

LOCALLY SOLID CONVERGENCE STRUCTURES

E. BILOKOPYTOV, J. CONRADIE, V.G. TROITSKY,
AND J.H. VAN DER WALT

ABSTRACT. While there is a well developed theory of locally solid topologies, many important convergences in vector lattice theory are not topological. Yet they share many properties with locally solid topologies. Building upon the theory of convergence structures, we develop a theory of locally solid convergences, which generalize locally solid topologies but also includes many important non-topological convergences on a vector lattice. We consider some natural modifications of such structures: unbounded, bounded, and Choquet. We also study some specific convergences in vector lattices from the perspective of locally solid convergence structures.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	3
3. Locally solid convergence structures	8
4. Unbounded modification	15
5. Relative uniform convergence	21
6. Bounded sets in convergence vector spaces	28
7. Bornological convergences	31
8. Bounded modification	37
9. Choquet modification	49
10. Weakest and minimal locally solid convergence structures	56

Date: April 25, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 46A40. Secondary: 46A19, 54A20.

Key words and phrases. vector lattice, convergence structure, bornology, order convergence, unbounded convergence, relative uniform convergence, Choquet convergence.

11. Adherence of an ideal	64
References	67

1. INTRODUCTION

In a topological space X , there is a natural way to define convergence, for both nets and filters. A net (x_α) converges to a point $x \in X$ if every neighborhood of x contains a tail of the net. A filter in the power set $\mathcal{P}(X)$ converges to x if it contains all neighborhoods of x .

There are, however, many examples of convergences occurring in analysis that are not derived from a topology in this way. For this reason, the concept of convergence has been extended beyond topological spaces, leading to so called *convergence structures* on sets and hence to *convergence spaces*. This theory can be formulated in the language of filters, as in [BB02], or “translated” into the language of nets, as was done in [BTW23].

Many useful convergences occur in the context of vector lattices. There is a well-developed theory of topologies compatible with the vector lattice structure, and of these the locally solid topologies are the most important (see, for example, [AB03]). There are examples of important non-topological convergences in vector lattices that share many properties with those of topological locally solid convergences. This motivates the generalization of the notion of a locally solid topology to that of a locally solid convergence. This was first explored in [vdW13] in the context of filter convergence structures. In this paper we continue the investigation of locally solid convergences, mostly, but not exclusively using net convergence.

We give a brief overview of the paper. Net and filter convergence structures are introduced and their relationship clarified in Section 2, which also contains results on adherences and uniform continuity. Basic properties of locally solid convergences are discussed in Section 3. A thread that runs through the paper is that of a modification of a given convergence. We look at a number of such modifications: the

unbounded modification (Section 4), the Mackey modification (Section 7), the bounded modification, also known as specified sets convergence (Section 8), the Choquet modification (Section 9) and, in various places throughout the paper, the topological modification.

A further concept that plays an important role in some of the convergences we discuss is that of a linear bornology; one can think of this as a generalization of the collection of bounded sets in a topological vector space. Bounded sets in convergence vector spaces are defined and characterized in Section 6. In Section 7, we investigate convergences induced by linear bornologies.

Two specific convergence structures are discussed in more detail: relative uniform convergence in Section 5 and finite-dimensional convergence in Section 7. We investigate properties of relative uniform convergence, and study its relationship to uniform convergence on compact sets in certain spaces of continuous functions. Finite-dimensional convergence can be defined on any vector space X ($x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{fd}} x$ if a tail of (x_α) is contained in a finite-dimensional subspace of X and converges to x there in the usual sense) and is the finest linear convergence on X . On vector lattices, the Archimedean property can be characterized in terms of it.

In Section 10, we consider minimal elements in the set of all Hausdorff locally solid convergences on a vector lattice and list a number of open problems. Finally, in Section 11, we show that an ideal J is a projection band if for some (equivalently, for all) complete locally solid convergence structure, the operation of taking the unbounded modification commutes with that of taking the restriction to J ; this answers a question from [KMT17].

2. PRELIMINARIES

Nets. Let X be a set. A net in X is a function $x: A \rightarrow X$, where A is a directed set; we denote this net by $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$, or simply by (x_α) . We use the convention of assuming that if the index set of a net is not explicitly given, it is the capital Greek letter corresponding to the lower case Greek letter used as subscript for the terms of the net. Thus, for

example, the index set for the net (x_β) is assumed to be B , and that for the net (x_γ) is Γ .

A tail set of the net (x_α) is a set of the form $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \geq \alpha_0\}$ for some $\alpha_0 \in A$. We say that a net (y_β) is a **quasi-subnet** of (x_α) if every tail set of (x_α) contains a tail set of (y_β) as a subset. Note that (x_α) and (y_β) may have different index sets. Two nets (x_α) and (y_β) are **tail equivalent** if each is a quasi-subnet of the other.

Convergence structures. We define a **net convergence structure** on a set X by specifying, for each $x \in X$, the nets (x_α) of elements of X which converge to x ; we denote this convergence by $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$. To qualify as a net convergence structure, the following natural axioms must be satisfied:

- (i) Constant nets converge: if $x_\alpha = x$ for every α then $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$;
- (ii) If a net converges to x then every quasi-subnet of it converges to x ;
- (iii) Suppose that $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ and $(y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ both converge to x . Let $(z_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ be a net in X such that $z_\alpha \in \{x_\alpha, y_\alpha\}$ for every α . Then $z_\alpha \rightarrow x$.

It is easy to see that tail equivalent nets have the same limits. When dealing with a pair of nets, we will often use the trick described in Remark 2.5 in [BTW23] to replace them with a pair of nets with the same index set, which are tail equivalent to the original nets.

A **filter convergence structure** on X is defined by specifying, for each $x \in X$, the filters \mathcal{F} in $\mathcal{P}(X)$ which converge to x ; we denote this convergence by $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow x$. To qualify as a filter convergence structure, the following axioms must be satisfied:

- (i) $[x] \rightarrow x$ for every $x \in X$, where $[x] = \{F \subseteq X : x \in F\}$ is the principal ultrafilter of x ;
- (ii) If $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow x$ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ then $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow x$;
- (iii) If $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow x$ and $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow x$ then $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G} \rightarrow x$.

Filters and nets in a set X are related in a natural way: for any net (x_α) its tail sets form a base of a filter, called the **tail filter** of (x_α) and denoted by $[x_\alpha]$, while every filter in $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is the tail filter of

some net. It was shown in [BTW23] that there is a one-to-one correspondence between filter convergence structures and net convergence structures. Namely, given a filter convergence structure, one may define a net convergence structure on the same space by requiring that a net (x_α) converges to x whenever its tail filter $[x_\alpha]$ converges to x . Conversely, given a net convergence structure, we define a filter convergence structure as follows: a filter \mathcal{F} converges to x if there is a net (x_α) such that $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$ and $\mathcal{F} = [x_\alpha]$. This allows us to just talk about **convergence structures**. We will use net and filter terminologies interchangeably. When dealing with more than one convergence structure on X at once, we will give names to them. For example, if we denote a convergence structure on X by λ then we write $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$ instead of just $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$, and we call the resulting pair (X, λ) a **convergence space**. We refer the reader to [BB02, BTW23] for unexplained notation and terminology.

Given two convergence structures λ and η on X , we say that λ is stronger than η (or η is weaker than λ) and write $\lambda \geq \eta$ if $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$ implies $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} x$ for every net (x_α) in X or, equivalently, $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$ implies $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\eta} x$ for every filter \mathcal{F} on X . For a filter base \mathcal{B} of subsets of X , we write $[\mathcal{B}]$ for the filter generated by \mathcal{B} . Recall that if $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a function and \mathcal{F} is a filter on X then we write $f(\mathcal{F})$ for the filter generated by $\{f(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$. For a net (x_α) in X we have $f([x_\alpha]) = [f(x_\alpha)]$. A function f between two convergence spaces is **continuous** if $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$ implies $f(x_\alpha) \rightarrow f(x)$ for every net (x_α) . Equivalently, if $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow x$ implies $f(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow f(x)$ for every filter \mathcal{F} . A convergence structure on a vector space is **linear** if the vector space operations are continuous; we call such a space a **convergence vector space**.

Closure and adherence. Recall that a set A in a convergence space (X, η) is **closed** if it contains the limit of each convergent net in it. For a set A , the **closure** of A is defined as the intersection of all the closed sets containing A , or, equivalently, the least closed set containing A . We denote the closure of A by \overline{A}^η or just by \overline{A} . By the **adherence** of A we mean the set of limits of all the nets in A . We write $\overline{A}^{1,\eta}$ or just \overline{A}^1 for the adherence of A . Note that we always have $A \subseteq \overline{A}^1 \subseteq \overline{A}$.

Further, we write \overline{A}^2 for the adherence of \overline{A}^1 , etc. In general, for an ordinal κ , we define $\overline{A}^{\kappa+1}$ as the adherence of \overline{A}^κ ; if κ is a limit ordinal then we define \overline{A}^κ as the union of \overline{A}^ι for all the ordinals ι that are less than κ .

Proposition 2.1. *Let A be a subset of X . Then there exists an ordinal number κ whose cardinality does not exceed that of X such that $\overline{A}^\kappa = \overline{A}$.*

Proof. Suppose not. Let α be the first ordinal number whose cardinality is greater than that of X . Then for every ordinal number $\kappa < \alpha$ we have $\overline{A}^\kappa \subsetneq \overline{A}^{\kappa+1}$. Pick any point in $\overline{A}^{\kappa+1} \setminus \overline{A}^\kappa$ and denote it by $f(\kappa)$. Then f is an injection from $[0, \alpha)$ into X , which is impossible because the cardinality of $[0, \alpha)$ is greater than that of X . \square

Uniform continuity. In order to translate the concept of uniform continuity of a function on a vector space into the language of nets, we first review the filter definition (cf. [BB02], Chapter 2). Let X be a convergence vector space. For $A \subseteq X$, we define $\Delta A \subseteq X^2$ by $\Delta A = \{(x, y) : x - y \in A\}$. For a filter \mathcal{F} on X , we define $\Delta\mathcal{F}$ to be the filter on X^2 generated by $\{\Delta A : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$. We define the **induced uniform convergence structure** \mathfrak{A} as the set of filters \mathcal{U} on X^2 such that $\mathcal{U} \supseteq \Delta\mathcal{F}$ for some filter \mathcal{F} on X with $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$. Let Y be another convergence vector space and \mathfrak{B} be the induced uniform convergence structure on Y^2 , defined in a similar way. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$. We define $f^{(2)}: X^2 \rightarrow Y^2$ by $f^{(2)}(x, y) = (f(x), f(y))$. As usual, for a filter \mathcal{U} on X^2 , we write $f^{(2)}(\mathcal{U})$ for $[f^{(2)}(H) : H \in \mathcal{U}]$. We say that f is **uniformly continuous** if $f^{(2)}(\mathcal{U}) \in \mathfrak{B}$ whenever $\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{A}$. As before, every filter \mathcal{U} on X^2 is the tail filter of some net in X^2 . That is, we can find two nets (x_α) and (y_α) in X , indexed by the same directed set, such that $\mathcal{U} = [(x_\alpha, y_\alpha)]$. It follows that $f^{(2)}(\mathcal{U}) = [(f(x_\alpha), f(y_\alpha))]$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let \mathcal{U} be a filter on X^2 with $\mathcal{U} = [(x_\alpha, y_\alpha)]$ as above. Then $\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{A}$ iff $x_\alpha - y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ in X .*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{A}$. Then $\mathcal{U} \supseteq \Delta\mathcal{F}$ for some filter \mathcal{F} on X with $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$. For every $A \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\Delta A \in \mathcal{U}$, hence ΔA contains a tail of $((x_\alpha, y_\alpha))$. We conclude that A contains a tail of $(x_\alpha - y_\alpha)$. This

yields $A \in [x_\alpha - y_\alpha]$ and, therefore, $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [x_\alpha - y_\alpha]$. It follows from $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$ that $[x_\alpha - y_\alpha] \rightarrow 0$ and then $x_\alpha - y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

Conversely, suppose that $x_\alpha - y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Fix α_0 . It follows from

$$\{(x_\alpha, y_\alpha) : \alpha \geq \alpha_0\} \subseteq \Delta\{x_\alpha - y_\alpha : \alpha \geq \alpha_0\}$$

that $\Delta\{x_\alpha - y_\alpha : \alpha \geq \alpha_0\} \in [(x_\alpha, y_\alpha)]$ and, therefore, $\Delta[x_\alpha - y_\alpha] \subseteq [(x_\alpha, y_\alpha)] = \mathcal{U}$. Now $[x_\alpha - y_\alpha] \rightarrow 0$ implies that $\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{A}$. \square

Proposition 2.3. *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a function between two convergence vector spaces. Then f is uniformly continuous iff for every two nets (x_α) and (y_α) in X with $x_\alpha - y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ we have $f(x_\alpha) - f(y_\alpha) \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that f is uniformly continuous, and $x_\alpha - y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Put $\mathcal{U} = [(x_\alpha, y_\alpha)]$. By the lemma, $\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{A}$. It follows that $[(f(x_\alpha), f(y_\alpha))] = f^{(2)}(\mathcal{U}) \in \mathfrak{B}$, and, by the lemma again, $f(x_\alpha) - f(y_\alpha) \rightarrow 0$.

To prove the converse, suppose that $\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{A}$. Represent \mathcal{U} as $\mathcal{U} = [(x_\alpha, y_\alpha)]$ as before. By the lemma, $x_\alpha - y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$. By the assumption, $f(x_\alpha) - f(y_\alpha) \rightarrow 0$. Applying the lemma again, we conclude that $f^{(2)}(\mathcal{U}) = [(f(x_\alpha), f(y_\alpha))] \in \mathfrak{B}$. \square

Remark 2.4. If f is uniformly continuous and $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ and $(y_\beta)_{\beta \in B}$ are two nets such that $x_\alpha - y_\beta \rightarrow 0$, where we consider $x_\alpha - y_\beta$ as a net indexed by $A \times B$, then $f(x_\alpha) - f(y_\beta) \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, define new nets indexed by $A \times B$ via $\tilde{x}_{\alpha,\beta} = x_\alpha$ and $\tilde{y}_{\alpha,\beta} = y_\beta$. Then $\tilde{x}_{\alpha,\beta} - \tilde{y}_{\alpha,\beta} \rightarrow 0$, hence, by the proposition, $f(\tilde{x}_{\alpha,\beta}) - f(\tilde{y}_{\alpha,\beta}) \rightarrow 0$, which just means $f(x_\alpha) - f(y_\beta) \rightarrow 0$.

However, this condition is not equivalent to uniform continuity. Indeed, in \mathbb{R} , $x_\alpha - y_\beta \rightarrow 0$ means that the two nets converge to the same limit, hence for every continuous $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have $f(x_\alpha) - f(y_\beta) \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 2.5. Let \mathcal{F} be a filter on X . Since $\Delta\mathcal{F}$ is a filter on X^2 , we can find two nets (x_α) and (y_α) in X such that $\Delta\mathcal{F} = [(x_\alpha, y_\alpha)]$. As in the proof of Lemma 2.2, one can prove that $\mathcal{F} = [x_\alpha - y_\alpha]$.

Vector lattices. For vector lattices (Riesz spaces) we will, unless otherwise indicated, use the notation and terminology of [AB03], to which we refer the reader for further information. Throughout the paper, all

vector lattices are assumed to be Archimedean unless specified otherwise.

3. LOCALLY SOLID CONVERGENCE STRUCTURES

Recall that a linear topology on a vector lattice X is said to be locally solid if it has a base of solid neighborhoods of zero. We will now extend the concept of local solidity to convergence spaces. For a filter \mathcal{F} on X , we write $\text{Sol}(\mathcal{F})$ for the filter generated by the solid hulls of the elements of \mathcal{F} . It is clear that $\text{Sol}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$.

Theorem 3.1. *For a linear convergence structure on a vector lattice X , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *If $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$ then there is a filter \mathcal{G} with a base of solid sets such that $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow 0$;*
- (ii) *If $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$ then $\text{Sol}(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow 0$;*
- (iii) *If $y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $|x_\alpha| \leq |y_\alpha|$ for every α then $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$;*
- (iv) *If $y_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and for every γ_0 there exists α_0 such that for every $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ there exists $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$ with $|x_\alpha| \leq |y_\gamma|$, then $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$.*

We call a convergence structure that satisfies any, hence all, of the condition in the theorem **locally solid**. By a **locally solid convergence space** we will mean a vector lattice equipped with a locally solid convergence structure. In the rest of the paper, we will mostly use (iii) (cf. Definition 2.1 in [AEG21]). Condition (i) was first used in [vdW13]. While in (iii), the two nets have the same index sets, we no longer assume this in (iv).

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Let $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$. Find a filter $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with a basis consisting of solid sets so that $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow 0$. Then $\mathcal{G} = \text{Sol}(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \text{Sol}(\mathcal{F})$, so that $\text{Sol}(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow 0$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iv) It follows from $y_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ that $[y_\gamma] \rightarrow 0$. By (ii), we have $\text{Sol}[y_\gamma] \rightarrow 0$. It can be easily verified that $[x_\alpha] \supseteq \text{Sol}[y_\gamma]$. We conclude that $[x_\alpha] \rightarrow 0$ and, therefore, $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

(iv) \Rightarrow (iii) is trivial.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Let $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$. Find a net $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ such that $\mathcal{F} = [x_\alpha]$. Let $\Gamma = \{(\alpha, z) : \alpha \in A, |z| \leq |x_\alpha|\}$. We pre-order Γ by the first component,

making it into a directed set. Given $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with $\gamma = (\alpha, z)$, we put $u_\gamma = x_\alpha$ and $v_\gamma = z$. Then $|v_\gamma| \leq |u_\gamma|$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. It follows from $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $[u_\gamma] = [x_\alpha]$ that $u_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and, therefore, $v_\gamma \rightarrow 0$. It is also easy to see that tails of (v_γ) are solid sets. Let $\mathcal{G} = [v_\gamma]$. Then $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow 0$ and \mathcal{G} has a base of solid sets. Let $U \in \mathcal{G}$. Then U contains a tail $\{v_\gamma\}_{\gamma \geq \gamma_0}$, which, in turn, contains $\{u_\gamma\}_{\gamma \geq \gamma_0}$. The latter agrees with a tail of (x_α) . It follows that $U \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence, $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. \square

We mention a few important examples. Clearly, a linear topology on a vector lattice X is locally solid iff the corresponding convergence structure is locally solid. In particular, norm convergence and absolute weak (aw) convergence (see Definition 2.32 in [AB03]) on a Banach lattice are locally solid.

One of the most important examples of a locally solid convergence is **order convergence**: a net $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ in a vector lattice X **converges in order** to x (written $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{o} x$) if there exists a net $(u_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ such that $u_\gamma \downarrow 0$ and for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ there exists $\alpha_0 \in A$ such that $|x_\alpha - x| \leq u_\gamma$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. In the language of filters, $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{o} x$ if \mathcal{F} contains a collection of order intervals whose intersection is $\{x\}$. Order convergence as a convergence structure was investigated in [BTW23].

Other examples of locally solid convergences include relative uniform, uo , un , and uaw convergence. These will be defined and discussed later throughout the paper.

The following proposition is the net version of Proposition 2.5 in [vdW13]; it generalizes many known results for order, relative uniform, norm, uo , un , and other specific locally solid convergences.

Proposition 3.2. *Let (X, \rightarrow) be a locally solid convergence vector lattice. Then the maps which take x to $|x|$, x^+ , and x^- are continuous, and the maps which take (x, y) to $x \vee y$ and $x \wedge y$ are jointly continuous.*

Proof. If $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$ then $x_\alpha - x \rightarrow 0$. By the triangle inequality, $||x_\alpha| - |x|| \leq |x_\alpha - x|$, so that $|x_\alpha| - |x| \rightarrow 0$ and, therefore, $|x_\alpha| \rightarrow |x|$. The proofs for x^+ and x^- are similar. To prove joint continuity of $x \vee y$ and $x \wedge y$ one can use the identities

$$x \vee y = \frac{1}{2}(x + y) + \frac{1}{2}|x - y| \quad \text{and} \quad x \wedge y = \frac{1}{2}(x + y) - \frac{1}{2}|x - y|.$$

□

We will now strengthen Proposition 3.2 to uniform continuity. Recall that the Robertson-Namioka Theorem asserts that a linear topology on a vector lattice is locally solid iff the lattice operations are uniformly continuous; see, e.g., [AB03, Theorem 2.17]. We will now generalize this fact to convergence structures (cf. Section 3 in [AEG21]).

A linear convergence on a vector lattice X is said to be **locally full** if it satisfies the “squeeze law”: if $x_\alpha \leq y_\alpha \leq z_\alpha$ for all α , $x_\alpha \rightarrow a$ and $z_\alpha \rightarrow a$ then $y_\alpha \rightarrow a$; equivalently, if $0 \leq x_\alpha \leq y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ implies $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$. The latter condition in the context of ordered convergence vector spaces was called a *full convergence* in [AEG21]; note that [AEG21] uses a slightly different definition of a convergence structure.

