

ON LATTICE-TOPOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF GENERAL WALLMAN SPACES

CARMEN VLAD

Mathematics Department
Pace University
Pace Plaza, New York, NY 10038 U.S.A.

(Received November 30, 1995 and in revised form March 25, 1996)

ABSTRACT. Let X be an arbitrary set and \mathcal{L} a lattice of subsets of X such that $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{L}$. $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ is the algebra generated by \mathcal{L} and $I(\mathcal{L})$ consists of all zero-one valued finitely additive measures on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$. Various subsets of $I(\mathcal{L})$ are considered and certain lattices are investigated as well as the topology of closed sets generated by them. The lattices are investigated for normality, regularity, repleteness and completeness. The topologies are similarly discussed for various properties such as T_2 and Lindelöf.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES: Normal, Lindelöf, countable compact lattices; strongly σ -smooth measures

1991 AMS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODES: 28C15, 28A12.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X be an arbitrary set and \mathcal{L} a lattice of subsets of X such that $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{L}$. $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ is the algebra generated by \mathcal{L} and $I(\mathcal{L})$ denotes those non trivial, zero-one valued, finitely additive measures on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$.

Various subsets of $I(\mathcal{L})$ are considered and certain lattices in these subsets are investigated as well as the topology of closed sets generated by them. The lattices are investigated for normality, regularity, and for a variety of repleteness and completeness conditions. The topologies are similarly investigated for various properties such as T_2 and Lindelöf. Necessary and sufficient conditions for these properties to hold can effectively be given in terms of measure conditions on the original lattice.

Some investigations in these matters have been begun in [2], [3] and [8]. We go beyond these results, and introduce new subsets of $I(\mathcal{L})$ and their lattices to investigate.

We begin with some standard notations and terminology that will be used throughout the paper. Our notations and terminology is consistent with that in the literature (see e.g. [1],[2],[5] and [10]), and is added mainly for the reader's convenience.

We then proceed in the subsequent sections to analyze in detail the lattice-topological structure of various Wallman spaces as indicated above.

2. BACKGROUND AND NOTATIONS

Let X be an arbitrary nonempty set, and \mathcal{L} a lattice of subsets of X . It is assumed throughout the paper that $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{L}$.

We adhere to the customary lattice-topological definitions which can be found for example in [1],[2],[4],[7] and [10]. Here, we just note some of the measure theoretic equivalents. For this purpose we introduce the following notations: $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ denotes the algebra generated by \mathcal{L} , and $I(\mathcal{L})$ the set of

non-trivial zero-one valued finitely additive measures on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ $I_R(\mathcal{L})$ the set of \mathcal{L} -regular measures of $I(\mathcal{L})$, where $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$ is \mathcal{L} -regular if for any $A \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ $\mu(A) = \sup\{\mu(L)/L \subset A, L \in \mathcal{L}\}$ sequences $\{L_n\}$ of sets of \mathcal{L} with $L_n \downarrow \emptyset$, $\mu(L_n) \rightarrow 0$. $I^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ the set of σ -smooth measures of $I(\mathcal{L})$ on \mathcal{L} , where $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$ is σ -smooth on \mathcal{L} if for all of σ -smooth measures on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ of $I(\mathcal{L})$ $I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ the set of \mathcal{L} -regular measures of $I^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. $\pi(\mathcal{L}) = \{\Pi, \text{ defined on } \mathcal{L}, \text{ non-trivial, monotone, and } \Pi(A \cap B) = \Pi(A)\Pi(B), A, B \in \mathcal{L}\}$ the set of all premeasures on \mathcal{L} $\pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is the set of all premeasures on \mathcal{L} which are σ -smooth on \mathcal{L}

Note that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between:

\mathcal{L} -filters \mathcal{F} and elements of $\pi(\mathcal{L})$ given by $\Pi(L) = 1$ iff $L \in \mathcal{F}$.

\mathcal{L} -filters with countable intersection property and $\pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$.

All elements of $I(\mathcal{L})$ and all prime \mathcal{L} -filters, given by:

for any $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$ we associate the prime \mathcal{L} -filter given by:

$$\mathcal{F} = \{A \in \mathcal{L} / \mu(A) = 1\}.$$

All elements of $I_R(\mathcal{L})$ and all \mathcal{L} -ultrafilters, given by the following rule. with each \mathcal{L} -ultrafilter \mathcal{F} we associate the zero-one valued measure defined on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ by:

$$\mu(E) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if there exists } A \in \mathcal{F}, A \subset E \\ 0 & \text{if there exists } A \in \mathcal{F}, A \subset E' \end{cases}.$$

