2 > r_1$  with  $v(m)(H_r^2) \leq b_2$  for any  $r \geq r_2$ . Proceeding by induction, we obtain a decreasing sequence  $(P_{r_l}^l)_l$  of infinite subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ , and a corresponding sequence  $(H_{r_l}^l)_l$ ,  $H_{r_l}^l = \bigcup \{H_n : n \in P_{r_l}^l\}$ , satisfying  $v(m)(H_{r_l}^l) \leq b_l$  for any  $l$ . Let us denote by  $n_1$  the first element of  $P_{r_1}^1$ , by  $n_2$  the first element of  $P_{r_2}^2$  larger than  $n_1$ , and so on. We claim that the sequence  $(H_{n_h})_h$  is the requested one.

Indeed, observe that  $H_{n_{h+p}} \subset H_{n_h}^h$  for every  $h, p \in \mathbb{N}$ . Set  $H^* = \bigcup_{h=1}^{\infty} H_{n_h}$ : note that, thanks to property  $(E)$ ,  $H^* \in \mathcal{L}$ . Choose any decreasing sequence  $(F_s)_s$  in the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated in  $H^*$  by the sets  $H_{n_h}$ , with  $\bigcap_{s=1}^{\infty} F_s = \emptyset$ . For every  $s$  there exists an integer  $j(s)$  with  $F_s \subset \bigcup_{h \geq j(s)} H_{n_h}$ . Note that  $\lim_s j(s) = +\infty$ . Choose now  $\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  and pick any integer  $s_0$  with  $j(s_0) \geq \varphi(1)$ . For every  $s \geq s_0$  we get

$$v(m)(F_s) \leq v(m)\left(\bigcup_{h \geq j(s_0)} H_{n_h}\right) \leq v(m)(H_{r_{j(s_0)}}^{j(s_0)}) \leq b_{j(s_0)} \leq b_{\varphi(1)} \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} b_{t, \varphi(t)}.$$

This ends the proof.  $\square$

A consequence of Theorem 3.8 is the following

**Theorem 3.9** *Let  $R, G, \mathcal{L}$  be as in Theorem 3.8,  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , be a sequence of equibounded, positive and  $(s)$ -bounded set functions. Then for every disjoint sequence  $(C_h)_h$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  there is a subsequence  $(C_{n_h})_h$  such that every  $m_j$  is continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  on the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $(C_{n_h})_h$  in the set  $\bigcup_{h=1}^{\infty} C_{n_h}$ .*

**Proof:** Let  $u := \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{N}} v(m_j)(G)$ : by equiboundedness of the  $m_j$ 's we get that  $u \in R$ . For every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $(a_{t,l}^{(j)})_{t,l}$  be a  $(D)$ -sequence related with  $(s)$ -boundedness of  $m_j$ . By the Fremlin lemma 2.3 there

exist a  $(D)$ -sequence  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$  with

$$u \wedge \left( \bigvee_q \left( \sum_{j=1}^q \left( \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t+j)}^{(j)} \right) \right) \right) \leq \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)}.$$

Set now  $\Psi := \left\{ \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi(t)} : \varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \right\}$ . Since  $R$  is weakly  $\sigma$ -distributive, we get  $\bigwedge \Psi = 0$ . Arguing analogously as in Theorem 3.8, we find an increasing sequence  $(\varphi_l)_l$  in  $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ , with

$$0 = \bigwedge \Psi = \bigwedge \left\{ \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi_l(t)} : l \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Set  $b_l := \bigvee_{t=1}^{\infty} a_{t,\varphi_l(t)}$ ,  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $(b_l)_l$  is an  $(O)$ -sequence in  $R$ , and the double sequence  $(b_{t,l})_{t,l}$ , defined by setting  $b_{t,l} := b_l$ ,  $t, l \in \mathbb{N}$ , is a  $(D)$ -sequence. We now prove that it fulfils the assertion.