Proposition 3.3. *Let X be a convergence vector space and a vector lattice. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The convergence is locally solid;*
- (ii) *The modulus operation is uniformly continuous;*
- (iii) *The modulus operation is continuous and the convergence is locally full.*

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) follows from Proposition 2.3 and the triangle inequality $||x_\alpha| - |y_\alpha|| \leq |x_\alpha - y_\alpha|$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) Suppose that $0 \leq y_\alpha \leq x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Since the modulus is uniformly continuous, it follows from $x_\alpha = y_\alpha - (y_\alpha - x_\alpha)$ that $|y_\alpha| - |y_\alpha - x_\alpha| \rightarrow 0$, hence $y_\alpha - (x_\alpha - y_\alpha) \rightarrow 0$, so that $2y_\alpha - x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and, therefore, $y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Suppose that $|y_\alpha| \leq |x_\alpha|$ for every α and $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Continuity of the modulus yields $|x_\alpha| \rightarrow 0$. It now follows from $-|x_\alpha| \leq y_\alpha \leq |x_\alpha|$ that $y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$. □

As in the proof of Proposition 3.2, the modulus operation in Proposition 3.3 may be replaced with any other lattice operation.

Recall that a convergence structure is **Hausdorff** when every net has at most one limit.

Proposition 3.4. *For a locally solid convergence space X , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) X is Hausdorff;
- (ii) Constant nets have unique limits;
- (iii) Every constant zero net converges to zero only;
- (iv) X^+ is closed;
- (v) Order intervals are closed;
- (vi) If $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$, $y_\alpha \rightarrow y$, and $x_\alpha \leq y_\alpha$ for all α then $x \leq y$.

Proof. The implicatons (i) \Rightarrow (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) and (iv) \Leftrightarrow (vi) are straightforward.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i) Suppose that $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$ and $x_\alpha \rightarrow y$. It follows from

$$|x - y| \leq |x_\alpha - x| + |x_\alpha - y| \rightarrow 0$$

that $|x - y| \rightarrow 0$, i.e., the constant net $|x - y|$ converges to zero. Since we also have $|x - y| \rightarrow |x - y|$, our assumption yields $|x - y| = 0$ and, therefore, $x = y$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv) Let (x_α) be a net in X^+ with $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$. Then $0 = x_\alpha^- \rightarrow x^-$; it follows that $x^- = 0$ and, therefore, $x \in X^+$. Hence X^+ is closed.

(iv) \Rightarrow (v) because $[a, b] = (a + X^+) \cap (b - X^+)$. We get (v) \Rightarrow (iii) by considering the trivial interval $[0, 0]$. \square

For every locally solid convergence, we have $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$ iff $|x_\alpha - x| \rightarrow 0$. Thus, the convergence is determined by positive nets converging to zero. In [Bil23a, Theorem 2.1], this idea was developed as follows:

Theorem 3.5. *Consider a non-empty family of nets in X_+ ; we write $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ to indicate that (x_α) is in the family. Suppose that the following axioms are satisfied:*

- (i) if $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and (y_β) is a quasi-subnet of (x_α) then $y_\beta \rightarrow 0$;
- (ii) If $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $0 \leq y_\alpha \leq x_\alpha$ for every α then $y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$;
- (iii) If $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ then $x_\alpha + y_\alpha \rightarrow 0$;
- (iv) $\frac{1}{n}x \rightarrow 0$ for every $x \in X_+$.

Then \rightarrow extends to a locally solid convergence structure on all of X via $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$ if $|x_\alpha - x| \rightarrow 0$. In this case, the resulting convergence on X is Hausdorff iff no constant net in $X_+ \setminus \{0\}$ converges to zero.

Properties of locally solid convergences.

Proposition 3.6. *Let (x_α) be a net in a Hausdorff locally solid convergence space X . If $x_\alpha \leq y$ for all α and $x_\alpha \rightarrow y$ then $y = \sup x_\alpha$.*

Proof. Clearly, y is an upper bound of the net. If z is another upper bound then, passing to the limit, we get $y \leq z$ by Proposition 3.4. \square

The following is motivated by the definition of order convergence; it follows immediately from Theorem 3.1(iv):

Lemma 3.7. *Let $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ and $(y_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ be two nets in a locally solid convergence space X . Suppose that $y_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ there exists $\alpha_0 \in A$ such that $|x_\alpha| \leq |y_\gamma|$ whenever $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. Then $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$.*

The next three statements are concerned with monotone nets. Note that $x_\alpha \uparrow x$ need not imply $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$. For example, the implication fails for norm convergence on ℓ_∞ . Theorem 3.11 will provide a condition under which the statement will be true.

Proposition 3.8 ([vdW13]). *Let (x_α) be an increasing net in a Hausdorff locally solid convergence space X . Then $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$ implies $x_\alpha \uparrow x$.*

Proof. Fix any α_0 . Then $x_\alpha \geq x_{\alpha_0}$ for every $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$, hence $x \geq x_{\alpha_0}$. It follows that x is an upper bound of the net. By Proposition 3.6, we have $x_\alpha \uparrow x$. \square

Note that in the following two results we do not assume X to be Hausdorff.

Proposition 3.9. *Let X be a locally solid convergence space, and $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ and $(y_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ two nets in X_+ such that $x_\alpha \downarrow$, $\{y_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma\} \subseteq \{x_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}$, and $y_\gamma \rightarrow 0$. Then $x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that the assumptions of Lemma 3.7 are satisfied. For every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ there exists $\alpha_0 \in A$ such that $y_\gamma = x_{\alpha_0}$. It follows that for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ we have $0 \leq x_\alpha \leq x_{\alpha_0} = y_\gamma$. \square

Corollary 3.10. *Let X be a locally solid convergence space. If a monotone net in X has a convergent quasi-subnet then the entire net converges to the same limit.*

Proof. Suppose that (x_α) is decreasing, (y_γ) is a quasi-subnet of (x_α) , and $y_\gamma \rightarrow x$. Subtracting x and passing to a tail of (y_γ) , we may assume that $y_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and $\{y_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma\} \subseteq \{x_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}$. From the continuity of lattice operations, we get $y_\gamma^+ \rightarrow 0$ and $y_\gamma^- \rightarrow 0$. It suffices to prove that $x_\alpha^+ \rightarrow 0$ and $x_\alpha^- \rightarrow 0$.

Applying Proposition 3.9 to the nets (x_α^+) and (y_γ^+) , we conclude that $x_\alpha^+ \rightarrow 0$. Note that $x_\alpha^- \uparrow$. It is enough to show that the nets (x_α^-) and (y_γ^-) satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 3.1(iv). Fix γ_0 . Find α_0 such that $x_{\alpha_0} = y_{\gamma_0}$. Take $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. Since (y_γ) is a quasi-subnet of (x_α) , we can find γ_1 such that $\{y_\gamma : \gamma \geq \gamma_1\} \subseteq \{x_\beta : \beta \geq \alpha\}$. Take $\gamma \geq \gamma_0, \gamma_1$. Then there exists $\beta \geq \alpha$ such that $y_\gamma^- = x_\beta^- \geq x_\alpha^- \geq 0$. \square

A locally solid convergence space (X, η) is **order continuous** or **Lebesgue** if $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\circ} 0$ implies $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ for every net (x_α) , that is, $\eta \leq \circ$. The following result, which originally appeared as Theorem 4.1 in [Bil23a], follows immediately from Lemma 3.7.

Theorem 3.11. *A locally solid convergence space (X, η) is order continuous iff $x_\alpha \downarrow 0$ implies $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ for every net (x_α) .*

Proposition 3.12. *Let X be a Hausdorff locally solid convergence space. If every order interval in X is compact then X is order complete and order continuous.*

Proof. Suppose that $0 \leq x_\alpha \downarrow$. Without loss of generality, (x_α) is contained in an order interval. Then it has a convergent quasi-subnet, say, $y_\gamma \rightarrow x$. By Corollary 3.10, $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$. Proposition 3.8 yields $x = \inf x_\alpha$. This proves that X is order complete. If $x_\alpha \downarrow 0$ then the preceding argument yields $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$ with $x = \inf x_\alpha = 0$, hence X is order continuous. \square

For topologies, Proposition 3.12 was proved in [Lip22].

Proposition 3.13. *Let Y be a sublattice of a locally solid Hausdorff convergence vector lattice X . Then the adherence \overline{Y}^1 is again a sublattice and $\overline{(Y_+)}^1 = (\overline{Y}^1)_+$.*

Proof. \overline{Y}^1 is a sublattice and $(\overline{Y}^1)_+ \subseteq \overline{(Y_+)}^1$ because lattice operations are continuous. Suppose now that $x \in \overline{(Y_+)}^1$. Then there exists a net

(y_α) in Y_+ such that $y_\alpha \rightarrow x$. It follows that $y_\alpha = y_\alpha^+ \rightarrow x^+$. Since X is Hausdorff, $x = x^+$ and, therefore, $x \geq 0$. It follows that $x \in (\overline{Y^1})_+$. \square

The following is a consequence of the continuity of lattice operations:

Proposition 3.14. *Let X be a Hausdorff locally solid convergence space. For every set A in X , its disjoint complement A^d is closed. It follows that every band in X is closed.*

The proof of the following statement is routine.

Proposition 3.15 ([Bil23a]). *Let X be a locally solid convergence space and (x_α) a net in X_+ . The set $\{v \in X : |v| \wedge x_\alpha \rightarrow 0\}$ is an ideal.*

Example 3.16. Recall that a net (x_α) in a vector lattice X **σ -order converges** to x , written $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\sigma o} x$, if there exists a sequence (u_n) in X_+ such that $u_n \downarrow 0$ and for every n there exists α_n such that $|x_\alpha - x| \leq u_n$ whenever $\alpha \geq \alpha_n$. In filter language, $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\sigma o} x$ if \mathcal{F} contains a sequence of order intervals whose intersection is $\{x\}$. It is easy to see that this is a Hausdorff locally solid convergence structure and it is stronger than order convergence. If X has the countable sup property then σo convergence agrees with order convergence. The convergence structure σo was investigated in [AW05].

Let X be a convergence space and Y a convergence vector space. We may equip the vector space $C(X, Y)$ of all continuous functions from X to Y with the convergence structure of **continuous convergence**: $f_\alpha \rightarrow f$ if for every net (x_γ) in X , if $x_\gamma \rightarrow x$ then the double net $(f_\alpha(x_\gamma))_{(\alpha, \gamma)}$ converges to $f(x)$. In the language of filters, a filter Φ in $C(X, Y)$ converges to $f \in C(X, Y)$ if $\Phi[\mathcal{F}] \rightarrow f(x)$ whenever $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow x$ in X ; see [BTW23] for details. It was observed in [BTW23, Proposition 8.1] that if Y is a complete Hausdorff topological vector space then continuous convergence on $C(X, Y)$ is complete. We now show that local solidness also passes to $C(X, Y)$:

Proposition 3.17. *Let X be a convergence space and Y a locally solid convergence space. Then continuous convergence on $C(X, Y)$ is locally solid.*

Proof. It is easy to see that $C(X, Y)$ is a vector lattice under the point-wise order. Suppose that $f_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $|g_\alpha| \leq |f_\alpha|$ for every α . If $x_\gamma \rightarrow x$ then $f_\alpha(x_\gamma) \rightarrow 0$; it follows from $|g_\alpha(x_\gamma)| \leq |f_\alpha(x_\gamma)| \rightarrow 0$ that $g_\alpha(x_\gamma) \rightarrow 0$ and, therefore, $g_\alpha \rightarrow 0$. \square

4. UNBOUNDED MODIFICATION

Let (X, η) be a locally solid convergence vector lattice. Define a new convergence structure $u\eta$ on X as follows: $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{u\eta} x$ if $|x_\alpha - x| \wedge u \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ for every $u \in X_+$. It is easy to see that $\xrightarrow{u\eta}$ is again a locally solid convergence structure. We call it the **unbounded modification** of η , or just unbounded η -convergence. Clearly, η and $u\eta$ agree on order bounded sets. It follows that unbounded modification is idempotent, i.e., $u(u\eta) = u\eta$.

Unbounded order convergence (i.e., the unbounded modification of order convergence), abbreviated as uo-convergence, has been extensively studied; see [Nak48, Pap64, Kap97, Frem04, GTX17] and references therein. The unbounded modification of norm convergence in a Banach lattice, called un-convergence, was studied in [Tro04, DOT17, KMT17]. The unbounded modification of absolute weak convergence in Banach lattices was studied in [Zab18] under the name of uaw-convergence. Note that the unbounded modification of a convergence induced by locally solid topology is again topological; in particular, un-convergence and uaw-convergence are topological. M. Taylor in [Tay18, Tay19] studied unbounded modifications of locally solid topologies on vector lattices. Unbounded modifications of convergence structures were studied in [AEG21] under a slightly different definition of a convergent structure.

More generally, let η be a locally solid convergence structure on X , I an ideal in X , and (x_α) a net in X ; we say that (x_α) unboundedly η -converges with respect to I , and write $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{u_I\eta} x$ if $|x_\alpha - x| \wedge u \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ for every $u \in I_+$. It follows from Theorem 3.5 (or it can be verified directly) that $u_I\eta$ is again a locally solid convergence structure. Hence, by Proposition 3.2, lattice operations are $u_I\eta$ -continuous. We clearly have $u_I\eta \leq u\eta \leq \eta$ and $u_I(u_I\eta) = u_I\eta$. In the special case when $I = X$, we get $u_I\eta = u\eta$. We require I to be an ideal and not just a subset of

X because if $A \subseteq X$ is an arbitrary subset then, by Proposition 3.15, the condition

$$\forall u \in A \quad |x_\alpha - x| \wedge |u| \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$$

is equivalent to $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{u_I \eta} 0$ where $I = I(A)$ is the ideal generated by A .

Proposition 4.1. *Let η be a locally solid convergence on X . Then $u_I \eta$ is Hausdorff iff η is Hausdorff and I is order dense. In particular, if η is Hausdorff then $u \eta$ is Hausdorff.*

Proof. Suppose that η is Hausdorff and I is order dense. We will show that $u_I \eta$ is Hausdorff. Suppose that (x_α) is a constant zero net and $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{u_I \eta} x$. According to Proposition 3.4, it suffices to show that then $x = 0$. Let $u \in I^+$. By assumption, the constant net $|x| \wedge u$ is η -convergent to zero. Since η is Hausdorff, we have $|x| \wedge u = 0$. Since $u \in I^+$ is arbitrary and I is order dense, we conclude that $x = 0$.

Suppose now that $u_I \eta$ is Hausdorff. Then η is Hausdorff because it is a stronger convergence. Suppose that I fails to be order dense. There exists $x > 0$ in X with $x \perp I$. It follows that every constant net with x as the constant term $u_I \eta$ -converges to zero, hence $u_I \eta$ fails to be Hausdorff. \square

Proposition 4.2 ([Bil23a]). *Let η be a Hausdorff locally solid convergence on X . Then $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{u \eta} x$ iff $a \vee (x_\alpha \wedge b) \xrightarrow{\eta} a \vee (x \wedge b)$ for all $a, b \in X$.*

Proof. If $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{u \eta} x$ and $a, b \in X$, continuity of lattice operations yields $a \vee (x_\alpha \wedge b) \xrightarrow{u \eta} a \vee (x \wedge b)$. Since the net $(a \vee (x_\alpha \wedge b))$ is order bounded, $u \eta$ and η agree on it.

The converse follows from the fact that for every $u \geq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x_\alpha - x| \wedge u &= \left| (x - u) \vee (x_\alpha \wedge (x + u)) - x \right| \\ &= \left| (x - u) \vee (x_\alpha \wedge (x + u)) - (x - u) \vee (x \wedge (x + u)) \right| \xrightarrow{\eta} 0. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Recall that \overline{A}^η and $\overline{A}^{1,\eta}$ stand for the closure and the adherence of A with respect to η , respectively, while $\overline{A}^{2,\eta}$ is the adherence of $\overline{A}^{1,\eta}$. The

proof of the following proposition was motivated by an unpublished manuscript by M. Taylor and by Proposition 4.1 in [AEG21].

Proposition 4.3. *Let Y be a sublattice of X and η a locally solid Hausdorff convergence structure on X . Then $\overline{Y}^{1,\eta} \subseteq \overline{Y}^{1,u\eta} \subseteq \overline{Y}^{2,\eta}$. Furthermore, $\overline{Y}^\eta = \overline{Y}^{u\eta}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.13, the adherences are sublattices. Since $u\eta \leq \eta$, we clearly have $\overline{Y}^{1,\eta} \subseteq \overline{Y}^{1,u\eta}$. Let $0 \leq x \in \overline{Y}^{1,u\eta}$. By Proposition 3.13, there exists a net (y_α) in Y_+ such that $y_\alpha \xrightarrow{u\eta} x$. Proposition 4.2 yields $u \wedge y_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} u \wedge x$ for every $u \in X_+$. For every $y \in Y_+$, we have $y \wedge y_\alpha \in Y$ for every α ; it follows from $y \wedge y_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} y \wedge x$ that $y \wedge x \in \overline{Y}^{1,\eta}$. In particular, $y_\alpha \wedge x \in \overline{Y}^{1,\eta}$ for every α . It now follows from $y_\alpha \wedge x \xrightarrow{\eta} x \wedge x = x$ that $x \in \overline{Y}^{2,\eta}$. Hence, $\overline{Y}^{u\eta} \subseteq \overline{Y}^{2,\eta}$. Proposition 3.13 yields $\overline{Y}^{u\eta} \subseteq \overline{Y}^{2,\eta}$.

It follows that η and $u\eta$ have the same closed sublattices. Thus, $\overline{Y}^\eta = \overline{Y}^{u\eta}$. \square

Question 4.4. Lemma 2.6 of [GL18] provides an example that the first inclusion in Proposition 4.3 may be proper. Is there an example where the second inclusion is proper?

We now present a filter characterization of unbounded modifications. For $u \in X_+$ and $A \subseteq X$, we write $|A| \wedge u = \{|a| \wedge u : a \in A\}$. For a filter \mathcal{F} in X , we write $|\mathcal{F}| \wedge u$ for the filter generated by $\{|A| \wedge u : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Note that $|\mathcal{F}| \wedge u = f(\mathcal{F})$ where $f: X \rightarrow X$ is given by $f(x) = |x| \wedge u$. In particular, $|[x_\alpha]| \wedge u = [|x_\alpha| \wedge u]$ for every net (x_α) in X .

Proposition 4.5. *Let η be a locally solid convergence structure on X , I an ideal in X , and \mathcal{F} a filter on X . Then $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{u_I\eta} 0$ iff $|\mathcal{F}| \wedge u \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ for every $u \in I_+$.*

Proof. Find a net (x_α) with $\mathcal{F} = [x_\alpha]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{u_I\eta} 0 &\Leftrightarrow x_\alpha \xrightarrow{u_I\eta} 0 &\Leftrightarrow \forall u \in I_+ \quad |x_\alpha| \wedge u \xrightarrow{\eta} 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall u \in I_+ \quad [|x_\alpha| \wedge u] \xrightarrow{\eta} 0 &\Leftrightarrow \forall u \in I_+ \quad |\mathcal{F}| \wedge u \xrightarrow{\eta} 0. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Here is a sketch of an alternative proof of Proposition 4.5 in the special case $I = X$. It follows from Proposition 4.2 that $u\eta$ is the

weakest convergence that makes all the functions of the form $x \mapsto a \vee (x \wedge b)$ continuous as maps to (X, η) . Thus, $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{u\eta} x$ iff $a \vee (\mathcal{F} \wedge b) \xrightarrow{\eta} x$ for all a and b . The latter is equivalent to $|\mathcal{F}| \wedge u \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ for all $u \geq 0$.

Remark 4.6. Just as we did for nets, one can consider unbounded convergence of filters with respect to an arbitrary subset A instead of an ideal. And, just as for nets, this is easily seen to be equivalent to unbounding with respect to $I(A)$.

Proposition 4.7. *Let \mathcal{F} be a filter with a base of solid sets. Then $\mathcal{F} \subseteq |\mathcal{F}| \wedge u$ for every $u \geq 0$. If $0 \leq v \leq u$ then $|\mathcal{F}| \wedge u \subseteq |\mathcal{F}| \wedge v$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{B} be a base of \mathcal{F} consisting of solid sets. If $A \in \mathcal{F}$ then there exists $B \in \mathcal{B}$ with $A \supseteq B \supseteq |B| \wedge u \in |\mathcal{F}| \wedge u$; it follows that $A \in |\mathcal{F}| \wedge u$ and, therefore, $\mathcal{F} \subseteq |\mathcal{F}| \wedge u$.

Moreover, since $|B| \wedge v \subseteq |B| \wedge u \subseteq |A| \wedge u$ and $|B| \wedge v \in |\mathcal{F}| \wedge v$, it follows that $|A| \wedge u \in |\mathcal{F}| \wedge v$ and, therefore, $|\mathcal{F}| \wedge u \subseteq |\mathcal{F}| \wedge v$. \square

A locally solid convergence is said to be **unbounded** if it equals its unbounded modification or, equivalently, if it is the unbounded modification of some locally solid convergence. Obviously, $u\eta$ and u_n convergences are unbounded.

