

A RADON-NIKODÝM THEOREM FOR VALUATIONS

JEAN GOUBAULT-LARRECQ

UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-SACLAY, CNRS, ENS PARIS-SACLAY, LABORATOIRE
MÉTHODES FORMELLES,
4, AVENUE DES SCIENCES, 91190, GIF-SUR-YVETTE, FRANCE.
E-MAIL: GOUBAULT@LSV.FR

ABSTRACT. We enquire under which conditions, given two σ -finite, ω -continuous valuations ν and μ , ν has density with respect to μ . The answer is that ν has to be absolutely continuous with respect to μ , plus a certain Hahn decomposition property, which happens to be always true for measures.



For the purpose of Open Access, a CC-BY public copyright licence has been applied by the authors to the present document and will be applied to all subsequent versions up to the Author Accepted Manuscript arising from this submission.

1. INTRODUCTION

In its simplest form, the Radon-Nikodým theorem [19, 16] states that a σ -finite measure ν has a measurable density with respect to a σ -finite measure μ if and only if ν is absolutely continuous with respect to μ . The purpose of this paper is to investigate a similar question in the larger setting of ω -continuous valuations, a setting which encompasses both measures and the continuous valuations used in the semantics of probabilistic programming languages [12, 11].

Probably the distinguishing feature of valuations compared to measures is that they give mass to sets forming a collection that is not necessarily closed under complements: a lattice of subsets of valuations, a topology for continuous valuations, and what we call an ω -topology for ω -continuous valuations.

Sets equipped with such collection of sets are Pervin spaces, topological spaces, and what we call ω -topological spaces respectively. They form categories **Perv**, **Top** and ω **Top** respectively.

As we will see, the question of the existence of density maps is more about the category in which the density maps should reside, not so much about the distinction between valuations and measures. Indeed, on sufficiently nice topological spaces, continuous valuations and measures are essentially the

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 28C15; Secondary 60B05.

Key words and phrases. Measure, valuation, Radon-Nikodým derivative, density function.

same thing, and therefore *measurable* density maps will exist under the familiar assumptions of the classical Radon-Nikodým theorem. This will also entail that they do not exist in general as morphisms in **Top** or $\omega\mathbf{Top}$, as we will see in Section 4.2.

Hence some additional assumptions are needed to ensure that density maps exist in the relevant categories, and it is the purpose of this paper to identify them.

Outline. We give brief preliminaries in Section 2, and we develop the theory of valuations, including ω -continuous valuations, measures and continuous valuations, in Section 3. We develop necessary conditions for density maps to exist in Section 4, and we show that they are sufficient in Section 5. Our final result includes the classical Radon-Nikodým theorem as a special case.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We assume some basic knowledge about topology [9] and about measure theory [3]. We will need the following from domain theory [9, 8].

A *directed* family D in a poset P is a non-empty family such that any two elements of D have a common upper bound in D . A *dcpo* (short for directed-complete partial order) is a poset in which every directed family has a supremum. We write $\sup^\uparrow D$, or $\sup_{i \in I}^\uparrow x_i$ if $D = (x_i)_{i \in I}$, for directed suprema. We also write \bigcup^\uparrow for directed union. An ω *dcpo* is defined similarly, except that we only require the existence of suprema of *monotone sequences* $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (namely, $x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n \leq \dots$) instead of directed families.

A function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between dcpos is *Scott-continuous* if and only if it is monotonic (order-preserving) and preserves suprema of directed sets, namely $\sup_{i \in I}^\uparrow f(x_i) = f(\sup_{i \in I}^\uparrow x_i)$ for every directed family $(x_i)_{i \in I}$. It is ω -*continuous* if and only if it is monotonic and preserves suprema of monotone sequences.

The *Scott topology* on a dcpo has as open sets those subsets U that are upwards-closed (if $x \in U$ and $x \leq y$ then $y \in U$) and such that every directed family D such that $\sup^\uparrow D \in U$ intersects U . The Scott-continuous maps are exactly the continuous maps with respect to the Scott topologies.

3. VALUATIONS AND MEASURES

As our general setting, we will consider pairs (X, \mathcal{L}) where X is a set and \mathcal{L} is a lattice of subsets, namely a family of subsets of X that is closed

under finite intersections and finite unions. In particular, the empty set and X belong to \mathcal{L} .

We retrieve topological spaces by requiring that \mathcal{L} be closed under arbitrary unions; or just under directed unions. Indeed, the union of any family $(U_i)_{i \in I}$ of subsets of X is equal to the directed supremum $\bigcup_{J \text{ finite } \subseteq I} \bigcup_{j \in J} U_j$.

We will call ω -topology on X any lattice of subsets \mathcal{L} that is at the same time an ω cpo under inclusion. Then (X, \mathcal{L}) is an ω -topological space. It is equivalent to require that \mathcal{L} be closed under countable unions, since the union of any countable family $(U_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of \mathcal{L} is the union $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{i=0}^n U_i$ of a chain of elements of \mathcal{L} .

A lattice of subsets \mathcal{L} that is closed under complements is a *algebra of subsets*, and an ω -topology \mathcal{L} that is closed under complements is the same thing as a σ -algebra. Then (X, \mathcal{L}) is called a *measurable space*.

There are categories **Perv**, **BPerv**, **Top**, ω **Top** and **Mes** whose objects are pairs (X, \mathcal{L}) where \mathcal{L} is a lattice of subsets, resp. an algebra of subsets, resp. a topology, resp. an ω -topology, resp. a σ -algebra. In each case, the morphisms $f: (X, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{L}')$ are the maps $f: X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f^{-1}(V) \in \mathcal{L}$ for every $V \in \mathcal{L}'$. They are called *continuous* maps on **Top**, and *measurable* maps on **Mes**. The categories **Perv** and **BPerv** are the categories of *Pervin spaces* and *Boolean Pervin spaces* respectively [18, Section 3.1]. Those categories are all full subcategories of **Perv**.

Let $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ be the dcpo of extended non-negative real numbers $\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$, with the usual ordering \leq extended by the stipulation that $r \leq \infty$ for every $r \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$. We will always equip $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ with the Scott topology of \leq , making it an object of all the categories mentioned above. The open subsets of that Scott topology are the half-open intervals $]t, \infty]$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, plus $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ and \emptyset .

We write $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ for the set of morphisms from (X, \mathcal{L}) to $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ (implicitly equipped with its Scott topology), in any full subcategory of **Perv** containing $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$. In other words, the elements h of $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ are the functions $h: X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ such that $h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \in \mathcal{L}$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

When (X, \mathcal{L}) is a measurable space, $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ is the set of all measurable maps from (X, \mathcal{L}) to $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ with its usual Borel σ -algebra, generated by the intervals. This is because one can write any interval as a Boolean combination of intervals of the form $]t, \infty]$. When (X, \mathcal{L}) is a topological space, $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ is known as the set of *lower semicontinuous maps* from (X, \mathcal{L}) to $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$.

If \mathcal{L} is an ω -topology (resp., a topology), then $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ is an ω cpo (resp., a dcpo) under the pointwise ordering defined by $h \leq h'$ if and only if $h(x) \leq$

$h'(x)$ for every $x \in X$; additionally, suprema of monotone sequences (resp., directed suprema) are computed pointwise: $(\sup_{i \in I}^{\uparrow} h_i)(x) = \sup_{i \in I}^{\uparrow} (h_i(x))$. In order to see this, it suffices to show that $\sup_{i \in I}^{\uparrow} (h_i(x))$ is in $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$; and the inverse image of $]t, \infty]$ under that map is $\bigcup_{i \in I}^{\uparrow} h_i^{-1}(]t, \infty])$, since $]t, \infty]$ is Scott-open.

Given any Pervin space (X, \mathcal{L}) , a *valuation* ν on (X, \mathcal{L}) is a map $\nu: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ that is:

- *strict*: $\nu(\emptyset) = 0$;
- *monotonic*: $U \subseteq V$ implies $\nu(U) \leq \nu(V)$;
- *modular*: for all $U, V \in \mathcal{L}$, $\nu(U) + \nu(V) = \nu(U \cup V) + \nu(U \cap V)$.

A *continuous valuation* is a valuation that is Scott-continuous, and an ω -*continuous valuation* is a valuation that is ω -continuous.

Continuous valuations have been the cornerstone of the domain-theoretic semantics of probabilistic languages since Claire Jones' PhD thesis [12, 11], and had first been studied by Nait Saheb-Djahromi [20]. The concept of valuation is older, and dates back to Smiley [21], Horn and Tarski [10], and Pettis [17], at least; see [14].

An ω -continuous valuation on a measurable space (X, \mathcal{L}) is a *measure*. Measures are usually defined as σ -additive maps $\nu: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$, but the two definitions are equivalent. Let us recall that $\nu: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ is *additive* (where \mathcal{L} is any lattice of subsets) if and only if $\nu(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\nu(U \cup V) = \nu(U) + \nu(V)$ for all pairs of two disjoint sets $U, V \in \mathcal{L}$, and σ -*additive* (where \mathcal{L} is any ω -topology) if and only if $\nu(\bigcup_{i \in I} U_n) = \sum_{i \in I} \nu(U_i)$ for every countable family $(U_i)_{i \in I}$ of pairwise disjoint elements U_i of \mathcal{L} . The equivalence of ω -continuous valuations and σ -additive maps on σ -algebras follows from the following facts.