The support of $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$ is $S(\mu) = \cap \{L \in \mathcal{L} / \mu(L) = 1\}$. With this notation, we now note: \mathcal{L} is compact iff $S(\mu) \neq \emptyset$ for every $\mu \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$. \mathcal{L} is countably compact iff $I_R(\mathcal{L}) = I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. \mathcal{L} is normal iff for each $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$, there exists a unique $\nu \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu$ i.e. $\mu(L) \leq \nu(L)$ for all $L \in \mathcal{L}$. \mathcal{L} is regular iff whenever $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$, then $S(\mu_1) = S(\mu_2)$. \mathcal{L} is replete iff for any $\mu \in I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, $S(\mu) \neq \emptyset$. \mathcal{L} is prime-complete iff for any $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, $S(\mu) \neq \emptyset$. \mathcal{L} is Lindelof iff for any $\Pi \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, $S(\Pi) \neq \emptyset$. Finally, if μ_x is the measure concentrated at $x \in X$ then $\mu_x \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$, for all $x \in X$, iff \mathcal{L} is disjunctive.

For further results and related matters see [6], [8] and [9].

3. THE SPACES $I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, $I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ AND THE LATTICES $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$

We consider in this section the important space $I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$; for $A \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ define

$$\mathcal{W}_\sigma(A) = \{\mu \in I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L}) \mid \mu(A) = 1\}.$$

Then, assuming \mathcal{L} is disjunctive, $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) = \{\mathcal{W}_\sigma(L) / L \in \mathcal{L}\}$ is a lattice in $I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ isomorphic to \mathcal{L} , under the map $L \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_\sigma(L)$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$, and $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})) = \mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}))$. Also, the map $\mu \rightarrow \mu'$, where $\mu'(\mathcal{W}_\sigma(A)) = \mu(A)$, $A \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ is a bijection between $I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and $I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}))$. It is well known that $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is replete and is a basis for the closed sets $\tau\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, all arbitrary intersections of sets of $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. It is this topological space $I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, $\tau\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, and lattice $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ which we will consider here and subsequent sections. Analogously, we also consider $I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$; here we do not need the assumption of disjunctiveness on \mathcal{L} , and $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) = \{\mathcal{V}_\sigma(L) / L \in \mathcal{L}\}$ where $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(A) = \{\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) / \mu(A) = 1\}$, $A \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$. $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is prime complete, and is a base for the closed sets $\tau\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ of $I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. A few of the properties to be considered have been investigated in [3], we give slightly different proofs, and include some of them for completeness.

THEOREM 3.1 a) Consider $I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ with \mathcal{L} disjunctive. $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is regular iff for all $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\nu \in I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, if $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ and $\mu_1 \leq \nu$ then $\mu_2 \leq \nu$

b) The topological space $I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, $\tau\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ with \mathcal{L} disjunctive is considered. Then the space is T_2 iff for $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu \leq \nu_1$, $\mu \leq \nu_2$ where $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ it follows that $\nu_1 = \nu_2$.

c) Consider $I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is regular iff for all $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\nu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ if $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ and $\mu_1 \leq \nu$ then $\mu_2 \leq \nu$.

d) Consider the topological space $I_o(\mathcal{L})$, $\tau\mathcal{V}_o(\mathcal{L})$. This space is T_2 iff for $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$ with $\mu \leq \nu_1(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu \leq \nu_2(\mathcal{L})$ where $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in I_o(\mathcal{L})$, it follows $\nu_1 = \nu_2$

PROOF. The proofs for a) and c) and for b) and d) are similar. We just prove a) and b)

a) Let $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(\mathcal{L})$. Then there exist $\mu'_1, \mu'_2 \in I(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\mu'_1(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})) = \mu_1(\mathcal{L})$, $\mu'_2(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})) = \mu_2(\mathcal{L})$ for all $L \in \mathcal{L}$. $\mu_1(\mathcal{L}) \leq \mu_2(\mathcal{L}) \Rightarrow \mu'_1 \leq \mu'_2$ on $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$. Suppose $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is regular. Then $S(\mu'_1) = S(\mu'_2)$ where

$$S(\mu'_1) = \{L \in \mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}) \mid \mu'_1(L) = 1\}, S(\mu'_2) = \{L \in \mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}) \mid \mu'_2(L) = 1\}.$$

Let now $\nu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ with $\mu_1 \leq \nu$. We have $\nu' \in I_R^o(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\mu'_1 \leq \nu'$ on $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$, therefore $S(\nu') \subset S(\mu'_1) = S(\mu'_2)$; hence $\mu'_2 \leq \nu'$ on $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ i.e. $\mu_2 \leq \nu$ on \mathcal{L} . Conversely, let $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\nu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ such that if $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu_1 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$ then $\mu_2 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Let now $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in I(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$ and assume $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ on $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$. Then $\lambda_1 = \mu'_1$ and $\lambda_2 = \mu'_2$ where $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu'_1 \leq \mu'_2(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$ i.e. $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(\mathcal{L})$. Now $S(\mu'_2) \subset S(\mu'_1)$. If $\lambda \in S(\mu'_1)$, then clearly $\lambda \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu_1 \leq \lambda(\mathcal{L})$. Hence by the assumption $\mu_2 \leq \lambda(\mathcal{L})$ which implies $\lambda \in S(\mu'_2)$.

