

COMPLETENESS AND ADDITIVE PROPERTY FOR SUBMEASURES

JONATHAN M. KEITH AND PAOLO LEONETTI

ABSTRACT. Given an extended real-valued submeasure ν defined on a field of subsets Σ of a given set, we provide necessary and sufficient conditions for which the pseudometric d_ν defined by $d_\nu(A, B) := \min\{1, \nu(A \Delta B)\}$ for all $A, B \in \Sigma$ is complete. As an application, we show that if $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a lower semicontinuous submeasure and $\nu(A) := \lim_n \varphi(A \setminus \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\})$ for all $A \subseteq \omega$, then d_ν is complete. This includes the case of all weighted upper densities, fixing a gap in a proof by Just and Krawczyk in [Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **285** (1984), 803–816]. In contrast, we prove that if ν is the upper Banach density (or an upper density greater than or equal to the latter) then d_ν is not complete. We conclude with several characterizations of completeness in terms of the Stone space of the Boolean algebra Σ/ν .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ be a field of subsets of a nonempty set X , that is, a nonempty family of subsets of X that is stable under finite unions and complements. Denote also by ω the set of nonnegative integers and by $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := [-\infty, \infty]$ the two-point compactification of the reals, endowed with its natural total order. A map $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is said to be a *capacity* if it is monotone (that is, $\nu(A) \leq \nu(B)$ for all $A, B \in \Sigma$ with $A \subseteq B$) and satisfies $\nu(\emptyset) = 0$. If, in addition, the capacity ν is also subadditive (that is, $\nu(A \cup B) \leq \nu(A) + \nu(B)$ for all $A, B \in \Sigma$), then it is said to be a *submeasure*. Lastly, a capacity (or a submeasure) ν is called *bounded* if $\nu(X) < \infty$ and *normalized* if $\nu(X) = 1$. It is clear that submeasures are necessarily nonnegative. If there is no risk of confusion, we will write also $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow S$, for some $S \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Given a submeasure $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, it is easy to check that the map $d_\nu : \Sigma^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\forall A, B \in \Sigma, \quad d_\nu(A, B) := \min\{1, \nu(A \Delta B)\}.$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 11B05, 54E50. Secondary: 28A12, 54A20.

Key words and phrases. Completeness; submeasures; additive property; lower semicontinuous submeasures; upper Banach density; exact Hahn decomposition; Stone space.

is a pseudometric on the field Σ . In the context of Boolean algebras, d_ν is also known as a Fréchet–Nikodym metric, see e.g. [13, Fact 2.3]. The aim of this work is to provide necessary and sufficient conditions on ν such that the pseudometric space (Σ, d_ν) is complete, hence to show completeness or non-completeness for large classes of submeasures. It is worth noting that the completeness of the pseudometrics d_ν was important in studies of the famous Maharam’s problem [41, 47], cf. e.g. [3, p. 62] and [2, 31].

Examples of normalized submeasures include the nonnegative finitely additive probability measures $\mu : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (for instance, the characteristic functions of free ultrafilters on ω and, of course, all the σ -additive probability measures), the upper asymptotic density $\mathbf{d}^* : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\forall A \subseteq \omega, \quad \mathbf{d}^*(A) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A \cap n|}{n} \quad (1)$$

(where, as usual, we identify each $n \in \omega$ with the set $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$), and all upper densities on ω considered in [14, 24, 38], e.g. the upper analytic, upper Pólya, and upper Banach densities. In different contexts, we find also exhaustive submeasures [33, 47], nonpathological and lower semicontinuous submeasures [18, 45], and duals of exact games [42, 43].

1.1. Literature results: additive setting. Throughout, we reserve the symbol μ for finitely additive maps. The following result characterizes the completeness of the pseudometric space (Σ, d_μ) in the case where the domain Σ is a σ -field.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ be a σ -field of subsets on a set X , and let $\mu : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a nonnegative, finitely additive, bounded map. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The pseudometric space (Σ, d_μ) is complete;*
- (ii) *For every increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ , there exists $A \in \Sigma$ such that $\mu(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\mu(A) = \lim_n \mu(A_n)$.*

Proof. See [28, Theorem 1] or [27, Lemma 2.2, Theorem 2.4, and Remark 2.5]. \square

Additional equivalent conditions can be found in [28, Theorem 1], including completeness of the function space $L_1(\mu)$ or $L_p(\mu)$ for some $p \in [0, \infty)$ (see also [6, Theorem 3.4]). We refer the reader to the article [6] of Basile and Bhaskara Rao for a systematic study of completeness of $L_p(\mu)$ spaces and the related spaces (Σ, d_μ) . However, we will not consider these characterisations further here.

The property in item (ii) above is usually called **AP(NULL)** and provides a weak form of continuity from below for μ , cf. e.g. [10]. The next result shows

that, even in the case $\Sigma = \mathcal{P}(\omega)$, one cannot replace the condition $\mu(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ in the latter property with $|A_n \setminus A| < \infty$ for all $n \in \omega$. To this aim, recall that the asymptotic density $\mathbf{d}(A)$ of a set $A \subseteq \omega$ is defined as in (1) by replacing $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$, provided that latter limit exists (cf. Section 2.2).

