

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

**AVERAGING STRONGLY SUBADDITIVE SET FUNCTIONS IN
UNIMODULAR AMENABLE GROUPS. I**

WILLIAM RICHARD EMERSON

AVERAGING STRONGLY SUBADDITIVE SET FUNCTIONS IN UNIMODULAR AMENABLE GROUPS I

W. R. EMERSON

Kieffer has considered the problem of averaging strongly subadditive, nonpositive, right invariant set functions S defined on the class \mathcal{K} of precompact Borel subsets of a locally compact (unimodular) amenable group G as a means of defining entropy in an abstract probabilistic context. He shows if $\{A_\alpha\}$ is a net in \mathcal{K} satisfying an appropriate growth condition then $\lambda(A_\alpha)^{-1}S(A_\alpha)$ has a limit depending only on S , where λ is right Haar measure on G . Here we prove a somewhat stronger result of the same type based on a Fundamental Inequality valid in any locally compact group G and for any set function S as described above:

$$\lambda(A)^{-1}S(KA) \leq \lambda(K^{-1})^{-1}S(K)$$

for all sets A in \mathcal{K} of positive measure and all open sets K in \mathcal{K} which satisfy $\lambda(K) = \lambda(\bar{K})$, the so-called open continuity sets in \mathcal{K} .

This inequality when considered in a unimodular, amenable group G then yields the existence of the limit in question by standard amenable group arguments; this inequality also allows us to give a much more explicit formula for its value:

$$\inf \{ \lambda(K)^{-1}S(K) : K \text{ an open continuity set in } \mathcal{K} \}.$$

1. Definitions, notation, and other relevancies. Throughout the topological group G is assumed locally compact, noncompact, and equipped with a fixed right invariant Haar measure λ . Also $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(G)$ is the set of all precompact Borel subsets of G , \mathcal{K}_0 consists of all open sets in \mathcal{K} , and \mathcal{K}_+ consists of all sets in \mathcal{K} of positive measure. Standard notation is generally in force, e.g. \bar{A} , A' , A° represent the closure, complement, and interior of A (in G) respectively.

DEFINITION 1.1. For any subsets A and K of G ,

$$[A]_K = \{g \in G : Kg \subseteq A\}.$$

DEFINITION 1.2. Let $\{A_\alpha\}$ be a net of sets from \mathcal{K}_+ . Then $\{A_\alpha\}$ is:

- (i) regular, $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{B}$, iff $\lim_\alpha \lambda(KA_\alpha)^{-1} \lambda([A_\alpha]_K) = 1$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$,

- (ii) admissible, $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{A}$, iff $\lim_\alpha \lambda(\bar{A}_\alpha)^{-1} \lambda([A_\alpha]_K) = 1$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$,
- (iii) full, $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{F}$, iff $\lim_\alpha \lambda(A_\alpha)^{-1} \lambda([A_\alpha]_K) = 1$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$,
- (iv) almost closed, $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{C}$, iff $\lim_\alpha \lambda(\bar{A}_\alpha)^{-1} \lambda(A_\alpha) = 1$.

Note. The notation $[A]_K$ and the definition of \mathcal{R} is essentially that of Kieffer [5]. It is trivial to verify that

$$[A]_K = \bigcap \{k^{-1}A : k \in K\}.$$

Observe also that the family \mathcal{K}_0 of (i)-(iii) could equivalently be replaced by any subfamily of \mathcal{K} which is cofinal under inclusion. Finally, in case a set $B \subseteq G$ is not Haar measurable, e.g. some $[A]_K$, $\lambda(B)$ denotes inner Haar measure. We next give some basic properties of these nets.

PROPOSITION 1.3.