Let X be a convergence space. We claim that the continuous convergence on $C(X)$ is unbounded. In fact, a more general statement is true:

Proposition 4.8. *Let X be a convergence space and Y an unbounded locally solid convergence vector lattice. Then continuous convergence on $C(X, Y)$ is unbounded.*

Proof. Suppose that $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{uc} 0$ in $C(X, Y)$; we need to show that $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{c} 0$. Fix $y \in Y_+$ and let $g \in C(X, Y)$ be the constant y function. Then $|f_\alpha| \wedge g \xrightarrow{c} 0$. Suppose that $x_\gamma \rightarrow x$ in X . Then $|f_\alpha(x_\gamma)| \wedge y \rightarrow 0$. Since y is arbitrary and the convergence in Y is unbounded, we conclude that $f_\alpha(x_\gamma) \rightarrow 0$ and, therefore, $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{c} 0$. \square

We defined a locally solid convergence η to be unbounded if $u\eta = \eta$. More generally, given a locally solid convergence η , one can ask when $u_I\eta = \eta$ for some ideal I . In Section 11, we will provide a partial

answer to this question (Proposition 11.5), as well as some additional properties of unbounded convergence structures.

Some properties of uo-convergence. Recall that a sublattice Y of X is regular iff it is a subspace of X in the sense of the uo-convergence structure, that is, $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{uo}} x$ in Y iff $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{uo}} x$ in X for every net (x_α) in Y and every $x \in Y$; see [Pap64, Theorem 7.5] or [GTX17, Theorem 3.2].

If X is universally complete then order convergence and unbounded order convergence agree on sequences in X , see, e.g., Theorem 3.2 in [Kap97]. However, this fails for nets, even for double sequences:

Theorem 4.9 ([TayMSc]). *Uo-convergence and order convergence agree iff X is finite-dimensional.*

Proof. It is easy to see that if X is finite-dimensional then the two convergences agree. Suppose that X is infinite-dimensional. Let (x_n) be a disjoint sequence of non-zero vectors. Define a double sequence $y_{n,m} = mx_n$. Since X is Archimedean, no tail of this net is order bounded, hence it fails to converge in order. We claim that it is uo-null.

Replacing X with X^δ , we may assume without loss of generality that X is order complete. Fix $u \in X_+$. For every n , consider the band projection of u onto the band B_{x_n} ; it is given by $P_{x_n}u = \sup_m(u \wedge mx_n)$. The sequence $(P_{x_n}u)$ is disjoint and order bounded by u , hence $P_{x_n}u \xrightarrow{o} 0$. On the other hand, $y_{n,m} \wedge u \leq P_{x_n}u$ for all n and m ; it follows that $y_{n,m} \wedge u \xrightarrow{o} 0$ and, therefore, $y_{n,m} \xrightarrow{\text{uo}} 0$. \square

It follows that if X is infinite-dimensional then order convergence is not unbounded. It was observed in [KMT17, Theorem 2.3] that the norm topology on a Banach lattice X is unbounded iff X has a strong unit.

Let X be a discrete vector lattice. For every atom a in X_+ , consider the corresponding band projection P_a . A net (x_α) converges to zero **component-wise** (or **point-wise**) if (P_ax_α) converges to zero for every atom a (in the one-dimensional subspace spanned by a). We write $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{p} x$ if $x_\alpha - x$ converges to zero coordinate-wise. It is easy to

see that this is a Hausdorff locally solid convergence. By [AB03, Theorem 1.78], one may view X as an order dense (hence regular) sublattice of \mathbb{R}^A , where A is a maximal disjoint collection of atoms in X . Then coordinate-wise convergence on X agrees with point-wise convergence in \mathbb{R}^A .

Proposition 4.10. *In a discrete vector lattice, uo -convergence agrees with coordinate-wise convergence.*

Proof. Let X be a discrete vector lattice. We view X as an order dense (hence regular) sublattice of \mathbb{R}^A , where A is a maximal disjoint collection of atoms in X . Therefore, it suffices to show that uo -convergence agrees with point-wise convergence in \mathbb{R}^A . Let (x_α) be a net in \mathbb{R}^A ; it suffices to show that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{uo} x$ in \mathbb{R}^A iff (x_α) converges to x point-wise. We may assume without loss of generality that $x = 0$ and $x_\alpha \geq 0$ for all α .

Suppose that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{uo} 0$. Fix $a \in A$. Then $x_\alpha \wedge \mathbb{1}_{\{a\}} \xrightarrow{o} 0$. However, $x_\alpha \wedge \mathbb{1}_{\{a\}}$ is a scalar multiple of $\mathbb{1}_{\{a\}}$; namely, $x_\alpha \wedge \mathbb{1}_{\{a\}} = (x_\alpha(a) \wedge 1) \mathbb{1}_{\{a\}}$. It follows that $x_\alpha(a) \wedge 1 \rightarrow 0$, hence $x_\alpha(a) \rightarrow 0$.

Suppose now that (x_α) converges to 0 point-wise. Fix $0 \leq u \in \mathbb{R}^A$. We need to show that $x_\alpha \wedge u \xrightarrow{o} 0$. It suffices to show that $v_\alpha \downarrow 0$, where $v_\alpha = \sup_{\beta \geq \alpha} (x_\beta \wedge u)$. This follows immediately from the observation that $v_\alpha(a) \downarrow 0$ for every $a \in A$. \square

Recall that given a convergence vector space (X, λ) , the topology given by the collection of all λ -closed sets is called the **topological modification** of λ ; we will denote this topology by $t(\lambda)$ or just $t\lambda$. See, for instance Definitions 1.3.1 and 1.3.8 in [BB02] and [BTW23, page 249 & Proposition 3.3]. The topological modification of a locally solid convergence need not be locally solid: it was shown in Example 10.7 in [BTW23] that $t(o)$ need not even be linear.

Proposition 4.11. *Let X be a vector lattice with the countable supremum property and τ a Hausdorff locally solid order continuous topology on X . Then $t(uo) = u\tau$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that uo -closed and $u\tau$ -closed sets agree. Since τ is an order continuous topology, $\tau \leq o$, and so $u\tau \leq uo$. It follows

that every $u\tau$ -closed set is uo -closed. To prove the converse, suppose that A is uo -closed, (x_α) is a net in A and $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{u\tau} x$. We need to show that $x \in A$. By [DdJ23, Theorem 5.6], there exists a sequence (α_k) of indices such that $x_{\alpha_k} \xrightarrow{uo} x$. It follows that $x \in A$. \square

Corollary 4.12. *The topological modification of uo -convergence on an order continuous Banach lattice is the un -topology.*

Remark 4.13. Under the assumption of Proposition 4.11, we may restrict both convergences in the proposition to any subset B of X , that is, $t((uo)|_B) = (u\tau)|_B$. The same proof works.

5. RELATIVE UNIFORM CONVERGENCE

Relative uniform convergence (or just uniform convergence) in an (Archimedean) vector lattice X was discussed in [BTW23]. Recall that a net (x_α) **converges relatively uniformly** to x , written $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{ru} x$, if there exists $e \in X_+$, called a **regulator** of convergence, such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an index α_0 such that $|x_\alpha - x| < \varepsilon e$ whenever $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. Equivalently, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an index α_0 such that $|x_\alpha - x| < \frac{1}{n}e$ whenever $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$.¹ The latter observation suggests the sequential nature of relative uniform convergence. In the filter language, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{ru} 0$ whenever there exists $e \in X_+$ such that $[-\varepsilon e, \varepsilon e] \in \mathcal{F}$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$; equivalently, $[-\frac{1}{n}e, \frac{1}{n}e] \in \mathcal{F}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 5.1. *Relative uniform convergence is the strongest locally solid convergence.*

Proof. We need to prove that for every locally solid convergence structure η on X , if $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{ru} 0$ then $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$. For sequences, the proof is straightforward. For nets, it requires some detail. Let e be a regulator for $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{ru} 0$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists α_0 such that $|x_\alpha| \leq \frac{1}{n}e$ whenever $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. Since $\frac{1}{n}e \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$, it follows from Lemma 3.7 that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$. \square

¹Replacing the condition $|x_\alpha - x| < \frac{1}{n}e$ with $-\frac{1}{n}e \leq x_\alpha - x \leq \frac{1}{n}e$, one can extend the concept of relative uniform convergence to ordered vector spaces.

Let $e \in X_+$. Recall that x is in the principal ideal I_e iff $|x| \leq \lambda e$ for some $\lambda > 0$. That is, $x \in I_e$ iff $\|x\|_e$ is finite, where

$$\|x\|_e = \inf \{ \lambda \geq 0 : |x| \leq \lambda e \}.$$

It is easy to see that $(I_e, \|\cdot\|_e)$ is a normed lattice. Furthermore, $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} x$ iff $\|x_\alpha - x\|_e \rightarrow 0$ for some $e \in X_+$. The Krein-Kakutani Representation Theorem asserts that the completion of $(I_e, \|\cdot\|_e)$ is lattice isometric to $C(K)$ for some compact Hausdorff space K , with e corresponding to $\mathbb{1}$. Thus, a net (x_α) converges relatively uniformly in X iff it converges in the supremum norm in the appropriate $C(K)$ space.

Recall [BTW23, page 252] that a net $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ in a convergence vector space is **Cauchy** if the double net $(x_\alpha - x_\beta)$ indexed by A^2 converges to zero. A convergence vector space is **complete** (or **sequentially complete**) if every Cauchy net (respectively, sequence) is convergent.

Theorem 5.2. *Let X be a vector lattice. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) *X is relatively uniformly complete, i.e., complete with respect to relative uniform convergence;*
- (ii) *$(I_e, \|\cdot\|_e)$ is complete for every $e \in X_+$ (and is, therefore, lattice isometric to some $C(K)$ space);*
- (iii) *X admits a sequentially complete Hausdorff locally solid convergence structure.*
- (iv) *X admits a complete Hausdorff locally solid convergence structure.*

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (iv) \Rightarrow (iii) is trivial.

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii) Let λ be a sequentially complete Hausdorff locally solid convergence structure. Let $e \in X_+$ and (x_n) a Cauchy sequence in $(I_e, \|\cdot\|_e)$. Then (x_n) is relatively uniformly Cauchy in X . By Proposition 5.1, (x_n) is λ -Cauchy. By assumption, $x_n \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$ for some $x \in X$.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Since (x_n) is $\|\cdot\|_e$ -Cauchy, there exists n_0 such that $|x_n - x_m| \leq \varepsilon e$ for every $n, m \geq n_0$ and, therefore, $x_n \in [x_m - \varepsilon e, x_m + \varepsilon e]$. Since order intervals are λ -closed, passing to the limit on n we get $x \in [x_m - \varepsilon e, x_m + \varepsilon e]$. This yields $\|x_m - x\|_e \leq \varepsilon$. It follows that (x_n) is $\|\cdot\|_e$ -convergent to x .

(ii) \Rightarrow (i) Suppose that $(I_e, \|\cdot\|_e)$ is complete for every $e \in X_+$. Let (x_α) be a relatively uniformly Cauchy net in X . That is, the double net $(x_\alpha - x_\beta)_{(\alpha, \beta)}$ converges relatively uniformly to zero. Let e be a regulator of this convergence. There exists α_0 such that for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ we have $\|x_\alpha - x_{\alpha_0}\|_e < 1$. It follows that $|x_\alpha| \leq |x_{\alpha_0}| + e =: u$. Hence, the tail $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \geq \alpha_0}$ is contained in I_u and is Cauchy with respect to $\|\cdot\|_u$. Since $(I_u, \|\cdot\|_u)$ is complete, it follows that (x_α) converges in $(I_u, \|\cdot\|_u)$, hence the net converges relatively uniformly in X . \square

Note that relative uniform convergence depends on the ambient space. That is, given a sublattice Y of X , the subspace convergence structure induced on Y by the relative uniform convergence on X need not agree with the relative uniform convergence on Y . It is easy to see that if $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} x$ in Y then $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} x$ in X , but the converse may fail. For example, the sequence $\frac{1}{n}e_n$ converges to zero relatively uniformly in ℓ_∞ , but not in ℓ_1 . However, if Y is majorizing in X then $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} x$ in Y iff $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} x$ in X , assuming that (x_α) and x are in Y . It was observed in [TT20] that if Y is a relatively uniformly closed sublattice of a relatively uniformly complete vector lattice X (in particular, if Y is a norm closed sublattice of a Banach lattice X) then $x_n \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$ in Y iff $x_n \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$ in X for every sequence (x_n) in Y , yet this may fail for nets.

Corollary 5.3. *Norm, order, and relative uniform convergences agree for sequences in c_0 .*

Proof. It is clear that relative uniform convergence implies order convergence. Since c_0 is order continuous, order convergence implies norm convergence. Suppose now that $x_n \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} 0$ for a sequence (x_n) in c_0 . Since c_0 is a norm closed subspace of ℓ_∞ , we have $x_n \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} 0$ in ℓ_∞ . It follows that $x_n \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$ in ℓ_∞ . By the preceding discussion, we now have $x_n \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$ in c_0 . \square

It was shown in [Wir75] that norm and relative uniform convergence for sequences in a Banach lattice X agree iff X is lattice isomorphic to an AM-space.

Every norm convergent sequence in a Banach lattice X has a relatively uniformly convergent subsequence; see, e.g., Lemma 1.1 in [TT20].

It follows that relatively uniformly closed sets in X agree with norm closed sets. Hence, the topological modification of ru in X is the norm topology. This remains valid in a locally solid Frechet lattice, as every convergent net in such a space contains (as a subset) a sequence that is relatively uniformly convergent to the same limit by Proposition 5.1 of [DdJ23]. It also follows that if X is an order continuous Banach lattice then order closed sets in X agree with norm closed sets and, therefore, the topological modification of order convergence on X is the norm topology.

Unbounded modification of ru convergence. We write ru for the relative uniform convergence and $u(\text{ru})$ for its unbounded modification. It follows from Proposition 5.1 that $u(\text{ru})$ is the strongest unbounded convergence on X .

Recall that the norm topology on a Banach lattice X is unbounded iff X has a strong unit.

Proposition 5.4. *If X has a strong unit then ru convergence is unbounded.*

Proof. Let e be a strong unit in X . Suppose that (x_α) is a net in X_+ such that $x_\alpha \wedge u \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$ for every $u \in X_+$. In particular, $x_\alpha \wedge e \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$. Since e is a strong unit, one can choose e as the regulator for the latter convergence. In particular, $x_\alpha \wedge e \leq \frac{1}{2}e$ for all sufficiently large α , which implies $x_\alpha \leq e$, so that $x_\alpha \wedge e = x_\alpha$. It follows that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$. \square

Question 5.5. Is the converse of Proposition 5.4 true? That is, if the relative uniform convergence X is unbounded, does this imply that X has a strong unit?

In order continuous Banach lattices, ru-convergence agrees with order convergence by, e.g., [BW80], hence $u(\text{ru})$ agrees with $u\text{o}$. On the other hand, on $C(K)$ spaces, $u(\text{ru}) = \text{ru}$ by Proposition 5.4, and is, generally, different from $u\text{o}$.

Example 5.6. *Relative uniform convergence on c_0 is not unbounded.* Let (e_n) be the standard unit basis of c_0 . For every $0 \leq u \in c_0$, we have $e_n \wedge u \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} 0$ and, therefore, $e_n \wedge u \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$ by Corollary 5.3. Yet, clearly, (e_n) does not converge to zero relatively uniformly.

Let Ω be a Hausdorff locally compact topological space. The space $C_0(\Omega)$ of continuous real-valued functions on Ω vanishing at infinity is a Banach lattice under the supremum norm. We write $C_c(\Omega)$ for the space of all continuous real valued functions on Ω with compact support. Clearly, $C_c(\Omega)$ is an ideal in $C_0(\Omega)$, while the latter is an ideal in $C(\Omega)$. We say that a net (f_α) in $C(\Omega)$ converges to some $f \in C(\Omega)$ **uniformly on compact sets** and write $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ucc}} f$ if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every compact $K \subseteq \Omega$ there exists α_0 such that $|f_\alpha(\omega) - f(\omega)| < \varepsilon$ whenever $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ and $\omega \in K$. It is easy to see that ucc is a locally solid topological convergence. By [BB02, Corollary 1.5.17] or [BTW23, Proposition 8.3], ucc agrees with the continuous convergence on $C_0(\Omega)$. It was observed in [Tro04, Example 20] that $\text{ucc} = \text{un}$ on $C_0(\Omega)$.

Proposition 5.7. *Let Ω be a locally compact topological space. Put $I = C_c(\Omega)$. The following convergences on $C_0(\Omega)$ coincide: $\text{u}(\text{ru})$, $\text{u}_I(\text{ru})$, un , u_In , and ucc . In particular, ucc is unbounded.*

Proof. It is straightforward that $\text{u}(\text{ru}) \geq \text{u}_I(\text{ru}) \geq \text{u}_I\text{n}$ and $\text{u}(\text{ru}) \geq \text{un} \geq \text{u}_I\text{n}$. It therefore suffices to show that $\text{u}_I\text{n} \geq \text{ucc} \geq \text{u}(\text{ru})$.

$\text{u}_I\text{n} \geq \text{ucc}$: Let $0 \leq f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{u}_I\text{n}} 0$ and let K be a compact set. Find $u \in C_c(\Omega)_+$ such that u equals 1 on K . It follows from $f_\alpha \wedge u \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} 0$ that f_α converges to zero uniformly on K .

$\text{ucc} \geq \text{u}(\text{ru})$: Suppose that $0 \leq f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ucc}} 0$. Let $u \in C_0(\Omega)_+$. We want to show that $f_\alpha \wedge u \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$. We use \sqrt{u} as a regulator. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $u \in C_0(\Omega)_+$, the set $K := \{\omega : u(\omega) \geq \varepsilon^2\}$ is compact. Find α_0 such that $f_\alpha(\omega) < \varepsilon^2$ for all $\omega \in K$ whenever $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. Fix $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ and let $\omega \in \Omega$. If $\omega \in K$ then $f_\alpha(\omega) < \varepsilon^2 \leq \varepsilon\sqrt{u(\omega)}$. If $\omega \notin K$ then $u(\omega) < \varepsilon^2$, so that $u(\omega) \leq \varepsilon\sqrt{u(\omega)}$. In either case, $(f_\alpha \wedge u)(\omega) \leq \varepsilon\sqrt{u(\omega)}$. \square

Analogously, one can prove the following:

Proposition 5.8. *For a locally compact topological space Ω , $\text{u}(\text{ru}) = \text{un} = \text{ucc}$ on $C_c(\Omega)$. In particular, ucc is unbounded.*

Remark 5.9. It is easy to see that in $C_c(\Omega)$, we have $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$ iff $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} 0$ and there exists α_0 and a compact set K such that $\text{supp } f_\alpha \subseteq K$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. Observe that, in this case, $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} 0$ is equivalent to $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ucc}} 0$.

We can now prove a somewhat similar result for $C_0(\Omega)$:

Corollary 5.10. *In $C_0(\Omega)$, we have $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$ iff $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ucc}} 0$ and there exists α_0 such that $(f_\alpha)_{\alpha \geq \alpha_0}$ is norm bounded and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set K such that $|f_\alpha(\omega)| < \varepsilon$ whenever $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ and $\omega \notin K$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$ iff $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{u(ru)}} 0$ and the net is eventually order bounded. Now combine Proposition 5.7 with Proposition 3.5 of [BT22]. \square

We can now completely characterize those Ω for which the relative uniform convergence on $C_0(\Omega)$ is unbounded. In particular, this yields an affirmative answer to Question 5.5 for $C_0(\Omega)$ spaces.

Corollary 5.11. *A locally compact topological space Ω is compact iff the relative uniform convergence on $C_0(\Omega)$ is unbounded.*

Proof. The forward implication follows from Proposition 5.4. Suppose that $\text{u(ru)} = \text{ru}$. Proposition 5.7 implies that $\text{ru} \geq \text{n} \geq \text{un} = \text{u(ru)} = \text{ru}$. It follows that $\text{n} = \text{un}$. Using [KMT17, Theorem 2.3] we conclude that $C_0(\Omega)$ has a strong unit, say, u . Then $u(\omega) > 0$ for every $\omega \in \Omega$. It follows that $\sqrt{u} \leq \lambda u$ for some $\lambda > 0$. We conclude that $u(\omega) \geq \frac{1}{\lambda^2}$ for every $\omega \in \Omega$. This yields that Ω is compact. \square

In the preceding corollary, $C_0(\Omega)$ may be replaced with $C_c(\Omega)$. Note that the relevant direction of the proof of Theorem 2.3 in [KMT17] remains valid for normed lattices.

Question 5.12. Characterize vector lattices where u(ru) is topological. Characterize Banach lattices where $\text{u(ru)} = \text{un}$; do we have $\text{t}(\text{u(ru)}) = \text{un}$?

Next, we extend some of the preceding results to the case when $X = C(\Omega)$, where Ω is locally compact and σ -compact. This is equivalent to Ω having a **compact exhaustion**, i.e., a sequence $(K_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of compact subsets such that $K_n \subseteq \text{Int } K_{n+1}$ for every n and $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n = \Omega$; see, e.g., [Eng89, 3.8.C]. For example, our results will apply when $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$. Note that in this case every compact $K \subseteq \Omega$ is contained in K_n for

some n . For convenience, we put $K_0 = \emptyset$. It is easy to see that the ucc topology is generated by the seminorms

$$\|f\|_n = \sup\{|f(t)| : t \in K_n \setminus \text{Int } K_{n-1}\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

so $C(\Omega)$ is a Frechet space. A subset A of $C(\Omega)$ is bounded with respect to the ucc topology iff $\sup_{f \in A} \|f\|_n < \infty$ for every n .