Theorem 1.2. *There exists an additive extension $\mu : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of the asymptotic density \mathbf{d} with the following properties:*

- (i) *The pseudometric space $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_\mu)$ is complete;*
- (ii) *There exists an increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ such that, if $A \subseteq \omega$ satisfies $|A_n \setminus A| < \infty$ for all $n \in \omega$, then $\mu(A) \neq \lim_n \mu(A_n)$.*

Proof. It follows by [10, Corollary 4 or Theorem 5(b)] and Theorem 1.1. □

In contrast, the same authors also proved the following:

Theorem 1.3. *There exists an additive extension $\mu : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of the asymptotic density \mathbf{d} such that the pseudometric space $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_\mu)$ is not complete.*

Proof. It follows by [10, Theorem 6] and the argument following its proof, together with Theorem 1.1. □

In both results above from [10], the authors consider special additive extensions of the asymptotic density \mathbf{d} which are also called *density measures*, namely, maps $\mu^{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined by

$$\forall A \subseteq \omega, \quad \mu^{\mathcal{F}}(A) := \mathcal{F}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A \cap n|}{n}, \tag{2}$$

where \mathcal{F} is a free ultrafilter on ω . Kunisada proved in [35, Theorem 5.1] a necessary and sufficient condition for a density measure $\mu^{\mathcal{F}}$ to have **AP(NULL)**.

1.2. Literature results: non-additive setting. So far, only some rather special cases have been proved in the literature, all in the case $\Sigma = \mathcal{P}(\omega)$.

The first example is due to Solecki in his seminal work [45]: a map $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is said to be a *lower semicontinuous submeasure* (in short, lscsm) if it is a submeasure such that $\varphi(F) < \infty$ for all finite $F \subseteq \omega$ and

$$\forall A \subseteq \omega, \quad \varphi(A) = \sup\{\varphi(A \cap n) : n \in \omega\}.$$

Notice that the above property is precisely the lower semicontinuity of the submeasure φ , regarding its domain $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ as the Cantor space 2^ω , that is, if $A_n \rightarrow A$

then $\liminf_n \varphi(A_n) \geq \varphi(A)$. Examples of lscsm include $\varphi(A) = |A|$ or $\varphi(A) = \sum_{n \in A} 1/(n+1)$ or $\varphi(A) = \sup_{n \geq 1} |A \cap n|/n$, cf. also [18, Chapter 1].

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a lscsm. Then the pseudometric space $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_\varphi)$ is complete.*

Proof. See the proof of implication (iii) \implies (i) in [45, Theorem 3.1]. \square

Of course, the upper asymptotic density d^* defined in (1) is not a lscsm (since $d^*(A) = 0$ for every finite $A \subseteq \omega$). However, the first-named author recently proved that the analogous result holds for d^* :

Theorem 1.5. *The pseudometric space $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_{d^*})$ is complete.*

Proof. See [34, Theorem 1.1]. \square

Just and Krawczyk claimed in [32, Lemma 3.1] that the analogue of Theorem 1.5 holds for all weighted upper densities, that is, maps $\nu_f : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\nu_f(A) := \limsup_n \sum_{i \in A \cap n} f(i) / \sum_{i \in n} f(i)$, where $f : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an Erdős–Ulam function, that is, a nonnegative function such that $\lim_n \sum_{i \in n} f(i) = \infty$ and $\lim_n f(n) / \sum_{i \in n} f(i) = 0$. It seems to us that their proof contains a gap that does not appear easily fixable.¹ A further generalization was claimed by Farah in [18, Lemma 1.3.3(c)], which has been used also in [22, Proposition 2]. However, as confirmed by Farah in personal communications regarding the latter result, his argument also contains a gap. We show in Theorem 2.5 below, with a different proof, that their claims were, in fact, correct. (A revised and corrected version of [18, Lemma 1.3.3(c)] can be found in [17, Proposition 5.2.2].)

2. MAIN RESULTS

Our first main result characterizes the completeness of the pseudometric spaces (Σ, d_ν) , hence providing the analogue of Theorem 1.1 for submeasures.

To this aim, if Σ is a field of subsets on a set X , we say then a Σ -partition $\langle A, A^c \rangle$ of X is an *exact Hahn decomposition* of a map $\lambda : \Sigma \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ if $\lambda(B) \geq 0$ for all $B \in \Sigma$ with $B \subseteq A$, and $\lambda(B) \leq 0$ for all $B \in \Sigma$ with $B \subseteq A^c$. It is known that exact Hahn decompositions do not necessarily exist, even if λ is finitely additive,

¹More precisely, the last centered upper bound of the distance $\rho_h(a_n/I_h, a/I_h)$ in the proof of [32, Lemma 3.1] is given by $2^{-n} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-(n+k)}$, which goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. However, the latter should be replaced by $2^{-n} + k2^{-n}$, which does not necessarily go to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ because in the construction there is no explicit dependence between n and k .

see [9, Remark 2.6.3 and Example 11.4.7]. Characterizations of completeness in the finitely additive case through exact Hahn decompositions can be found in [1, Proposition 3] and [6, Proposition 6.2]. It is worth remarking that exact Hahn decompositions played a role to prove a Radon-Nikodym type theorem for certain submeasures, see [29].