- If \mathcal{L} is an algebra of subsets, then the additive maps $\nu: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ are exactly the valuations on (X, \mathcal{L}) . Indeed, if ν is additive, then strictness is clear, monotonicity follows from the fact that if $U \subseteq V$, then $\nu(V) = \nu(V \setminus U) + \nu(U) \geq \nu(U)$, and modularity from $\nu(U) + \nu(V) = \nu(U \setminus V) + \nu(U \cap V) + \nu(V) = \nu(U \cap V) + \nu(U \cup V)$. Conversely, any valuation ν is additive, since if U and V are disjoint, then $\nu(U \cup V) = \nu(U \cup V) + \nu(U \cap V) = \nu(U) + \nu(V)$.
- If \mathcal{L} is an ω -topology, then the σ -additive maps are exactly the ω -continuous, additive maps. This follows from the fact that every countably infinite union $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n$ can be written as $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}^{\uparrow} \bigcup_{i=0}^n U_i$, plus additivity.

Addition is Scott-continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$, and it follows that valuations on (X, \mathcal{L}) form a dcpo under the *stochastic ordering*, defined by $\mu \leq \nu$ if and only if $\mu(U) \leq \nu(U)$ for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$; directed suprema are computed pointwise: $(\sup_{i \in I}^\uparrow \nu_i)(U) = \sup_{i \in I}^\uparrow (\nu_i(U))$. The same can be said for continuous valuations on a topological space, or for ω -continuous valuations on an ω -topological space, hence also for measures on a measurable space, since suprema commute.

The simplest way to define a notion of integration is by the following *Choquet formula* [5, Chapter VII, Section 48.1, p. 265]:

$$\int_{x \in X} h(x) d\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^\infty \nu(h^{-1}([t, \infty])) dt, \quad (3.1)$$

for every function $h \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$, and for every valuation ν on (X, \mathcal{L}) . The integral on the right is an ordinary improper Riemann integral, which is well-defined because the map $t \mapsto \nu(h^{-1}([t, \infty]))$ is antitonic (order-reversing). Indeed, it is easy to see that, for any antitonic map $f: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$, $\int_0^\infty f(t) dt$ is the supremum of the monotone sequence of lower Darboux sums $\sum_{k=1}^{N2^N} f(\frac{k}{2^N})$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$. This was already observed in the proof of Lemma 4.2 of Regina Tix's master's thesis [22], which also contains the following statement; the proof boils down to a familiar commutation of suprema.

Fact 1 (Lemma 4.2, 3rd item, of [22]). *Riemann integration is Scott-continuous in the integrated antitonic map. In particular, for any directed family $(f_i)_{i \in I}$ (countable or not) of antitonic maps from \mathbb{R}_+ to $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$, in the pointwise ordering, $\int_0^\infty \sup_{i \in I}^\uparrow f_i(t) dt = \sup_{i \in I}^\uparrow \int_0^\infty f_i(t) dt$.*

Equation (3.1) makes sense for more general set functions ν than just valuations, but we will not make use of this. We also write $\int h d\nu$ for $\int_{x \in X} h(x) d\nu$.

We sum up the main properties of the Choquet integral in the following proposition; h, h' and h_i stand for arbitrary elements of $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$, μ, ν and ν_i for valuations on (X, \mathcal{L}) , a and b are arbitrary elements of \mathbb{R}_+ . Addition and multiplication on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ are defined in the obvious way, with the caveat that $0 \cdot \infty = \infty \cdot 0 = 0$, so as to ensure that multiplication, not just addition, is Scott-continuous. On spaces of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ -valued maps and of valuations, addition and scalar multiplication are defined pointwise. The *characteristic map* $\chi_U: X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ maps every $x \in U$ to 1 and all other points to 0; χ_U is in $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ if and only if $U \in \mathcal{L}$. The *Dirac valuation* δ_x maps every $U \in \mathcal{L}$ to 1 if $x \in U$, to 0 otherwise; namely, $\delta_x(U) = \chi_U(x)$. Given a morphism $f: (X, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{L}')$, the *image valuation* $f[\nu]$ of any valuation ν on (X, \mathcal{L}) is

defined by $f[\nu](V) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \nu(f^{-1}(V))$; this is a valuation, resp. an ω -continuous valuation, resp. a measure, resp. a continuous valuation if ν is.

Proposition 2. *Choquet integration is:*

- (i) *linear in the valuation:* $\int h d(a\mu + b\nu) = a \int h d\mu + b \int h d\nu$;
- (ii) *Scott-continuous in the valuation:* $\int h d \sup_{i \in I} \nu_i = \sup_{i \in I}^\uparrow \int h d\nu_i$ if $(\nu_i)_{i \in I}$ is directed;
- (iii) *linear in the integrated function if (X, \mathcal{L}) is an ω -topological space and ν is an ω -continuous valuation:* $\int (ah + bh') d\nu = a \int h d\nu + b \int h' d\nu$;
- (iv) *ω -continuous in the integrated function if (X, \mathcal{L}) is an ω -topological space and ν is ω -continuous (in particular, $\int \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow h_i d\nu = \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow \int h_i d\nu$), and Scott-continuous if (X, \mathcal{L}) is a topological space and ν is a continuous valuation (notably, $\int \sup_{i \in I}^\uparrow h_i d\nu = \sup_{i \in I}^\uparrow \int h_i d\nu$ if $(h_i)_{i \in I}$ is directed).*

Additionally,

- (v) $\int \chi_U d\nu = \nu(U)$ for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$;
- (vi) $\int h d\delta_x = h(x)$ for every $x \in X$.

Proof. The argument follows classical lines, and most notably [22, Section 4].

Item (i) follows from the fact that Riemann integration is itself linear, and (ii) follows from Fact 1; monotonicity is clear. Item (v) follows from the fact that $(\sup_{i \in I}^\uparrow h_i)^{-1}(]t, \infty]) = \bigcup_{i \in I}^\uparrow h_i^{-1}(]t, \infty])$, ν is Scott-continuous and Fact 1. Item (iv) is proved similarly. As far as (v) is concerned, we have $\int \chi_U d\nu = \int_0^\infty \nu(\chi_U^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt = \int_0^\infty f(t) dt$ where f maps every $t \in [0, 1[$ to $\nu(U)$ and every $t \geq 1$ to 0. For (vi), $\int h d\delta_x = \int_0^\infty \delta_x(h^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt = \int_0^\infty g(t) dt$ where g maps every $t < h(x)$ to 1, and every $t \geq h(x)$ to 0. The only tricky point is to show item (iii).

First, we have $\int ah d\nu = \int_0^\infty \nu(ah^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt$. If $a = 0$, this is equal to $0 = a \int h d\nu$. If $a \neq 0, \infty$, this is equal to $\int_0^\infty \nu(h^{-1}(]t/a, \infty])) dt = \int_0^\infty \nu(h^{-1}(]u, \infty])) a du = a \int_0^\infty \nu(h^{-1}(]u, \infty])) du = a \int h d\nu$. Hence $\int ah d\nu = a \int h d\nu$ for every $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$; this also holds when $a = \infty$ by (iv), since $\infty = \sup^\uparrow \mathbb{N}$. Hence it suffices to show that $\int (h + h') d\nu = \int h d\nu + \int h' d\nu$.

We proceed in steps. We fix h . For every $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$, we claim that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\epsilon^\infty \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cup (h^{-1}(]t - \epsilon, \infty]) \cap U) dt \\ &= \int_\epsilon^\infty \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt + \int_0^\epsilon \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cap U) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

If $\int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cap U) dt < \infty$, then we reason as follows. By the modularity law, the fact that the intersection of $h^{-1}(]t, \infty])$ with $h^{-1}(]t - \epsilon, \infty]) \cap U$ simplifies to $h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cap U$, and the usual properties of Riemann integrals,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cup (h^{-1}(]t - \epsilon, \infty]) \cap U) dt \\
&= \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt + \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t - \epsilon, \infty]) \cap U) dt \\
&\quad - \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cap U) dt \\
&= \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt + \int_0^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cap U) dt \\
&\quad - \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cap U) dt \\
&= \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt + \int_0^{\epsilon} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cap U) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cap U) dt = \infty$, then since $h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cap U$ is included in $h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cup (h^{-1}(]t - \epsilon, \infty]) \cap U$, both sides of (3.2) are equal to ∞ .