Lemma 5.13. *Let (K_n) be a compact exhaustion of Ω , and let (m_n) be a sequence in \mathbb{N} . There exists $f \in C(\Omega)$ such that $f|_{K_n \setminus \text{Int } K_{n-1}} \geq m_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. We may assume that (m_n) is increasing; otherwise, replace m_n with $\max\{m_1, \dots, m_n\}$. Using Urysohn's lemma, find f_n in $C(K_n \setminus \text{Int } K_{n-1})$ such that f_n equals m_n on ∂K_{n-1} , m_{n+1} on ∂K_n , and is between m_n and m_{n+1} on the rest of $K_n \setminus \text{Int } K_{n-1}$ (we again put $K_0 = \emptyset$). We now define f on Ω so that it agrees with f_n on $K_n \setminus \text{Int } K_{n-1}$. It is easy to verify that f satisfies the requirements of the lemma. \square

Proposition 5.14. *Suppose that Ω is locally compact and σ -compact. Then*

- (i) $\text{u}(\text{ru}) = \text{ucc}$ on $C(\Omega)$;
- (ii) A subset of $C(\Omega)$ is order bounded iff it is bounded in the ucc topology;
- (iii) A net in $C(\Omega)$ converges relatively uniformly iff it converges ucc and is eventually (order) bounded;
- (iv) Relative uniform convergence on $C(\Omega)$ is unbounded iff Ω is compact.

Proof. (i) Observe that ucc is unbounded because if $0 \leq f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{u}(\text{ucc})} 0$ then $\mathbb{1} \wedge f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ucc}} 0$; it is then easy to see that $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ucc}} 0$. It now follows from $\text{ru} \geq \text{ucc}$ that $\text{u}(\text{ru}) \geq \text{ucc}$.

We are now going to show that $\text{u}(\text{ru}) \leq \text{ucc}$. If Ω is compact, this is trivial, so we assume now that Ω is not compact. Suppose that $0 \leq f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ucc}} 0$. Let $u \geq 0$. We need to show that $f_\alpha \wedge u \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$. We may assume that $u \geq \mathbb{1}$ and the set $C_n = \{\omega \in \Omega : u(\omega) \leq n\}$ is compact for every n , because if this is not the case, we may replace u with $u \vee \mathbb{1} \vee f$, where f is the function from Lemma 5.13 with $m_n = n$.

For every n , there is an α_n such that $f_\alpha(\omega) \leq \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{n}u^2(\omega)$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_n$ and all $\omega \in C_n$. If $\omega \notin C_n$ then $u(\omega) \leq \frac{1}{n}u^2(\omega)$. It follows that $f_\alpha \wedge u \leq \frac{1}{n}u^2$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_n$. We conclude that $f_\alpha \wedge u \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} 0$.

(ii) The forward implication is straightforward. For the converse, if A is ucc-bounded, put $m_n = \sup_{f \in A} \|f\|_n$ and apply Lemma 5.13.

(iii) follows from combining (i) and (ii).

(iv) If Ω is compact then ru-convergence is unbounded by Proposition 5.4. Assume that Ω is not compact. Then there is a compact exhaustion (K_n) which does not stabilize, that is, $K_n \neq K_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Find a disjoint sequence (f_n) in $C(\Omega)$ such that f_n equals 1 on ∂K_{2n-1} and vanishes outside of $\text{Int } K_{2n} \setminus K_{2n-2}$, for $n \geq 2$. Then the double sequence (mf_n) is ucc-null but not eventually order bounded. Therefore, it is u(ru)-null by (i), but nor ru-null by (iii). \square

Question 5.15. Characterize those locally solid topologies in which topologically bounded and order bounded sets agree.

6. BOUNDED SETS IN CONVERGENCE VECTOR SPACES

Let (X, λ) be a convergence vector space over \mathbb{K} , where \mathbb{K} is \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} . We recall the concept of a λ -bounded set; see, e.g., [BTW23], for details. A subset A of X is λ -**bounded** if $[\mathcal{N}_0 A] \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$, where \mathcal{N}_0 is the neighbourhood filter of 0 in \mathbb{K} . Equivalently, for every net $(r_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ in \mathbb{K} with $r_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ we have $(r_\gamma x)_{(\gamma, x)} \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$, where the latter net is indexed by $\Gamma \times A$ ordered by the first component; we denote this net by $(r_\gamma A)$. It was observed in [BTW23] that if A is circled then instead of a general net (r_γ) in the definition of a bounded set, it suffices to take the sequence $(\frac{1}{n})$. In general, it suffices to take $(0, 1)$ viewed as a net decreasing to zero:

Theorem 6.1. *Let A be a set in a convergence vector space X . The following are equivalent:*

- (i) A is bounded;
- (ii) $(0, 1)A \rightarrow 0$, where $(0, 1)$ is viewed as a decreasing net;
- (iii) If $r_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ in \mathbb{K} and (x_γ) is a net in A then $r_\gamma x_\gamma \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is trivial.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) The net $(\sqrt{|r_\gamma|}x_\gamma)$ is a quasi-subnet of $(0, 1)A$, hence it converges to zero. Also, the net $(\frac{r_\gamma}{\sqrt{|r_\gamma|}})$ converges to zero (if $r_\gamma = 0$ we interpret the quotient as zero). By the continuity of scalar multiplication, $r_\gamma x_\gamma \rightarrow 0$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Let $(r_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ be a net in \mathbb{K} with $r_\gamma \rightarrow 0$. Define a new index set $\Lambda = \Gamma \times A$, ordered by the first component. Define two nets indexed by Λ : for $(\gamma, a) \in \Lambda$, let $s_{(\gamma,a)} = r_\gamma$ and $x_{(\gamma,a)} = a$. It is easy to see that $(s_{(\gamma,a)})$ is tail equivalent to (r_γ) . It follows that $s_{(\gamma,a)} \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, $s_{(\gamma,a)}x_{(\gamma,a)} \rightarrow 0$. Since the net $(s_{(\gamma,a)}x_{(\gamma,a)})$ is tail equivalent to $(r_\gamma A)$, we have $r_\gamma A \rightarrow 0$ and, therefore, A is bounded. \square

Example 6.2. It is easy to see that for topological vector spaces, one may replace nets with sequences in Theorem 6.1(iii). However, this is not true for general linear convergences. Recall from [BTW23] that order bounded sets in a vector lattice are precisely the sets that are bounded with respect to order convergence. The set $\{e_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in c_0 is not order bounded, yet for every sequence (r_k) in \mathbb{R} with $r_k \rightarrow 0$ and for every sequence (n_k) in \mathbb{N} , the sequence $(r_k e_{n_k})$ is order null.

Remark 6.3. It is claimed in [BB02, BTW23] that the convex hull of a bounded set in a convergence vector space is again bounded. This may, actually, fail even in the case of a topological convergence if the space is not locally convex. Indeed, let A be the unit ball in ℓ_p with $0 < p < 1$. Then A is bounded with respect to the quasi-norm $\|\cdot\|_p$, hence with respect to the corresponding convergence, yet its convex hull is unbounded.

Recall that a subset A of a vector lattice X is **dominable** iff A is order bounded as a subset of the universal completion X^u of X .

Theorem 6.4. *A subset A of a vector lattice X is uo-bounded iff it is dominable.*

Proof. Replacing A with its solid hull, we may assume without loss of generality that A is solid. In particular, it is circled. Thus, A is uo-bounded in X iff $\frac{1}{n}A \xrightarrow{\text{uo}} 0$ in X . Since X is regular in X^u , $\frac{1}{n}A \xrightarrow{\text{uo}} 0$ in X iff $\frac{1}{n}A \xrightarrow{\text{uo}} 0$ in X^u , hence A is uo-bounded in X iff A is uo-bounded

in X^u . Thus, without loss of generality, X is universally complete. It now suffices to prove that if A is uo-bounded then it is order bounded. The converse implication is trivial as $\text{uo} \leq \text{o}$.

Suppose that A is uo-bounded. Being universally complete, X has a weak unit, say, e . Since $\frac{1}{n}A \xrightarrow{\text{uo}} 0$, the net $(|\frac{1}{n}a| \wedge e)$, which is indexed by $\mathbb{N} \times A$, ordered by the first component, is order null. Hence

$$0 = \inf_{(n,a)} \sup_{(m,b) \geq (n,a)} |\frac{1}{m}b| \wedge e = \inf_n \sup_{m \geq n, b \in A} \frac{1}{m}|b| \wedge e = \inf_n \sup_{a \in A} \frac{1}{n}|a| \wedge e.$$

Put $x_n = \sup_{a \in A} \frac{1}{n}|a| \wedge e$. Then $0 \leq x_n \leq e$ and $x_n \downarrow 0$. Put $s_n = P_{e-x_n}e$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $e \geq s_n = \sup_m e \wedge m(e - x_n) \geq e - x_n$. It follows that $0 \leq s_n \uparrow e$. Let $d_1 = s_1$ and $d_n = s_n - s_{n-1}$ for $n > 1$; then (d_n) is disjoint and $\sum_{n=1}^m d_n = s_m$ for every m . Put $h = \bigvee_n n d_n$; the supremum exists because X is universally complete. Let $0 \leq a \in A$; we will show that $a \leq h$ and, therefore, $A \subseteq [-h, h]$.

Fix n . Clearly, $(\frac{1}{n}a - e)^+ \perp (e - \frac{1}{n}a)^+$. It follows from $(e - \frac{1}{n}a)^+ \geq (e - x_n)^+ = e - x_n$ and the fact that d_n is in the band generated by $e - x_n$ that $(\frac{1}{n}a - e)^+ \perp d_n$. Therefore, $0 = P_{d_n}(\frac{1}{n}a - e)^+ = (\frac{1}{n}P_{d_n}a - P_{d_n}e)^+$, so that $P_{d_n}a \leq nP_{d_n}e = n d_n$. We conclude that

$$P_{s_m}a = \sum_{n=1}^m P_{d_n}a \leq \sum_{n=1}^m n d_n \leq h.$$

By Theorem 1.48(ii) in [AB06], it follows from $s_m \uparrow e$ that $P_{s_m}a \uparrow P_e a = a$ because e is a weak unit. This yields $a \leq h$. \square

Question 6.5. Characterize un-bounded subsets of a Banach lattice.

Recall that a linear convergence is **locally bounded** if every convergent net has a bounded tail or, equivalently, if every convergent filter contains a bounded set. It is well known that a locally convex topology is locally bounded iff it is normable. It is easy to see that order and relative uniform convergences are locally bounded.

Proposition 6.6. *In a vector lattice X , uo-convergence is locally bounded iff X is finite-dimensional.*

Proof. Follow the proof of Theorem 4.9; observe that tails of the double sequence $(y_{n,m})$ there are not dominable. \square

7. BORNOLICAL CONVERGENCES

Let X be a set. A collection \mathcal{B} of subsets of X is a **bornology** if it is closed under taking subsets and finite unions and $X = \bigcup \mathcal{B}$. Members of a bornology are referred to as **bounded** sets. A subset \mathcal{B}_0 of a bornology \mathcal{B} is a **base** of \mathcal{B} if every set in \mathcal{B} is contained in a set from \mathcal{B}_0 . It is easy to see that a collection \mathcal{B}_0 of subsets of X is a base for some bornology iff $X = \bigcup \mathcal{B}_0$ and for every $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}_0$ there exists $A \in \mathcal{B}_0$ such that $A_1 \cup A_2 \subseteq A$.

A bornology \mathcal{B} on a vector space X is said to be a **linear** or **vector bornology** if

- (i) $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ implies $A_1 + A_2 \in \mathcal{B}$;
- (ii) if $A \in \mathcal{B}$ then $\alpha A \in \mathcal{B}$ for every non-zero scalar α ;
- (iii) if $A \in \mathcal{B}$ then the balanced (or circled) hull of A is in \mathcal{B} .

A vector space equipped with a linear bornology is said to be a **bornological vector space**. A linear operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ between two bornological vector spaces is said to be **bounded** if it maps bounded sets to bounded sets. We refer the reader to [Hog77] for further details on bornological spaces.

Example 7.1. In a topological vector space, the bounded sets form a linear bornology. In the case of a normed space, the set of all balls centred at the origin of positive integer radius forms a countable base for this bornology.

Example 7.2. In a vector lattice, all order bounded sets form a linear bornology. The set of all order intervals of the form $[-u, u]$ with $u \geq 0$ is a base of this bornology.

Example 7.3. Let (X, λ) be a convergence vector space. All λ -bounded sets form a linear bornology on X . If $T: X \rightarrow Y$ is a continuous linear operator between two convergence vector spaces then T is clearly bounded with respect to the induced bornologies.

Example 7.4. Let X be a vector space, then the set of all bounded subsets of finite-dimensional subspaces of X is a linear bornology in X .

Let (X, \mathcal{B}) be a bornological vector space. We define the **bornological convergence** structure induced by \mathcal{B} on X as follows: $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$ if there exists $A \in \mathcal{B}$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ the set εA contains a tail of the net; we define $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} x$ if $x_\alpha - x \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$. It is clear that in the preceding definition one can replace the bornology \mathcal{B} with any base of it. In particular, it suffices to consider only circled sets in \mathcal{B} . In terms of filters, $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$ if $\mathcal{F} \supseteq [\mathcal{N}_0 A]$ for some $A \in \mathcal{B}$; here \mathcal{N}_0 stands for the usual base of zero neighbourhoods in the scalar field. Indeed, for a net (x_α) and a circled set $A \in \mathcal{B}$, εA contains a tail of the net for every ε iff $\mathcal{N}_0 A \subseteq [x_\alpha]$.

Example 7.5. If \mathcal{B} is the bornology of norm bounded sets in a normed space then $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ is norm convergence. If \mathcal{B} is the bornology of all order bounded sets in a vector lattice then $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ is relative uniform convergence.

In the following theorem, we collect a few basic properties of $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Theorem 7.6. *Let (X, \mathcal{B}) be a bornological vector space. Then*

- (i) $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a linear convergence;
- (ii) $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ is Hausdorff iff \mathcal{B} contains no non-trivial subspaces;
- (iii) a set A belongs to \mathcal{B} iff it is $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ -bounded;
- (iv) $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ is locally bounded;
- (v) $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ is the strongest linear convergence structure for which every set in \mathcal{B} is bounded.

Proof. (i) Suppose that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} x$ and $y_\alpha \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} y$; we need to check that $x_\alpha + y_\alpha \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} x + y$. Replacing x_α and y_α with $x_\alpha - x$ and $y_\alpha - y$, we may assume that $x = y = 0$. Find $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist α_0 such that $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \geq \alpha_0} \subseteq \varepsilon A$ and $(y_\alpha)_{\alpha \geq \alpha_0} \subseteq \varepsilon B$. It follows that for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ we have $x_\alpha + y_\alpha \in \varepsilon A + \varepsilon B = \varepsilon(A + B)$. Since $A + B \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $x_\alpha + y_\alpha \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$.

Suppose now that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} x$ and $r_\alpha \rightarrow r$. Find a circled set $A \in \mathcal{B}$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists α_0 such that $x_\alpha - x \in \varepsilon A$ for all $\alpha > 0$. Let B be the circled hull of $\{x\}$. Then B is bounded and so is $A + B$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Find α_0 such that $|r_\alpha - r| < \varepsilon$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. In particular, $|r_\alpha| \leq |r| + \varepsilon$. Passing to a further tail, we may assume that $x_\alpha - x \in \frac{\varepsilon}{|r| + \varepsilon} A$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. We then have

$r_\alpha(x_\alpha - x) \in r_\alpha \frac{\varepsilon}{|r|+\varepsilon} A \subseteq \varepsilon A$ and $(r_\alpha - r)x \in \varepsilon B$. It follows that $r_\alpha x_\alpha - rx = r_\alpha(x_\alpha - x) + (r_\alpha - r)x \in \varepsilon(A + B)$.

(ii) Suppose that \mathcal{B} contains a non-trivial subspace. In particular, it contains $\text{span}\{a\}$ for some non-zero $a \in X$. Then the constant a sequence converges both to a and to 0 in $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$, hence $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ fails to be Hausdorff. Conversely, suppose that $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ is not Hausdorff. Then there exists a net (x_α) such that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} a$ and $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} b$ for some $a \neq b$. Subtracting b from everything, we may assume that $b = 0$. It follows that there is a circled set $A \in \mathcal{B}$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ the set εA contains both x_α and $x_\alpha - a$ for all sufficiently large α . This yields $a \in 2\varepsilon A$. Since ε is arbitrary, we have $\text{span}\{a\} \subseteq A$, hence $\text{span}\{a\} \in \mathcal{B}$.

(iii) If $A \in \mathcal{B}$ then $[\mathcal{N}_0 A] \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$, which means that A is $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ -bounded. To prove the converse, suppose that A is $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ -bounded. Let $r_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}$, then $r_\alpha A \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$. It follows that there exists $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $r_\alpha A \subseteq B$ for all sufficiently large α ; this yields $A \in \mathcal{B}$.

(iv) follows immediately from (iii).

(v) Let λ be a linear convergence structure for which every set in \mathcal{B} is bounded. If $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$ then $[\mathcal{N}_0 A] \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ for some $A \in \mathcal{B}$. Since A is λ -bounded, we have $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$. □

Summarizing, every linear bornology \mathcal{B} yields a linear convergence structure $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$, while every linear convergence structure λ yields a linear bornology, namely, the bornology of all λ -bounded sets. These two operations are not quite inverses of each other. If we start with a linear bornology \mathcal{B} and form the associated convergence $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$, then by Proposition 7.6(iii), the bounded sets for $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ are exactly \mathcal{B} , so we get back where we started.

However, if we start with a linear convergence λ , and put \mathcal{B} to be the bornology of all λ -bounded sets, then the convergence $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ is the **Mackey modification** λ_m of λ . We generally have $\lambda \leq \lambda_m$. A linear convergence structure λ is said to be **Mackey** if $\lambda = \lambda_m$. See [BB02, BTW23] for further information about Mackey convergences and Mackey modifications; including Proposition 3.7.16 in [BB02], which provides an intrinsic characterization of Mackey convergences.

In an (Archimedean) vector lattice X , order bounded sets are exactly the sets that are bounded with respect to order convergence; it follows that the Mackey modification of order convergence is relative uniform convergence and therefore order bounded sets are exactly the sets that are bounded with respect to relative uniform convergence. Combining this with Theorem 6.4, we immediately get the following:

Proposition 7.7. *The Mackey modification of uo -convergence on a vector lattice X is the restriction to X of the relative uniform convergence on X^u .*

It follows from the preceding discussion that for a linear bornology \mathcal{B} , the Mackey modification of $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ is again $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$. Now Proposition 3.9 of [BTW23] yields the following:

Proposition 7.8. *For a linear operator $T: X \rightarrow Y$ between bornological spaces, T is bounded iff it is continuous with respect to the convergences induced by the bornologies.*

Locally solid bornologies. A linear bornology on a vector lattice is said to be **locally solid** if it has a base of solid sets. It is easy to see that, in this case, the solid hull of every bounded set is bounded. It is clear that the bornology of all norm bounded sets in a normed lattice is locally solid. The bornology of all order bounded sets in a vector lattice is locally solid; moreover, it is the least locally solid bornology. It is also easy to see that dominable sets form a locally solid bornology. It is straightforward that if \mathcal{B} is a locally solid bornology then $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a locally solid convergence.

Proposition 7.9. *Let (X, η) be a locally solid convergence space. The collection of all η -bounded sets is a locally solid bornology. Every order bounded set is η -bounded.*

Proof. Suppose that A is η -bounded. Then $[\mathcal{N}_0 A] \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$. Since η is locally solid, $\text{Sol}(\mathcal{N}_0 A) \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$. It is easy to see that $\text{Sol}(\mathcal{N}_0 A) = [\mathcal{N}_0 \text{Sol}(A)]$. Hence, $[\mathcal{N}_0 \text{Sol}(A)] \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ and, therefore, $\text{Sol}(A)$ is η -bounded. The second claim is straightforward. \square

Question 7.10. Recall that a subset A in a normed lattice X is **almost order bounded** if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $u \in X_+$ such that $A \subseteq [-u, u] + \varepsilon B_X$. It is easy to see that almost order bounded sets form a locally solid bornology. It would be interesting to describe the bornological convergence generated by the bornology of almost order bounded sets. Since this bornology contains all order bounded sets and is contained in the bornology of norm bounded sets, the corresponding bornological convergence is weaker than relative uniform convergence but stronger than norm convergence. Note that the bornology of almost order bounded sets may be generalized to locally solid topological vector lattices.

Example 7.11. The collection of all equicontinuous sets in $C(\Omega)$, for a Tychonoff space Ω , is a linear bornology. We claim that if this bornology is locally solid then Ω is discrete (and then every set in $C(\Omega)$ is equicontinuous). Indeed, the solid hull of $\mathbb{1}$ is $[-\mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}]$ and it should be equicontinuous. Fix $t \in \Omega$ and find its open neighborhood U such that $|f(s) - f(t)| < \frac{1}{2}$, for every $s \in U$ and every $-\mathbb{1} \leq f \leq \mathbb{1}$. If there were $s \in U \setminus \{t\}$, we could then find $f \in C(\Omega)$ with $-\mathbb{1} \leq f \leq \mathbb{1}$, $f(t) = 1$ and $f(s) = -1$, which would lead to a contradiction. Hence, $U = \{t\}$.