- (i) $\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset$ iff $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$ iff $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$ iff G is unimodular and amenable,
- (ii) If G is discrete $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{F}$, otherwise $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}$ with proper inclusions (if $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$),
- (iii) $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}$ implies $\{A_\alpha^0\} \in \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}$ respectively,
- (iv) $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}$,
- (v) $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\{B_\alpha\}$ subsets of \mathcal{K} such that $\lambda(\bar{A}_\alpha)^{-1} \lambda(\bar{B}_\alpha) \rightarrow 0$ implies $\{C_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{A}$ where $C_\alpha = A_\alpha \cup B_\alpha$,
- (vi) $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\{B_\alpha\}$ subsets of \mathcal{K} such that $\lambda(A_\alpha)^{-1} \lambda(B_\alpha) \rightarrow 0$ implies $\{C_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{F}$ where $C_\alpha = A_\alpha \cup B_\alpha$.

Note. (v) and (vi) show that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{F} are closed under “small” enlargement as indicated whereas \mathcal{R} is much more sensitive and apparently does not admit any obvious perturbations (for nondiscrete G).

Proof. For $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$, $Kg \subseteq A$ iff $Kg \subseteq A^0$ and thus $[A]_K = [A^0]_K$ and (iii) follows. Assume moreover that $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$ always contains the identity e of G (such sets are cofinal) to guarantee that $[A]_K \subseteq A$ and upon writing

$$\lambda(\bar{A})^{-1} \lambda([A]_K) = (\lambda(\bar{A})^{-1} \lambda(A)) (\lambda(A)^{-1} \lambda([A]_K)),$$

where both factors on the right are ≤ 1 , (iv) follows. Next (v) and (vi) follow readily from the inclusion

$$[A]_K \subseteq [A \cup B]_K \text{ and } \lambda(\bar{C}_\alpha)^{-1} \lambda(\bar{A}_\alpha) \rightarrow 1 \text{ and } \lambda(C_\alpha)^{-1} \lambda(A_\alpha) \rightarrow 1,$$

respectively. Turning to (ii), equality for discrete G follows from

known arguments, e.g. [2, Theorem 1], and the inclusions are clear in general since $A_\alpha \subseteq \bar{A}_\alpha \subseteq KA_\alpha$ if $e \in K$ (which we may always assume by the note following Definition 1.2). On the other hand to see that they are proper we utilize (vi) and (v). First, we observe that any nondiscrete locally compact σ -compact group G contains a Borel null set N such that $\bar{N} = G$ (the same is true for arbitrary G if one replaces null by locally null):

For let K be any compact normal subgroup of G with $\lambda(K) = 0$ and for which G/K is second countable (e.g. as follows from [4, Theorem A.9] upon choosing $\lambda(W_i) \rightarrow 0$) and let C be any countable dense subset of G/K . Then the full inverse image of C in G , say N , is the union of a countable family of cosets of K and is clearly a Borel null set in G with $\bar{N} = G$.

Now fix any $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{F}$ and let N be a Borel null set for which $\lambda(\bar{N}) = +\infty$ (if G is not σ -compact, let $G_1 \subseteq G$ be a σ -compact, non-compact, open subgroup of G and choose N as above with $\bar{N} = G_1$). Then for any $N_\alpha \subseteq N$ and $N_\alpha \in \mathcal{N}$, $\{C_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{F}$ where $C_\alpha = A_\alpha \cup N_\alpha$ by (vi) (taking $B_\alpha = N_\alpha$). But $\bar{N}_\alpha \subseteq \bar{C}_\alpha$ which may be chosen to satisfy $\lambda(\bar{N}_\alpha) > 2\lambda(A_\alpha)$ (since $\lambda(\bar{N}) = +\infty$), and for such a choice of $\{N_\alpha\}$ the net $\{C_\alpha\} \notin \mathcal{A}$. Similarly (in light of (i)), let $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{A}$. Then trivially by (v), if F_α is chosen to be any finite subset of G for each α we have $\{C_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{A}$ where $C_\alpha = A_\alpha \cup F_\alpha$. Next fix any $K_0 \in \mathcal{K}_0$ and choose F_α to satisfy $\lambda(K_0 F_\alpha) > 2\lambda(A_\alpha)$ additionally, which is possible since G is not compact. Then clearly the net $\{C_\alpha\} \notin \mathcal{B}$ since it violates the defining property for $K = K_0$. Finally to prove (i): that G unimodular and amenable implies $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$ is straightforward and shown in [5]. On the other hand, since $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ trivially, it suffices to show $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$ implies G unimodular and amenable to complete the proof of the equivalence. If G were not unimodular, let $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$ be chosen such that $\Delta(k) \geq 2$ for some $k \in K$, where Δ is the modular function of G . Then since $K[A]_K \subseteq A$ for any $A \subseteq G$ we have