Now, $\int (h + \epsilon \chi_U) d\nu$ is equal to $\int_0^{\infty} (h + \epsilon \chi_U)^{-1}(]t, \infty]) dt$, and $(h + \epsilon \chi_U)^{-1}(]t, \infty])$ is equal to $h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cup U$ if $t < \epsilon$ and to $h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cup (h^{-1}(]t - \epsilon, \infty]) \cap U$ otherwise. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int (h + \epsilon \chi_U) d\nu \\
&= \int_0^{\epsilon} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cup U) dt + \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cup (h^{-1}(]t - \epsilon, \infty]) \cap U) dt \\
&= \int_0^{\epsilon} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cup U) dt + \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^{\epsilon} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) \cap U) dt \quad \text{by (3.2)} \\
&= \int_0^{\epsilon} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty]) dt + \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^{\epsilon} \nu(U) dt \quad \text{by modularity of } \nu \text{ under the } \int_0^{\epsilon} \text{ terms} \\
&= \int h d\nu + \epsilon \nu(U).
\end{aligned}$$

This being done, let a *very simple function* be any map h' of the form $\epsilon \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{U_i}$ where $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $U_i \in \mathcal{L}$. By induction on n , and using what we have just proved, we obtain that $\int (h + h') d\nu = \int h d\nu + \int h' d\nu$.

Finally, every $h' \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ is the supremum of the monotone sequence of very simple functions $h'_N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{i=1}^{N2^N} \chi_{h'^{-1}(]i/2^N, \infty])}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\int (h +$

$h') d\nu = \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^{\uparrow} \int (h + h'_N) d\nu = \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^{\uparrow} (\int h d\nu + \int h'_N d\nu) = \int h d\nu + \int h' d\nu$ by using (iv). \square

Property (iv) is usually called the monotone convergence theorem (or the Beppo Levi theorem) when applied to measurable spaces and measures.

We will also use the following baby version of the Riesz representation theorem. A *linear* map $F: \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ is one such that $F(ah) = aF(h)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (*positive homogeneity*) and $h \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ and $F(h + h') = F(h) + F(h')$ for all $h, h' \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ (*additivity*). It is equivalent to require $F(ah + bh') = aF(h) + bF(h')$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $h, h' \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$; if F is ω -continuous, then this extends to the cases where a or b or both is equal to ∞ .

Proposition 3. *Let (X, \mathcal{L}) be an ω -topological space (resp., a topological space). There is a one-to-one correspondence between ω -continuous (resp., continuous) valuations ν on (X, \mathcal{L}) and linear ω -continuous (resp., Scott-continuous) maps $F: \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$. In one direction, $F(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int h d\nu$, and in the other direction, $\nu(U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\chi_U)$.*

Proof. We deal with the ω -continuous case only, since the continuous case is similar. The continuous case was also dealt with by Tix [22, Satz 4.16], using similar arguments. Given an ω -continuous valuation ν , the map $F_\nu: h \mapsto \int h d\nu$ is ω -continuous and linear by items (ii) and (iv) of Proposition 2. Conversely, given an ω -continuous linear map $F: \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$, we define $\nu_F(U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\chi_U)$. Then ν_F is strict since F maps the constant 0 map to 0 by positive homogeneity, ω -continuous since F is, and since the map $U \mapsto \chi_U$ is itself ω -continuous, and modular because of the equality $\chi_U + \chi_V = \chi_{U \cup V} + \chi_{U \cap V}$ and the additivity of F . We have $\nu_{F_\nu} = \nu$, because for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$, $\nu_{F_\nu}(U) = F_\nu(\chi_U) = \int \chi_U d\nu = \nu(U)$ by item (v) of Proposition 2. In order to show that $F_{\nu_F} = F$, we realize that $F_{\nu_F}(\chi_U) = \int \chi_U d\nu_F = \nu_F(U) = F(\chi_U)$ by item (v) of Proposition 2. Then, by the linearity of the integral (item (iii)), $F_{\nu_F}(h) = F(h)$ for every very simple function (as introduced in the proof of Proposition 2), and since every element of $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ is a supremum of a monotone sequence of very simple functions, we conclude by the ω -continuity of F and of F_{ν_F} (item (iv)) that $F_{\nu_F} = F$. \square

4. DENSITY MAPS

Lemma 4. *Let (X, \mathcal{L}) be an ω -topological space, let $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$, and μ be an ω -continuous valuation on (X, \mathcal{L}) .*

The map that sends every $h \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ to $\int hg \, d\mu$ is well-defined, linear and ω -continuous.

It is Scott-continuous provided that \mathcal{L} is a topology and μ is Scott-continuous.

Proof. We must first show that the integral makes sense, namely that the product map hg is in $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$. The multiplication map $a, b \mapsto ab$ is Scott-continuous from $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+ \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ to $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$, hence, for every $t > 0$, $ab > t$ if and only if there are two rational numbers $p, q > 0$ such that $p > a$, $q > b$ and $pq > t$. For every $t > 0$, $(hg)^{-1}(]t, \infty])$ is then equal to $\bigcup_{p, q \in \mathbb{Q}, pq > t} h^{-1}(]p, \infty]) \cap g^{-1}(]q, \infty])$. That is an infinite countable union, hence it is in \mathcal{L} . Therefore hg is in $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$.

Since product by g is linear and ω -continuous (even Scott-continuous), the remaining claims follow from items (iv) and (v) of Proposition 2. \square

Proposition 3 then turns this ω -continuous linear function into an ω -continuous valuation, defined as follows.

Definition 5. For every ω -topological space (X, \mathcal{L}) , for every $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$, and for every ω -continuous valuation μ on (X, \mathcal{L}) , we define:

$$(g \cdot \mu)(U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int \chi_U \cdot g \, d\mu \quad (4.1)$$

for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$.

Lemma 4 and Proposition 3 together yield the following.

Proposition 6. For every ω -topological space (X, \mathcal{L}) , for every $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$, and for every ω -continuous valuation μ on (X, \mathcal{L}) ,

- (i) $g \cdot \mu$ is an ω -continuous valuation;
- (ii) $g \cdot \mu$ is a continuous valuation if (X, \mathcal{L}) is a topological space and μ is a continuous valuation;
- (iii) For every $h \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$,

$$\int h \, d(g \cdot \mu) = \int hg \, d\mu. \quad (4.2)$$

In particular, if \mathcal{L} is a σ -algebra, then $g \cdot \mu$ is a measure for every measure μ and every measurable map g from X to $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$. The measure $g \cdot \mu$ is sometimes written as $g \, d\mu$.

Given two valuations μ and ν on (X, \mathcal{L}) , one may wonder when one can write ν as $g \cdot \mu$ for some suitable map g —this is the goal of this paper. If $\nu = g \cdot \mu$, then we will see that ν and μ must satisfy two conditions: absolute continuity, and what we call the Hahn decomposition property, after the Hahn decomposition theorem of measure theory.

4.1. Absolute continuity. We take the following definition of absolute continuity. While different from the usual definition, it is not entirely unusual, see for example [4].

Definition 7 (Absolute continuity). *Given two valuations μ and ν on a Pervin space (X, \mathcal{L}) , we say that ν is absolutely continuous with respect to μ if and only if for every $U_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\nu(U_0) < \infty$, for every $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\}$, there is an $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\}$ such that for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $U \subseteq U_0$ and $\mu(U) < \eta$, $\nu(U) < \epsilon$.*

Remark 8. *When ν is a bounded valuation, the definition of absolute continuity simplifies to: for every $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\}$, there is an $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\}$ such that for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\mu(U) < \eta$, $\nu(U) < \epsilon$.*

The usual definition of absolute continuity is given as item (2) in the following proposition, where we show that it is equivalent in the case of σ -finite measures. A valuation ν on a Pervin space (X, \mathcal{L}) is σ -finite if and only if there is a countable family of sets $E_n \in \mathcal{L}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n = X$ and $\nu(E_n) < \infty$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Replacing E_n by $\bigcup_{k=0}^n E_k$ if necessary, we may assume that $(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a monotone sequence. This definition applies to measures as well, in which case we retrieve the usual notion of σ -finiteness. Considering Remark 8, the following is well-known for bounded measures [3, page 422], and the proof is entirely similar.

Proposition 9 (Absolute continuity, simplified). *Let ν, μ be two measures on a measurable space (X, \mathcal{L}) , and consider the following statements.*

- (1) ν is absolutely continuous with respect to μ ;
- (2) for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\mu(U) = 0$, $\nu(U) = 0$.

Then (2) implies (1), and (1) and (2) are equivalent if ν is σ -finite.

Proof. Let us assume that (2) holds, but not (1). There is an $\epsilon > 0$ and a set $U_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\nu(U_0) < \infty$ and, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, letting $\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1/2^n$, there is an element $V_n \in \mathcal{L}$ with $V_n \subseteq U_0$ such that $\mu(V_n) < 1/2^n$ but $\nu(V_n) \geq \epsilon$. In particular, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mu(V_n) < \infty$, so by the first Borel-Cantelli lemma [3, Theorem 4.3], $\mu(\bigcap_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} V_n) = 0$. Using (2), it follows that $\nu(\bigcap_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \geq m} V_n) = 0$. The sets $\bigcup_{n \geq m} V_n$ form a decreasing sequence of elements of \mathcal{L} included in U_0 , hence of finite ν -measure. Therefore $\inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \nu(\bigcup_{n \geq m} V_n) = 0$. This is impossible, since for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\nu(\bigcup_{n \geq m} V_n) \geq \nu(V_m) \geq \epsilon$.