b) Suppose $I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$, $\tau\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is T_2 which implies that $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is T_2 , and let μ, ν_1, ν_2 as above. Then $\mu' \leq \nu'_1$ on $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ where $\mu' \in I(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\nu'_1 \in I_R^o(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$, which implies $\nu_1 \in S(\nu'_1) \subset S(\mu')$. Also $\mu' \leq \nu'_2$ on $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ where $\nu'_2 \in I_R^o(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$, which implies $\nu_2 \in S(\nu'_2) \subset S(\mu')$. Recall that \mathcal{L} is T_2 iff for each $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$, $S(\mu) = \emptyset$ or a singleton, hence since $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is T_2 it follows $\nu_1 = \nu_2$. Conversely, assume that for $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$, if $\mu \leq \nu_1(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu \leq \nu_2(\mathcal{L})$ then $\nu_1 = \nu_2$. Suppose $S(\mu') \neq \emptyset$, where $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$, $\lambda \in I(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\lambda = \mu'$. If $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in S(\mu')$ then $\mu \leq \nu_1(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu \leq \nu_2(\mathcal{L})$ i.e. $\nu_1 = \nu_2$. Therefore $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is T_2 and thus $\tau\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is T_2 .

We now show that the assumption of regularity for $\mathcal{V}_o(\mathcal{L})$ in $I_o(\mathcal{L})$ is very strong.

THEOREM 3.2 Consider $I_o(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{V}_o(\mathcal{L})$. $\mathcal{V}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is regular iff $I_o(\mathcal{L}) = I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$

PROOF. Suppose $I_o(\mathcal{L}) = I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$. Then $\mathcal{V}_o(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$. Now let $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$, $\nu \in I_o(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(\mathcal{L})$, $\mu_1 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Then, since $I_o(\mathcal{L}) = I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$, $\mu_1 \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ so $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ and $\mu_1 = \nu$. Conversely, suppose $\mathcal{V}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is regular and let $\mu \in I_o(\mathcal{L})$; there exists $\nu \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$ i.e. $\mu' \leq \nu'(\mathcal{V}_o(\mathcal{L}))$, where $\mu', \nu' \in I_o(\mathcal{V}_o(\mathcal{L}))$. But $S(\mu') = S(\nu')$ since $\mathcal{V}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is regular. Hence $\mu \in S(\nu')$ i.e. $\nu \leq \mu(\mathcal{L})$. It follows $\mu = \nu$ and then $\mu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$.

4. ON NORMAL, SLIGHTLY NORMAL, MILDLY NORMAL AND LINDELÖF LATTICES

In this section we wish to consider normality and related questions as well as Lindelöf properties concerning the lattices $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ in $I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{V}_o(\mathcal{L})$ in $I_o(\mathcal{L})$. Related details on normality can be found in [4], [7] and [9]. We recall some definitions.

DEFINITION 4.1

- a) \mathcal{L} is slightly normal if for all $\mu \in I_o(\mathcal{L}')$, there exists a unique $\nu \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$
- b) \mathcal{L} is mildly normal if for all $\mu \in I_o(\mathcal{L})$, there exists a unique $\nu \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$
- c) \mathcal{L} is almost countably compact if $\mu \in I_R(\mathcal{L}')$ implies $\mu \in I_o(\mathcal{L})$.

THEOREM 4.1 Suppose \mathcal{L} is disjunctive. Then

a) Consider $I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ and suppose \mathcal{L} is Lindelöf and satisfies the condition: for all $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\nu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$, if $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu_1 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$, then $\mu_2 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Then $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is slightly and mildly normal.

- b) If \mathcal{L} is complement generated then $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is slightly normal.
- c) If \mathcal{L} is almost countably compact and mildly normal then $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is normal.

PROOF. a) \mathcal{L} is disjunctive and Lindelöf implies $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ Lindelöf. Also, by Theorem 3.1 it follows that $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is regular. Then $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is slightly and mildly normal (see [4])

- b) \mathcal{L} is complement generated implies $L = \bigcap_1^\infty L'_n$, L and $L_n \in \mathcal{L}$, all n

$$W_\sigma(L) = W_\sigma\left(\bigcap_1^\infty L'_n\right) = \bigcap_1^\infty W_\sigma(L'_n) = \bigcap_1^\infty [W_\sigma(L_n)]'.$$

Hence $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ complement generated which implies $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ slightly normal (see [4])

c) By the assumption, for any $\mu \in I_R(\mathcal{L}')$ it follows $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and then there exists a unique $\nu \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Let $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \lambda(L')$ with $\mu \in I_R(\mathcal{L}')$ Also $\lambda \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and $\lambda \leq \mu \leq \nu$, on \mathcal{L} with $\nu_1 \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$, unique. Therefore if $\mu \leq \nu_2(\mathcal{L})$ with $\nu_2 \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$ then $\lambda \leq \mu \leq \nu_2(\mathcal{L})$, and so $\nu_1 = \nu_2$. Hence \mathcal{L} is normal and also $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is normal.