Moreover, given a submeasure $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and a d_ν -Cauchy sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ with values in Σ , we write

$$\nu_{(A_n)}^+(B) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(A_n \cap B) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_{(A_n)}^-(B) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(B \setminus A_n)$$

for all $B \in \Sigma$. Observe that both limits exist in $[0, \infty]$: in fact, since $(A_n \cap B) \triangle (A_m \cap B) \subseteq A_n \triangle A_m$ for all $n, m \in \omega$ then the sequence $(\nu(A_n \cap B) : n \in \omega)$ is Cauchy in $[0, \infty]$, hence convergent to $\nu_{(A_n)}^+(B) \in [0, \infty]$ (the case of $\nu_{(A_n)}^-(B)$ is analogous). In the following, we assume the convention $\infty - \infty := 0$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ be a field of subsets on a set X , and let $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a submeasure. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The pseudometric space (Σ, d_ν) is complete;*
- (ii) *For every d_ν -Cauchy sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ , the map $\nu_{(A_n)}^+ - \nu_{(A_n)}^-$ admits an exact Hahn decomposition;*
- (iii) *For every increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$, there exists $A \in \Sigma$ such that $\nu(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \nu(A \setminus A_n) = 0$.*

Condition (iii) above is the analogue of **AP(NULL)** for submeasures. Note that, even if $\nu(F) = 0$ for all finite $F \in \Sigma$, the condition “ $\nu(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ ” cannot be replaced with “ $|A_n \setminus A| < \infty$ for all $n \in \omega$,” (see Remark 3.1 below).

As a first immediate application, we show that Gangopadhyay’s characterization (namely, Theorem 1.1) holds, more generally, for fields of sets.

Corollary 2.2. *Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ be a field of subsets on a set X , and let $\mu : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a nonnegative, finitely additive, bounded map. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The pseudometric space (Σ, d_μ) is complete;*
- (ii) *For every increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ , there exists $A \in \Sigma$ such that $\mu(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\mu(A) = \lim_n \mu(A_n)$.*

Quite surprisingly, it seems that the above characterization cannot be found explicitly in the literature. As remarked by K. P. S. Bhaskara Rao in personal

communications, [8, Theorem 3.3] is a relevant result in the finitely additive setting and may provide an alternative route to a direct proof of Corollary 2.2.

As another immediate application, we recover [34, Proposition 3.4]:

Corollary 2.3. *Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ be a σ -field of subsets on a set X , and let $\nu : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a submeasure which is σ -subadditive. Then (Σ, d_ν) is complete.*

In Section 2.1, we provide a large class of submeasures $\nu : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_\nu)$ is complete (see Theorem 2.5), which will give a positive proof to the claims in [32, Lemma 3.1] and [18, Lemma 1.3.3(c)]. In Section 2.2, we provide another large class of submeasures $\nu : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_\nu)$ is *not* complete (see Theorem 2.7). Remarkably, this class includes the upper Banach density \mathbf{bd}^* and the upper Buck density \mathbf{b}^* defined in (3) and (4) below, resp.; in both cases, some preliminaries will be necessary. Lastly, we will provide in Section 2.3 further relationships between the completeness of the pseudometric spaces (Σ, d_ν) and a certain submeasure defined on the power set of the Stone space of the quotient Σ/ν . Proofs of our results follow in Section 3.

2.1. Positive results: ideals and lscsms. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on the nonnegative integers ω , that is, a family of subsets of ω which is closed under subsets and finite unions. Unless otherwise stated, it is also assumed that \mathcal{I} contains the family Fin of finite subsets of ω , and that $\omega \notin \mathcal{I}$. Set also $\mathcal{I}^+ := \mathcal{P}(\omega) \setminus \mathcal{I}$.

Proposition 2.4. *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . Then $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_{\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{I}^+}})$ is complete.*

Regarding ideals as subsets of the Cantor space 2^ω , we can speak about their topological complexity: for instance, \mathcal{I} can be an analytic, Borel, or a F_σ -subset of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$. In addition, we say that \mathcal{I} is a P -ideal if it is σ -directed modulo finite sets, that is, for every sequence (A_n) of sets in \mathcal{I} there exists $A \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $A_n \setminus A$ is finite for all $n \in \omega$. For instance, Fin is a F_σ P -ideal, and the family of asymptotic density zero sets

$$\mathcal{Z} := \{A \subseteq \omega : \mathbf{d}^*(A) = 0\}$$

is an analytic P -ideal which is not F_σ . Also, maximal ideals (i.e., the complements of free ultrafilters on ω) do not have the Baire property, hence they are not analytic. We refer to [18] for an excellent textbook on the theory of ideals.

Given a lscsm $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, define the family

$$\text{Exh}(\varphi) := \{S \subseteq \omega : \|S\|_\varphi = 0\}, \quad \text{where } \|S\|_\varphi := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(S \setminus n).$$

Informally, $\|S\|_\varphi$ stands for the φ -mass at infinity of the set S . A classical result of Solecki [45, Theorem 3.1] states that an ideal \mathcal{I} on ω is an analytic P -ideal if and only if there exists a lscsm φ such that

$$\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(\omega) < \infty.$$

We remark that the family of analytic P -ideals is large and includes, among others, all Erdős–Ulam ideals introduced by Just and Krawczyk in [32], ideals generated by nonnegative regular matrices [23, 25], the Fubini products $\emptyset \times \text{Fin}$, which can be defined as $\{A \subseteq \omega : \forall n \in \omega, A \cap I_n \in \text{Fin}\}$, where (I_n) is a given partition of ω into infinite sets, certain ideals used by Louveau and Veličković [40], and, more generally, density-like ideals and generalized density ideals [12, 36]. Additional pathological examples can be found in [46]. It has been suggested in [11, 12] that the theory of analytic P -ideals may have some relevant yet unexploited potential for the study of the geometry of Banach spaces.