Conversely, we assume that (1) holds and that ν is σ -finite. Let $(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a monotone sequence of elements of \mathcal{L} covering X and such that $\nu(E_n) <$

∞ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let also $U \in \mathcal{L}$ be such that $\mu(U) = 0$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $U \cap E_n$ is included in U , and $\mu(U \cap E_n) = 0$, so by absolute continuity, for every $\epsilon > 0$, $\nu(U \cap E_n) < \epsilon$. Since ϵ is arbitrary, $\nu(U \cap E_n) = 0$. Then $\nu(U) = \nu(U \cap \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow E_n) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow \nu(U \cap E_n) = 0$. \square

We will use the following often.

Lemma 10. *Let (X, \mathcal{L}) be a Pervin space, μ be a valuation on (X, \mathcal{L}) and $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$. For every $U \in \mathcal{L}$, $(g \cdot \mu)(U) = \int_0^\infty \mu(U \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt$.*

Proof. Let $\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g \cdot \mu$. For every $U \in \mathcal{L}$, we write $\nu(U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int \chi_U g d\mu$ as $\int_0^\infty \mu((\chi_U g)^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt$. For every $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $(\chi_U g)^{-1}(]t, \infty])) = U \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty]))$, whence the result. \square

Proposition 11. *Let μ and ν be two valuations on a Pervin space (X, \mathcal{L}) . If $\nu = g \cdot \mu$ for some function $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$, then ν is absolutely continuous with respect to μ .*

Proof. Let us fix $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and $U_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\nu(U_0) < \infty$.

Let $h(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu(U_0 \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty]))$, and $h_N(t)$ be defined as $h(t)$ if $t \leq N$, 0 otherwise. The maps h_N , $N \in \mathbb{N}$, are antitonic, and their pointwise supremum is h . Using Lemma 10, with $U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U_0$, and Fact 1, $\nu(U_0) = \int_0^\infty h(t) dt = \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow \int_0^\infty h_N(t) dt$. Since $\nu(U_0) < \infty$, for some $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, $\int_0^\infty h_N(t) dt > \nu(U_0) - \epsilon/2$. Then $\int_N^\infty h(t) dt < \epsilon/2$.

Let $\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon/(2N)$. For every $U \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $U \subseteq U_0$ and $\mu(U) < \eta$, we show that $\nu(U) < \epsilon$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(U) &= (g \cdot \mu)(U) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \mu(U \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt \quad \text{by Lemma 10} \\ &= \int_0^N \mu(U \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt + \int_N^\infty \mu(U \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt \\ &\leq N\mu(U) + \int_N^\infty h(t) dt < N\mu(U) + \epsilon/2 < N\eta + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

4.2. Absolute continuity is not enough. Given a topological space (X, \mathcal{L}) , let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L})$ be its Borel σ -algebra. A *Borel measure*, namely a measure on $(X, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L}))$, induces a valuation on (X, \mathcal{L}) by restriction to the open sets. The Borel measures for which the induced valuation is continuous are traditionally called *τ -smooth*. By Adamski's theorem [1, Theorem 3.1], it is equivalent to require all Borel measures on $(X, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L}))$ to be τ -smooth, or to require (X, \mathcal{L}) to be *hereditarily Lindelöf*; a space is hereditarily Lindelöf if

and only if every family $(U_i)_{i \in I}$ of open subsets has a countable subfamily with the same union. All second-countable spaces are hereditarily Lindelöf.

There has been quite some literature on the converse question, among which [15, 2, 13]: given a continuous valuation ν on (X, \mathcal{L}) , does ν extend to a (necessarily τ -smooth) Borel measure? One of the most general theorems of this kind is the following [7, Theorem 1]: every continuous valuation on an LCS-complete space extends to a Borel measure; an *LCS-complete* space is a homeomorph of a G_δ subset of a locally compact sober space. The class of LCS-complete spaces includes all locally compact sober spaces, Matthew de Brecht's quasi-Polish spaces [6], and therefore also all Polish spaces.

Additionally, a standard use of the $\pi\lambda$ -theorem [3, Theorem 3.2] shows that any σ -finite continuous valuation ν on (X, \mathcal{L}) extends to a *unique* Borel measure. That Borel measure μ is such that there exists a monotone sequence $(U_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of open sets covering X and such that $\mu(U_n) < \infty$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This is a stricter condition than simply being σ -finite, since U_n is required to be open, and Borel measures having this property are sometimes called *moderated*.

Since quasi-Polish spaces are second-countable [6, Definition 16], hence hereditarily Lindelöf, it follows that σ -finite continuous valuations are in one-to-one correspondence with moderated τ -smooth measures on quasi-Polish spaces.

We use this to transport the classical Radon-Nikodým theorem over to the world of continuous valuations.

In one direction, given any σ -finite continuous valuation μ on an LCS-complete space (X, \mathcal{L}) , let $\tilde{\mu}$ be its unique extension to a Borel measure. For every measurable map (not just any lower semicontinuous map) g , in $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L}))$, we can form the measure $g \cdot \tilde{\mu}$ on $(X, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L}))$. This induces an ω -continuous valuation by restriction to \mathcal{L} , which we write as $g \cdot \mu$, extending Definition 5 to a larger class of density functions. With this definition, we have the following.

Theorem 12. *For any two σ -finite continuous valuations on an LCS-complete space (X, \mathcal{L}) , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\tilde{\nu}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\tilde{\mu}$;
- (2) there is a measurable map $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L}))$ such that $\nu = g \cdot \mu$.

Additionally, g is unique up to $\tilde{\mu}$ -null sets.

Proof. The condition $\nu = g \cdot \mu$ is equivalent to $\tilde{\nu} = g \cdot \tilde{\mu}$, by our (re)definition of $g \cdot \mu$. We conclude by invoking the classical Radon-Nikodým theorem. \square

Although this is a positive result, this gives us a recipe to show that absolute continuity is *not* enough for two σ -finite ω -continuous valuation to have a density $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$: find measurable maps that are equal to no lower semicontinuous map up to a $\tilde{\mu}$ -null set.

We provide two counter-examples. The first one relies on the existence of non-trivial specialization orderings in non- T_1 spaces. The second one takes place in \mathbb{R} with its standard metric topology.

Example 13. Let $\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a\delta_x + b\delta_y$, where $a, b > 0$ and x and y are two points of an LCS-complete space (X, \mathcal{L}) with $x < y$. (We let $x \leq y$ if and only if every $U \in \mathcal{L}$ containing x contains y ; this is the specialization preordering of (X, \mathcal{L}) . A space is T_0 if and only if \leq is antisymmetric, and every LCS-complete space is T_0 . We write $x < y$ if $x \leq y$ and $y \not\leq x$.) Next, consider any $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L}))$ such that $g(x) > g(y)$. For example, taking $g \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 - h$ fits, where h is any lower semicontinuous map from (X, \mathcal{L}) to $[0, 1] \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ such that $h(x) \neq h(y)$; indeed, every lower semicontinuous map is monotonic. We note that g is equal to no lower semicontinuous map up to any $\tilde{\mu}$ -null set, because g is antitonic, lower semicontinuous maps are monotonic, and the $\tilde{\mu}$ -null sets are the Borel sets that contain neither x nor y . Therefore $g \cdot \mu$ has no lower semicontinuous density with respect to μ . For a concrete instance of this construction, consider Sierpiński space for (X, \mathcal{L}) , namely $(\{0, 1\}, \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{0, 1\}\})$, $x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$, $y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$, $g(0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$, $g(1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$.

Example 14. Let μ be the bounded discrete valuation $\delta_0 + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} \delta_{1/2^n}$ on \mathbb{R} with its standard topology. Let g map every non-zero real number to 0, and 0 to 1. This is a measurable map. The $\tilde{\mu}$ -null sets are the Borel sets that do not contain 0 or any point $1/2^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If g were equal to some $h \in \mathfrak{L}(\mathbb{R})$ up to some $\tilde{\mu}$ -null set, then we would have $h(0) = 1$ and $h(1/2^n) = 0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. But then $h^{-1}([1/2, \infty])$ would contain 0, hence $1/2^n$ for n large enough, and that is impossible since $h(1/2^n) = 0$. It follows that $g \cdot \mu$ has no lower semicontinuous density with respect to μ .

We will therefore look for additional conditions imposed by the existence of $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ such that $\nu = g \cdot \mu$.

4.3. The Smiley-Horn-Tarski theorem. Let $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ be the smallest algebra of subsets of X containing \mathcal{L} . Its elements are the unions of finite collections of pairwise disjoint crescents. A *crescent* is a difference $U \setminus V$ of elements $U, V \in \mathcal{L}$; we can assume $V \subseteq U$ without loss of generality.