More generally, let X be a convergence space and $A \subseteq C(X)$. We say that A is **equicontinuous** if $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$ in X and $\varepsilon > 0$ then there exists α_0 such that $|f(x_\alpha) - f(x)| < \varepsilon$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ and $f \in A$. It can be easily verified that this is consistent with the filter definition of equicontinuity in Definition 2.4.1 of [BB02]. It is also easy to see that equicontinuous sets form a linear bornology in $C(X)$.

Suppose now that X is a convergence vector space. Let $\mathcal{L}_c X$ be the space of all continuous linear functionals on X . Equicontinuous subsets in $\mathcal{L}_c X$ form a linear bornology because it is a restriction of the bornology of equicontinuous sets in $C(X)$ to $\mathcal{L}_c X$.

Finite-dimensional convergence. Let X be a vector space. Define **finite-dimensional convergence** on X as follows: $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{fd}} 0$ if a tail of (x_α) is contained in a finite-dimensional subspace of X and converges to zero there in the usual sense; put $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{fd}} x$ when $x_\alpha - x \xrightarrow{\text{fd}} 0$.

Let $(e_i)_{i \in I}$ be a Hamel basis in X ; we write $P_i x$ for the i -th coordinate of x . It is easy to see that if $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{fd}} x$ then $P_i x_\alpha \rightarrow P_i x$ for every i , i.e., (x_α) converges to x coordinate-wise. The converse is false: let X be a vector space with a countable Hamel basis $(e_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, then, viewed as a sequence, (e_i) converges to zero coordinate-wise, but not in fd.

Here we collect a few basic facts about this convergence:

Proposition 7.12. *Finite-dimensional convergence on a vector space X is Hausdorff and complete. It is the strongest linear convergence on X . It agrees with the convergence induced by the bornology of all bounded subsets of finite-dimensional subspaces.*

Proof. It is easy to see that fd convergence is exactly the convergence induced by the bornology of all bounded subsets of finite-dimensional subspaces, cf. Example 7.4. Therefore, it is Hausdorff by Theorem 7.6(ii). It is the strongest linear convergence on X because every linear convergence on finite-dimensional vector spaces is weaker than coordinate-wise convergence.

To show that fd convergence is complete, suppose that (x_α) is a Cauchy net in X . Then a tail of this net is contained in a finite-dimensional subspace, and is Cauchy there in the usual sense. Hence this tail is convergent (in the subspace and, therefore, with respect to fd convergence). \square

In an ordered vector space, finite dimensional convergence can be used to characterize the Archimedean property.

Proposition 7.13. *Let X be an ordered vector space. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) X is Archimedean;
- (ii) X_+ is relatively uniformly closed;
- (iii) X_+ is fd-closed.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Suppose X is Archimedean, and $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} x$ for some net (x_α) in X^+ . It follows that there exists a regulator $u \geq 0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists α such that $x_\alpha - \frac{u}{n} \leq x \leq x_\alpha + \frac{u}{n}$. Then $x \geq -\frac{u}{n}$ for every n . It follows that $x \geq 0$, hence $x \in X_+$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) is trivial as finite dimensional convergence is the strongest linear convergence on X .

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Suppose that $x \in X$ and $y \in X_+$ satisfy $nx \leq y$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $x - \frac{y}{n} \leq 0$ for all n . Since the sequence $(x - \frac{y}{n})$ is contained in the linear span of x and y , passing to the fd-limit, we conclude that $x \leq 0$. \square

Proposition 7.14. *Let X be an ordered vector space and $e \in X_+$. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) e is a strong order unit;
- (ii) X_+ is an ru-neighborhood of e ;
- (iii) X_+ is an fd-neighborhood of e .

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Suppose that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} e$. Without loss of generality, we may take e as a regulator of this convergence. Then for all sufficiently large α we have $-\frac{\epsilon}{2} \leq x_\alpha - e \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and, therefore, $x_\alpha \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \geq 0$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) is trivial.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Let $x \in X$. It follows from $\frac{x}{n} + e \xrightarrow{\text{fd}} e$ that for some sufficiently large n we have $\frac{x}{n} + e \geq 0$ and, therefore, $x \geq -ne$. Applying the same argument to $-x$, we find m such that $x \leq me$. \square

Since fd is the strongest linear convergence, the two preceding propositions yield the following:

Corollary 7.15. *Let X be an ordered vector space equipped with a linear convergence. If X_+ is closed then X is Archimedean. If X_+ is a neighborhood of e then e is a strong unit.*

8. BOUNDED MODIFICATION

Let (X, λ) be a convergence space and \mathcal{B} a bornology on X . One can define a new convergence $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ as follows: $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}} x$ if $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$ and a tail of (x_α) is contained in a set in \mathcal{B} . In terms of filters, we define $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}} x$ if $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$ and $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$. It is easy to see that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}} x$ iff $[x_\alpha] \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$. We call this convergence the **bounded modification** of λ by \mathcal{B} , or the \mathcal{B} -modification of λ . In [BB02, p. 3], this convergence is called the **specified sets convergence** for λ with respect to \mathcal{B} . This concept is motivated by the notion of a mixed topology, see, e.g., [Coop87,

Conr06]. The notation $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ should not be confused with $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$, which we have used to denote the bornological convergence associated with the bornological vector space (X, \mathcal{B}) . We will use $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ only for bornological convergences.

The following properties of $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ are straightforward:

Proposition 8.1. *Let (X, λ) be a convergence space and \mathcal{B} a bornology on X . Then*

- (i) $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ is the strongest convergence on X that agrees with λ on sets in \mathcal{B} .
- (ii) $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ is the strongest convergence η on X for which the embedding $(A, \lambda|_A) \hookrightarrow (X, \eta)$ is continuous for every $A \in \mathcal{B}$.
- (iii) $(\lambda_{\mathcal{B}})_{\mathcal{B}} = \lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$. If \mathcal{C} is another bornology on X then $(\lambda_{\mathcal{B}})_{\mathcal{C}} = \lambda_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{C}}$.
- (iv) If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a function from X to another convergence space Y , then f is $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ -continuous iff its restriction to A is λ -continuous for every $A \in \mathcal{B}$.

If X is a vector space and both λ and \mathcal{B} are linear then so is $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ (cf. [BB02, p. 86]). Indeed, if $x_{\gamma} \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}} x$ and $y_{\gamma} \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}} y$ then $x_{\gamma} \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$, $y_{\gamma} \xrightarrow{\lambda} y$ and the nets have tails in some sets A and B from \mathcal{B} , respectively. Then $x_{\gamma} + y_{\gamma} \xrightarrow{\lambda} x + y$ and the net $(x_{\gamma} + y_{\gamma})$ has a tail in $A + B$, hence $x_{\gamma} + y_{\gamma} \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}} x + y$. The proof for scalar multiplication is similar.

Proposition 8.2. *Let (X, λ) be a convergence vector space and \mathcal{B} a linear bornology on X . A set A is $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ -bounded iff A is λ -bounded and $A \in \mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. Let $r_{\gamma} \rightarrow 0$ in \mathbb{K} . It is easy to see that $r_{\gamma}A \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$ iff $r_{\gamma}A \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}$. \square

Given a convergence structure λ and a bornology \mathcal{B} , we say that λ is **locally \mathcal{B} -bounded** if every λ -convergent net has a \mathcal{B} -bounded tail or, equivalently, if $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$. A topological space is locally compact iff its convergence structure is locally \mathcal{B} -bounded, where \mathcal{B} is the bornology of relatively compact sets. A linear convergence λ is locally bounded precisely when it is locally \mathcal{B} -bounded, where \mathcal{B} is the bornology of all λ -bounded sets. If (X, τ) is a topological vector space and \mathcal{B} is a linear

bornology on X , τ is locally \mathcal{B} -bounded iff every point has a \mathcal{B} -bounded neighbourhood. Indeed, let \mathcal{N}_x be the set of all neighborhoods of x . If $\tau = \tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ then $\mathcal{N}_x \xrightarrow{\tau} x$ implies $\mathcal{N}_x \xrightarrow{\tau_{\mathcal{B}}} x$ and, therefore, $\mathcal{N}_x \cap \mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$; the converse is trivial.

Proposition 8.2 yields the following:

Corollary 8.3. *Given a linear bornology \mathcal{B} and a locally \mathcal{B} -bounded linear convergence λ , every λ -bounded set is in \mathcal{B} .*

Let (X, λ) be a convergence vector space. Recall that λ_m stands for the Mackey modification of λ ; we always have $\lambda \leq \lambda_m$. Recall also that $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ stands for the bornological convergence induced by a bornology \mathcal{B} as in Section 7.

Proposition 8.4. *Let (X, λ) be a convergence vector space, and \mathcal{B} a linear bornology on X such that every set in \mathcal{B} is λ -bounded. Then*

- (i) *A subset A of X is $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ -bounded iff $A \in \mathcal{B}$;*
- (ii) *$\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ is locally bounded;*
- (iii) *$\lambda \leq \lambda_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\lambda_m \leq \mu_{\mathcal{B}}$;*
- (iv) *Every $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ -continuous functional on X is \mathcal{B} -bounded.*

Proof. (i) follows from Proposition 8.2.

(ii) If $x_{\gamma} \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$ then it has a tail in some $A \in \mathcal{B}$, which is $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ -bounded by (i).

(iii) $\lambda \leq \lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ is immediate. The rest follows from (i), Proposition 7.6(v), and the fact that every set in \mathcal{B} is λ -bounded.

(iv) Let $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be a $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ -continuous linear functional. It follows from (iii) that f is $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}$ -continuous. Now Proposition 7.8 yields that f is \mathcal{B} -bounded. \square

Corollary 8.5. *Let (X, λ) be a convergence vector space, \mathcal{C} the bornology of λ -bounded sets and \mathcal{B} a vector bornology in X such that $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. Then $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}} = \lambda$ iff λ is locally bounded and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}$.*

Example 8.6. Let λ , \mathcal{B} , and \mathcal{C} be as in the preceding corollary. Even if λ is locally bounded, we need not have $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ if $\mathcal{B} \neq \mathcal{C}$. Indeed, take $X = \ell_1$, let λ be norm convergence on X , and \mathcal{B} the bornology of all order bounded sets. It is easy to see that $\lambda < \lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Example 8.7. We observed in Proposition 8.4 that in general $\lambda \leq \lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\lambda \leq \lambda_m$. What is the relationship between λ_m and $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$? If λ is Mackey (i.e., $\lambda_m = \lambda$), it is locally bounded by [BB02, Proposition 3.7.16], so if we take \mathcal{B} to be the bornology of all λ -bounded sets then we have $\lambda_m = \lambda = \lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ by Corollary 8.5

On the other hand, in Example 8.6, we have $\lambda_m = \lambda < \lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$. Furthermore, if we let λ be order convergence on an infinite-dimensional vector lattice, and \mathcal{B} the bornology of all order bounded (that is, λ -bounded) sets, then $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}} = \lambda$ while λ_m is relative uniform convergence, so $\lambda_m > \lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Example 8.8. (Cf. Example 7.11.) Let X be a topological vector space. Let \mathcal{B} be the vector bornology on X^* consisting of all equicontinuous sets. It is easy to see that a subset G of X^* is equicontinuous iff it is contained in a polar of a neighborhood of zero in X , hence such polars form a base of \mathcal{B} .

We write w^* for weak*-convergence on X^* , i.e., $w^* = \sigma(X^*, X)$; we write $w_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ for its bounded modification by \mathcal{B} . Every equicontinuous set in X^* is weak*-bounded, so that the assumptions of Proposition 8.4 are satisfied. Therefore, $w_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ -bounded sets are exactly the sets in \mathcal{B} . By Proposition 8.4 in [BTW23], $w_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ is continuous convergence on X^* .

Suppose now that, in addition, X is a Hausdorff locally convex topological vector space. Then the space of all weak*-continuous linear functionals on X^* can be identified with X . Moreover, the set of all linear functionals on X^* which are w^* -continuous on equicontinuous subsets of X^* equals the space of all $w_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ -continuous functionals on X^* , which in turn equal to the second dual of X in the sense of [BB02] and [BTW23]. By [BB02, Theorem 4.3.20] or [BTW23, Theorem 8.12], this second dual may be identified with the completion of X ; thus we have recovered Grothendieck's completion theorem, see, e.g., Theorem 2 in Chapter III, Section 3.6 in [Bour87].

Example 8.9. The collection of all finite-dimensional subspaces of a vector space X is a base for a bornology; let \mathcal{B} be the resulting bornology. It is easy to see that the bounded modification of any Hausdorff linear convergence on X by \mathcal{B} is finite-dimensional convergence because

all linear Hausdorff convergences agree on finite dimensional subspaces (see [BB02, Theorem 3.3.19]).

The following result shows that a bounded modification of a topological convergence is typically non-topological.

Proposition 8.10. *Let (X, τ) be a topological space and \mathcal{B} a bornology on X . If the bounded modification $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ of τ -convergence by \mathcal{B} is topological, then for every $x \in X$ there exists $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that every eventually \mathcal{B} -bounded net that τ -converges to x is eventually in B .*

Proof. Suppose that $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ is topological. Let \mathcal{F} be the filter of all neighborhoods of x in this topology. Then $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\tau_{\mathcal{B}}} x$, hence there exists a $B \in \mathcal{B}$ which is a neighborhood of x in $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$. If (x_{α}) is net such that $x_{\alpha} \xrightarrow{\tau} x$ and such that a tail of it is in \mathcal{B} then $x_{\alpha} \xrightarrow{\tau_{\mathcal{B}}} x$, hence (x_{α}) has a tail in B . \square

For a normed space X , we write S_X for the unit sphere of X .

Corollary 8.11. *Let X be a normed space and τ a linear topology on X . The bounded modification $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ of τ by the bornology \mathcal{B} of all norm bounded sets is not topological provided that $0 \in \overline{S_X}^{\tau}$.*

Proof. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Take $r > 0$ so that $B \cap (rS_X) = \emptyset$. Since $0 \in \overline{S_X}^{\tau}$, one can find a net (x_{α}) in rS_X such $x_{\alpha} \xrightarrow{\tau} 0$. Then (x_{α}) is bounded, yet misses B . By Proposition 8.10, $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ fails to be topological. \square

Example 8.12. (Cf. Example 8.8.) Let X be an infinite-dimensional normed space with dual X^* . Let \mathcal{B} be the bornology of all norm bounded sets in X^* . These are the equicontinuous sets in X^* ; it follows that $w_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ coincides with continuous convergence on X^* . Since 0 belongs to the weak*-closure of S_{X^*} , Corollary 8.11 implies that the bounded modification $w_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ of the weak*-topology on X^* by \mathcal{B} is not topological.

A similar argument shows that if we consider the bornology \mathcal{B} of norm-bounded sets in X then the bounded modification of the weak convergence on X by \mathcal{B} is not topological.

Note that since every weakly convergent sequence is norm-bounded, $w = w_{\mathcal{B}}$ on sequences. This fails for nets as there are weakly null nets in X that are not eventually norm bounded.

Next, we study the relationship between bounded and topological modifications. Recall that the topological modification $t\lambda$ of a convergence structure λ is the strongest topology (whose convergence is) weaker than λ ; see, e.g., Proposition 3.5 in [BTW23].

Proposition 8.13. *Let \mathcal{B} be a bornology on a set X .*

- (i) *If λ is a convergence structure on X then $t(\lambda_{\mathcal{B}})$ is the strongest topology on X that is weaker than λ on sets from \mathcal{B} .*
- (ii) *If τ is a topology on X then $t(\tau_{\mathcal{B}})$ is the strongest topology on X that agrees with τ on sets from \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. (i) is straightforward.

(ii) First, we will show that $t(\tau_{\mathcal{B}})$ agrees with τ on sets from \mathcal{B} . By the discussion before the proposition, $\tau_{\mathcal{B}} \geq t(\tau_{\mathcal{B}})$. It follows from (i) that $t(\tau_{\mathcal{B}}) \geq \tau$. Hence, $\tau_{\mathcal{B}} \geq t(\tau_{\mathcal{B}}) \geq \tau$. Since τ and $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ agree on sets from \mathcal{B} , all the three convergences agree there.

Let σ be a topology on X which agrees with τ on sets from \mathcal{B} . It follows from (i) that $\sigma \leq t(\tau_{\mathcal{B}})$. \square

Proposition 8.14. *Let (X, λ) be a convergence space and \mathcal{B} a bornology on X ; let $A \subseteq X$. Then*

- (i) *A is $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ -closed iff $\overline{A \cap B}^{1, \lambda} \subseteq A$ for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$;*
- (ii) *A is $(t\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}}$ -closed iff $\overline{A \cap B}^{\lambda} \subseteq A$ for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. (i) is straightforward; (ii) follows from (i) and the observation that $\overline{C}^{1, t\lambda} = \overline{C}^{t\lambda} = \overline{C}^{\lambda}$ for every set C . \square

Clearly, $t(\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}) = t((t\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}})$ iff $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $(t\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}}$ have the same closed sets. By Proposition 8.14, this boils down to the difference between the λ -closure and the λ -adherence of certain sets. We now present an example to show that we may have $t(\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}) \neq t((t\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}})$.

Example 8.15. Put $X = [0, 1]^2$, let τ be the Euclidean topology on X . Let \mathcal{D} be the bornology on X consisting of subsets of all sets of the form $([0, 1] \times \{0\}) \cup (F \times [0, 1])$, where F is a finite subset of $[0, 1]$. Let $\lambda := \tau_{\mathcal{D}}$, and \mathcal{B} the bornology of all sets whose intersection with $\mathbb{Q} \times \{0\}$ is finite. Put $A := (\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]) \times [0, 1]$. Then A satisfies the condition (i) in Proposition 8.14, but fails (ii) for $B = (0, 1] \times [0, 1]$

because $\overline{A \cap B}^{1,\lambda}$ contains $(\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]) \times \{0\}$, so that $\overline{A \cap B}^{2,\lambda}$ contains $[0, 1] \times \{0\}$ and, therefore, $\overline{A \cap B}^{2,\lambda}$ is not contained in A .

Proposition 8.16. *Let (X, λ) be a convergence space and \mathcal{B} a bornology on X with a base \mathcal{B}_0 of λ -closed sets. Then $t(\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}) = t((t\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}})$.*

Proof. Observe that $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ is the final convergence for the family of inclusions $(B, \lambda|_B) \hookrightarrow X$, where B runs over \mathcal{B} and $\lambda|_B$ is the restriction of λ to B . Moreover, since \mathcal{B}_0 is a base of \mathcal{B} , it suffices to consider all $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$.

Proposition 1.3.14 of [BB02] asserts that topological modification commutes with taking the final convergence structure; it follows that $t(\lambda_{\mathcal{B}})$ is the final convergence structure for the inclusions $(B, t(\lambda|_B)) \hookrightarrow X$ with $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$.

Let $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Since B is closed, the restriction operation commutes with topological modification, i.e., $t(\lambda|_B) = (t\lambda)|_B$ by Proposition 1.3.10 of [BB02]. It follows that $t(\lambda_{\mathcal{B}})$ is the final convergence structure for the inclusions $(B, (t\lambda)|_B) \hookrightarrow X$ as $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Applying Proposition 8.13(ii) with $\tau = t\lambda$, we conclude that the latter final convergence is $t((t\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}})$. \square

Example 8.17. Let X be an infinite-dimensional normed space. As in Example 8.12, the convergence $w_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ coincides with continuous convergence on X^* , and is not topological. This implies that $w_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ is strictly stronger than $bw^* := t(w_{\mathcal{B}}^*)$. The latter is the mixed topology, which is defined as the strongest topology that agrees with the weak* topology on norm bounded sets. By Banach-Dieudonné theorem this topology is the restriction of the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets. In particular, bw^* is a linear topology; see, e.g., [Coop87, I.2.A], Section 3.5 in Chapter IV of [Bour87] or [BMP03].

The locally solid case.

Proposition 8.18. *Let X be a vector lattice, λ a locally solid convergence on X , and \mathcal{B} a locally solid bornology on X . Then the bounded modification $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$ is again locally solid. If, in addition, λ is order continuous then so is $\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}$.*

Proof. The first claim is straightforward. Suppose that λ is order continuous and $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{o} 0$. Then $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$. Passing to a tail, we may assume that (x_α) is contained in an order interval. Since every order interval is contained in \mathcal{B} , we conclude that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$. \square

Example 8.19. Remark 5.9, Corollary 5.10, and Theorem 5.14 may be interpreted as follows: relative uniform convergence on the appropriate spaces of continuous functions may be obtained as a bounded modification of ucc convergence. In particular, Theorem 5.14 says that if Ω is locally compact and σ -compact, then relative uniform convergence on $C(\Omega)$ is the bounded modification of ucc convergence by the bornology of all ucc (or, equivalently, order) bounded sets.

Example 8.20. It is easy to see that the bounded modification of uo-convergence by the bornology of all order bounded sets is order convergence.