REMARK. Consider $I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ with \mathcal{L} Lindelöf. If for all $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\nu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ such that if $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu_1 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$ it follows that $\mu_2 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$, then $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is slightly and mildly normal.

PROOF. Similar to a) of Theorem 4.1.

We next consider the following condition:

- (1) For any $\Pi \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, there exists $\nu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\Pi \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$

THEOREM 4.2.

- a) If condition (1) is satisfies and if \mathcal{L} is prime complete then \mathcal{L} is Lindelöf.
- b) If \mathcal{L} is Lindelöf then condition (1) holds.
- c) \mathcal{L} satisfies condition (1) iff $I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, $\tau\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is Lindelöf.

PROOF. a) Let $\Pi \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ be an \mathcal{L} -filter with the countable intersection property By condition (1) there exists $\nu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and $\Pi \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. \mathcal{L} prime complete implies $S(\nu) \neq \emptyset$ and then $S(\Pi) \neq \emptyset$

b) Let $\Pi \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. Since \mathcal{L} is Lindelöf, $S(\Pi) \neq \emptyset$ and therefore there exists $x \in X$ such that $x \in S(\Pi)$ Then $\Pi \leq \mu_x(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu_x \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$.

c) Suppose that \mathcal{L} satisfies condition (1). Let $\Pi' \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}))$ and define $\pi(L) = \Pi'(V_\sigma(L))$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$. If $L_n \downarrow \emptyset$, $L_n \in \mathcal{L}$ then $V_\sigma(L_n) \downarrow \emptyset$ and $\Pi(L_n) = \Pi'(V_\sigma(L_n)) \rightarrow 0$, i.e. $\Pi \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ By condition (1), there exists $\nu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\Pi \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Hence $\nu' \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\Pi' \leq \nu'$ on $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, where $\nu'(V_\sigma(L)) = \nu(L)$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$. Therefore $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ satisfies condition (1). Next, we show that $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is prime complete. For this, let $S(\nu') = \bigcap_{\alpha \in A} \{V_\sigma(L_\alpha) / \nu'(V_\sigma(L_\alpha)) = 1, L_\alpha \in \mathcal{L}\}$. But $\nu'(V_\sigma(L)) = 1$ iff

$\nu(L) = 1$, iff $\nu \in V_\sigma(L) = \{\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) / \mu(L) = 1, L \in \mathcal{L}\}$. Hence $V_\sigma(L) \neq \emptyset$ which implies $S(\nu') \neq \emptyset$ Now, $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ satisfies condition (1) and prime complete implies $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ Lindelöf and then $\tau\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is Lindelöf. Conversely, let $(I_\sigma(\mathcal{L}), \tau\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}))$ be Lindelöf Let $\Pi \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and define $\Pi'(V_\sigma(L)) = \Pi(L)$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$. Then $V_\sigma(L_n) \downarrow \emptyset$ implies $L_n \downarrow \emptyset$ and $\Pi(L_n) = \Pi'(V_\sigma(L_n)) \rightarrow 0$, hence $\Pi' \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}))$. $\tau\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ Lindelöf implies $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ Lindelöf and then $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ satisfies condition (1), hence there exists $\nu' \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}))$ such that $\Pi' \leq \nu'(\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}))$, where $\nu'(V_\sigma(L)) = \nu(L)$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$ $\Pi(L) = 1$ implies $\Pi'(V_\sigma(L)) = 1$ and then $\nu'(V_\sigma(L)) = 1$ i.e. $\nu(L) = 1$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$. Hence $\Pi \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$.

REMARK. If \mathcal{L} is disjunctive and if for each $\Pi \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, there exists a $\nu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\Pi \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$ then $I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$, $\tau\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is Lindelöf. This result is known and appears e.g. in [8].

5. ON PRIME COMPLETE AND COUNTABLY COMPACT LATTICES

In this section we investigate the equivalence and consequences of stronger lattice completeness assumption.

THEOREM 5.1 Let \mathcal{L} be a disjunctive lattice $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is prime complete iff for $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ there exists $\nu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$.

PROOF. Let $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and the associated $\mu' \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}))$ defined by $\mu'(W_\sigma(L)) = \mu(L)$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$ If $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is prime complete, $S(\mu') \neq \emptyset$ and then there exists $\nu \in S(\mu')$, $\nu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ and it follows

that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Conversely, let $\mu' \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}))$ and consider the associated $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu'(W_\sigma(L)) = \mu(L)$. For $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, there exists $\nu \in I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Therefore $\nu' \in I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\mu' \leq \nu'(\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}))$ which implies $S(\nu') \subset S(\mu')$ and since $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is replete, $S(\nu') \neq \emptyset$

THEOREM 5.2

a) Let \mathcal{L} be disjunctive, almost countably compact and mildly normal and let $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ be prime complete. Then \mathcal{L} is countably compact.

b) Let \mathcal{L} be disjunctive, regular, Lindelöf, almost countably compact and let $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ be prime complete. Then \mathcal{L} is countably compact.