The *Smiley-Horn-Tarski theorem* [21, 10, 17] states that every bounded valuation ν on (X, \mathcal{L}) extends to a unique (bounded) valuation on $(X, \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}))$.

In general, every valuation ν on (X, \mathcal{L}) (not necessarily bounded) extends to a valuation on $(X, \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}))$, but that extension may fail to be unique [8, Proposition IV-9.4]. We will usually write an extension of ν on $(X, \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}))$ with the same letter ν , although one should be careful that such extensions may fail to be unique when ν is not bounded. Still, some uniqueness remains: if $C \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ can be written as a disjoint union of crescents $U_i \setminus V_i$ with $V_i \subseteq U_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$), and if $\nu(U_i) < \infty$ for every i , then necessarily $\nu(C) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\nu(U_i) - \nu(V_i))$.

Lemma 15. *Let (X, \mathcal{L}) be a Pervin space, μ be a bounded valuation on (X, \mathcal{L}) and $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$. The function ν that maps every $C \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ to $\int_0^\infty \mu(C \cap g^{-1}([t, \infty])) dt$ is a valuation on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ that extends $g \cdot \mu$ to $(X, \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}))$.*

We call the valuation ν above the *canonical extension* of $g \cdot \mu$ to $(X, \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}))$. There may be others: while μ is bounded, $g \cdot \mu$ may fail to be.

Proof. The definition of $\nu(C)$ makes sense, since the extension of μ to $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, which is required to make sense of $\mu(C \cap g^{-1}([t, \infty]))$ is unique, owing to the fact that μ is bounded. It is clear that $\nu(\emptyset) = 0$. The modularity and the monotonicity of ν on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ follow from the modularity and the monotonicity of μ . Hence ν is a valuation, and it extends $g \cdot \mu$ by Lemma 10. \square

Since extensions to $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ are unique for bounded valuations, we obtain the following.

Corollary 16. *Let (X, \mathcal{L}) be a Pervin space, μ be a bounded valuation on (X, \mathcal{L}) and $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$. If $\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g \cdot \mu$ is bounded, then its unique extension to $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ is such that $\nu(C) = \int_0^\infty \mu(C \cap g^{-1}([t, \infty])) dt$ for every $C \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$.*

4.4. Signed valuations. In order to state the Hahn decomposition property, we need to introduce signed valuations.

A *signed valuation* is a map $\varsigma: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (not \mathbb{R}_+) that is *strict* ($\varsigma(\emptyset) = 0$) and *modular* (for all $U, V \in \mathcal{L}$, $\varsigma(U \cup V) + \varsigma(U \cap V) = \varsigma(U) + \varsigma(V)$).

Typical examples of signed valuations are given by maps $\nu - r \cdot \mu: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where ν and μ are bounded valuations on (X, \mathcal{L}) , and every $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

We have the following analogue of the bounded form of the Smiley-Horn-Tarski theorem. The proof uses ingredients similar to Proposition 3, and can also be used to derive the classical Smiley-Horn-Tarski theorem.

Proposition 17. *Let \mathcal{L} be a lattice of subsets of a set X , and ς be a signed valuation on (X, \mathcal{L}) . Then ς extends to a unique signed valuation*

on $(X, \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}))$. The extension—still written ς —satisfies $\varsigma(U \setminus V) = \varsigma(U) - \varsigma(U \cap V) = \varsigma(U \cup V) - \varsigma(V)$ for all $U, V \in \mathcal{L}$.

Proof. If $\varsigma^{\%}$ is any signed valuation extending ς on $(X, \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}))$, then it is defined uniquely on crescents by the fact that $\varsigma^{\%}(U \setminus V)$ must be equal to $\varsigma(U) - \varsigma(U \cap V)$ and also to $\varsigma(U \cup V) - \varsigma(V)$ for all $U, V \in \mathcal{L}$, by modularity and the fact that $\varsigma^{\%}((U \cap V) \cap (U \setminus V))$ and $\varsigma^{\%}(V \cap (U \setminus V))$ must both be equal to $\varsigma^{\%}(\emptyset) = 0$; then $\varsigma^{\%}$ is uniquely determined on finite disjoint unions of crescents by additivity.

We proceed as follows to prove the existence of $\varsigma^{\%}$. Let M^+ be the set of functions $h \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ taking their values in \mathbb{N} . One can write any such h as $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \chi_{U_i}$ in a unique way, where $U_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq U_n \supseteq \cdots$ form an antitone sequence of elements of \mathcal{L} , with $U_n = \emptyset$ for n large enough. Indeed, U_i is determined uniquely as $h^{-1}([i, \infty])$ (which is equal to $h^{-1}([i - \epsilon, \infty])$ for any $\epsilon \in]0, 1[$, hence is in \mathcal{L}). On every such $h \in M^+$, let $F(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varsigma(U_i)$. This is a finite sum, because ς is strict.

With h as above and $U \in \mathcal{L}$, $h + \chi_U$ is equal to $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \chi_{V_i}$ where $V_i = (h + \chi_U)^{-1}([i, \infty]) = h^{-1}([i, \infty]) \cup (h^{-1}([i - 1, \infty]) \cap U) = U_i \cup (U_{i-1} \cap U)$; when $i = 1$, we use the convention that $U_0 = X$. Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} F(h + \chi_U) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varsigma(U_i \cup (U_{i-1} \cap U)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\varsigma(U_i) + \varsigma(U_{i-1} \cap U) - \varsigma(U_i \cap U)) \\ &\quad \text{by modularity; note that } U_i \cap U_{i-1} \cap U \text{ simplifies to } U_i \cap U \\ &= F(h) + \varsigma(U), \end{aligned}$$

by canceling the telescoping terms $\varsigma(U_{i-1} \cap U)$ and $\varsigma(U_i \cap U)$, so that only $\varsigma(U_0 \cap U) = \varsigma(U)$ remains.

For every $h' \in M^+$, written as $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \chi_{V_j}$ where $V_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq V_n \supseteq \cdots$ form an antitone sequence of elements of \mathcal{L} , with $V_n = \emptyset$ for n large enough, we obtain that $F(h + h') = F(h) + F(h')$ by induction on the number of non-empty sets V_n .

We can therefore extend F to an additive map from M to \mathbb{Z} , where M is the collection of differences $f - g$ of two elements of M^+ , by $F(f - g) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(f) - F(g)$. This is unambiguous: if $f - g = f' - g'$, then $f + g' = f' + g$, so $F(f) + F(g') = F(f') + F(g)$, or equivalently $F(f) - F(g) = F(f') - F(g')$.

Let us define $\varsigma^+(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\chi_C)$ for every subset C of X such that $\chi_C \in M$. Amongst those, we find the crescents $U \setminus V$ (with $U, V \in \mathcal{L}$ and $V \subseteq U$), since $\chi_{U \setminus V} = \chi_U - \chi_V$. We also find the finite disjoint unions of crescents

C_1, \dots, C_n , since their characteristic map is $\sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{C_i}$. Now ς^+ is strict since $F(0) = 0$, and modular on $(X, \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}))$. The latter rests on the fact that for any sets C and C' , $\chi_{C \cup C'} + \chi_{C \cap C'} = \chi_C + \chi_{C'}$: then $\varsigma(C \cup C') + \varsigma(C \cap C') = F(\chi_{C \cup C'} + \chi_{C \cap C'})$ (since F is additive) $= F(\chi_C + \chi_{C'}) = \varsigma(C) + \varsigma(C')$ (since F is additive, once again). \square

4.5. The Hahn decomposition property.

Definition 18 (Hahn decomposition property). *Let (X, \mathcal{L}) be a Pervin space. A signed valuation $\varsigma: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has the Hahn decomposition property if and only if there is an element U of \mathcal{L} such that:*

- for every crescent C included in U , $\varsigma(C) \geq 0$;
- for every crescent C disjoint from U , $\varsigma(C) \leq 0$.

In this definition, we extend ς implicitly to a valuation on $(X, \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}))$, using Proposition 17, in order to make sense of $\varsigma(C)$. We will call the set U given above a *witness* to the Hahn decomposition property.

Proposition 19. *Let μ and ν be two bounded valuations on a Pervin space (X, \mathcal{L}) . If $\nu = g \cdot \mu$ for some $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$, then for every $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the signed valuation $\nu - r \cdot \mu$ has the Hahn decomposition property—and one can take $U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g^{-1}(]r, \infty])$ as a witness to the latter.*

Proof. We take $U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g^{-1}(]r, \infty])$. For every crescent $C \subseteq U$, $C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty]) = C$ for every $t \in [0, r]$, since $g^{-1}(]t, \infty])$ contains U in that case. Hence:


$$\begin{aligned} \nu(C) &= \int_0^\infty \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt && \text{by Corollary 16} \\ &= \int_0^r \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt + \int_r^\infty \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt \\ &\geq \int_0^r \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt = \int_0^r \mu(C) dt = r \cdot \mu(C). \end{aligned}$$

For every crescent C disjoint from U , $C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])$ is empty for every $t \geq r$, since $g^{-1}(]t, \infty])$ is included in U in that case. Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(C) &= \int_0^\infty \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt \\ &= \int_0^r \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt \leq \int_0^r \mu(C) dt = r \cdot \mu(C). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Given any valuation ν on a Pervin space (X, \mathcal{L}) , and any $U_0 \in \mathcal{L}$, we can define a valuation $\nu|_{U_0}$ by letting $\nu|_{U_0}(U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \nu(U \cap U_0)$ for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$; then $\nu|_{U_0}$ is an ω -continuous (resp., continuous) valuation if ν is. We also note

FIGURE 1. Bounding $(g \cdot \mu)(C)$ from above

that $\nu|_{U_0}$ is a bounded valuation if and only if $\nu(U_0) < \infty$. We use this in the proof of the following corollary, and we will use the notion again later.