Example 8.21. In the preceding example, suppose that X is discrete. In this case, by Proposition 4.10, uo-convergence agrees with point-wise convergence, hence is topological. On the other hand, order convergence is not topological unless X is finite-dimensional; see [DEM20] or Corollary 10.11 in [BTW23]. This yields another example of a topological convergence, which has a non-topological bounded modification. (See also Proposition 8.10.)

Example 8.22. Let X be a normed lattice, and consider uo-convergence on X . The set of all uo-continuous linear functionals on X is rather small; it consists only of linear combinations of the coordinate functionals of atoms in X ; see, e.g., Proposition 2.2 in [GLX18]. Let \mathcal{B} be the bornology of all norm bounded sets in X . The bounded modification $\text{uo}_{\mathcal{B}}$ yields a richer dual space. It was shown in Theorem 2.3 in [GLX18] that the dual X_{uo}^{\sim} of X with respect to this convergence is the order continuous part of the order continuous dual of X .

In this example, the condition in Proposition 8.4 that every set in \mathcal{B} should be λ -bounded is not satisfied. It follows from Theorem 6.4 and Proposition 8.2 that $(\text{uo})_{\mathcal{B}}$ -bounded sets in X are the sets that are both dominable and norm bounded.

Proposition 8.23. *Let X be a vector lattice with the countable supremum property, τ a Hausdorff locally solid order continuous topology on X , and \mathcal{B} a locally solid bornology on X . Then*

- (i) *The topological modifications of $(u\tau)_{\mathcal{B}}$ and of $(uo)_{\mathcal{B}}$ are equal and agree with the strongest topology coinciding with $u\tau$ on members of \mathcal{B} ;*
- (ii) *A linear functional on X is $(uo)_{\mathcal{B}}$ -continuous iff it is $(u\tau)_{\mathcal{B}}$ -continuous.*

Proof. (i) By Proposition 8.13(i), the topological modifications of $(uo)_{\mathcal{B}}$ and of $(u\tau)_{\mathcal{B}}$ are the strongest topologies on X that are weaker than uo and $u\tau$, respectively, on sets in \mathcal{B} . But these two topologies agree because by Remark 4.13, for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$, a topology on B is weaker than $(uo)|_B$ iff it is weaker than $(u\tau)|_B$.

(ii) follows from (i) and Proposition 1.3.9(iii) of [BB02]. □

Analogously to X_{uo}^{\sim} , we write X_{un}^{\sim} for the dual of X with respect to $un_{\mathcal{B}}$, where \mathcal{B} is the bornology of the norm bounded sets on a Banach lattice X and n is convergence with respect to the norm on X .

Corollary 8.24. *Let X be an order continuous Banach lattice. Then $X_{uo}^{\sim} = X_{un}^{\sim}$.*

Example 8.25. One may ask whether, under the assumptions of Proposition 8.23, the topological modification of $(uo)_{\mathcal{B}}$ is always a linear topology. The following example shows that the answer is “no”.

Let $X = L_{\infty}[0, 1]$, τ be the topology of convergence in measure, and \mathcal{B} the bornology of all order (or, equivalently, norm) bounded sets in X . Then X , τ , and \mathcal{B} satisfy the assumptions of the proposition. It is easy to see that τ is unbounded and that $(uo)_{\mathcal{B}} = o$. Hence, it follows from the proposition that $t(o)$ is the strongest topology coinciding with τ on bounded sets. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that $t(o)$ is linear. Then it would be the strongest linear topology coinciding with τ on bounded sets; it would then equal the Mackey topology $\tau(L_{\infty}, L_1)$ by Theorem 5 of [Now89]; see also a discussion before Corollary 3.8 in [Conr06]. However, it was shown in Theorem 16 in [ACW22] that $\tau(L_{\infty}, L_1) \neq t(o)$ on X .

Example 8.26. Let τ be a locally solid order continuous topology on a vector lattice X , let \mathcal{B} be the bornology of all order bounded sets in X . It is easy to see that $\tau_{\mathcal{B}} = (\text{u}\tau)_{\mathcal{B}}$. Since all Hausdorff order continuous locally solid topologies agree on order bounded sets (see [AB03], Theorem 4.22), $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ is independent of the topology chosen. It follows from $\tau \leq \text{o}$ that $\tau_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \text{o}$. We will see that, in general, $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ need not agree with order convergence.

To see this, let $X = L_p[0, 1]$ with $1 \leq p < \infty$, and let τ be the norm topology of X . In this case, $\text{u}\tau$ is the topology of convergence in measure. The typewriter sequence as in, e.g., [BTW23, Example 10.6] is an order bounded sequence in X which converges in measure to zero, and hence also with respect to $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$, but is not order convergent to zero.

In the preceding example, $\text{u}\tau$ is the topology of convergence in measure and, therefore, does not depend on p . However, $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ does. Indeed, let $f_n = \sqrt{n}\mathbb{1}_{[\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{1}{n}]}$. Then (f_n) is order bounded in $L_1[0, 1]$; since it converges to zero in measure, we have $f_n \xrightarrow{\tau_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$ in $L_1[0, 1]$. Yet (f_n) is not order bounded in $L_2[0, 1]$, hence it fails to $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}$ -converge to zero in $L_2[0, 1]$.

Example 8.20 suggests a natural conjecture regarding the interaction between locally solid convergences and bornologies. Let λ be a locally solid convergence on a vector lattice X , and $\text{u}\lambda$ be its unbounded modification. When can one recover λ from $\text{u}\lambda$ by taking the bounded modification of $\text{u}\lambda$ by an appropriate bornology, i.e., when do we have $(\text{u}\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}} = \lambda$? Two natural bornologies in this context appear to be the bornology of all order bounded sets and of all λ -bounded sets.

Proposition 8.27. *Let λ a locally solid convergence on a vector lattice X .*

- (i) *If \mathcal{B} is the bornology of λ -bounded sets in X and λ is locally bounded, then $(\text{u}\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \lambda$.*
- (ii) *If \mathcal{B} is the bornology of order bounded sets in X , then $\lambda \leq (\text{u}\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}}$.*

A locally solid convergence on a vector lattice is said to be **locally order bounded** if it is locally \mathcal{B} -bounded, where \mathcal{B} is the bornology of all order bounded sets.

Proposition 8.28. *Let λ be a locally solid convergence on a vector lattice X , and \mathcal{B} the bornology of all order bounded sets. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) λ is locally order bounded;
- (ii) $\lambda = (\mathfrak{u}\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}}$;
- (iii) λ is locally bounded, and every λ -bounded set is order bounded.

Proof. (ii) \Rightarrow (i) and (iii) \Rightarrow (i) are trivial. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) because λ and $\mathfrak{u}\lambda$ agree on order bounded sets. (i) \Rightarrow (iii) because every λ -bounded set is order bounded by Corollary 8.3. \square

Corollary 8.29. *Let X be a normed lattice, \mathfrak{n} convergence in norm, and \mathcal{B} the bornology of all order bounded sets. Then $(\mathfrak{un})_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathfrak{n}$ iff X has a strong unit.*

Proposition 8.30. *Let X be a normed lattice without a strong unit and \mathcal{B} the bornology of all norm bounded sets in X . The bounded modification $(\mathfrak{un})_{\mathcal{B}}$ of \mathfrak{un} -convergence by \mathcal{B} fails to be topological. In particular, $(\mathfrak{un})_{\mathcal{B}} \neq \mathfrak{n}$.*

Proof. By [KMT17, Theorem 2.3], we have $\mathfrak{un} < \mathfrak{n}$. It follows that there exists a net (x_{α}) in S_X such that $x_{\alpha} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{un}} 0$. Using Corollary 8.11, we get that $(\mathfrak{un})_{\mathcal{B}}$ fails to be topological. \square

Example 8.31. The following example shows that both $(\mathfrak{u}\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}} < \lambda$ and $(\mathfrak{u}\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}} > \lambda$ are possible in Proposition 8.27. Let λ be norm convergence on $L_1[0, 1]$. Then $\mathfrak{u}\lambda$ is \mathfrak{un} -convergence. Let $f_n = n\mathbb{1}_{[0, \frac{1}{n}]}$. Clearly, $\|f_n\| = 1$ for all n , hence (f_n) fails to λ -converge to 0. However, if \mathcal{B} is the bornology of all λ -bounded sets (that is, of all norm bounded sets) then $f_n \xrightarrow{(\mathfrak{un})_{\mathcal{B}}} 0$, so $(\mathfrak{u}\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}} \neq \lambda$. Since $(\mathfrak{u}\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \lambda$ by Proposition 8.27(i), we get $(\mathfrak{u}\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}} < \lambda$.

Now let $g_n = n\mathbb{1}_{[\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n-1}]}$, and let \mathcal{B} be the bornology of all order bounded sets. Then $g_n \xrightarrow{\|\cdot\|} 0$, but no tail of (g_n) is order bounded,

hence (g_n) fails to converge to zero in $(u\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}}$. Hence, again, $(u\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}} \neq \lambda$. Since $(u\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}} \geq \lambda$ by Proposition 8.27(ii), we get $(u\lambda)_{\mathcal{B}} > \lambda$.

Proposition 8.32. *Let τ be a locally solid locally order bounded linear topology on a vector lattice X . Then X has a strong unit and τ is relative uniform convergence.*

Proof. Since τ is locally order bounded, the neighborhood filter of zero, \mathcal{N}_0 , contains an order bounded set, hence an order interval $[-e, e]$ for some $e \in X_+$. It follows that e is a strong unit. It follows from $[-e, e] \in \mathcal{N}_0$ that τ is stronger than the topology induced by the norm $\|\cdot\|_e$. On the other hand, the latter is the strongest locally solid convergence on X . \square

We now look at the locally solid aspect of Examples 8.8, 8.12, and 8.17.

Example 8.33. Let X be a locally solid topological vector lattice. By Theorem 2.22 in [AB03], its topological dual X^* is an ideal in its order dual X^\sim , hence X^* is a vector lattice. We claim that the linear bornology \mathcal{B} of all equicontinuous sets in X^* is locally solid. Indeed, \mathcal{B} has a base formed by polars of neighborhoods of zero in X . Therefore, for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ there exists a neighborhood U of zero in X such that $B \subseteq U^\circ$. Since X is locally solid, we can find a solid neighborhood V of zero in X such that $V \subseteq U$; it follows that $V^\circ \supseteq U^\circ$, hence $B \subseteq V^\circ$. Note that V° is solid; see, e.g., the paragraph after Theorem 6.1 in [AB03].

Example 8.34. Let $X = \ell_p$ with $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, let Y be c_{00} considered as a subspace of ℓ_q , where $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$, and let $Z = \ell_q$ (for $p = 1$ put $Z := c_0$). We know that uo-convergence and coordinate-wise convergence on X agree; see Proposition 4.10. Moreover, this convergence is equal to $\sigma(X, Y)$, and so is weak* when X is considered a dual of Y . Since Y is dense in Z , it follows that $\sigma(X, Z)$ and $\sigma(X, Y)$ agree on the norm-bounded subsets of X . Consider the bounded modification of this convergence by the bornology \mathcal{B} of all norm bounded sets. This is exactly the $w_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ convergence described in Example 8.12 (in this case, we may view $X = Y^*$ or $X = Z^*$). This convergence is not topological, but its topological modification is bw^* , which is a linear topology (see

Example 8.17). When $1 < p < \infty$, $\sigma(X, Z)$ is the weak topology, hence for sequences $w_{\mathcal{B}}^*$ agrees with weak convergence. When $p = \infty$, \mathcal{B} is the bornology of order bounded sets, and so $\text{bw}^* = \text{t}(w_{\mathcal{B}}^*) = \text{t}(\text{uo}_{\mathcal{B}}) = \text{t}(\text{o})$. Applying the same argument to $\ell_{\infty}(\Omega)$, for an arbitrary set Ω , we conclude that the topological modification of order convergence on $\ell_{\infty}(\Omega)$ is linear.

While the topological modification of order convergence on $\ell_{\infty}(\Omega)$ is linear, this is not the case for $L_{\infty}[0, 1]$, as we proved in Example 8.25. It is also not the case for $C[0, 1]$, according to [BTW23, Example 10.7]. Since both $\ell_{\infty}(\Omega)$ and $L_{\infty}[0, 1]$ are isomorphic to $C(K)$ spaces, this motivates the following question.

Question 8.35. Is it true that if $\text{t}(\text{o})$ is linear on $C(K)$, then K has a dense set of isolated points?

9. CHOQUET MODIFICATION

Recall that a filter \mathcal{U} is an **ultrafilter** if it is maximal, i.e., not properly contained in another filter. Equivalently, for every set A , either $A \in \mathcal{U}$ or $X \setminus A \in \mathcal{U}$. Furthermore, a filter \mathcal{U} is an ultrafilter iff it is **prime**, i.e., if $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ for some filters \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} then $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ or $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. Every filter is contained in an ultrafilter.

Let (X, η) be a convergence space. We say that it is **Choquet** if $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\eta} x$ whenever $\mathcal{U} \xrightarrow{\eta} x$ for every ultrafilter $\mathcal{U} \supseteq \mathcal{F}$; see pp. 17–18 in [BB02]. It is easy to see that every topological convergence is Choquet. Given an arbitrary convergence structure (X, η) , its **Choquet modification** $c\eta$ is defined as follows: $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{c\eta} x$ if $\mathcal{U} \xrightarrow{\eta} x$ for every ultrafilter \mathcal{U} containing \mathcal{F} . Using the fact that every ultrafilter is prime, it is easy to see that $c\eta$ is a Choquet convergence structure and $c\eta \leq \eta$.

We will now “translate” these two terms into the net language. We write $(y_{\beta}) \preceq (x_{\alpha})$ to indicate that (y_{β}) is a quasi-subnet of (x_{α}) .

Lemma 9.1. *For a net (x_{α}) in a convergence space X and $x \in X$, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *Every ultrafilter containing $[x_{\alpha}]$ converges to x ;*
- (ii) *Every quasi-subnet of (x_{α}) has a further quasi-subnet that converges to x .*

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Let (y_β) be a quasi-subnet of (x_α) . Note that $[y_\beta]$ is contained in some ultrafilter, say, \mathcal{U} . Find a net (z_γ) such that $\mathcal{U} = [z_\gamma]$. Observe that $[x_\alpha] \subseteq [y_\beta] \subseteq [z_\gamma]$. It follows that $(z_\gamma) \preceq (y_\beta)$ and by (i), $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow x$. Therefore, $z_\gamma \rightarrow x$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i) Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter such that $[x_\alpha] \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. Find a net (y_β) with $[y_\beta] = \mathcal{U}$. Then $(y_\beta) \preceq (x_\alpha)$. By (ii), there exists a net (z_γ) such that $(z_\gamma) \preceq (y_\beta)$ and $z_\gamma \rightarrow x$. It follows that $[z_\gamma] \rightarrow x$. Finally, it follows from $\mathcal{U} = [y_\beta] \subseteq [z_\gamma]$ and the maximality of \mathcal{U} that $[z_\gamma] = \mathcal{U}$, hence $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow x$. \square

In (ii), one may replace “quasi-subnets” with “subnets”, in either one or in both occurrences. This is because it was observed in [BTW23, Proposition 2.2] that every subnet is a quasi-subnet, and every subnet is tail equivalent to a quasi-subnet.

The following two propositions are immediate consequences of Lemma 9.1.

Proposition 9.2. *Let X be a convergence space. X is Choquet iff for every net (x_α) in X and $x \in X$, if every (quasi-)subnet of (x_α) has a further (quasi-)subnet that converges to x , then $x_\alpha \rightarrow x$.*

Proposition 9.3. *Let (X, η) be a convergence space. Then $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{c\eta} x$ iff every (quasi-)subnet of (x_α) has a further (quasi-)subnet that η -converges to x .*

It is easy to see that if η is Hausdorff then so is $c\eta$. It was observed in [BB02, Proposition 1.3.25(ii)] that if a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between two convergence spaces (X, η) and (Y, λ) is η -to- λ continuous then it is also $c\eta$ -to- $c\lambda$ continuous. If η is linear then so is $c\eta$; see [BB02, Proposition 3.1.4].

Let \mathcal{B} be a bornology on a set X ; suppose that \mathcal{B} is proper in the sense that $\mathcal{B} \neq \mathcal{P}(X)$. Then \mathcal{B} is a proper ideal in $\mathcal{P}(X)$. Let \mathcal{F} be a filter on X . If $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$ then there exists an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} containing \mathcal{F} such that $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$, see, e.g., Lemma 2.1 in [ABT]. That is, \mathcal{F} contains a bounded set iff every ultrafilter containing \mathcal{F} contains a bounded set. It follows that Choquet modification commutes with bornological modification:

Proposition 9.4. *Let (X, η) be a convergence space, and \mathcal{B} a bornology on X . Then $(c\eta)_{\mathcal{B}} = c(\eta_{\mathcal{B}})$. In particular, if η is Choquet then so is $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$.*

Proof. For a filter \mathcal{F} , $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{(c\eta)_{\mathcal{B}}} x$ iff $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{c\eta} x$ and \mathcal{F} meets \mathcal{B} . By the remark preceding the proposition, this is equivalent to saying that for every ultrafilter \mathcal{U} containing \mathcal{F} we have $\mathcal{U} \xrightarrow{\eta} x$ and \mathcal{U} meets \mathcal{B} , hence $\mathcal{U} \xrightarrow{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}} x$. This means $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{c(\eta_{\mathcal{B}})} x$. \square

Proposition 9.5. *Let \mathcal{B} be a bornology on a set X , and (x_{α}) a net in X . Every quasi-subnet of (x_{α}) in turn has a bounded quasi-subnet iff (x_{α}) is eventually bounded.*

Proof. Suppose (x_{α}) is not eventually bounded. Then $[x_{\alpha}] \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$. As before, find an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} containing $[x_{\alpha}]$ such that $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$. Then $\mathcal{U} = [y_{\beta}]$ for some quasi-subnet (y_{β}) of (x_{α}) . By assumption, there exists a bounded net (z_{γ}) such that $(z_{\gamma}) \preceq (y_{\beta})$. Since $[y_{\beta}] \subseteq [z_{\gamma}]$, maximality of \mathcal{U} yields $[y_{\beta}] = [z_{\gamma}]$ and, therefore, $[z_{\gamma}] \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$, which is a contradiction.

The converse implication is straightforward. \square

Remark 9.6. Let η be a linear convergence and \mathcal{B} a linear bornology on a vector space X . If η is locally \mathcal{B} -bounded, i.e., $\eta = \eta_{\mathcal{B}}$, then it follows from Proposition 9.4 that $(c\eta)_{\mathcal{B}} = c(\eta_{\mathcal{B}}) = c\eta$, hence $c\eta$ is also locally \mathcal{B} -bounded.

Suppose now that η is locally bounded, that is, it is locally \mathcal{B} -bounded where \mathcal{B} is the bornology of all η -bounded sets. By the preceding paragraph, $c\eta$ is also locally \mathcal{B} -bounded. By Corollary 8.3, every $c\eta$ -bounded set is η -bounded. On the other hand, since $c\eta \leq \eta$, η -bounded sets are $c\eta$ -bounded. Thus, if η is locally bounded then η and $c\eta$ have the same bounded sets.

Proposition 9.7. *Let η be a convergence structure on a vector lattice X . If η is locally solid then so is $c\eta$. Moreover, η and $c\eta$ agree on monotone nets.*

Proof. We will use Proposition 3.3(iii). Since the modulus operation is η -to- η continuous, it is also $c\eta$ -to- $c\eta$ continuous. So it suffices to verify that $c\eta$ is locally full. Suppose that $0 \leq y_{\alpha} \leq x_{\alpha} \xrightarrow{c\eta} 0$. Let $(y_{\alpha\beta})$

be a subnet of (y_α) . Consider the corresponding subnet (x_{α_β}) of (x_α) . Since $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{c\eta} 0$, there exists a further subnet $(x_{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}})$ of (x_{α_β}) such that $x_{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}} \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$. Since η is locally solid, we have $y_{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}} \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ and, therefore, $y_\alpha \xrightarrow{c\eta} 0$.

For the “moreover” clause, we always have $c\eta \leq \eta$. Suppose that $x_\alpha \downarrow$ and $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{c\eta} x$. Then there exists a quasi-subnet (y_β) of (x_α) such that $y_\beta \xrightarrow{\eta} x$. Then $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} x$ by Corollary 3.10. \square

It was shown in Theorem 1.5.5. in [BB02] that continuous convergence on $C(\Omega)$ is Choquet. By Example 1.5.26(i) and Theorem 4.3.9 in [BB02], if Ω is not locally compact then this provides an example of a locally solid convergence which is Choquet but not topological.

Recall that if $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a function and \mathcal{F} is a filter on X then we write $f(\mathcal{F})$ for the filter generated by $\{f(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$. It is easy to see that if \mathcal{F} is an ultrafilter then so is $f(\mathcal{F})$. If X is a vector lattice and $u \in X_+$ then $|\mathcal{F}| \wedge u$ equals $f(\mathcal{F})$ where $f(x) = |x| \wedge u$. In particular, if \mathcal{F} is an ultrafilter then so is $|\mathcal{F}| \wedge u$.

The following proposition shows that the unbounded modification commutes with the Choquet modification.