PROOF. a) Must show that $I_R(\mathcal{L}) = I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. Let $\mu \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$; we have $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L}')$ where $\nu \in I_R(\mathcal{L}')$. Since \mathcal{L} is almost countably compact we have $\nu \leq \mu(\mathcal{L})$ with $\mu \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$ and $\nu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. But $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is prime complete and by Theorem 5.1 there exists $\rho \in I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\nu \leq \rho(\mathcal{L})$. \mathcal{L} almost countably compact and mildly normal implies \mathcal{L} normal (see [4]). By the normality of \mathcal{L} the \mathcal{L} -regular measure μ such that $\nu \leq \mu$ must be unique, hence $\mu = \rho \in I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$.

b) \mathcal{L} regular and Lindelöf implies \mathcal{L} mildly normal and by the above result, it follows that \mathcal{L} is countably compact.

THEOREM 5.3 Suppose $I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is T_1 and \mathcal{L} disjunctive and $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ prime complete. Then $I_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) = I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$.

PROOF. Since $I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is T_1 , given $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ with $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, there exist $L_1, L_2 \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\mu_1 \in V_\sigma(L_1'), \mu_2 \notin V_\sigma(L_1')$ and $\mu_2 \in V_\sigma(L_2'), \mu_1 \notin V_\sigma(L_2')$. Therefore $\mu_1(L_1') = 1, \mu_2(L_1') = 0$ or $\mu_1(L_1) = 0, \mu_2(L_1) = 1$ and $\mu_2(L_2') = 1, \mu_1(L_2') = 0$ or $\mu_2(L_2) = 0, \mu_1(L_2) = 1$. Since $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ prime complete, given $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ there exists $\nu \in I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ with $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. If $\mu \neq \nu$, by above there exists $L \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\nu(L) = 0$ and $\mu(L) = 1$.

This is a contradiction, hence $\mu = \nu$, and $I_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) = I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$.

REMARK. The converse of Theorem 5.3 is true i.e. if $I_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) = I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ then $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is T_1 and since $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is prime complete, then $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is prime complete.

DEFINITION 5.1 Let $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$, $E \subset X$ and define

$$\mu'(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(L_i'), E \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n L_i', L_i \in \mathcal{L} \right\} = \inf \{ \mu(L'), E \subset L', L \in \mathcal{L} \}.$$

DEFINITION 5.2 Let $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, $E \subset X$ and define

$$\mu''(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(L_i'), E \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} L_i', L_i \in \mathcal{L} \right\}.$$

Clearly, μ' is a finitely subadditive outer measure and μ'' is an outer measure (see [7]). Let $\mathfrak{I}_{\mu''}$ be the set of μ'' -measurable sets, where E is measurable with respect to μ'' if for any $A \subset X$, $\mu''(A) = \mu''(A \cap E) + \mu''(A \cap E')$.

We give now a condition when for a given $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ there exists a $\nu \in I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$ i.e. the condition of Theorem 5.1.

THEOREM 5.4 Let $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. Suppose $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{L}_{\mu''}$ and \mathcal{L} semiseparates $\delta(\mathcal{L})$. Then $\mu \leq \mu''(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu''|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})} \in I_R^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$.

PROOF. Let $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. Then we have $\mu \leq \mu''(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{L}_{\mu''}$ which is closed under complement and countable unions (see [7]). Therefore $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}) \subset \mathfrak{I}_{\mu''}$. $\mu''|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})}$ is then a measure on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$. μ'' countably additive implies $\mu''|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})} \in I^\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. To show that $\mu''|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})} \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$, assume $\mu''(A') = 1$, $A \in \mathcal{L}$. Then there exist $\{L_n\}, L_n \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $A' \supseteq \bigcap_n L_n$ and $\mu(L_n) = 1$ for all n . (For if $A \supset \bigcap_n L_n, \mu(L_n) = 1$ then $A' \subset \bigcup_n L_n, \mu(L_n') = 0$, contradiction.) But $\bigcap_n L_n \in \delta(\mathcal{L})$ and $A \cap$

$\left(\bigcap_n L_n\right) = \emptyset$. Hence by semiseparation there exists $\tilde{L} \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $A \cap \tilde{L} = \emptyset$ (or $\tilde{A} \subset A'$) and $\bigcap_n L_n \subset \tilde{L}$. May assume $L_n \downarrow$ and then $\mu''(\bigcap_n L_n) = 1$. We then have $\bigcap_n L_n \subset \tilde{L} \subset A'$ which implies $\mu''(L) = 1$ i.e. $\mu''|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})} \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$

THEOREM 5.5 Let \mathcal{L} be a disjunctive lattice and assume that $\mathcal{L} \subset \bigcap_{\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})} \mathcal{I}_{\mu''}$ and that \mathcal{L} semiseparates $\delta(\mathcal{L})$. Then $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is prime complete.