It is easy to check that, for each finite lscsm φ , the map $\|\cdot\|_\varphi$ is monotone, subadditive, and invariant under finite modifications, cf. [18, Lemma 1.3.3(a)-(b)]. In addition, the lscsm φ in such a representation is not necessarily unique, cf. Example 3.3 below for the case of the ideal \mathcal{Z} . On a similar note, we will show in Proposition 3.5 that, if φ_1, φ_2 are two lscsms with $\text{Exh}(\varphi_1) = \text{Exh}(\varphi_2)$, then the pseudometrics $d_{\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_1}}$ and $d_{\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_2}}$ are topologically equivalent, though not necessarily metrically equivalent (see Proposition 3.4).

With the above context, our main positive result follows:

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a lscsm. Then $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_{\|\cdot\|_\varphi})$ is complete.*

Since \mathcal{Z} is an analytic P -ideal, Theorem 2.5 provides a generalization of Theorem 1.5, cf. also Example 3.3 below. In addition, a special case of Theorem 2.5 follows by a result of Solecki in [45, Theorem 3.4], where he shows that the topology induced by $d_{\|\cdot\|_\varphi}$ is discrete if and only if $\text{Exh}(\varphi)$ is a F_σ -ideal. It seems plausible that an alternative proof of Theorem 2.5 could be obtained using the notion of algebraic convergence studied in [3, Section 2], cf. also [2, 31].

As remarked by Farah in personal communications, an instance of Theorem 2.5 can also be obtained as follows: suppose that φ is a lscsm such that $\text{Exh}(\varphi)$ is a generalized density ideal. Then the Boolean algebra $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{Exh}(\varphi)$ endowed with the metric induced by $d_{\|\cdot\|_\varphi}$ is countably saturated, see [21, Proposition 2.8] and cf. also [19, Theorem 16.5.1] and the argument preceding [20, Corollary 6.5]; thus, completeness is a consequence of the latter property. However, it is an open

question whether the analogous argument holds for all analytic P -ideals; see the last paragraph of [21, Section 2].

The density measures $\mu^{\mathcal{F}}$ in (2) used by Blass et al. [10] do not fall into the realm of Theorem 2.5: in fact, for each free ultrafilter \mathcal{F} on ω , the family $\{A \subseteq \omega : \mu^{\mathcal{F}}(A) = 0\}$ is an ideal which is not analytic by the proof of [5, Theorem 2.10], hence it cannot coincide with $\text{Exh}(\varphi)$ for any lscsm φ .

2.2. Negative results: upper densities. In this section, complementing Proposition 2.4, we provide a simple class of pseudometric spaces $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_\nu)$ which are *not* complete.

Proposition 2.6. *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . Let also $(a_n : n \in \omega)$ be a sequence of strictly positive reals such that $\sum_n a_n = 1$. Define the submeasure ν by*

$$\forall A \subseteq \omega, \quad \nu(A) := \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(A) + \sum_{n \in A} a_n.$$

Then $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_\nu)$ is not complete.

Then, we study natural instances of ν such as upper Banach density. To this aim, following [38, Definition 1], we say that a map $\mu^* : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an *upper density* on ω if it satisfies the following properties:

- (F1) $\mu^*(\omega) = 1$;
- (F2) $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(B)$ for all $A \subseteq B \subseteq \omega$;
- (F3) $\mu^*(A \cup B) \leq \mu^*(A) + \mu^*(B)$ for all $A, B \subseteq \omega$;
- (F4) $\mu^*(k \cdot A) = \mu^*(A)/k$ for all $A \subseteq \omega$ and all nonzero $k \in \omega$;
- (F5) $\mu^*(A + h) = \mu^*(A)$ for all $A \subseteq \omega$ and $h \in \omega$.

It is readily seen that, if μ^* is an upper density, then $0 \leq \mu^*(A) \leq 1$ for all $A \subseteq \omega$, and $\mu^*(F) = 0$ for every finite $F \subseteq \omega$, see [38, Proposition 2 and Proposition 6]; in particular, each μ^* is a normalized submeasure.

Examples of upper densities include the upper asymptotic density \mathbf{d}^* defined in (1), the upper α -densities with $\alpha \geq -1$ [38, Example 4], the upper Banach density \mathbf{bd}^* defined by

$$\forall A \subseteq \omega, \quad \mathbf{bd}^*(A) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{k \in \omega} \frac{|A \cap [k, k+n]|}{n}, \quad (3)$$

the upper analytic density [38, Example 6], the upper Polya density [38, Example 8], and the upper Buck density \mathbf{b}^* defined by

$$\forall A \subseteq \omega, \quad \mathbf{b}^*(A) := \inf_{X \in \mathcal{A}, A \subseteq X} \mathbf{d}^*(A), \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{A} stands for the family of finite unions of infinite arithmetic progressions $k \cdot \omega + h$ (with $k, h \in \omega$ and $k \neq 0$). With these premises, recall that

$$\mathbf{d}^*(A) \leq \mathbf{bd}^*(A) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^*(A) \leq \mathbf{b}^*(A) \quad (5)$$

for all $A \subseteq \omega$ and all upper densities μ^* on ω , see [38, Theorem 3].

For any upper density μ^* on ω , we denote by μ_* its lower dual, that is, the map defined by $\mu_*(A) := 1 - \mu^*(\omega \setminus A)$ for all $A \subseteq \omega$. We denote by μ the density induced by the pair (μ^*, μ_*) , that is, the restriction of μ^* to the family $\text{dom}(\mu) := \{A \subseteq \omega : \mu^*(A) = \mu_*(A)\}$. For instance, if μ^* is the upper asymptotic density \mathbf{d}^* , then \mathbf{d}_* is the lower asymptotic density, \mathbf{d} is the asymptotic density, and $\text{dom}(\mathbf{d})$ is the family of sets $A \subseteq \omega$ which admits asymptotic density (that is, $\mathbf{d}^*(A) = \mathbf{d}_*(A)$).