$$\lambda(A) \geq \lambda(K[A]_K) \geq \lambda(k[A]_K) = \Delta(k)\lambda([A]_K) \geq 2\lambda([A]_K),$$

showing that $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$. Therefore G is unimodular, and if $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$ we have

$$\lambda(K[A_\alpha]_K)^{-1}\lambda([A_\alpha]_K) \longrightarrow 1 \text{ since } K[A_\alpha]_K \subseteq A_\alpha,$$

and consequently by inversion invariance in G ,

$$\lambda([A_\alpha]_K^{-1}K^{-1})^{-1}\lambda([A_\alpha]_K^{-1}) \longrightarrow 1$$

and the net $\{[A_\alpha]_K^{-1}\}$ eventually satisfies condition (A) of [3] for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and K^{-1} which is equivalent to amenability.

We now define and investigate a special family of subsets of G

which is crucial to our analysis.

DEFINITION 1.4. $\mathcal{K}_e = \{K \in \mathcal{K} : \lambda(\bar{K}) = \lambda(K)\}$ is called the class of (precompact) weak continuity sets of G .

Note. This terminology is so chosen because a set $K \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfying the stronger condition $\lambda(\bar{K}) = \lambda(K^0)$ is called a continuity set of G [6, p. 174], i.e. iff χ_K is Riemann integrable. Of course for $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$ the conditions coincide. Also observe $K \in \mathcal{K}_e$ iff $K^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}_e$.

The following result gives an equivalent characterization of \mathcal{K}_e which is used in the sequel.

LEMMA 1.5. $K \in \mathcal{K}_e$ iff for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there corresponds a symmetric open neighborhood $O = O(\varepsilon)$ of e such that $\lambda(O^2 K^{-1}) - \lambda(K^{-1}) < \varepsilon$.

Proof. $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$ iff $K^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}_e$ iff $\lambda(\overline{K^{-1}}) = \lambda(K^{-1})$. Now for any neighborhood O of e we have $\overline{K^{-1}} \subseteq O^2 K^{-1}$ and consequently

$$\lambda(\overline{K^{-1}}) - \lambda(K^{-1}) \leq \lambda(O^2 K^{-1}) - \lambda(K^{-1}) < \varepsilon$$

implying $\lambda(\overline{K^{-1}}) = \lambda(K^{-1})$, i.e. $K^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}_e$, if the second condition holds for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Conversely, assume $K \in \mathcal{K}_e$. By the regularity of λ , given any $\varepsilon > 0$ there corresponds an open $U = U(\varepsilon) \supseteq \bar{K}^{-1}$ such that $\lambda(U) - \lambda(\bar{K}^{-1}) < \varepsilon$. Now U' is closed and \bar{K} compact implying $U' \bar{K}$ is closed in G . Moreover, since $\bar{K}^{-1} = \overline{K^{-1}} \subseteq U$, we must have $e \notin U' \bar{K}$ and thus by the continuity of group operations there exists an open symmetric neighborhood O of e such that O^2 is disjoint from $U' \bar{K}$, i.e. $O^2 \bar{K}^{-1} = O^2 \overline{K^{-1}} \subseteq U$, and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(O^2 K^{-1}) - \lambda(K^{-1}) &= \lambda(O^2 K^{-1}) - \lambda(\overline{K^{-1}}) \quad (\text{since } K^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}_e) \\ &\leq \lambda(O^2 \overline{K^{-1}}) - \lambda(\overline{K^{-1}}) \leq \lambda(U) - \lambda(\overline{K^{-1}}) < \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

as was to be shown.

The following results show how pervasive the open (weak) continuity sets are in \mathcal{K}_0 .