Corollary 20. *Let μ and ν be two valuations on a Pervin space (X, \mathcal{L}) . If $\nu = g \cdot \mu$ for some $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$, then for every $U_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\nu(U_0) < \infty$ and $\mu(U_0) < \infty$, for every $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the signed valuation $\nu|_{U_0} - r \cdot \mu|_{U_0}$ has the Hahn decomposition property.*

Proof. If $\nu(U_0) < \infty$ and $\mu(U_0) < \infty$, then $\nu|_{U_0} = g \cdot \mu|_{U_0}$, since for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$, $\nu|_{U_0}(U) = \nu(U \cap U_0) = \int_0^\infty \mu(U \cap U_0 \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty]) dt$ (by Lemma 10) $= \int_0^\infty \mu|_{U_0}(U \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty]) dt = (g \cdot \mu|_{U_0})(U)$. We conclude by using Proposition 19. \square

5. THE EXISTENCE OF DENSITY MAPS

We now show that absolute continuity and the Hahn decomposition property suffice to guarantee the existence of a density function. The following are the two key lemmata. We write \mathbb{Q}_2 for the set of dyadic numbers, namely rational numbers of the form $p/2^n$ with $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We also use the Smiley-Horn-Tarski theorem in order to make sense of $\nu(C)$ below, and the canonical extension given in Lemma 15 in order to make sense of $(g \cdot \mu)(C)$.

Lemma 21. *Let (X, \mathcal{L}) be a Pervin space, $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$, and ν, μ be two bounded valuations on (X, \mathcal{L}) . Let us assume that for every non-negative dyadic number $r \in \mathbb{Q}_2 \cap \mathbb{R}_+$, for every crescent $C \subseteq g^{-1}(]r, \infty])$, $\nu(C) \geq r \cdot \mu(C)$. Then for every $C \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, $\nu(C) \geq (g \cdot \mu)(C)$. In particular, $\nu \geq g \cdot \mu$ on (X, \mathcal{L}) .*

Proof. It suffices to show the claim for every crescent C . Once this is done, the claim that $\nu(C) \geq (g \cdot \mu)(C)$ for every $C \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ follows from the fact that C is a disjoint union of crescents, and that ν and $g \cdot \mu$ are additive.

We fix a crescent C . By definition of canonical extensions (Lemma 15), $(g \cdot \mu)(C) = \int_0^\infty \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt$.

The main ingredient of the proof is summarized in Figure 1: the sum of the areas of the vertical bands on the left is equal to the sum of the areas of the horizontal bands on the right. We will rely on that figure in what follows.

Let $f(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty]))$, and $f_N(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(t)$ if $t \leq N$, 0 otherwise. In the figure, f is shown as the solid decreasing curve, both on the left-hand side and on the right-hand side. Since f is the pointwise supremum of $(f_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(g \cdot \mu)(C) = \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^\infty f_N(t) dt$ by Fact 1.

We fix an arbitrary $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $r < (g \cdot \mu)(C)$. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, $r \leq \int_0^\infty f_N(t) dt = \int_0^N \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt \leq \sum_{k=1}^{N2^N} \frac{1}{2^N} \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(](k-1)/2^N, \infty]))$. The latter is the sum of the areas of the vertical bands on the left of Figure 1.

Reorganizing the summation, that is also equal to the sum of the areas of the horizontal bands on the right, so:

$$r \leq \sum_{k=1}^{N2^N} \frac{k}{2^N} \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(](k-1)/2^N, \infty])) \setminus g^{-1}(]k/2^N, \infty])) \\ + N \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]N, \infty])).$$


The final term in the sum is the area of the bottommost band. The sum of the terms with $1 \leq k \leq N$ is bounded from above by $\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{k}{2^N} \mu(C) \leq \frac{N(N+1)}{2^{N+1}} \mu(C)$. For every k between $N+1$ and $N2^N$, the crescent $C' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C \cap g^{-1}(](k-1)/2^N, \infty])) \setminus g^{-1}(]k/2^N, \infty]))$ is included in $g^{-1}(](k-1)/2^N, \infty]))$, so $\nu(C') \geq (k-1)/2^N \mu(C')$ by assumption. Similarly, $\nu(C \cap g^{-1}(]N, \infty])) \geq N \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]N, \infty]))$.

It follows that:

$$r \leq \frac{N(N+1)}{2^{N+1}} \mu(C) + \sum_{k=N+1}^{N2^N} \frac{k}{k-1} \nu(C \cap g^{-1}(](k-1)/2^N, \infty])) \setminus g^{-1}(]k/2^N, \infty])) \\ + \nu(C \cap g^{-1}(]N, \infty])).$$

In the middle sum, $k/(k-1)$ is smaller than or equal to $(N+1)/N$. We also have $\nu(C \cap g^{-1}(]N, \infty])) \leq \frac{N+1}{N} \nu(C \cap g^{-1}(]N, \infty]))$, because $\frac{N+1}{N} \geq 1$. Hence:

$$r \leq \frac{N(N+1)}{2^{N+1}} \mu(C) + \frac{N+1}{N} \sum_{k=N+1}^{N2^N} \nu(C \cap g^{-1}(](k-1)/2^N, \infty])) \setminus g^{-1}(]k/2^N, \infty])) \\ + \frac{N+1}{N} \nu(C \cap g^{-1}(]N, \infty]))$$

FIGURE 2. Bounding $(g \cdot \mu)(C)$ from below

By the additivity of ν , the right-hand side is equal to $\frac{N(N+1)}{2^{N+1}}\mu(C) + \frac{N+1}{N}\nu(C \cap g^{-1}(]N/2^N, \infty]))$. Since $C \cap g^{-1}(]N/2^N, \infty])$ is included in C , and ν is monotonic, $r \leq \frac{N(N+1)}{2^{N+1}}\mu(C) + \frac{N+1}{N}\nu(C)$. We let N tend to ∞ , and we obtain that $r \leq \nu(C)$. Taking suprema over all $r < (g \cdot \mu)(C)$, $(g \cdot \mu)(C) \leq \nu(C)$. \square

We have a somewhat symmetric situation in the following lemma, except that we cannot conclude that $(g \cdot \mu)(C) \geq \nu(C)$ without further assumptions. Once again, we use the canonical extension of $g \cdot \mu$ to make sense of $(g \cdot \mu)(C)$.

Lemma 22. *Let (X, \mathcal{L}) be a Pervin space, $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$, and ν, μ be two bounded valuations on (X, \mathcal{L}) . Let us assume that for every non-negative dyadic number $r \in \mathbb{Q}_2 \cap \mathbb{R}_+$, for every crescent C disjoint from $g^{-1}(]r, \infty])$, $\nu(C) \leq r \cdot \mu(C)$. Then there is an directed countable family $(U_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of \mathcal{L} with the following properties:*

- (i) $\nu(X \setminus \bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^{\uparrow} U_N) = 0$;
- (ii) for every $C \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $(g \cdot \mu)(C) \geq \frac{N}{N+1}\nu(C \cap U_N) + N(\mu(C \cap U_N) - \frac{1}{N+1}\nu(C \cap U_N))$;

Proof. By definition of canonical extensions (Lemma 15), $(g \cdot \mu)(C) = \int_0^\infty \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]t, \infty])) dt \geq \sum_{k=1}^{N2^N-1} \frac{1}{2^N} \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]k/2^N, \infty])) dt$. The latter is the area of the vertical bands on the left of Figure 2, which rewrites as the area of the horizontal bands on the right, namely:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N2^N-1} \frac{k}{2^N} \mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]k/2^N, \infty]) \setminus g^{-1}(]k/2^N, \infty]) + N\mu(C \cap g^{-1}(]N, \infty])).$$

The last term is the area of the bottommost band.

For each k , the crescent $C' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C \cap g^{-1}(]k/2^N, \infty]) \setminus g^{-1}(]k/2^N, \infty])$ is disjoint from $g^{-1}(]k/2^N, \infty])$, so by assumption, $\nu(C') \leq \frac{k+1}{2^N} \cdot \mu(C')$.