Our main negative result follows:

Theorem 2.7. *Let μ^* be an upper density on ω such that $\mathbf{bd}^*(A) \leq \mu^*(A)$ for all $A \subseteq \omega$. Then $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_{\mu^*})$ is not complete.*

Thanks to (5), the above result applies to the upper Banach density \mathbf{bd}^* and the upper Buck density \mathbf{b}^* . In addition, thanks to [38, Proposition 10], it applies also to the upper density $(\alpha(\mathbf{bd}^*)^q + (1 - \alpha)(\mathbf{b}^*)^q)^{1/q}$ for every $q \in [1, \infty)$ and every $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ (more generally, the set of upper densities satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 2.7 is countably q -convex for every $q \in [1, \infty)$).

2.3. Relationships with Stone spaces. Let Σ and ν be as in the statement of Theorem 2.1, and let $\nu^* : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be the map defined by

$$\forall A \subseteq X, \quad \nu^*(A) := \inf \{\nu(C) : C \in \Sigma \text{ and } A \subseteq C\}.$$

Of course, ν^* is a submeasure which extends ν . We write $\overline{\Sigma}$ for the closure of Σ in the space $(\mathcal{P}(X), d_{\nu^*})$. As it follows by Remark 3.8, this is precisely the classical Peano–Jordan completion in the finitely additive case. With a small abuse of notation, given a field $\Sigma' \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$, we write (Σ', d_{ν^*}) for the pseudometric space (Σ', d_ψ) , where ψ stands for the restriction of ν^* on Σ' .

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ be a field of subsets on a set X , and let $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a submeasure. Then $(\overline{\Sigma}, d_{\nu^*})$ is complete whenever (Σ, d_ν) is complete.*

It is worth noting that, as it follows by [6, Proposition 5.1 and Example 5.2], the converse implication of Lemma 2.8 fails even if ν is finitely additive.

Several equivalent conditions for the completeness of $(\overline{\Sigma}, d_{\nu^*})$ will be given in Theorem 2.9 below. To this aim, denote by Σ/ν the quotient space of Σ with the

ideal $\{A \in \Sigma : \nu(A) = 0\}$. Equip Σ/ν with the quotient topology, and denote the canonical projection by

$$\pi : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma/\nu.$$

Thus, a generic element of Σ/ν is an equivalence class of the type $\pi(A) = \{C \in \Sigma : \nu(A \Delta C) = 0\}$ for some set $A \in \Sigma$. Now, let S be the Stone space of the Boolean algebra Σ/ν , that is, the set of ultrafilters on Σ/ν , equipped with its usual topology. Recall that S is compact and totally disconnected. Denote by \mathcal{C} the field of all clopen (that is, simultaneously open and closed) subsets of S , so that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(S)$. We denote by $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$ the σ -field generated by \mathcal{C} . It is known that $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$ coincides with the Baire σ -field of S , that is, the smallest σ -field containing the compact G_δ sets (the short argument is essentially contained in Lemma 3.14(vi) below. By Stone's representation theorem, there exists a Boolean isomorphism

$$\phi : \Sigma/\nu \rightarrow \mathcal{C},$$

see e.g. [44, Chapter 1, Section 8] for a textbook exposition on Boolean algebras. For each $B \subseteq S$ let $\Delta(B)$ be the family of all sequences $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ with values in Σ such that $B \subseteq \bigcup_n \phi(\pi(A_n))$ (of course, each $\Delta(B)$ is nonempty since $\phi(\pi(X)) = S$). Thus, define the outer measure $\hat{\nu} : \mathcal{P}(S) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ by

$$\forall B \subseteq S, \quad \hat{\nu}(B) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{n \in \omega} \nu(A_n) : (A_n) \in \Delta(B) \right\},$$

and observe that $\hat{\nu}$ is σ -subadditive by the very same argument used in the first part of the proof of [15, Lemma III.5.5]. Define also the map $\tilde{\nu} : \mathcal{P}(S) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ by

$$\forall B \subseteq S, \quad \tilde{\nu}(B) := \inf \{ \nu(A) : A \in \Sigma \text{ and } B \subseteq \phi(\pi(A)) \}.$$

Of course, both $\hat{\nu}$ and $\tilde{\nu}$ are submeasures, and $\hat{\nu} \leq \tilde{\nu}$. Let also ∂B be the set of boundary points of $B \subseteq S$. Finally, let $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ be the closure of \mathcal{C} with respect to $d_{\hat{\nu}}$, and $\mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}}$ denote the family of $\hat{\nu}$ -null sets. Several properties of $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ can be found in Lemma 3.9 and the subsequent results. Analogous notations are used for $\tilde{\nu}$. Lastly, let $\text{nwd}(S)$ denote the family of the nowhere dense sets in S .

With the above premises, we have the following characterization, in the same spirit of [6, Theorem 4.2] for the finitely additive case, cf. also [7, 30] and the related comments in [6, Section 4].