Proposition 9.8. *Let (X, η) be a locally solid convergence space. Then $u(c\eta) = c(u\eta)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $0 \leq x_\alpha \xrightarrow{c(u\eta)} 0$. Fix $u \geq 0$. Take any quasi-subnet (y_β) of $(u \wedge x_\alpha)$. It follows from $u \wedge x_\alpha \xrightarrow{c(u\eta)} 0$ that there exists a quasi-subnet (z_γ) of (y_β) such that $z_\gamma \xrightarrow{u\eta} 0$. Since the net (z_γ) is eventually order bounded, we have $z_\gamma \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$. It follows that $u \wedge x_\alpha \xrightarrow{c\eta} 0$ and, therefore, $0 \leq x_\alpha \xrightarrow{u(c\eta)} 0$.

For the converse, we will use filter language. Suppose that $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{u(c\eta)} 0$. Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter with $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. Fix $u \geq 0$. Then $|\mathcal{F}| \wedge u \subseteq |\mathcal{U}| \wedge u$. By the comment preceding the proposition, $|\mathcal{U}| \wedge u$ is an ultrafilter. It follows from $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{u(c\eta)} 0$ that $|\mathcal{F}| \wedge u \xrightarrow{c\eta} 0$, hence $|\mathcal{U}| \wedge u \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ and, therefore, $\mathcal{U} \xrightarrow{u\eta} 0$. We now conclude that $\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{c(u\eta)} 0$. \square

Remark 9.9. Using the same proof, one can prove that $u_I(c\eta) = c(u_I\eta)$ for every ideal I .

Proposition 9.10. *Let η be a locally solid locally order bounded convergence on X such that $c\eta$ is topological. Then X has a strong unit and η is relative uniform convergence.*

Proof. By Remark 9.6 and Proposition 9.4, $c\eta$ is locally solid and locally order bounded. By Proposition 8.32, X has a strong unit and $c\eta = \text{ru}$. It now follows from $\text{ru} = c\eta \leq \eta \leq \text{ru}$ that $\eta = \text{ru}$. \square

Example 9.11. Since every norm convergent sequence in a Banach lattice has a subsequence that converges relatively uniformly, one may naturally conjecture that the same may be true for nets. This is, generally, not true. Indeed, this would imply that $c(\text{ru})$ is norm convergence, hence X has a strong unit by Proposition 9.10. Below, we provide a specific example of a norm null net in a Banach lattice with no order bounded subnets.

Fix an uncountable set Ω . Put $X = \ell_1(\Omega)$. Let Γ be the set of all finite non-empty subsets of Ω , ordered by inclusion. For $\gamma \in \Gamma$, put $x_\gamma = \frac{1}{|\gamma|^2} \mathbb{1}_\gamma$, where $|\gamma|$ is the cardinality of γ . Clearly, $\|x_\gamma\| = \frac{1}{|\gamma|} \rightarrow 0$.

Suppose that there is a subnet $(x_{\gamma_\alpha})_{\alpha \in A}$ of $(x_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ which is order bounded by some $u \in \ell_1(\Omega)_+$. Since the set $\{\gamma_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}$ is co-final in Γ , it follows that for every $t \in \Omega$, $\{t\} \subseteq \gamma_\alpha$ for some α ; we conclude that $u(t) \geq x_{\gamma_\alpha}(t) > 0$. This means that u has uncountable support, which is impossible in $\ell_1(\Omega)$.

In the rest of this section, we will discuss when order and uo convergences are Choquet.

Lemma 9.12. *Let K be a compact topological space with no isolated points, and F a norm dense sublattice of $C(K)$ such that $\mathbb{1} \in F$. There exists a net in $F \cap [0, \mathbb{1}]$ which, viewed as a net in $C(K)$, is co-null but not order null.*

Proof. We start by construction an index set. For each $s \in K$, let \mathcal{N}_s be the set of all neighborhoods of s . Put $A = K \times \prod_{s \in K} \mathcal{N}_s$. That is, for every $\alpha \in A$, the first component is some point of K , which we will denote by t_α , and the second component is a family $(U_s^\alpha)_{s \in K}$, where $U_s^\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_s$ for every s . We pre-order A as follows $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$ if $U_s^{\alpha_2} \subseteq U_s^{\alpha_1}$ for every $s \in K$. For every $\alpha \in A$, use, e.g., Proposition 4.1 in [Bil23b]

to find a function $f_\alpha \in F$ such that $0 \leq f_\alpha \leq \mathbb{1}$, $f_\alpha(t_\alpha) = 1$, and f_α vanishes outside of $U_{t_\alpha}^\alpha$. It is easy to see that for every $t \in K$, in every tail of the net there exists an index α such that $f_\alpha(t) = 1$; it follows that the supremum of every tail is $\mathbb{1}$ and, therefore, f_α fails to converge to zero in order.

We will show that $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{co}} 0$. Let (f_{α_β}) be a subnet of (f_α) . By compactness of K , there is a further subnet $(f_{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}})$ such that $(t_{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}})$ converges to some t_0 . We will show that $f_{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}} \xrightarrow{\circ} 0$; this will complete the proof. Fix an open non-empty subset U of K . By Theorem 3.2 in [BT22], it suffices to show that some tail of $(f_{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}})$ vanishes on some open non-empty subset V of U . Since K has no isolated points, we can find $W \in \mathcal{N}_{t_0}$ and an open non-empty subset V of U such that $W \cap V = \emptyset$. Define α_0 as follows: $t_{\alpha_0} = t_0$, and let $U_s^{\alpha_0}$ be W if $s \in W$ and K otherwise. Passing to a tail, we may assume that $\alpha_{\beta_\gamma} \geq \alpha_0$ and $t_{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}} \in W$ for all γ . Then $U_{t_{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}}}^{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}} \subseteq W$. Since $f_{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}}$ vanishes outside of $U_{t_{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}}}^{\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}}$, it vanishes on V . \square

Theorem 9.13. *For an Archimedean vector lattice X the following are equivalent:*

- (i) X is discrete;
- (ii) Order convergence on X is Choquet;
- (iii) Unbounded order convergence on X is Choquet;
- (iv) Unbounded order convergence on X is topological.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (iv) If X is discrete then uo convergence is topological by Proposition 4.10.

(iv) \Rightarrow (iii) is trivial.

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii) follows from Example 8.20 and Proposition 9.4.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i) Assume that X is not discrete. Then there exists $0 < e \in X$ such that I_e is atomless. By Krein-Kakutani's Representation Theorem, there exists a lattice isomorphic embedding $T: I_e \rightarrow C(K)$ for some compact Hausdorff space K , such that $F := \text{Range } T$ is a norm dense sublattice and $\mathbb{1} \in F$. Since F is atomless, K has no isolated points; see, e.g., Lemma 4.2 in [ABT]. Let (f_α) be a net as in Lemma 9.12.

It is easy to see that F is order dense and, therefore, regular in $C(K)$. It follows that order convergences in F and in $C(K)$ agree for order bounded nets; see, e.g., Corollary 2.12 in [GTX17]. Therefore, (f_α) is co-null but not order null not only in $C(K)$ but also in F . Put $x_\alpha = T^{-1}f_\alpha$. Since T is a lattice isomorphism, (x_α) is co-null but not order null in I_e ; it is also order bounded there. Since I_e is regular, we conclude that (x_α) is co-null but not order null in X . It follows that order convergence on X fails to be Choquet. \square

Remark 9.14. The fact that uo-convergence is topological iff the vector lattice is discrete is known: it was shown in Theorem 7.5 in [Tay19] that uo-convergence agrees with the convergence of a locally convex-solid topology iff X is discrete; in the general case, this fact may be deduced by combining results of [Ell68, Pap65, Win62]. A direct proof may be found in [TayMSc] and in [ABT].

Question 9.15. Characterize Archimedean vector lattices on which relative uniform convergence or σ -order convergence is Choquet.

Some partial answers to this question are already contained in this article. First, if X has a strong unit, then ru is given via a norm, and so in particular it is Choquet. In an order continuous Banach lattice we have $o = ru$ (see, e.g., [BW80]), hence in this case the latter is Choquet if and only if X is discrete. In Example 8.19, we observed that relative uniform convergence on the appropriate spaces of continuous functions may be obtained as a bounded modification of ucc convergence; since ucc is topological and, therefore, Choquet, we conclude by Proposition 9.4 that ru on these spaces is Choquet as well. Hence, neither discreteness nor having strong unit are necessary conditions. Is discreteness sufficient?

If X has countable supremum property, then $o = \sigma o$, and so the latter is Choquet if and only if X is discrete. Discreteness is not necessary due to existence of the following class of examples. Recall that a compact Hausdorff space K is called a P' space or an almost P space (see [Vek73]) if every non-empty closed G_δ set has a nonempty interior, or equivalently, σo on $C(K)$ is given via the supremum norm. Clearly, in this case σo is Choquet, but K does not necessarily have a dense set

of isolated points: for a counterexample, take $K = \beta\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathbb{N}$, which has no isolated points.

10. WEAKEST AND MINIMAL LOCALLY SOLID CONVERGENCE STRUCTURES

Let X be a set. All convergence structures on X are naturally ordered by the “weaker/stronger” relation. So it makes sense to ask whether a family \mathcal{A} of convergence structures on X has a least element (the weakest convergence in the family), a greatest element (the strongest convergence), whether it has minimal elements (an element of \mathcal{A} is minimal if no other element of \mathcal{A} is weaker than it) or maximal elements (defined analogously). It may also be of interest to know whether $\inf \mathcal{A}$ and $\sup \mathcal{A}$ exist. Naturally, when \mathcal{A} consists of linear (or locally solid) Hausdorff convergences, we may want to find $\inf \mathcal{A}$ and $\sup \mathcal{A}$ with respect to the same class.

We start with the set of all convergence structures on X . The strongest convergence on X is discrete (only eventually constant nets are convergent), while the weakest convergence is trivial (every net converges to every point). Every collection of convergence structures \mathcal{A} has a supremum given as follows: a net (or a filter) converges if it converges with respect to every convergence in the collection. It follows that if the elements of \mathcal{A} are Hausdorff, linear, or locally solid then so is $\sup \mathcal{A}$. In [BB02, Definition 1.2.1], this convergence structure is called the *initial convergence structure with respect to the family \mathcal{A}* .

Since every set of convergences has a supremum, the set of all convergence structures on X is a complete lattice. This implies that $\inf \mathcal{A}$ always exists. In the special case when \mathcal{A} is directed downwards, $\inf \mathcal{A}$ can be easily described as follows: a net converges with respect to $\inf \mathcal{A}$ if it converges with respect to *some* convergence in \mathcal{A} . It follows that in this case if elements of \mathcal{A} are Hausdorff, linear, or locally solid then so is $\inf \mathcal{A}$.

Describing $\inf \mathcal{A}$ for a general \mathcal{A} requires more effort. Furthermore, $\inf \mathcal{A}$ need not preserve whatever nice properties that elements of \mathcal{A} may have. Using [BB02, p. 8], one may characterize $\inf \mathcal{A}$ in the language of filters as follows: $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow x$ whenever $\mathcal{F} \supseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{F}_n$, where

each \mathcal{F}_i converges to x with respect to some convergence in \mathcal{A} (dependent on i).

Next, we present a net version of this characterization. We use the concept of a mixing of a family of nets, introduced in [BTW23]. We recall from [BTW23] that if a net M is the mixing of a family of nets Σ then the tail filter of M equals the intersection of the tail filters of the nets in Σ . Furthermore, in a convergence space, if Σ is finite and each net in Σ converges to x then so does M .

Proposition 10.1. *Let X be a set, \mathcal{A} a collection of convergence structures on X , and $\lambda = \inf \mathcal{A}$. Then $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$ iff (x_α) is a quasi-subnet of the mixing of a finite collection S_1, \dots, S_n of nets, where each S_i converges to x with respect to some convergence in \mathcal{A} .*

Proof. Let (x_α) be a quasi-subnet of M , where M is the mixing of a finite collection S_1, \dots, S_n of nets, where each S_i converges to x with respect to some convergence in \mathcal{A} . Then clearly $S_i \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$ for each i ; it follows that $M \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$ and, therefore, $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$.

Conversely, suppose that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$. Then $[x_\alpha] \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$. It follows that $[x_\alpha] \supseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{F}_n$, where each \mathcal{F}_i converges with respect to some convergence in \mathcal{A} . For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, find a net S_i such that $\mathcal{F} = [S_i]$, and let M be the mixing of S_1, \dots, S_n . Then each S_i converges to x with respect to some convergence structure in \mathcal{A} . We also have

$$[x_\alpha] \supseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{F}_n = [S_1] \cap \dots \cap [S_n] = [M],$$

so that (x_α) is a quasi-subnet of M . □

Suppose now that X is a vector space. The strongest linear convergence on X is finite-dimensional convergence, while the weakest is the trivial one. Let \mathcal{A} be a set of linear convergence structures on X . The infimum of \mathcal{A} in the set of all convergence structures described above need not be linear. However, since $\sup \mathcal{A}$ is linear for every such \mathcal{A} , the collection of all linear convergence structures is itself a complete lattice. Therefore, every collection \mathcal{A} of linear convergence structures has an infimum in the set of all linear convergence structures. In the filter language, this infimum was described in [BB02, Corollary 3.3.7] as follows: a filter converges to 0 if it contains $\mathcal{F}_1 + \dots + \mathcal{F}_n$, where each

\mathcal{F}_i converges to 0 with respect to some convergence in \mathcal{A} . Analogously to Proposition 10.1, we can translate this to the language of nets as follows:

Proposition 10.2. *A net converges to zero in the infimum of \mathcal{A} within the lattice of linear convergences iff it is a quasi-subnet of $S_1 + \dots + S_n$, where each S_i converges to 0 with respect to some convergence in \mathcal{A} .*

The situation with local solidity is similar. Let X be a vector lattice. The strongest locally solid convergence is relative uniform convergence, while the weakest is the trivial one. The supremum of a collection of locally solid convergences is locally solid, and so the set of all locally solid convergences is a complete lattice. It follows that every set \mathcal{A} of locally solid convergences has an infimum in this lattice. In fact, it coincides with the infimum of \mathcal{A} in the lattice of linear convergences. Indeed, denote the latter infimum by \rightarrow . If $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$ then it contains $\mathcal{F}_1 + \dots + \mathcal{F}_n$, where each \mathcal{F}_i and, therefore, also $\text{Sol}(\mathcal{F}_i)$, converges to zero with respect to some convergence in \mathcal{A} . Hence, \mathcal{F} contains $\text{Sol}(\mathcal{F}_1) + \dots + \text{Sol}(\mathcal{F}_n) \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, \rightarrow is locally solid.

The following example implies that the infimum of all Hausdorff locally solid convergences on X need not be Hausdorff. That is, there may be no weakest Hausdorff locally solid convergence on X .

Example 10.3. Let $X = C[0, 1]$. Consider two convergence structures on X : let μ be convergence in measure and let η be pointwise convergence on $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$. It can be easily verified that both are locally solid Hausdorff convergences. Let (q_n) be an enumeration of $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$. One can easily construct a sequence (x_n) in X such that x_n takes the value 1 at the points q_1, \dots, q_n , but the measure of the support of x_n tends to zero. It follows that $x_n \xrightarrow{\mu} 0$ but $x_n \xrightarrow{\eta} \mathbb{1}$. Hence, for every convergence λ that is weaker than both μ and η we have both $x_n \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$ and $x_n \xrightarrow{\lambda} \mathbb{1}$, so that any such λ fails to be Hausdorff.

Proposition 10.4. *Let X be a discrete vector lattice. Then coordinate-wise convergence is the weakest locally solid Hausdorff convergence on X .*

Proof. Let η be a locally solid Hausdorff convergence on X . If $0 \leq x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$, it follows from $P_a x_\alpha \leq x_\alpha$ that $P_a x_\alpha \rightarrow 0$ for every atom a in X and, therefore, $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{p} 0$. \square

Note that for a discrete vector lattice, the weakest Hausdorff locally solid convergence is also the weakest Hausdorff and locally solid topology.

It is known that on an order continuous discrete Banach lattice, uo and un convergences agree with coordinate-wise convergence; see, e.g., Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.4 in [DEM20]. We now generalize this as follows.

Corollary 10.5. *Let X be a discrete vector lattice and λ a Hausdorff order continuous locally solid convergence on X . Then $u\lambda = p$.*

Proof. Since λ is order continuous, we have $\lambda \leq o$. It follows that $u\lambda \leq uo$. By Proposition 4.10, we have $uo = p$, hence $u\lambda \leq p$. Minimality of p yields $u\lambda = p$. \square

Remark 10.6. Recall that on an order continuous Banach lattice, ru convergence agrees with order convergence (see, e.g., [BW80]). Let X be an order continuous discrete Banach lattice and η a Hausdorff locally solid convergence on X . By Proposition 5.1, we have $\eta \leq ru = o$, so Corollary 10.5 yields $u\eta = p$. In particular, η agrees with p on order bounded nets. Furthermore, the bounded modification of η by the bornology of all order bounded sets is order convergence.

Minimal convergences. We observed earlier that for every downward directed set of Hausdorff linear (or locally solid) convergence structures, its infimum in the set of all convergence structures always exists and is again Hausdorff and linear (respectively, locally solid). Using Zorn’s lemma, we now obtain the following:

Proposition 10.7. *Let X be a vector space (or a vector lattice). The set of all Hausdorff linear (respectively, locally solid) convergences on X has a minimal element.*

Remark 10.8. A similar argument shows that given a Hausdorff linear (or locally solid) convergence structure λ , there is a minimal Hausdorff

linear (respectively, locally solid) convergence structure that is dominated by λ .

By a **minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence** on a vector lattice X we mean a minimal element in the set of all Hausdorff locally solid convergences on X .

Proposition 10.9. *Every minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence is unbounded and Choquet.*

Proof. Let η be a minimal locally solid Hausdorff convergence. Then $u\eta$ and $c\eta$ are Hausdorff locally solid convergences with $u\eta \leq \eta$ and $c\eta \leq \eta$. It follows that $u\eta = \eta = c\eta$. \square

We are going to prove that every minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence is order continuous. We will use the following auxiliary concept. Given two locally solid convergences η and λ on a vector lattice X , we introduce their **composition** $\eta\lambda$ as follows: we say that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta\lambda} x$ if there exists a net (v_γ) in X_+ such that $v_\gamma \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$ and for every γ the net $(|x_\alpha - x| - v_\gamma)^+ \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ as a net in α . We say that (v_γ) is a **control net** for the convergence.

Proposition 10.10. *If η and λ are two locally solid convergence structures then so is $\eta\lambda$.*

Proof. It suffices to verify that the assumptions of Theorem 3.5 are satisfied for nets in X_+ . (i) is obvious because if (y_β) is a quasi-subnet of (x_α) then for every γ the net $(y_\beta - v_\gamma)^+$ is a quasi-subnet of $(x_\alpha - v_\gamma)^+$. (ii) follows from the observation that if $0 \leq y_\alpha \leq x_\alpha$ then $0 \leq (y_\alpha - v_\gamma)^+ \leq (x_\alpha - v_\gamma)^+$.

To verify (iii), let $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta\lambda} 0$ and $y_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta\lambda} 0$ in X_+ . Let (u_β) and (v_γ) be the corresponding control nets. Then $u_\beta + v_\gamma \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$ and for every β and γ we have

$$((x_\alpha + y_\alpha) - (u_\beta + v_\gamma))^+ \leq (x_\alpha - u_\beta)^+ + (y_\alpha - v_\gamma)^+ \xrightarrow{\eta} 0,$$

hence $x_\alpha + y_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta\lambda} 0$ with control net $(u_\beta + v_\gamma)$.

To see (iv), just take the control net to be the zero net. \square

Proposition 10.11. *Let η and λ be two locally solid convergence structures. Then $\eta\lambda \leq \eta$. Furthermore, λ dominates $\eta\lambda$ on monotone nets. If λ is order continuous then so is $\eta\lambda$.*

Proof. If $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} x$ then $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta\lambda} x$; just take (v_γ) to be a constant zero net.

Suppose that (x_α) is monotone and $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$; we need to show that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta\lambda} x$. Without loss of generality, $x_\alpha \downarrow$ and $x = 0$. We take (x_α) itself as a control net. For every fixed β , the net $(x_\alpha - x_\beta)^+$ is eventually zero, hence is η -null, so that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta\lambda} 0$.

The last claim now follows from Theorem 3.11. □

Proposition 10.12. *The composition $\eta\lambda$ of two locally solid convergences is Hausdorff iff both η and λ are Hausdorff.*

Proof. Suppose that η and λ are both Hausdorff; we will show that so is $\eta\lambda$. We will use Proposition 3.4(iii). Let (x_α) be a constant zero net such that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta\lambda} x$ for some $x \in X$. Let (v_γ) be a control net. For every γ , the net $((|x_\alpha - x| - v_\gamma)^+)$ is η -null. However, every term in this net is the constant $(|x| - v_\gamma)^+$. Since η is Hausdorff, we conclude that $(|x| - v_\gamma)^+ = 0$ and, therefore, $|x| \leq v_\gamma$. It now follows from $v_\gamma \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$ and local solidity of λ that $|x| \xrightarrow{\lambda} 0$. Since λ is Hausdorff, we conclude that $x = 0$.