LEMMA 1.6. If $C \subseteq U$ are subsets of G with C compact and $U \in \mathcal{K}_0$ then there is an $O \in \mathcal{K}_0 \cap \mathcal{K}_e$ such that $C \subseteq O \subseteq \bar{O} \subseteq U$.

Proof. Since G is normal as a topological space, by Urysohn's lemma there is a continuous $f: G \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $f(C) = 0$ and $f(U') = 1$. Now for each t in $(0, 1)$ set $O_t \doteq f^{-1}([0, t])$ and observe that O_t is always open and $C \subseteq O_t \subseteq \bar{O}_t \subseteq U$ since $\bar{O}_t \subseteq f^{-1}([0, t])$. But $f^{-1}([0, t]) = O_t \cup f^{-1}(\{t\})$, and since

$$U \{f^{-1}(\{t\}): t \in (0, 1)\} \subseteq U \text{ and } \lambda(U) < +\infty ,$$

the disjointness of the $f^{-1}(\{t\})$ implies $\lambda(f^{-1}\{t\}) = 0$ for all but at most countably many $t \in (0, 1)$. Any such nonexceptional $t \in (0, 1)$ yields an $O_t \in \mathcal{H}_c$ as desired.

COROLLARY 1.7. *For any $K \in \mathcal{H}$,*

- (i) $\sup \{\lambda(O): \bar{O} \subseteq K, O \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}_c\} = \lambda(K^0),$
- (ii) $\inf \{\lambda(O): K \subseteq O, O \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}_c\} = \lambda(\bar{K}).$

Note. (ii) says that $K \in \mathcal{H}$ is a weak continuity set iff K may be covered arbitrarily close in measure by open (weak) continuity sets.

Proof. $O \in \mathcal{H}_0$ and $\bar{O} \subseteq K$ imply $O \subseteq K^0$ and $\lambda(O) \leq \lambda(K^0)$ so \leq is clear in (i). Also $K \subseteq O$ implies $\bar{K} \subseteq \bar{O}$, and since $O \in \mathcal{H}_c$ we have $\lambda(\bar{K}) \leq \lambda(\bar{O}) = \lambda(O)$ so \geq is clear in (ii). Conversely, given any $\varepsilon > 0$ the regularity of λ yields a compact $C \subseteq K^0$ satisfying $\lambda(K^0) - \varepsilon < \lambda(C)$. But by Lemma 1.6 (with $U = K^0$) we may find an $O \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}_c$ such that $C \subseteq O \subseteq \bar{O} \subseteq K^0 \subseteq K$ implying $\lambda(O) \geq \lambda(C) > \lambda(K^0) - \varepsilon$ implying \geq also holds in (i) and equality follows. Finally, regularity of λ means we may find a $U \in \mathcal{H}_0$ with $\bar{K} \subseteq U$ and $\lambda(U) - \lambda(\bar{K}) < \varepsilon$. Thus by Lemma 1.6 again (with $C = \bar{K}$) we may find an $O \in \mathcal{H}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}_c$ such that $K \subseteq \bar{K} \subseteq O \subseteq \bar{O} \subseteq U$ and consequently

$$\lambda(O) - \lambda(\bar{K}) \leq \lambda(U) - \lambda(\bar{K}) < \varepsilon ,$$

i.e. $\lambda(O) < \lambda(\bar{K}) + \varepsilon$, and \leq is true in (ii) and the proof of equality is complete.

We conclude this section with a definition of the set functions which we shall consider as well as a fundamental “rearrangement” result needed in the next section.

DEFINITION 1.8. A set function $S: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow R$ is said to be regular iff

- (i) $S \leq 0$ always, $S(\emptyset) = 0$,
- (ii) $S(A \cup B) + S(A \cap B) \leq S(A) + S(B)$ for $A, B \in \mathcal{H}$
- (iii) $S(Ag) = S(A)$ for $A \in \mathcal{H}$ and $g \in G$,

i.e. a nonpositive, normalized, strongly subadditive, and (right) translation invariant function on the precompact Borel subsets of G .

Note. These are the same set functions considered in [5] where their probabilistic genesis is also described.

We conclude this section with the discrete rearrangement theorem for strongly subadditive set functions.