Theorem 2.9. *Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ be a field of subsets on a set X , and let $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a submeasure. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (A1) *The pseudometric space $(\overline{\Sigma}, d_{\nu^*})$ is complete;*

- (A2) For every increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$, there exists a decreasing sequence $(D_m : m \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $\nu(A_n \setminus D_m) = 0$ for all $n, m \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \nu(D_n \setminus A_n) = 0$;
- (A3) For every increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$, there exists $C \subseteq X$ such that $\nu^*(A_n \setminus C) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \nu^*(C \setminus A_n) = 0$;
- (B1) $\hat{\nu}(U) = \hat{\nu}(\bar{U})$ for every set $U \subseteq S$;
- (B2) $\hat{\nu}(U) = \hat{\nu}(\bar{U})$ for every set $U \subseteq S$ which is a countable union of clopen sets;
- (B3) For every increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$, there exists a decreasing sequence $(D_m : m \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $\nu(A_n \setminus D_m) = 0$ for all $n, m \in \omega$ and $\sup_n \nu(A_n) = \inf_m \nu(D_m)$;
- (B4) For every increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$, there exists $C \subseteq X$ such that $\nu^*(A_n \setminus C) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\sup_n \nu(A_n) = \nu^*(C)$;
- (C1) The pseudometric space $(\mathcal{P}(X), d_{\nu^*})$ is complete;
- (C2) The pseudometric space (Σ', d_{ν^*}) is complete for every closed field $\Sigma' \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ which contains Σ ;
- (C3) The pseudometric space (Σ', d_{ν^*}) is complete for some closed field $\Sigma' \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ which contains Σ ;
- (D1) $\hat{\nu} = \tilde{\nu}$;
- (D2) $\tilde{\nu}$ is σ -subadditive;
- (D3) For every $B \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $A, C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ and $\tilde{\nu}(C \setminus A) < \varepsilon$;
- (D4) For every $B \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$, there exist sets $A, C \subseteq S$ such that A is open, C is closed, $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$, and $\hat{\nu}(C \setminus A) = 0$;
- (D5) $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$;
- (D6) A subset of S is the boundary of some element of $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if it is closed and $\hat{\nu}$ -null;
- (D7) $\mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}} = \text{nwd}(S) \cap \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\partial B \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ for every $B \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$;
- (E1) $\tilde{\nu}(\partial B) = 0$ for every set $B \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$;
- (E2) $\hat{\nu}(\partial B) = 0$ for every set $B \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$;

(E3) $\hat{\nu}(\partial B) = 0$ for every set $B \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ which is a countable union of clopen sets.

As an application in the case where Σ is closed, we provide some additional equivalences for the completeness of (Σ, d_ν) in terms of properties of the Stone space S .

Corollary 2.10. *Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ be a field of subsets on a set X such that $\Sigma = \overline{\Sigma}$, and let $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a submeasure. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The pseudometric space (Σ, d_ν) is complete;*
- (ii) *For every $B \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ there exists $A \in \Sigma$ such that $\tilde{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A)) \triangle B) = 0$;*
- (iii) *For every $B \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ there exists $A \in \Sigma$ such that $\hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A)) \triangle B) = 0$;*
- (iv) *For every $B \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ which is a countable union of clopen sets, there exists $A \in \Sigma$ such that $\hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A)) \triangle B) = 0$.*

To conclude, we remark that, in the case where ν is finitely additive, an equivalence in the same spirit of (A1) \iff (B1) can be obtained as a consequence of [6, Theorem 4.2 and Proposition 5.1] (however, in the latter work the definition of $\hat{\nu}$ is different, see [6, Section 1.15] for details).

3. PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS IN SECTION 2

Let us start with the proof of our main characterization.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. (i) \implies (ii). Let $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ be a d_ν -Cauchy sequence in Σ and let $A \in \Sigma$ be a d_ν -limit. Then, for every $B \in \Sigma$, since $(A_n \cap B) \triangle (A \cap B) \subseteq A_n \triangle A$ for all $n \in \omega$, we have

$$\nu_{(A_n)}^+(B) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(A_n \cap B) = \nu(A \cap B),$$

and similarly $\nu_{(A_n)}^-(B) = \nu(B \setminus A)$. Now, define $\lambda := \nu_{(A_n)}^+ - \nu_{(A_n)}^-$. It follows that $\lambda_{(A_n)}(B) \geq 0$ for all $B \in \Sigma$ with $B \subseteq A$, and $\lambda_{(A_n)}(B) \leq 0$ for all $B \in \Sigma$ with $B \subseteq A^c$. Hence $\langle A, A^c \rangle$ is an exact Hahn decomposition of $\lambda_{(A_n)}$.

(ii) \implies (iii). Pick an increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$. Observe that, for all $n, m \in \omega$ with $m \geq n$, we have $d_\nu(A_n, A_m) \leq \nu(A_m \setminus A_n) \leq \sum_{k \geq n} \nu(A_{k+1} \setminus A_k)$, hence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ is d_ν -Cauchy. It follows by item (ii) that the map $\lambda := \nu_{(A_n)}^+ - \nu_{(A_n)}^-$ admits an exact Hahn decomposition $\langle A, A^c \rangle$, for some $A \in \Sigma$. We claim that A is a set witnessing (iii).

To this aim, fix $k \in \omega$. Since $A_k \setminus A \subseteq A^c$, then $\lambda(A_k \setminus A) \leq 0$. But $\nu_{(A_n)}^-(A_k \setminus A) = \lim_n \nu((A_k \setminus A) \setminus A_n) = 0$. It follows that $\nu_{(A_n)}^+(A_k \setminus A) = \lambda(A_k \setminus A) \leq 0$, hence $0 = \nu_{(A_n)}^+(A_k \setminus A) = \lim_n \nu(A_n \cap (A_k \setminus A)) = \nu(A_k \setminus A)$.