By property  $(E)$ , the sequence  $(C_n)_n$  admits a subsequence  $(H_n)_n$ , such that  $\mathcal{L}$  contains the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the  $H_n$ 's in  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} H_n$ . By Theorem 3.8 there exist an infinite subset  $P_1 \subset \mathbb{N}$  and a positive integer  $h_1$  with

$$v(m_1) \left( \bigcup_{j \in P_1, j \geq h} H_j \right) \leq b_1 \quad \text{whenever } h \geq h_1.$$

There are an infinite subset  $P_2 \subset P_1$  and a  $h_2 > h_1$  with

$$v(m_2) \left( \bigcup_{j \in P_2, j \geq h} H_j \right) \leq b_2 \quad \text{for each } h \geq h_2.$$

Without loss of generality, we can and do suppose  $\min P_2 > \min P_1$ .

Proceeding by induction, we find a decreasing sequence  $(P_n)_n$  of infinite subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ , a strictly increasing sequence  $(p_n)_n$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ , with  $p_n = \min P_n$  for all  $n$ , and a sequence  $(h_n)_n$  with  $h_n < h_{n+1}$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $v(m_n) \left( \bigcup_{j \in P_n, j \geq h} H_j \right) \leq b_n$  for every  $h \geq h_n$ . Let  $P := \{p_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , and set  $q_n := \max\{h_n, p_n\}$ . For each  $n$  and  $h \geq q_n$ , we get

$$0 \leq v(m_n) \left( \bigcup_{j \in P, j \geq h} H_j \right) \leq v(m_n) \left( \bigcup_{j \in P_n, j \geq h} H_j \right) \leq b_n.$$

From this it follows that

$$(D) \lim_n v(m_n) \left( \bigcup_{j \in P, j \geq h} H_j \right) = 0 = \bigwedge_n v(m_n) \left( \bigcup_{j \in P, j \geq h} H_j \right)$$

for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , getting the assertion.  $\square$

We now prove the equivalence between Theorems  $(BJ)$ ,  $(N)$ ,  $(VHS)$  and  $(S)$ , extending [22, Theorem, p. 726].

(BJ)  $\implies$  (VHS) See Theorem 3.6.

(VHS)  $\implies$  (N) (see also [6, 22]) Let  $\tau$  be the Fréchet-Nikodým topology generated by the family of all order continuous submeasures, that is all 1-subadditive, increasing and continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  real-valued set functions defined on  $\mathcal{L}$  (see also [21, 22]). If  $(H_n)_n$  is any decreasing sequence in  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $\tau\text{-}\lim_n H_n = \emptyset$  and  $H = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} H_n \in \mathcal{L}$ , then  $\eta(H) = 0$  for every order continuous submeasure  $\eta$ , and so  $H = \emptyset$ . From this and Remark 2.9 it follows that, if  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , is a sequence of set functions, continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ , then they are  $\tau$ -continuous. By (VHS), they are uniformly  $\tau$ -continuous. From this and Lemma 3.4 it follows that the  $m_j$ 's are also uniformly continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ . Thus, (VHS) implies (N).

(N)  $\implies$  (BJ) Let  $(C_h)_h$  be any disjoint sequence in  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $m_j : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow R$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , be a sequence of equibounded  $k$ -triangular ( $s$ )-bounded set functions. Fix arbitrarily a subsequence  $(C_{h_r})_r$  of  $(C_h)_h$ . By Theorem 3.9 there is a sub-subsequence  $(C_{h_{r_s}})_s$  of  $(C_{h_r})_r$  such that every  $m_j$  is continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  on the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the  $C_{h_{r_s}}$ 's in the set  $\bigcup_{s=1}^{\infty} C_{h_{r_s}}$ . From this and (N) it follows that  $(D)\lim_s \left( \bigvee_j v(m_j)(C_{h_{r_s}}) \right) = 0$  with respect to a suitable regulator  $(b_{t,l})_{t,l}$ , independent of  $(C_{h_r})_r$ . By arbitrariness of  $(C_{h_r})_r$  and Proposition 3.1 we get

$$(D)\lim_h \left( \bigvee_j v(m_j)(C_h) \right) = 0$$

with respect to  $(b_{t,l})_{t,l}$ , that is the assertion.

(N)  $\implies$  (S) See Theorem 3.7.