Therefore:

$$(g \cdot \mu)(C) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{N2^{N-1}} \frac{k}{k+1} \nu(C \cap g^{-1}([k/2^N, \infty]) \setminus g^{-1}([(k+1)/2^N, \infty])) \\ + N\mu(C \cap g^{-1}([N, \infty])).$$

Keeping only the terms from the summation with $k \geq N$ and observing that $\frac{k}{k+1} \geq \frac{N}{N+1}$ for all such k ,

$$(g \cdot \mu)(C) \geq \sum_{k=N}^{N2^{N-1}} \frac{N}{N+1} \nu(C \cap g^{-1}([k/2^N, \infty]) \setminus g^{-1}([(k+1)/2^N, \infty])) \\ + N\mu(C \cap g^{-1}([N, \infty])) \\ = \frac{N}{N+1} \nu(C \cap g^{-1}([N/2^N, \infty]) \setminus g^{-1}([N, \infty])) \\ + N\mu(C \cap g^{-1}([N, \infty])) \\ = \frac{N}{N+1} \nu(C \cap g^{-1}([N/2^N, \infty])) \\ + N \left(\mu(C \cap g^{-1}([N, \infty])) - \frac{1}{N+1} \nu(C \cap g^{-1}([N, \infty])) \right).$$

Let $U_N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g^{-1}([N/2^N, \infty])$ for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$: we have just proved (ii). The family $(U_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ is directed: given any $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N/2^N \leq i/2^i, j/2^j$ because $N/2^N$ tends to 0 as N tends to ∞ ; and then U_N contains both U_i and U_j .

Finally, $\bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow U_N = g^{-1}([0, \infty])$. Let C be the crescent $X \setminus \bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow U_N$. This is disjoint from $g^{-1}([r, \infty])$ for every $r \in \mathbb{Q}_2 \cap \mathbb{R}_+$, so $\nu(C) \leq r \cdot \mu(C)$ for every $r \in \mathbb{Q}_2 \cap \mathbb{R}_+$ by assumption. As a consequence, $\nu(C) = 0$, and this is (i). \square

The role of absolute continuity is as follows.

Lemma 23. *Let (X, \mathcal{L}) be a Pervin space, and ν and μ be two bounded valuations on (X, \mathcal{L}) . Let $(U_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a countable family of elements of \mathcal{L} . If ν is absolutely continuous with respect to μ , then for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is an $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $N \geq N_0$, $N(\mu(U \cap U_N) - \frac{1}{N+1} \nu(U \cap U_N)) \geq -\epsilon$.*

Proof. Let us fix an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$. Using Remark 8, since ν and μ are bounded, we can find $\eta > 0$ such that for every $V \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\mu(V) < \eta$, $\nu(V) < \epsilon$. Since ν is bounded once again, there is an $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N_0\eta \geq \nu(X)$. For every $N \geq N_0$, either $\mu(U \cap U_N) < \eta$, in which case $\nu(U \cap U_N) - \epsilon < 0 \leq N\mu(U \cap U_N)$, or $\mu(U \cap U_N) \geq \eta$, in which case $N\mu(U \cap U_N) \geq N_0\eta \geq \nu(X) \geq \nu(U \cap U_N) - \epsilon$. Whatever the alternative,

we have $N\mu(U \cap U_N) - \nu(U \cap U_N) \geq -\epsilon$, and therefore $N(\mu(U \cap U_N) - \frac{1}{N+1}\nu(U \cap U_N)) \geq -\epsilon$, for every $N \geq N_0$. \square

The following is the only place in this section where we need our valuations to be ω -continuous.

Lemma 24. *Let ν be an ω -continuous bounded valuation on an ω -topological space (X, \mathcal{L}) , and let $(U_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a countable directed family of elements of \mathcal{L} such that $\nu(X \setminus \bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow U_N) = 0$. For every $C \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, $\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow \frac{N}{N+1}\nu(C \cap U_N) \geq \nu(C)$.*

Proof. Let $U_\infty \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow U_N$. For every $C \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, the family $(\nu(C \cap U_N))_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ is directed. This is because $(U_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ is directed and $U \in \mathcal{L} \mapsto \nu(C \cap U)$ is monotonic. Indeed, if $U \subseteq V$, then $\nu(C \cap V) = \nu(C \cap U) + \nu(C \cap (V \setminus U)) \geq \nu(C \cap U)$.

We claim that $\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow \nu(C \cap U_N) \geq \nu(C \cap U_\infty)$ for every $C \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$. (The equality follows by monotonicity of $U \mapsto \nu(C \cap U)$.) By additivity of ν , and since $+$ is Scott-continuous, it is enough to show this when C is a crescent, say $U' \setminus V'$, where $U', V' \in \mathcal{L}$ and $V' \subseteq U'$. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\nu(U' \cap U_N) \geq \nu(U' \cap U_\infty) - \epsilon$, since ν is ω -continuous. Since ν is monotonic, $\nu(V' \cap U_N) \leq \nu(V' \cap U_\infty)$, and therefore $\nu(C \cap U_N) = \nu(U' \cap U_N) - \nu(V' \cap U_N) \geq \nu(U' \cap U_\infty) - \nu(V' \cap U_\infty) - \epsilon = \nu(C \cap U_\infty) - \epsilon$.

Now, since $\nu(X \setminus U_\infty) = 0$, we have $\nu(C \cap U_\infty) = \nu(C)$. (Formally, $\nu(C \setminus U_\infty) \leq \nu(X \setminus U_\infty) = 0$, and then $\nu(C) = \nu(C \cap U_\infty) + \nu(C \setminus U_\infty) = \nu(C \cap U_\infty)$.) Therefore $\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow \nu(C \cap U_N) \geq \nu(C)$. Since multiplication is Scott-continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ and $\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow \frac{N}{N+1} = 1$, we conclude. \square

Corollary 25. *Let μ and ν be two bounded ω -continuous valuations on an ω -topological space (X, \mathcal{L}) . If ν is absolutely continuous with respect to μ and if for every non-negative dyadic number $r \in \mathbb{Q}_2 \cap \mathbb{R}_+$, for every crescent C disjoint from $g^{-1}(]r, \infty])$, $\nu(C) \leq r \cdot \mu(C)$, then $g \cdot \mu \geq \nu$ on (X, \mathcal{L}) .*

Proof. Let U_N be as in Lemma 22. For every $U \in \mathcal{L}$, for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $(g \cdot \mu)(U)$ is larger than or equal to the sum of $\frac{N}{N+1}\nu(U \cap U_N)$ and of $N(\mu(U \cap U_N) - \frac{1}{N+1}\nu(U \cap U_N))$. For every $\epsilon > 0$, the latter is larger than or equal to $-\epsilon$ for N large enough by Lemma 23, and the former is larger than or equal to $\nu(U) - \epsilon$ for N large enough by Lemma 24. Hence $(g \cdot \mu)(U) \geq \nu(U) - \epsilon$. We conclude since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary. \square

We now go beyond bounded valuations, and on to σ -finite valuations.

Lemma 26. *Let μ and ν be two ω -continuous valuations on an ω -topological space (X, \mathcal{L}) . If both ν and μ are σ -finite, there is a monotone sequence*

$(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of \mathcal{L} such that $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow E_n = X$ and $\nu(E_n), \mu(E_n) < \infty$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a monotone sequence of elements of \mathcal{L} such that $\nu(F_n) < \infty$ and $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow F_n = X$, and let $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ play the same rôle with μ . Then let $E_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F_n \cap G_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

We will call any monotone sequence $(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 26 a *witness* of the joint σ -finiteness of ν and μ .

Theorem 27 (Existence of density maps). *Let (X, \mathcal{L}) be an ω -topological space, and μ and ν be two σ -finite ω -continuous valuations on (X, \mathcal{L}) . Let (E_n) be any witness of joint σ -finiteness of ν and μ . Then the following properties are equivalent:*

- (1) *there is a density function $g \in \mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$ such that $\nu = g \cdot \mu$;*
- (2) *the following two conditions are met:*
 - (2a) *ν is absolutely continuous with respect to μ ;*
 - (2b) *for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for every $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\nu|_{E_n} - r \cdot \mu|_{E_n}$ has the Hahn decomposition property.*

Proof. The implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) is by Proposition 11 and Corollary 20.

In the converse direction, let $(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be as given in Lemma 26. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for each non-negative rational number q , $\nu|_{E_n} - q \cdot \mu|_{E_n}$ has the Hahn decomposition property, so there is an element $U_{nq} \in \mathcal{L}$ such that every crescent C included in U_{nq} satisfies $\nu(C \cap E_n) \geq q \cdot \mu(C \cap E_n)$ and every crescent C disjoint from U_{nq} satisfies $\nu(C \cap E_n) \leq q \cdot \mu(C \cap E_n)$.

Since \mathcal{L} is an ω -topology, $V_q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{\substack{q' \in \mathbb{Q}, q' \geq q \\ n \in \mathbb{N}}} (E_n \cap U_{nq'})$ is in \mathcal{L} for every $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, $q \geq 0$. Moreover, $(V_q)_{q \in \mathbb{Q}, q \geq 0}$ forms an antitonic chain: if $q \leq q'$ then $V_q \supseteq V_{q'}$.