Similarly, $A \setminus A_k \subseteq A$, hence $\lambda(A \setminus A_k) \geq 0$, so $\nu_{(A_n)}^+(A \setminus A_k) \geq \nu_{(A_n)}^-(A \setminus A_k)$. Since $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ is increasing, we have also

$$\nu_{(A_n)}^-(A \setminus A_k) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu((A \setminus A_k) \setminus A_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(A \setminus A_n).$$

Putting everything together, for all $k \in \omega$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(A \setminus A_n) &= \nu_{(A_n)}^-(A \setminus A_k) \leq \nu_{(A_n)}^+(A \setminus A_k) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(A_n \cap (A \setminus A_k)) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(A_n \setminus A_k) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=k}^{n-1} \nu(A_{i+1} \setminus A_i) = \sum_{i \geq k} \nu(A_{i+1} \setminus A_i). \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrariness of k , we conclude that $\lim_n \nu(A \setminus A_n) = 0$.

(iii) \implies (i). Let $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ be a Cauchy sequence in the pseudometric space (Σ, d_ν) . Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\nu(A_i \triangle A_j) < 2^{-i}$ for all $i, j \in \omega$ with $i \leq j$, since there is a subsequence with this property and a Cauchy sequence converges to the same limits as any subsequence. For all $i, j \in \omega$ with $i \leq j$, define the Σ -measurable set

$$B_{i,j} := \bigcap_{k=i}^j A_k$$

and note that

$$\nu(A_i \triangle B_{i,j}) \leq \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} \nu(A_k \setminus A_{k+1}) < 2^{1-i}. \quad (6)$$

In addition, for each $i \in \omega$, $(B_{i,j}^c : j \geq i)$ is an increasing sequence with

$$\sum_{j \geq i} \nu(B_{i,j+1}^c \setminus B_{i,j}^c) \leq \sum_{j \geq i} \nu(A_j \setminus A_{j+1}) < 2^{1-i}.$$

Hence, by assumption, for each $i \in \omega$ there exists $B_i \in \Sigma$ such that $\nu(B_i \setminus B_{i,j}) = \nu(B_{i,j}^c \setminus B_i^c) = 0$ for all $j \geq i$, and $\lim_j \nu(B_{i,j} \setminus B_i) = \lim_j \nu(B_i^c \setminus B_{i,j}^c) = 0$. Thus

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \nu(B_{i,j} \triangle B_i) = 0. \quad (7)$$

At this point, for all $i \in \omega$, define the Σ -measurable set

$$C_i := \bigcup_{k=0}^i B_k.$$

Observe that, for all integers $i, k \in \omega$ with $k \geq i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(B_i \Delta C_i) &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \nu(B_j \setminus B_{j+1}) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (\nu(B_j \setminus B_{j,k}) + \nu(B_{j,k} \setminus B_{j+1,k}) + \nu(B_{j+1,k} \setminus B_{j+1})) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \nu(B_{j+1,k} \setminus B_{j+1}). \end{aligned}$$

By the hypothesis as applied to each B_j and letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, this implies that

$$\forall i \in \omega, \quad \nu(B_i \Delta C_i) = 0. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, $(C_i : i \in \omega)$ is an increasing sequence and, for all $i, j \in \omega$ with $i \leq j$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{i+1} \setminus C_i &\subseteq B_{i+1} \setminus B_i \\ &\subseteq (B_{i+1} \setminus B_{i+1,j}) \cup (B_{i+1,j} \setminus B_{i,j}) \cup (B_{i,j} \setminus B_i) \\ &\subseteq (B_{i+1} \setminus B_{i+1,j}) \cup (A_{i+1} \setminus A_i) \cup (B_{i,j} \setminus B_i). \end{aligned}$$

Since ν is a submeasure then

$$\nu(C_{i+1} \setminus C_i) \leq \nu(B_{i+1} \setminus B_{i+1,j}) + \nu(A_{i+1} \setminus A_i) + \nu(B_{i,j} \setminus B_i) < 2^{-i}$$

for sufficiently large $j \in \omega$ and thus $\sum_i \nu(C_{i+1} \setminus C_i) < \infty$. By the standing assumption, there exists $A \in \Sigma$ such that $\nu(C_i \setminus A) = 0$ for all $i \in \omega$, and $\lim_i \nu(A \setminus C_i) = 0$. In particular,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nu(C_i \Delta A) = 0. \quad (9)$$

To conclude, we claim that (A_n) is d_ν -convergent to A . In fact, observe that for all $i, j \in \omega$ with $i \leq j$, we have

$$A_i \Delta A \subseteq (A_i \Delta B_{i,j}) \cup (B_{i,j} \Delta B_i) \cup (B_i \Delta C_i) \cup (C_i \Delta A).$$

Since ν is a submeasure, it follows by inequalities (6), (7), and (8) that

$$\forall i \in \omega, \quad \nu(A_i \Delta A) < 2^{1-i} + \nu(C_i \Delta A).$$

Finally, it follows by (9) that $\lim_i \nu(A_i \Delta A) = 0$. Hence (Σ, d_ν) is complete. \square

We continue with the proofs of its applications.