(S)  $\implies$  (N) Let  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $m_j$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , be as in the hypotheses of Theorem 3.5 and  $(A_n)_n$  be a disjoint sequence in  $\mathcal{L}$ . Choose arbitrarily a subsequence  $(C_h)_h$  of  $(A_h)_h$ . By property (E) there is a subsequence  $(C_{h_r})_r$  of  $(C_h)_h$ , such that  $\mathcal{L}$  contains the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the  $C_{h_r}$ 's in  $\bigcup_{r=1}^{\infty} C_{h_r}$ . For every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ , set

$$\mu_j(A) = m_j \left( \bigcup_{r \in A} C_{h_r} \right). \quad (32)$$

We claim that  $\mu_j$  is continuous from above at  $\emptyset$  for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Fix any decreasing sequence  $(K_n)_n$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ . Without loss of generality, we can suppose that  $(K_n)_n$  is strictly decreasing, and  $K_n \subset [n, +\infty[$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , getting

$$0 \leq v(\mu_j)(K_n) \leq v(\mu_j)([n, +\infty[) \leq v(m_j) \left( \bigcup_{r=n}^{\infty} C_{h_r} \right)$$

for every  $j$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . From (33), Proposition 2.12 and continuity from above at  $\emptyset$  of  $m_j$  (with respect to a single regulator  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ , which without loss of generality can be taken independent of  $(C_h)_h$  and

of  $j$ , arguing analogously as in (18) ) we get

$$(D) \lim_n v(m_j) \left( \bigcup_{r=n}^{\infty} C_{h_r} \right) = 0$$

with respect to  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ , and thus we have also  $(D) \lim_n v(\mu_j)(K_n) = 0$  with respect to  $(a_{t,l})_{t,l}$ , proving the claim. Moreover, it is not difficult to check pointwise convergence of the  $\mu_j$ 's with respect to a single regulator  $(b_{t,l})_{t,l}$ . By Theorem 3.7 the  $\mu_j$ 's are uniformly continuous from above at  $\emptyset$ . In particular, we get

$$0 \leq (D) \lim_n \left( \bigvee_j v(m_j)(C_{h_n}) \right) \leq (D) \lim_n \left( \bigvee_j \mu_j([n, +\infty[) \right) = 0,$$

namely

$$(D) \lim_n \left( \bigvee_j v(m_j)(C_{h_n}) \right) = 0 \tag{33}$$

with respect to a regulator, which by construction can be taken independent of the chosen sequence  $(C_h)_h$ . By arbitrariness of  $(C_h)_h$ , (33) and Proposition 3.1 we get

$$(D) \lim_h \left( \bigvee_j v(m_j)(A_h) \right) = 0.$$

Thus the  $m_j$ 's are uniformly  $(s)$ -bounded. From this and Lemma 3.4 we get uniform continuity from above at  $\emptyset$  of the  $m_j$ 's, and hence  $(N)$ .  $\square$

### Open problems:

- (a) Prove some limit theorems for  $k$ -triangular set functions with respect to other kinds of  $(s)$ -boundedness and continuity, and/or relatively to some other types of convergence.
- (b) Investigate some other property of non-additive set functions and their (semi)variations (see also [2, 26]).

## References

- [1] A. Aviles Lopez, B. Cascales Salinas, V. Kadets and A. Leonov, The Schur  $l_1$  theorem for filters, *J. Math. Phys., Anal., Geom.* **3** (4) (2007), 383-398.
- [2] A. I. Ban, *Intuitionistic fuzzy sets: theory and applications*, Nova Science Publ., Inc., New York, 2006.
- [3] A. Boccuto, Egorov property and weak  $\sigma$ -distributivity in Riesz spaces, *Acta Math. (Nitra)* **6** (2003), 61-66.
- [4] A. Boccuto and D. Candeloro, Uniform  $(s)$ -boundedness and convergence results for measures with values in complete  $(\ell)$ -groups, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **265** (2002), 170-194.