PROPOSITION 1.9. *Let $S: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow R$ satisfy*

$$S(K \cup T) + S(K \cap T) \leq S(K) + S(T)$$

for all $K, T \in \mathcal{K}$. Then:

(i) *if $K_i \in \mathcal{K}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $\sum_{i=1}^n S(I_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n S(K_i)$, where $I_j = \{g \in G: \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{K_i}(g) \geq j\}$, or equivalently the union of all intersections of j distinct K_i .*

(ii) *if (A, Σ, μ) is a finite measure space and $a \rightsquigarrow K_a$ is any (measurable) simple function from A into \mathcal{K} then*

$$\int_0^\infty S(I_t) dt \leq \int_A S(K_a) d\mu(a)$$

where

$$I_t = \left\{ g \in G: \int_A \chi_{K_a}(g) d\mu(a) \geq t \right\} \text{ for } t \geq 0.$$

Note. (ii) is written in integral form for the purposes of application even though it is an inequality of finite sums formally derived from (i). Of course $I_t = \emptyset$ for $t > \mu(A)$.

Proof. (i) is well known and readily proved by induction on n . Note that strong subadditivity itself is the case $n = 2$. To prove (ii) we first partition A into finitely many measurable sets, say $A = \bigcup \{A_i: 1 \leq i \leq r\}$, such that K_a is constant on each A_i . Then

$$(1) \quad \int_A S(K_a) d\mu(a) = \sum_{i=1}^r S(K^i) \mu(A_i),$$

where K^i is the constant value of K_a on A_i . Note

$$(2) \quad \int_A \chi_{K_a}(g) d\mu(a) = \sum \{\mu(A_i): 1 \leq i \leq r \text{ and } g \in K^i\}.$$

Now first assume all $\mu(A_i)$ are rational, say $\mu(A_i) = n_i/d$, $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then

$$(3) \quad \sum_{i=1}^r S(K^i) \mu(A_i) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^r n_i S(K^i) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^n S(K_j)$$

where $n = \sum_{i=1}^r n_i$ and K_j , $1 \leq j \leq n$, is simply any listing of the K^i where each K^i occurs n_i times for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Now by (i),

$$(4) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n S(I'_j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n S(K_j),$$

where $I'_j = \{g \in G: \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{K_i}(g) \geq j\}$ for any $j \geq 0$ (not necessarily integral). Since $I_t = I_{[t+1]}$, a.e. $\sum_{j=1}^n S(I'_j) = \int_0^\infty S(I_t) dt$ in "integral"

form. Furthermore, from equations (2) and (3) we see that $g \in I'_t$ iff $g \in I_{t/d}$ for any $t \geq 0$, i.e. $I'_t = I_{t/d}$, and consequently by (1), (3) and (4),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty S(I_t)dt &= \frac{1}{d} \int_0^\infty S(I_{t/d})dt = \frac{1}{d} \int_0^\infty S(I'_t)dt \leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^n S(K_j) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r S(K_i) \mu(A_i) = \int_A S(K_a) d\mu(a), \end{aligned}$$

and (ii) is proved if $\{\mu(A_i)\}$ are all rational. The general result follows upon passage to the limit since both sides of the inequality in (ii) are in fact finite sums which depend continuously on the $\{\mu(A_i)\}$ in light of (1) and (2).

2. The average of a regular set function. We now define the “average” which we are to analyze in the remainder of the paper.

DEFINITION 2.1. For any (real-valued) set function S on \mathcal{K} , let $M_s(K) = \lambda(K)^{-1}S(K)$ for $K \in \mathcal{K}_+$.

The main result of this paper is:

THEOREM 2.2. *If S is any regular set function on \mathcal{K} and $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{A}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha} M_s(A_\alpha) &= \inf \{M_s(K): K \in \mathcal{K}_e \cap \mathcal{K}_0\} \\ &= \inf \{M_s(K): K \in \mathcal{K}_e \cap \mathcal{K}_+\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note. The second equality follows readily from Corollary 1.7 (ii) and the monotonicity of S . This result is to be compared with the basic result of [5] which establishes the existence of the limit on the left for $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{R}$.