Suppose that $\eta\lambda$ is Hausdorff, we will now show that η and λ are both Hausdorff. It follows from $\eta\lambda \leq \eta$ that η is Hausdorff. Suppose now that (x_α) is a zero net and $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda} x$. Since this net is monotone, we get $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta\lambda} x$ and, therefore, $x = 0$. □

We call a convergence structure η **idempotent** if $\eta\eta = \eta$ (idempotent convergence structures were introduced and investigated in [Bil23a]).

Theorem 10.13. *Every minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence is order continuous and idempotent, and is weaker than uo -convergence.*

Proof. Let η be a minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence. It follows from $\eta\eta \leq \eta$ that $\eta\eta = \eta$.

Recall that \circ stand for order convergence. Notice that $\eta\circ$ is an order continuous Hausdorff locally solid convergence, and $\eta\circ \leq \eta$. It follows that $\eta\circ = \eta$ and, therefore, η is order continuous.

Since η is unbounded and $\eta \leq \circ$, we conclude that $\eta = \eta\circ \leq \text{uo}$. \square

Since every disjoint net is uo -null, we get the following:

Corollary 10.14. *For every minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence, every disjoint net is null.*

It may be interesting to compare properties of minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergences to that of minimal Hausdorff locally solid topologies. In the following theorem, we summarize several known results about the minimal Hausdorff locally solid topologies.

Theorem 10.15 ([AB03, Con05, Tay19, TayMSc]).

- (i) *There is at most one minimal Hausdorff locally solid topology.*
- (ii) *A Hausdorff locally solid topology τ is minimal iff $\tau \leq \text{uo}$ iff τ is order continuous and unbounded.*
- (iii) *If τ is minimal, then it extends to a locally solid topology on the universal completion X^u of X , which then becomes the completion of (X, τ) . In particular, τ is complete iff X is universally complete.*

We will now explore to which extent these results remain valid for convergences.

Example 10.16. *A minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence need not be unique.* In the notation of Example 10.3, we use Remark 10.8 to find two minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergences μ' and η' such that $\mu' \leq \mu$ and $\eta' \leq \eta$. It follows that $x_n \xrightarrow{\mu'} 0$ and $x_n \xrightarrow{\eta'} \mathbb{1}$. Therefore, $\mu' \neq \eta'$.

It follows from Remark 10.8 that if there is a unique minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence, then it also has to be the least. Again, this fails for topologies; see, e.g., [TayMSc, Example 3.28].

Example 10.17. By Theorem 10.13, every minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence is unbounded and order continuous. The converse

is false: on $L_p[0, 1]$ with $1 \leq p < \infty$, uo-convergence is unbounded and order continuous, yet it is not minimal as it strictly dominates un-convergence.

Example 10.18. According to Theorem 10.15, every Hausdorff locally solid topology that is weaker than uo-convergence is itself unbounded. The following example shows that this fails for convergences. Let $X = C[0, 1]$. For a positive net (f_α) , we define $f_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ if for every non-empty open interval I in $[0, 1]$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a non-empty open interval $J \subseteq I$ and an index α_0 such that for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ the average of f_α over J is less than ε . By Theorem 3.5, this yields a Hausdorff locally solid convergence on X . By [BT22, Theorem 3.2], $\eta \leq \text{uo}$. We will show that, nevertheless, η is not unbounded. Let (f_n) be the Schauder sequence in $C[0, 1]$ as in, say, [Car05, p. 28]. Let $g_n = f_n/\|f_n\|_{L_1}$. Observe that (g_n) is not η -null because for every interval J and every n there exists $m > n$ such that the support of g_m is contained in J and, therefore, the average of g_m over J is greater than one. On the other hand, for every positive $u \in C[0, 1]$, $g_n \wedge u \xrightarrow{\eta} 0$ because for every interval J , the average of $g_n \wedge u$ over J converges to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Recall that, by [Azo19, Theorem 17] or [TayMSc, Theorem 4.14], X is universally complete iff it is uo-complete.

Proposition 10.19. *If X is complete with respect to a Hausdorff locally solid convergence η with $\eta \leq \text{uo}$ then X is universally complete.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that X is uo-complete. Let (x_α) be a uo-Cauchy net in X . Then it is η -Cauchy, hence $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\eta} x$ for some x . We will show that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{uo}} x$. Fix $u \geq 0$. Since (x_α) is uo-Cauchy, $x_\alpha - x_\beta \xrightarrow{\text{uo}} 0$. Hence there exists a net v_γ such that $v_\gamma \downarrow 0$ and for every γ there exists α_0 such that $|x_\alpha - x_\beta| \wedge u \leq v_\gamma$ for all $\alpha, \beta \geq \alpha_0$. Passing to the limit in η , we conclude that $|x_\alpha - x| \wedge u \leq v_\gamma$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. It follows that $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{uo}} x$. \square

Corollary 10.20. *If X is complete with respect to a minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence then X is universally complete.*

We feel that we only scratched the surface in the subject of minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergences. We end the section with a list of questions that may suggest further developments of this topic.

Question 10.21. Is every minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence on a universally complete vector lattice necessarily complete? Does every minimal locally solid convergence on X extend to X^u ?

Assume that X has the countable supremum property, and τ is the minimal Hausdorff locally solid topology. By Theorem 10.15, τ is unbounded and order continuous, so by Proposition 4.11, $\tau = u\tau = t(uo)$. This motivates the following question:

Question 10.22. Suppose that X admits a minimal Hausdorff locally solid topology. Does it agree with the topological or Choquet modification of uo -convergence? In particular, if the topological modification of uo -convergence is Hausdorff, is it a minimal Hausdorff locally solid topology?

Question 10.23. Proposition 10.9 and Theorem 10.13 motivate the following question: Is the Choquet modification of uo -convergence necessarily a minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence?

Question 10.24. Is every minimal Hausdorff locally solid topology automatically a minimal Hausdorff locally solid convergence?

Question 10.25. It is known that for a Hausdorff locally solid topology, the following two properties are equivalent: every increasing order bounded net is Cauchy, and, every order bounded disjoint net is null; see [AB03, Theorem 3.22]. Such topologies are called pre-Lebesgue. For locally solid convergences, the forward implication remains true (just consider the net of partial sums). Is the converse implication true for convergences?

11. ADHERENCE OF AN IDEAL

Throughout this section, “ \rightarrow ” is a Hausdorff locally solid convergence structure on a vector lattice X . Recall that for a subset A of X , we write \overline{A}^1 for the adherence of A , \overline{A}^2 for the adherence of \overline{A}^1 , etc. J will

stand for an ideal of X . For $x \in X^+$, the set $[0, x] \cap J$ may be viewed as an increasing net in X .

Lemma 11.1. *Let $y \in X_+$. Then $y \in \overline{J}^1$ iff $y = \lim[0, y] \cap J$.*

Proof. Suppose that $y \in \overline{J}^1$. Find a net (x_α) in J with $x_\alpha \rightarrow y$. Replacing x_α with $y \wedge x_\alpha^+$, we may assume without loss of generality that $x_\alpha \in [0, y] \cap J$. Proposition 3.9 yields that $y = \lim[0, y] \cap J$.

The converse implication is trivial. □

Corollary 11.2. *The adherence of an ideal J is not changed by replacing the given locally solid convergence by its unbounded or Choquet modification, or its bounded modification by a locally solid bornology.*

Proof. For the unbounded modification, this follows from the fact that the net $[0, y] \cap J$ is order bounded. The same works for a bounded modification with a locally solid bornology, because such a bornology contains order bounded sets. For the Choquet modification, this follows from the fact that the net $[0, y] \cap J$ is increasing and Proposition 9.7. □

Proposition 11.3. *\overline{J}^1 is a projection band iff the net $[0, x] \cap J$ is convergent for every $x \in X_+$.*

Proof. Suppose that \overline{J}^1 is a projection band; let $x \in X_+$. Then $y := \sup[0, x] \cap \overline{J}^1$ exists. Clearly, $y \leq x$ and $y \in \overline{J}^1$. It is easy to see that $[0, x] \cap J = [0, y] \cap J$. It follows from Lemma 11.1 that $y = \lim[0, y] \cap J = \lim[0, x] \cap J$.

Conversely, suppose that $\lim[0, x] \cap J$ exists for every $x \in X_+$. Fix $x \in X_+$. Put $y := \lim[0, x] \cap J$. Clearly, $y \in \overline{J}^1$ and $y \leq x$. By Proposition 3.8, we have $y = \sup[0, x] \cap J$.

We claim that $x - y \perp J$. To see this, let $u \in [0, x] \cap J$ (in particular, $u \leq y$) and $z \in [0, x - y] \cap J$. Then $u + z \leq x$, so that $u + z \in [0, x] \cap J$ and, therefore, $u + z \leq y$. It follows that $u \leq y - z$. Taking the supremum over all $u \in [0, x] \cap J$, we get $y \leq y - z$, hence $z = 0$. This yields $[0, x - y] \cap J = \{0\}$, hence $x - y \perp J$.

It follows that $x - y \perp J^{dd}$. Since J^{dd} is closed by Proposition 3.14, we have $x - y \perp \overline{J}^1$. So we have a decomposition $x = y + (x - y)$ with $y \in \overline{J}^1$ and $x - y \perp \overline{J}^1$. We conclude that \overline{J}^1 is a projection band. □

Lemma 11.4. *Let $u_J(\text{ru})$ be the unbounded modification of relative uniform convergence with respect to J . Then $[0, x] \cap J \xrightarrow{u_J(\text{ru})} x$ for every $x \in X_+$.*

Proof. Fix $e \in J_+$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$(x - x \wedge ne) \wedge e \leq (x - ne)^+ \wedge (e - \frac{1}{n}x)^+ + \frac{1}{n}x = \frac{1}{n}x.$$

It follows that $(x - x \wedge ne) \wedge e \xrightarrow{\text{ru}} x$. This sequence is contained, as a subset, in the decreasing positive net $(x - y) \wedge e$ indexed by $y \in [0, x] \cap J$. By Proposition 3.9, the latter net ru-converges to zero. Since $e \in J_+$ is arbitrary, we get the conclusion. \square

Proposition 11.5. *Let η be a Hausdorff locally solid convergence on X and J an ideal in X . If $u_J\eta = \eta$ then $\overline{J}^{1,\eta} = X$.*

Proof. Let $x \in X_+$. Then $[0, x] \cap J \xrightarrow{u_J(\text{ru})} x$, so that $x \in \overline{J}^{1, u_J(\text{ru})}$. Since ru is the strongest locally solid convergence, we get $x \in \overline{J}^{1, u_J\eta} = \overline{J}^{1,\eta}$. \square

Question 11.6. Is the converse true? That is, if η is unbounded and $\overline{J}^{1,\eta} = X$, does this imply $u_J\eta = \eta$?

The answer to this question is “yes” if η is idempotent; see Proposition 3.1(v) in [Bil23a].

If B is a band in a Banach lattice X , then the restriction $(\text{un})|_B$ of un-convergence in X to B does not necessarily equal the “native” un-convergence of B , $u(n|_B)$; see Example 4.2 in [KMT17]. If B is a projection band, we do have equality by Theorem 4.3 in [KMT17]. In Question 4.7 in [KMT17] it was asked whether the converse is true: if $(\text{un})|_B = u(n|_B)$, is B a projection band? The following theorem answers this question in the affirmative; just take η to be the norm convergence and $J = B = \overline{J}^1$.

Theorem 11.7. *Let (X, η) be a complete locally solid convergence vector lattice, and J an ideal in X . Suppose that $(u\eta)|_J = u(\eta|_J)$, that is, the operation of taking the unbounded modification commutes with that of taking the restriction to J . Then \overline{J}^1 is a projection band.*

Proof. Fix $x \in X_+$. By Proposition 11.3 and since η is complete, it suffices to prove that the net $[0, x] \cap J$ is η -Cauchy. By Lemma 11.4, $[0, x] \cap J \xrightarrow{u_J(\text{ru})} x$. By Proposition 5.1, $[0, x] \cap J \xrightarrow{u_J\eta} x$. It follows that this net is $u_J\eta$ -Cauchy and, therefore, $u(\eta|_J)$ -Cauchy. By assumption, we conclude that the net is $(u\eta)|_J$ -Cauchy, hence $u\eta$ -Cauchy. Finally, this net is bounded, thus η -Cauchy. \square

Remark 11.8. The condition $(u\eta)|_J = u(\eta|_J)$ in the theorem is equivalent to $(u\eta)|_J$ being unbounded. The forward implication is obvious. For the converse, if $(u\eta)|_J$ is unbounded then we have $u(\eta|_J) \leq (u\eta)|_J = u((u\eta)|_J) \leq u(\eta|_J)$.

Let X be a Banach lattice and (x_α) a net in X . Since X may be viewed as a closed sublattice of X^{**} , if $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{un}} 0$ in X^{**} then $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{un}} 0$ in X . That is, the un-convergence on X is weaker than (or equal to) the un-convergence on X^{**} reduced to X .

Corollary 11.9. *Let X be an order continuous Banach lattice. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) X is a KB-space;
- (ii) $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{un}} 0$ in X iff $x_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{un}} 0$ in X^{**} for every net (x_α) in X .

Proof. Since X is order continuous, X is a closed ideal in X^{**} . X is a KB-space iff X is a projection band in X^{**} . By Theorem 11.7, the latter is equivalent to (ii). \square

The theorem fails without the order continuity assumption; $C[0, 1]$ is a counterexample, because un-convergence agrees with norm convergence on both $C[0, 1]$ and $C[0, 1]^{**}$.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank K. Abela, M. O'Brien, M. Taylor, M. Wortel, and O. Zabeti for valuable discussions.

REFERENCES

[ACW22] K. Abela, E. Chetcutti, H. Weber, On different modes of order convergence and some applications *Positivity* 26 (2022), no. 1, Paper No. 14, 22 pp.

- [AB03] C.D. Aliprantis and O. Burkinshaw, *Locally solid Riesz spaces with applications to economics*, 2nd ed., AMS, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [AB06] C.D. Aliprantis and O. Burkinshaw, *Positive operators*, 2nd edition, Springer, 2006.
- [AW05] R. Anguelov and J.H. van der Walt, Order convergence structure on $C(X)$. *Quaest. Math.* 28 (2005), no. 4, 425–457.
- [AEG21] A. Aydın, E. Emelyanov, S. Gorokhova, Full lattice convergence on Riesz spaces, *Indag. Math. (N.S.)*, 32(3), 2021, 658–690.
- [ABT] A. Aviles, E. Bilokopytov and V.G. Troitsky, Atomicity of Boolean algebras and vector lattices in terms of the order convergence, to appear in Proc. AMS.
- [Azo19] Y. Azouzi, Completeness for vector lattices, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 472 (2019) 216–230.
- [BB02] R. Beattie and H.-P. Butzmann, *Convergence Structures and Applications to Functional Analysis*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2002.
- [BW80] S.E. Bedingfield and A. Wirth, Norm and order properties of Banach lattices. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A*, 29 (1980), no. 3, 331–336.
- [Bil23a] E. Bilokopytov, Locally solid convergences and order continuity of positive operators, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 528(1), 2023, 127566.
- [Bil23b] E. Bilokopytov, Order continuity and regularity on vector lattices and on lattices of continuous functions, *Positivity*, 27 (2023), no. 4, Paper No. 52, 29 pp.
- [BT22] E. Bilokopytov and V.G. Troitsky, Order and uo-convergence in spaces of continuous functions, *Topology and Appl.*, Vol. 308, 2022, 107999.
- [Bour87] N. Bourbaki, *Topological vector spaces. Chapters 1–5*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [BMP03] M. Bruguera and E. Martín-Peinador, Banach-Dieudonné theorem revisited *J. Aust. Math. Soc.*, Vol. 75(1), 2003, 69–83.
- [Car05] N.L. Carothers, *A short course on Banach space theory*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [Coop87] J.B. Cooper, *Saks spaces and applications to functional analysis*. Second edition, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1987.
- [Con05] J.J. Conradie, The coarsest Hausdorff Lebesgue topology, *Quaest. Math.* 28 (2005) 287–304.
- [Conr06] J. Conradie, Mackey topologies and mixed topologies in Riesz spaces *Positivity*, 10 (2006), no. 3, 591–606.
- [DEM20] Y.A. Dabboorasad, E.Y. Emelyanov and M.A.A. Marabeh, Order Convergence in infinite-dimensional vector lattices is not topological, *Uzb. Mat. Zh.* (2020)(1) 159–166.

- [DOT17] Y. Deng, M. O'Brien, and V.G. Troitsky, Unbounded norm convergence in Banach lattices, *Positivity*, 21(3), 2017, pp 963–974
- [DdJ23] Y. Deng and M. de Jeu, Embedded unbounded order convergent sequences in topologically convergent nets. *Banach J. Math. Anal.* 18, 22 (2024)
- [Ell68] J.Th. Ellis, *Group topological convergence in completely distributive lattice-ordered groups*, Thesis (Ph.D.)–Tulane University, 1968.
- [Eng89] R. Engelking, *General topology*, Second edition. Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics, 6. Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [Frem04] D.H. Fremlin, *Measure Theory, vol. 3*, Torres Fremlin, Colchester, 2004, Broad foundations, Corrected second printing of the 2002 original.
- [GTX17] N. Gao, V.G. Troitsky, and F. Xanthos, Uo-convergence and its applications to Cesàro means in Banach lattices. *Israel J. Math.* 220 (2017), no. 2, 649–689.
- [GLX18] N. Gao, D. Leung, and F. Xanthos, Duality for unbounded order convergence and applications. *Positivity* 22 (2018), no. 3, 711–725.
- [GL18] N. Gao and D. Leung, Smallest order closed sublattices and option spanning, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 146(2), 705–716, 2018
- [Hog77] H. Hogbe-Nlend, *Bornologies and functional analysis*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1977.
- [KMT17] M. Kandic, M.M.A. Marabeh, and V.G. Troitsky, Unbounded norm topology in Banach lattices, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 451(1), 2017, 259–279.
- [Kap97] S. Kaplan, On unbounded order convergence, *Real Anal. Exchange* 23 (1997/98), 175–184.
- [Lip22] Z. Lipecki, Compactness of order intervals in a locally solid linear lattice, *Colloq. Math.*, 168 (2022), no. 2, 297–309.
- [LZ73] W.A.J. Luxemburg and A.C. Zaanen, *Riesz spaces. Vol. I* North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-London, 1971.
- [Nak48] H. Nakano, Ergodic theorems in semi-ordered linear spaces, *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 49, 1948, 538–556.
- [Now89] M. Nowak, On the finest Lebesgue topology on the space of essentially bounded measurable functions, *Pacific J. Math.*, 140 (1989), no. 1, 155–161.
- [BTW23] M. O'Brien, V.G. Troitsky, and J.H. van der Walt, Net convergence structures with applications to vector lattices. *Quaestiones Math.*, 46(2), (2023), 243–280.
- [Pap64] F. Papangelou, Order convergence and topological completion of commutative lattice-groups, *Math. Annalen*, 155, 81–107 (1964).

- [Pap65] F. Papangelou, Some considerations on convergence in abelian lattice-groups, *Pacific J. Math.*, vol. 15, 1965. 1347-1364.
- [Roy88] H.L. Royden, Real analysis. Third edition. Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, 1988.
- [TayMSc] M.A. Taylor, Unbounded convergences in vector lattices, *MSc. Thesis*, 2018.
- [Tay18] M.A. Taylor, Completeness of unbounded convergences, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 146 (2018), no. 8, 3413–3423.
- [Tay19] M.A. Taylor, Unbounded topologies and uo-convergence in locally solid vector lattices, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 472 (2019), no. 1, 981–1000.
- [TT20] M.A. Taylor and V.G. Troitsky, Bibasic sequences in Banach lattices. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 278(10), 2020, 108448.
- [Tro04] V.G. Troitsky, Measures of non-compactness of operators on Banach lattices, *Positivity*, 8(2), 2004, 165–178.
- [vdW13] J.H. Van der Walt, Applications of convergence spaces to vector lattice theory, *Topology Proc.* 41 (2013), 311–331.
- [VdW16] J.H. Van der Walt, A closed graph theorem for order bounded operators, *Quaestiones Math.* 39(2) 2016, 167–178.
- [Vek73] A.I. Veksler, A. I., P' -points, P' -sets, P' -spaces. A new class of order-continuous measures and functionals. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 212 (1973), 789–792.
- [Win62] E.C. Winnberg, Completely distributed lattice-ordered groups, *Pacific J. Math.*, vol. 12, 1965, 1131–1137.
- [Wir75] A. Wirth, Relatively uniform Banach lattices, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 52, 1975, 178–180.
- [Zab18] O. Zabeti, Unbounded absolute weak convergence in Banach lattices, *Positivity* 22 (2018), no. 2, 501–505

Email address: bilokopy@ualberta.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL AND STATISTICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, EDMONTON, CANADA

Email address: jurie.conradie@uct.ac.za

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN, CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA

Email address: troitsky@ualberta.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL AND STATISTICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA, EDMONTON, CANADA.

Email address: `janharm.vanderwalt@up.ac.za`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY
OF PRETORIA, PRETORIA, SOUTH AFRICA