- [5] A. Boccuto and D. Candeloro, Convergence and decompositions for  $(\ell)$ -group-valued set functions, *Comment. Math.* **44** (1) (2004), 11-37.
- [6] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou, Ideal limit theorems and their equivalence in  $(\ell)$ -group setting, *J. Math. Research* **5** (2) (2013), 43-60.
- [7] 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.
- [8] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou, *Convergence Theorems for Lattice Group-Valued Measures*, Bentham Science Publ., U. A. E., 2015.
- [9] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou, Matrix theorems and interchange for lattice group-valued series in the filter convergence setting, 2015, *Bull. Hellenic Math. Soc.* **59** (2016), 39-55.
- [10] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou, Limit theorems for lattice group-valued  $k$ -triangular set functions, *Proceedings of the 33rd PanHellenic Conference on Mathematical Education, Chania, Greece, 4-6 November 2016* (2016), 1-10.
- [11] 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** (57) (2017), 2825–2833.
- [12] A. Boccuto and X. Dimitriou, *Non-additive lattice group-valued set functions and limit theorems*, Lambert Acad. Publ., 2017. ISBN 978-613-4-91335-5.
- [13] A. Boccuto, X. Dimitriou and N. Papanastassiou, Countably additive restrictions and limit theorems in  $(\ell)$ -groups, *Atti Semin. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena Reggio Emilia* **57** (2010), 121-134; Addendum to: “Countably additive restrictions and limit theorems in  $(\ell)$ -groups”, *ibidem* **58** (2011), 3-10.
- [14] A. Boccuto, X. Dimitriou and N. Papanastassiou, Brooks-Jewett-type theorems for the pointwise ideal convergence of measures with values in  $(\ell)$ -groups, *Tatra Mt. Math. Publ.* **49** (2011), 17-26.
- [15] A. Boccuto, X. Dimitriou and N. Papanastassiou, Schur lemma and limit theorems in lattice groups with respect to filters, *Math. Slovaca* **62** (6) (2012), 1145-1166.
- [16] A. Boccuto, B. Riečan and M. Vráblová, *Kurzweil-Henstock Integral in Riesz Spaces*, Bentham Science Publ., U. A. E., 2009.
- [17] A. Boccuto and A. R. Sambucini, The monotone integral with respect to Riesz space-valued capacities, *Rend. Mat. (Roma)* **16** (1996), 491-524.
- [18] D. Candeloro, On the Vitali-Hahn-Saks, Dieudonné and Nikodým theorems (Italian), *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo Ser. II Suppl.* **8** (1985), 439-445.

- [19] D. Candeloro and G. Letta, On Vitali - Hahn - Saks and Dieudonné theorems (Italian), *Rend. Accad. Naz. Sci. XL Mem. Mat.* **9** (1) (1985), 203-213.
- [20] D. Candeloro and A. R. Sambucini, Filter convergence and decompositions for vector lattice-valued measures, *Mediterranean J. Math.* **12** (2015), 621-637.
- [21] I. Dobrakov, On submeasures I. *Dissertationes Math.* **112** (1974), 5-35.
- [22] L. Drewnowski, Equivalence of Brooks - Jewett, Vitali - Hahn - Saks and Nikodym theorems, *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Ser. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys.* **20** (1972), 725-731.
- [23] D. H. Fremlin, A direct proof of the Matthes-Wright integral extension theorem, *J. London Math. Soc.* **11** (2) (1975), 276-284.
- [24] E. Guariglia,  $k$ -triangular functions on an orthomodular lattice and the Brooks-Jewett theorem, *Radovi Mat.* **6** (1990), 241-251.
- [25] E. Pap, The Vitali-Hahn-Saks Theorems for  $k$ -triangular set functions, *Atti Sem. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena* **35** (1987), 21-32.
- [26] E. Pap, *Null-Additive Set Functions*, Kluwer Acad. Publishers/Ister Science, Bratislava, 1995.
- [27] B. Riečan and T. Neubrunn, *Integral, Measure and Ordering*, Kluwer Acad. Publ./Ister Science, Dordrecht/Bratislava, 1997.
- [28] S. Saeki, The Vitali-Hahn-Saks theorem and mesuroids, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **114** (3) (1992), 775-782.
- [29] W. Schachermayer, On some classical measure-theoretic theorems for non-sigma-complete Boolean algebras, *Dissertationes Math.* **214** (1982), 1-33.
- [30] F. Ventriglia, Cafiero theorem for  $k$ -triangular functions on an orthomodular lattice, *Rend. Accad. Sci. Fis. Mat. Napoli* **75** (2008), 45-52.
- [31] Z. Wang and G. J. Klir, *Generalized Measure theory*, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 2009.