The following proposition is at the center of our proof:

PROPOSITION 2.3 (The Fundamental Inequality). *If $A \in \mathcal{K}_+$ and $\mathcal{K} \in \mathcal{K}_e \cap \mathcal{K}_0$, then*

$$\lambda(A)^{-1}S(KA) \leq \lambda(K^{-1})^{-1}S(K).$$

Note. that K is assumed open is merely for technical convenience —to assure that $KA \in \mathcal{K}_+$, but the restriction to \mathcal{K}_e is crucial.

Proof. Fix $K \in \mathcal{K}_e \cap \mathcal{K}_0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose O as in Lemma 1.5, for this K and ε . Then cover A by $\bigcup \{Oa: a \in A\}$. and extract a finite subcover $\bigcup \{Oa_i: 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ (since the compact set $\bar{A} \subseteq \bigcup \{Oa: a \in A\}$ also). Define the finite partition of A into n sets

$$A_1 \doteq Oa_1 \cap A, A_i = (Oa_i - Oa_1 - \dots - Oa_{i-1}) \cap A, 1 < i \leq n,$$

and the (measurable) simple function from A into \mathcal{K} by $a \rightsquigarrow K_a \doteq KOa_k \cap KA$ for $a \in A_k \subseteq Oa_k$. Since O is symmetric $a \in Oa_k$ implies $a_k \in Oa$ and consequently for all $a \in A$,

$$(1) \quad Ka \subseteq KOa_k \cap KA = K_a \subseteq KO^2a \cap KA \subseteq KA.$$

The monotonicity and translation invariance of S give

$$(2) \quad \int_A S(K_a) d\lambda(a) \leq \int_A S(Ka) d\lambda(a) = \lambda(A)S(K).$$

Now by Proposition 1.9 (ii),

$$(3) \quad \int_0^\infty S(I_t) dt \leq \int_A S(K_a) d\lambda(a),$$

where

$$I_t = \left\{ g \in G : \int_A \chi_{K_a}(g) d\lambda(a) \geq t \right\}.$$

Moreover, in light of (1) we have for $t > 0$,

$$I_t \subseteq I_t^* \doteq \left\{ g \in G : \int_A \chi_{KO^2a \cap KA}(g) d\lambda(a) \geq t \right\} \subseteq KA$$

and consequently by (2), (3), and the monotonicity of S ,

$$(4) \quad \int_0^\infty S(I_t^*) dt \leq \lambda(A)S(K).$$

Finally for $g \in KA$, $g \in KO^2a \cap KA$ iff $a \in O^2K^{-1}g$ and therefore

$$\int_A \chi_{KO^2a \cap KA}(g) d\lambda(a) = \begin{cases} \lambda(O^2K^{-1}g \cap A), & g \in KA \\ 0, & g \notin KA, \end{cases}$$

Consequently $I_t^* = \emptyset$ and $S(I_t^*) = 0$ for $t > \lambda(O^2K^{-1})$ and thus

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty S(I_t^*) dt &= \int_0^{\lambda(O^2K^{-1})} S(I_t^*) dt \\ &\geq \int_0^{\lambda(O^2K^{-1})} S(KA) dt = \lambda(O^2K^{-1})S(KA), \end{aligned}$$

which in conjunction with (4) yields

$$\lambda(O^2K^{-1})S(KA) \leq \lambda(A)S(K)$$

or

$$\lambda(A)^{-1}S(KA) \leq \lambda(O^2K^{-1})^{-1}S(K),$$

and the proposition follows upon letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

We derive the following important corollary on our way to proving Theorem 2.2.