PROOF. $\mathcal{W}_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ is prime complete iff for any $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$, there exists $\nu \in I_R^g(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$, by Theorem 5.1. Now use Theorem 5.4 with $\nu = \mu''|_{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})}$.

6. STRONGLY σ -SMOOTH MEASURES

Here we consider another Wallman space and analyze the relevant lattice in detail.

DEFINITION 6.1 A measure $\mu \in I(\mathcal{L})$ is strongly σ -smooth on \mathcal{L} iff for any sequence $\{L_n\}$, $L_n \in \mathcal{L}$, $L_n \downarrow$, if $\bigcap_n L_n \in \mathcal{L}$ then $\mu(\bigcap_n L_n) = \inf \mu(L_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(L_n)$. We denote $J(\mathcal{L})$ the set of strongly σ -smooth nontrivial zero-one valued measures on \mathcal{L} .

DEFINITION 6.2 The lattice \mathcal{L} is weakly prime complete if for $\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})$, $S(\mu) \neq \emptyset$.

Now define the following condition:

- (2) For any $\Pi \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ there exists $\nu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\Pi \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$.

We summarize a few facts on σ -smoothness that will be used throughout this section for the reader's convenience (see [6])

- a) $I^g(\mathcal{L}) \subset J(\mathcal{L}) \subset I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$.
- b) \mathcal{L} normal and complement generated implies $J(\mathcal{L}) \subset I_R^g(\mathcal{L})$.
- c) $\mu \in I_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu' = \mu''(\mathcal{L})$ implies $\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})$.
- d) Since $\mu \in I_R^g(\mathcal{L})$ implies $\mu' = \mu''(\mathcal{L}')$, it follows that $\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ and then $I_R^g(\mathcal{L}) \subset J(\mathcal{L})$.

Analogously to Theorem 4.2 we have

THEOREM 6.1

- a) If condition (2) holds and if \mathcal{L} is weakly prime complete then \mathcal{L} is Lindelöf.
- b) If \mathcal{L} is Lindelöf then condition (2) holds.

PROOF. Omitted.

THEOREM 6.2 Define $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}) = \{V_J(L)/L \in \mathcal{L}\}$ where $V_J(L) = \{\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})/\mu(L) = 1, L \in \mathcal{L}\}$. Then \mathcal{L} satisfies condition (2) iff $J(\mathcal{L})$, $\tau\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is Lindelöf.

PROOF. Suppose \mathcal{L} satisfies condition (2), we show that $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ satisfies condition (2). For this, let $\Pi' \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$ and define $\Pi(L) = \Pi'(V_J(L))$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$. If $L_n \downarrow \emptyset$, $L_n \in \mathcal{L}$ then $V_J(L_n) \downarrow \emptyset$ and $\lim_n \Pi(L_n) = \lim_n \Pi'(V_J(L_n)) = 0$, hence $\Pi \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. By condition (2) there exists $\nu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\Pi \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Hence $\nu' \in J(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\Pi' \leq \nu'$ on $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ where $\nu'(V_J(L)) = \nu(L)$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$. For $\Pi' \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$, there exists $\nu' \in J(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$ such that $\Pi' \leq \nu'$ on $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$.

Next we show that $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is weakly prime complete; let $S(\nu') = \bigcap_{\alpha \in A} \{V_J(L_\alpha)/\nu'(V_J(L_\alpha)) = 1, L_\alpha \in \mathcal{L}\}$.

$\nu'(V_J(L)) = 1$ iff $\nu(L) = 1$ iff $\nu \in V_J(L) = \{\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})/\mu(L) = 1, L \in \mathcal{L}\}$. Hence $V_J(L) \neq \emptyset$ implies $S(\nu') \neq \emptyset$. Therefore $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is Lindelöf, and then $\tau\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is Lindelöf. Conversely, assume $(J(\mathcal{L}), \tau\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$ is Lindelöf and let $\Pi \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{L})$. Define $\Pi'(V_J(L)) = \Pi(L)$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$. Then $V_J(L_n) \downarrow \emptyset$ which implies $L_n \downarrow \emptyset$ and $\lim_n \Pi(L_n) = \lim_n \Pi'(V_J(L_n)) = 0$ i.e. $\Pi' \in \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$. $\tau\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ Lindelöf, then $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ Lindelöf, then $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ satisfies condition (2). Hence there exists $\nu' \in J(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$ such that $\Pi' \leq \nu'$ on $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$, where $\nu'(V_J(L)) = \nu(L)$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$. Therefore $\Pi \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$.