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, $q \geq 0$, we claim that for every crescent $C \subseteq V_q$, $\nu(C \cap E_n) \geq q \cdot \mu(C \cap E_n)$, and that every crescent C disjoint from V_q satisfies $\nu(C \cap E_n) \leq q \cdot \mu(C \cap E_n)$. The second property is clear: if C is disjoint from V_q , then it is disjoint from $E_n \cap U_{nq}$, so $C \cap E_n$ is a crescent disjoint from U_{nq} , whence $\nu((C \cap E_n) \cap E_n) \leq q \cdot \mu((C \cap E_n) \cap E_n)$. For the first property, where $C \subseteq V_q$, let us write C as $U \setminus V$ where $U, V \in \mathcal{L}$. We enumerate the rational numbers larger than or equal to q as $(q_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$. Since $C \subseteq V_q$, $\nu(C \cap E_n) = \nu(C \cap E_n \cap V_q)$. Now $E_n \cap V_q = \bigcup_{p, p' \geq n}^\uparrow W_{pp'}$, where $W_{pp'} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq p \\ 0 \leq k \leq p'}} (E_j \cap E_n \cap U_{jq_k})$. Therefore $\nu(C \cap E_n) = \nu(C \cap E_n \cap V_q) = \nu(U \cap E_n \cap V_q \setminus V) = \nu((U \cap E_n \cap V_q) \cup V) - \nu(V) = \sup_{p, p' \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow \nu((U \cap W_{pp'}) \setminus V) - \nu(V) = \sup_{p, p' \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow \nu(C \cap W_{pp'})$. Similarly, $\mu(C \cap E_n) = \sup_{p, p' \in \mathbb{N}}^\uparrow \mu(C \cap W_{pp'})$. We can

write $W_{pp'}$ as the finite disjoint union of crescents C_{jk} with $0 \leq j \leq p$ and $0 \leq k \leq p'$, where $C_{jk} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (E_j \cap E_n \cap U_{jq_k}) \setminus \bigcup_{\substack{0 \leq j' \leq j \\ 0 \leq k' \leq k \\ (j', k') \neq (j, k)}} (E_{j'} \cap E_n \cap U_{j'q_{k'}})$. Then $C_{jk} \subseteq U_{jq_k}$, hence also $C \cap C_{jk} \subseteq U_{jq_k}$, so $\nu(C \cap C_{jk} \cap E_j) \geq q_k \cdot \mu(C \cap C_{jk} \cap E_j)$. Since $C_{jk} \subseteq E_j$, this simplifies to $\nu(C \cap C_{jk}) \geq q_k \cdot \mu(C \cap C_{jk})$. Then $\nu(C \cap W_{pp'}) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq p \\ 0 \leq k \leq p'}} \nu(C \cap C_{jk}) \geq \sum_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq p \\ 0 \leq k \leq p'}} q_k \cdot \mu(C \cap C_{jk})$. Since $q_k \geq q$ for every k , this is larger than or equal to $q \cdot \sum_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq p \\ 0 \leq k \leq p'}} \mu(C \cap C_{jk}) = q \cdot \mu(C \cap W_{pp'})$. Taking suprema over $p, p' \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain that $\nu(C \cap E_n) \geq q \cdot \mu(C \cap E_n)$, as desired.

We define $g(x)$ as $\sup\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid \exists q \in \mathbb{Q}, q > t \text{ and } x \in V_q\}$. Then $g(x) > t$ if and only if $x \in V_q$ for some $q \in \mathbb{Q}, q > t$. Hence $g^{-1}([t, \infty]) = \bigcup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}, q > t} V_q$, which is in \mathcal{L} since \mathcal{L} is an ω -topology. Therefore g is in $\mathfrak{L}(X, \mathcal{L})$.

Let us fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For every non-negative dyadic number $r \in \mathbb{Q}_2 \cap \mathbb{R}_+$, $g^{-1}([r, \infty]) = \bigcup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}, q > r} V_q \subseteq V_r$, so for every crescent $C \subseteq g^{-1}([r, \infty])$, $\nu(C \cap E_n) \geq r \cdot \mu(C \cap E_n)$. By Lemma 21, $\nu|_{E_n} \geq g \cdot \mu|_{E_n}$. For every crescent C disjoint from $g^{-1}([r, \infty])$, C is disjoint from every V_q with $q > r$, so $\nu(C \cap E_n) \leq q \cdot \mu(C \cap E_n)$ for every rational $q > r$; therefore $\nu|_{E_n}(C) \leq r \cdot \mu|_{E_n}(C)$, and by Corollary 25, $g \cdot \mu|_{E_n} \geq \nu|_{E_n}$.

It follows that $\nu|_{E_n} = g \cdot \mu|_{E_n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, using the fact that $X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}^{\uparrow} E_n$ and the ω -continuity of ν , for every $U \in \mathcal{L}$, $\nu(U) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}^{\uparrow} \nu|_{E_n}(U) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}^{\uparrow} (g \cdot \mu|_{E_n})(U) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}^{\uparrow} \int_0^{\infty} \mu(U \cap E_n \cap g^{-1}([t, \infty])) dt$ (by Lemma 10), and this is equal to $\int_0^{\infty} \mu(E \cap g^{-1}([t, \infty])) dt$ by Fact 1 and the ω -continuity of μ , namely to $(g \cdot \mu)(U)$. Therefore $\nu = g \cdot \mu$. \square

Remark 28. *In the special case where \mathcal{L} is not only an ω -topology, but is also closed under complements, namely when \mathcal{L} is a σ -algebra, we have seen that ω -continuous valuations and measures are the same thing. Then, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\nu|_{E_n} - r \cdot \mu|_{E_n}$ is a signed measure. The Hahn decomposition theorem [3, Theorem 32.1] states that every signed measure has the Hahn decomposition property, and therefore property (2b) is simply true in the case of measures. Hence Theorem 27 implies the classical Radon-Nikodým theorem.*

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Adamski. τ -smooth Borel measures on topological spaces. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 78:97–107, 1977.
- [2] M. Alvarez-Manilla, A. Edalat, and N. Saheb-Djahromi. An extension result for continuous valuations. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 61:629–640, 2000.
- [3] P. Billingsley. *Probability and Measure*. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics. John Wiley and Sons, 3rd edition, 1995.

- [4] S. Bochner. Additive set functions on groups. *Annals of Mathematics*, 40:769–799, 1939.
- [5] G. Choquet. Theory of capacities. *Annales de l'Institut Fourier*, 5:131–295, 1953–54.
- [6] M. de Brecht. Quasi-Polish spaces. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 164(3):356–381, 2013.
- [7] M. de Brecht, J. Goubault-Larrecq, X. Jia, and Z. Lyu. Domain-complete and LCS-complete spaces. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 345:3–35, 2019. Proc. 8th International Symposium on Domain Theory (ISDT'19).
- [8] G. Gierz, K. H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J. D. Lawson, M. Mislove, and D. S. Scott. *Continuous Lattices and Domains*, volume 93 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [9] J. Goubault-Larrecq. *Non-Hausdorff Topology and Domain Theory—Selected Topics in Point-Set Topology*, volume 22 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [10] A. Horn and A. Tarski. Measures in boolean algebras. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 64, 1948.
- [11] C. Jones. *Probabilistic Non-Determinism*. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1990. Technical Report ECS-LFCS-90-105.
- [12] C. Jones and G. Plotkin. A probabilistic powerdomain of evaluations. In *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 186–195. IEEE Computer Society Press, 1989.
- [13] K. Keimel and J. Lawson. Measure extension theorems for T_0 -spaces. *Topology and its Applications*, 149(1–3):57–83, 2005.
- [14] D. A. Klain and G.-C. Rota. *Introduction to Geometric Probability*. Lezioni Lincee. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [15] J. D. Lawson. Valuations on continuous lattices. In R.-E. Hoffmann, editor, *Mathematische Arbeitspapiere*, volume 27, pages 204–225, Universität Bremen, 1982.
- [16] O. M. Nikodým. Sur une généralisation des intégrales de M. J. Radon. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 15, 1930.
- [17] B. J. Pettis. On the extension of measures. *Annals of Mathematics*, 54(1):186–197, 1951.
- [18] J.-É. Pin. Dual space of a lattice as the completion of a perrin space. In P. Höfner, D. Pous, and G. Struth, editors, *Relational and Algebraic Methods in Computer Science*, pages 24–40, Cham, 2017. Springer International Publishing.
- [19] J. Radon. Theorie und Anwendungen der absolut additiven Mengenfunktionen. *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Classe, Wien, Kl. IIa*, 122:1295–1438, 1913.
- [20] N. Saheb-Djahromi. Cpo's of measures for nondeterminism. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 12:19–37, 1980.
- [21] M. F. Smiley. An extension of metric distributive lattices with an application to general analysis. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 56(3):435–447, 1944.
- [22] R. Tix. *Stetige Bewertungen auf topologischen Räumen*. Diplomarbeit, TH Darmstadt, June 1995.