COROLLARY 2.4. *If S is any regular set function on \mathcal{K} and $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{F}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{K \in \mathcal{K}_+} M_S(K) &= \inf_{K \in \mathcal{K}_0} M_S(K) \leq \underline{\lim}_\alpha M_S(A_\alpha) \leq \overline{\lim}_\alpha M_S(A_\alpha) \\ (6) \quad &\leq \inf \{M_S(K): K \in \mathcal{K}_e \cap \mathcal{K}_0\} \\ &= \inf \{M_S(K): K \in \mathcal{K}_e \cap \mathcal{K}_+\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Only the last inequality requires a proof as all the other relations are straightforward, e.g. the note after Theorem 2.2. Fix $K \in \mathcal{K}_e \cap \mathcal{K}_0$ and note that $\lambda(K^{-1}) = \lambda(K)$ since G must be unimodular. Let $A'_\alpha \doteq [A_\alpha]_K$ implying $KA'_\alpha \subseteq A_\alpha$ and $S(A_\alpha) \leq S(KA'_\alpha)$ and consequently (for $\lambda(A'_\alpha) > 0$),

$$\begin{aligned} (7) \quad M_S(A_\alpha) &= \lambda(A_\alpha)^{-1} S(A_\alpha) \leq \lambda(A_\alpha)^{-1} \lambda(A'_\alpha) \{ \lambda(A'_\alpha)^{-1} S(KA'_\alpha) \} \\ &\leq \lambda(A_\alpha)^{-1} \lambda(A'_\alpha) M_S(K), \quad \text{by Proposition 2.3.} \end{aligned}$$

Thus since

$$\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \overline{\lim}_\alpha M_S(A_\alpha) \leq M_S(K)$$

and the last inequality of (6) follows immediately.

The following simple lemma is independent of the preceding argument and needed for Theorem 2.2.

LEMMA 2.5. *If $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{C}$ then*

$$\inf \{M_S(K): K \in \mathcal{K}_e \cap \mathcal{K}_0\} \leq \underline{\lim}_\alpha M_S(A_\alpha).$$

Proof. Since $\{A_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{C}$ upon utilizing Corollary 1.7 (ii) we obtain a net $\{O_\alpha\}$ with $\bar{A}_\alpha \subseteq O_\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_0 \cap \mathcal{K}_e$ such that $\lambda(O_\alpha)^{-1} \lambda(A_\alpha) \rightarrow 1$. Consequently, since $S(O_\alpha) \leq S(A_\alpha)$ by monotonicity, we have

$$\inf \{M_S(K): K \in \mathcal{K}_e \cap \mathcal{K}_0\} \leq \underline{\lim}_\alpha M_S(O_\alpha) \leq \underline{\lim}_\alpha M_S(A_\alpha)$$

as desired.

Theorem 2.2 follows immediately from Corollary 2.4 and Lemma 2.5 since $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}$ by 1.3 (iv).

3. Concluding comments. The question arises as to whether Theorem 2.2 remains valid with \mathcal{A} replaced by \mathcal{F} . This is in fact not the case for general regular S , but is permissible if S satisfies a mild "continuity" condition. See [2] for a discussion and proof of this and related questions such as when Proposition 2.3 is valid for general $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$, when the inf of $M_S(K)$ on \mathcal{K}_0 is the same as on $\mathcal{K}_0 \cap \mathcal{K}_e$, and the utility of the standard (Følner) summing nets in this context. An analogous theory for nonunimodular amenable groups

is to be desired but this author has had no success.

Thank to J. C. Kieffer for bringing these questions to my attention.

REFERENCES

1. W. R. Emerson, *Ratio properties in locally compact amenable groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **133** (1968), 179-204.
2. ———, *Averaging strongly subadditive set functions in unimodular amenable groups, II*, to appear.
3. W. R. Emerson and F. P. Greenleaf, *Covering properties and Folner conditions for locally compact groups*, Math. Zeit, **102** (1967), 370-384.
4. F. P. Greenleaf and M. Moskowitz, *Cyclic vectors for representations associated with positive definite measures: nonseparable groups*, Pacific J. Math., **45** (1973), 165-186.
5. J. C. Kieffer, *A ratio limit theorem for a strongly subadditive set function in a locally compact amenable group*, to appear, Pacific J. Math., (1976).
6. L. Kuipers and H. Niederreiter, *Uniform distribution of sequences*, New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1974.

Received July 29, 1975. Partially supported by NSF Grant GP-42920.