Again, analogous to our previous work we have:

THEOREM 6.3 Consider $J(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$. $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is regular iff for all $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\nu \in J(\mathcal{L})$, if $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu_1 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$ then $\mu_2 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$.

PROOF. For $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ we have $\mu'_1, \mu'_2 \in I(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$ and then $\mu'_1, \mu'_2 \in I(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$, $\mu'_1(V_J(L)) = \mu_1(L)$ and $\mu'_2(V_J(L)) = \mu_2(L)$. If $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is regular then $S(\mu'_1) = S(\mu'_2)$, where $S(\mu'_1) = \cap \{V_J(L) \in \mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}) / \mu'_1(V_J(L)) = 1, L \in \mathcal{L}\}$. Let $\nu \in J(\mathcal{L})$; $\nu' \in J(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\mu'_1 \leq \nu'$ on $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$. Then $\nu \in S(\mu'_2)$ i.e. $\mu_2 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Conversely, suppose $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\nu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ such that if $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu_1 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$ then $\mu_2 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in I(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ on $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$. Then $\lambda_1 = \mu'_1$ and $\lambda_2 = \mu'_2$ with $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$. Thus $\mu'_1 \leq \mu'_2$ on $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ which implies $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ on \mathcal{L} , hence $S(\mu'_2) \subset S(\mu'_1)$. If $\lambda \in S(\mu'_1)$ then clearly $\lambda \in J(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu_1 \leq \lambda(\mathcal{L})$. By the condition of the statement, $\mu_2 \leq \lambda(\mathcal{L})$ and then $\lambda \in S(\mu'_2)$. Hence $S(\mu'_2) = S(\mu'_1)$ and $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is regular.

THEOREM 6.4 Consider $J(\mathcal{L})$, $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$. If $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is regular, then $J(\mathcal{L}) = I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$.

PROOF. Let $\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})$. Then there exists $\nu \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$, hence $\mu' \leq \nu'$ on $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$, where $\mu' \in J(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\nu' \in I_R(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$. $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ regular implies $S(\mu') = S(\nu')$, therefore $\nu \leq \mu(\mathcal{L})$. Then $\mu = \nu(\mathcal{L})$ and since $\nu \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$, $J(\mathcal{L}) \subset I_o(\mathcal{L})$ it follows that $\mu \in I_R(\mathcal{L})$, $I_o(\mathcal{L})$ and then $\mu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$. Thus $J(\mathcal{L}) = I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$.

THEOREM 6.5 Consider $J(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$, with \mathcal{L} Lindelöf. If for all $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in I(\mathcal{L})$ and $\nu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ such that if $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu_1 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$ then $\mu_2 \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$ it follows that $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is slightly and mildly normal.

PROOF. By Theorem 6.3 $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is regular. We show as in the Remark of Theorem 4.1 that $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is Lindelöf and then, $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ being regular and Lindelöf, it follows that it is also slightly and mildly normal.

THEOREM 6.6 $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is prime complete iff for $\mu \in I_o(\mathcal{L})$ there exists $\nu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$.

Let $\mu \in I_o(\mathcal{L})$ such that there exists $\nu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Consider the corresponding $\mu' \in I_o(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\nu' \in J(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$ for which $\mu' \leq \nu'$ holds on $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$. $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ weakly prime complete implies $S(\nu') \neq \emptyset$ and since $\mu' \leq \nu'$ it follows $S(\mu') \neq \emptyset$, so that $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ is prime complete. Conversely, suppose $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$ prime complete and let $\mu \in I_o(\mathcal{L})$. Consider the corresponding $\mu' \in I_o(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L}))$, for which $S(\mu') \neq \emptyset$, so there exists $\nu \in S(\mu')$ and $\mu \leq \nu$ on $\mathcal{V}_J(\mathcal{L})$. Hence $\nu \in J(\mathcal{L})$.

We can now return to $I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ and the lattice $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$, where \mathcal{L} is disjunctive, and can ask when this lattice is weakly prime complete.

THEOREM 6.7 Let \mathcal{L} be a disjunctive lattice and consider $I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$. $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is weakly prime complete iff for $\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ there exists $\nu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$.

PROOF. Let $\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ and consider the associated $\mu' \in J(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$ defined by $\mu'(W_o(L)) = \mu(L)$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$. $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ prime complete implies $S(\mu') \neq \emptyset$, and then there exists $\nu \in S(\mu')$ and $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$, $\nu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$.

Conversely, let $\mu' \in J(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$ and consider the associated $\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu'(W_o(L)) = \mu(L)$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$. Assume now that there exists $\nu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$. Then $\nu' \in I_R^o(\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\mu' \leq \nu'$ on $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$. Hence $S(\nu') \subset S(\mu')$ and since $\mathcal{W}_o(\mathcal{L})$ is replete, $S(\nu') \neq \emptyset$.

We finally note that the conditions of Theorem 5.4 that $\mathcal{L} \in \mathfrak{J}_{\mu''}$ is very strong if $\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})$, namely.

THEOREM 6.8 Let $\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ and assume that $\mathcal{L} \in \mathfrak{J}_{\mu''}$. Then if there exists $\nu \in I_R^o(\mathcal{L})$ such that $\mu \leq \nu(\mathcal{L})$ then $\mu = \nu$.

PROOF. Suppose there exists $L \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\mu(L) = 0$ and $\nu(L) = 1$. Now $\mu \leq \nu = \nu'' \leq \mu''(\mathcal{L})$, therefore $\mu''(L) = 1$, and since $\mathcal{L} \in \mathfrak{J}_{\mu''}$ we get $\mu''(L') = 0$. But $\mu \in J(\mathcal{L})$ iff $\mu = \mu' = \mu''(\mathcal{L}')$. Therefore $\mu(L') = 0$ which implies $\mu(X) = 0$, contradiction. It follows that $\mu = \nu$.

REFERENCES

- [1] ALEXANDROFF, A.D., Additive set functions in abstract spaces, *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)* **8**, 50 (1940), 307-348.
- [2] BACHMAN, G. and STRATIGOS, P., Lattice repleteness and some of its applications to topology, *J. Math. Anal. & Appl.*, **99**, 2 (1984), 472-492.

- [3] CONNELL, R., On certain Wallman spaces, *Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.*, **17**, 2 (1994), 273-276.
- [4] EID, G., On normal lattices and Wallman spaces, *Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.*, **13**, 1 (1990), 31-38.
- [5] GRASSI, P., Outer measures and associated lattice properties, *Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.*, **16**, 4 (1992), 687-694.
- [6] HSU, P-S., Applications of outer measures to separation properties of lattices and regular or σ -smooth measures, *Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.*, **19**, 2 (1996), 253-262.
- [7] VLAD, C., Regular measures and normal lattices, *Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.*, **17**, 3 (1994), 441-446.
- [8] VLAD, C., Lattice separation and properties of Wallman type spaces, *Annali di Matematica pura ed applicata*, (IV), Vol. CLV (1991), 65-79.
- [9] VLAD, C., On normal lattices and semiseparation of lattices, *J. Indian Math. Soc.*, **56** (1991), 259-273.
- [10] WALLMAN, H., Lattices and topological spaces, *Ann. of Math.*, **39** (1938), 112-126

Special Issue on Intelligent Computational Methods for Financial Engineering

Call for Papers

As a multidisciplinary field, financial engineering is becoming increasingly important in today's economic and financial world, especially in areas such as portfolio management, asset valuation and prediction, fraud detection, and credit risk management. For example, in a credit risk context, the recently approved Basel II guidelines advise financial institutions to build comprehensible credit risk models in order to optimize their capital allocation policy. Computational methods are being intensively studied and applied to improve the quality of the financial decisions that need to be made. Until now, computational methods and models are central to the analysis of economic and financial decisions.

However, more and more researchers have found that the financial environment is not ruled by mathematical distributions or statistical models. In such situations, some attempts have also been made to develop financial engineering models using intelligent computing approaches. For example, an artificial neural network (ANN) is a nonparametric estimation technique which does not make any distributional assumptions regarding the underlying asset. Instead, ANN approach develops a model using sets of unknown parameters and lets the optimization routine seek the best fitting parameters to obtain the desired results. The main aim of this special issue is not to merely illustrate the superior performance of a new intelligent computational method, but also to demonstrate how it can be used effectively in a financial engineering environment to improve and facilitate financial decision making. In this sense, the submissions should especially address how the results of estimated computational models (e.g., ANN, support vector machines, evolutionary algorithm, and fuzzy models) can be used to develop intelligent, easy-to-use, and/or comprehensible computational systems (e.g., decision support systems, agent-based system, and web-based systems)

This special issue will include (but not be limited to) the following topics:

- **Computational methods:** artificial intelligence, neural networks, evolutionary algorithms, fuzzy inference, hybrid learning, ensemble learning, cooperative learning, multiagent learning

- **Application fields:** asset valuation and prediction, asset allocation and portfolio selection, bankruptcy prediction, fraud detection, credit risk management
- **Implementation aspects:** decision support systems, expert systems, information systems, intelligent agents, web service, monitoring, deployment, implementation

Authors should follow the Journal of Applied Mathematics and Decision Sciences manuscript format described at the journal site <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jamds/>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/>, according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	December 1, 2008
First Round of Reviews	March 1, 2009
Publication Date	June 1, 2009

Guest Editors

Lean Yu, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China; Department of Management Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong; yulean@amss.ac.cn

Shouyang Wang, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China; sywang@amss.ac.cn

K. K. Lai, Department of Management Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong; mskkklai@cityu.edu.hk