QUEENS COLLEGE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

RICHARD ARENS (Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

J. DUGUNDJI
Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

R. A. BEAUMONT
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

D. GILBARG AND J. MILGRAM
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
OSAKA UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
* * *
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of your manuscript. You may however, use them in the displayed equations. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. Items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. **39**. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics expects the author's institution to pay page charges, and reserves the right to delay publication for nonpayment of charges in case of financial emergency.

100 reprints are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$72.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: \$36.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.),
8-8, 3-chome, Takadanobaba, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Copyright © 1975 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Manufactured and first issued in Japan

Graham Donald Allen, Francis Joseph Narcowich and James Patrick Williams, <i>An operator version of a theorem of Kolmogorov</i>	305
Joel Hilary Anderson and Ciprian Foias, <i>Properties which normal operators share with normal derivations and related operators</i>	313
Constantin Gelu Apostol and Norberto Salinas, <i>Nilpotent approximations and quasiniipotent operators</i>	327
James M. Briggs, Jr., <i>Finitely generated ideals in regular F-algebras</i>	339
Frank Benjamin Cannonito and Ronald Wallace Gatterdam, <i>The word problem and power problem in 1-relator groups are primitive recursive</i>	351
Clifton Earle Corzatt, <i>Permutation polynomials over the rational numbers</i>	361
L. S. Dube, <i>An inversion of the S_2 transform for generalized functions</i>	383
William Richard Emerson, <i>Averaging strongly subadditive set functions in unimodular amenable groups. I</i>	391
Barry J. Gardner, <i>Semi-simple radical classes of algebras and attainability of identities</i>	401
Irving Leonard Glicksberg, <i>Removable discontinuities of A-holomorphic functions</i> ...	417
Fred Halpern, <i>Transfer theorems for topological structures</i>	427
H. B. Hamilton, T. E. Nordahl and Takayuki Tamura, <i>Commutative cancellative semigroups without idempotents</i>	441
Melvin Hochster, <i>An obstruction to lifting cyclic modules</i>	457
Alistair H. Lachlan, <i>Theories with a finite number of models in an uncountable power are categorical</i>	465
Kjeld Laursen, <i>Continuity of linear maps from C^*-algebras</i>	483
Tsai Sheng Liu, <i>Oscillation of even order differential equations with deviating arguments</i>	493
Jorge Martinez, <i>Doubling chains, singular elements and hyper-Z l-groups</i>	503
Mehdi Radjabalipour and Heydar Radjavi, <i>On the geometry of numerical ranges</i>	507
Thomas I. Seidman, <i>The solution of singular equations, I. Linear equations in Hilbert space</i>	513
R. James Tomkins, <i>Properties of martingale-like sequences</i>	521
Alfons Van Daele, <i>A Radon Nikodým theorem for weights on von Neumann algebras</i>	527
Kenneth S. Williams, <i>On Euler's criterion for quintic nonresidues</i>	543
Manfred Wischnewsky, <i>On linear representations of affine groups. I</i>	551
Scott Andrew Wolpert, <i>Noncompleteness of the Weil-Petersson metric for Teichmüller space</i>	573
Volker Wrobel, <i>Some generalizations of Schauder's theorem in locally convex spaces</i>	579
Birge Huisgen-Zimmermann, <i>Endomorphism rings of self-generators</i>	587
Kelly Denis McKennon, <i>Corrections to: "Multipliers of type (p, p)"; "Multipliers of type (p, p) and multipliers of the group L_p-algebras"; "Multipliers and the group L_p-algebras"</i>	603
Andrew M. W. Glass, W. Charles (Wilbur) Holland Jr. and Stephen H. McCleary, <i>Correction to: "a^*-closures to completely distributive lattice-ordered groups"</i>	606
Zvi Arad and George Isaac Glauberger, <i>Correction to: "A characteristic subgroup of a group of odd order"</i>	607
Roger W. Barnard and John Lawson Lewis, <i>Correction to: "Subordination theorems for some classes of starlike functions"</i>	607
David Westreich, <i>Corrections to: "Bifurcation of operator equations with unbounded linearized part"</i>	608