Proof of Corollary 2.2. Pick an increasing sequence (A_n) in Σ . Observe that $\sum_n \mu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$: otherwise there would exist $n_0 \in \omega$ such that $\mu(X) < \sum_{n \leq n_0} \mu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) = \mu(A_{n_0+1} \setminus A_0) \leq \mu(A_{n_0+1})$, which is impossible. Suppose that there exists $A \in \Sigma$ such that $\mu(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \mu(A \setminus A_n) = 0$. Since $|\mu(A) - \mu(A_n)| \leq \mu(A_n \setminus A) + \mu(A \setminus A_n)$ for all $n \in \omega$, then $\lim_n \mu(A_n) = \mu(A)$. Conversely, suppose that there exists $A \in \Sigma$ such that $\mu(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \mu(A_n) = \mu(A)$. Since $\mu(A \setminus A_n) = \mu(A) - \mu(A_n) + \mu(A_n \setminus A)$, then $\lim_n \mu(A \setminus A_n) = 0$. This proves that item (ii) of Corollary 2.2 is a rewriting of item (iii) of Theorem 2.1 for nonnegative finitely additive bounded maps. The conclusion follows by Theorem 2.1. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.3. Pick an increasing sequence (A_n) in Σ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$ and define $A := \bigcup_k A_k \in \Sigma$. Then $A_n \setminus A = \emptyset$ for all $n \in \omega$. In addition, since $A \setminus A_n = \bigcup_{k \geq n} (A_{k+1} \setminus A_k)$ for all $n \in \omega$, we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(A \setminus A_n) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j \geq n} \nu(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j) = 0.$$

The conclusion follows by Theorem 2.1. \square

Remark 3.1. Item (iii) in Theorem 2.1 cannot be replaced by:

- (ii') For every increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$, there exists $A \in \Sigma$ such that $A_n \setminus A \in \text{Fin}$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \nu(A \setminus A_n) = 0$.

In fact, choose $\Sigma = \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and let μ be as in the statement of Theorem 1.2. Then $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_\mu)$ is complete, i.e., item (i) in Theorem 2.1 holds. On the other hand, there exists an increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ such that, if $A \subseteq \omega$ satisfies $A_n \setminus A \in \text{Fin}$ for all $n \in \omega$, then $\mu(A) \neq \lim_n \mu(A_n)$. Since μ is invariant modulo finite sets then there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that $\mu(A) \geq \mu(A_n) + \kappa$ for all $n \in \omega$. Since $\mu(A \setminus A_n) = \mu(A) - \mu(A_n) + \mu(A_n \setminus A)$ for all $n \in \omega$, we obtain $\liminf_n \mu(A \setminus A_n) \geq \kappa$. In addition, $\sum_n \mu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$, by the same argument as in the proof of Corollary 2.2. Therefore item (ii') above fails.

Remark 3.2. In the same vein as Remark 3.1, there exists a finitely additive map $\mu : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying property **AP(NULL)** and such that its zero set $\mathcal{I} := \{A \subseteq \omega : \mu(A) = 0\}$ is not a P -ideal.

In fact, let μ be an additive extension of the asymptotic density \mathbf{d} satisfying the claim of Theorem 1.2. Then by item (i) the induced pseudometric d_μ is complete,

hence **AP(NULL)** holds by Corollary 2.2. In addition, by item (ii), it is possible to pick an increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ such that, if $B \subseteq \omega$ satisfies $A_n \setminus B \in \text{Fin}$ for all $n \in \omega$, then $\mu(B) \neq \lim_n \mu(A_n)$. Thanks to **AP(NULL)**, there exists $A \subseteq \omega$ such that $C_n := A_n \setminus A \in \mathcal{I}$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\mu(A) = \lim_n \mu(A_n)$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that \mathcal{I} is a P -ideal. Then there exists $C \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $C_n \setminus C \in \text{Fin}$ for all $n \in \omega$. Lastly, define $B := A \cup C$. Then $A_n \setminus B = C_n \setminus C \in \text{Fin}$ for all $n \in \omega$, and $\mu(B) = \mu(A) = \lim_n \mu(A_n)$. This provides the claimed contradiction.

It is natural to investigate whether the topological and uniform properties of the pseudometric $d_{\|\cdot\|_\varphi}$ induced by an lscsm φ can be deduced from some property of the exhaustive ideal $\text{Exh}(\varphi)$. For example, below we identify two lscsms with the same exhaustive ideal that also induce metrically equivalent pseudometrics.

Example 3.3. Define $I_n := \omega \cap [2^n, 2^{n+1})$ for all $n \in \omega$, and let $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ and $\psi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be the lscsms given by

$$\varphi(A) := \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{|A \cap n|}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(A) := \sup_{n \in \omega} \frac{|A \cap I_n|}{|I_n|}$$

for all $A \subseteq \omega$. It is clear that $\|A\|_\varphi = \mathbf{d}^*(A)$ and $\|A\|_\psi = \limsup_n |A \cap I_n|/|I_n|$ for each $A \subseteq \omega$. Note

$$\mathcal{Z} = \text{Exh}(\varphi) = \text{Exh}(\psi)$$

(see [4, Lemma 3.1] or [37, Theorem 2]; cf. also the proof of [18, Theorem 1.13.3(a)], which shows that \mathcal{Z} is a density-ideal).

In addition, $d_{\|\cdot\|_\psi}$ and $d_{\mathbf{d}^*}$ are metrically equivalent or, more precisely,

$$\forall A \subseteq \omega, \quad \frac{\|A\|_\psi}{2} \leq \mathbf{d}^*(A) \leq 16\|A\|_\psi.$$

For, fix $A \subseteq \omega$ such that $\alpha := \mathbf{d}^*(A) \in (0, 1]$. On the one hand, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist infinitely many $n \in \omega$ such that $|A \cap I_n| \geq 2^n(1 - \varepsilon)\|A\|_\psi$. Since $A \cap I_n \subseteq A \cap 2^{n+1}$, it follows that $|A \cap 2^{n+1}| \geq 2^n(1 - \varepsilon)\|A\|_\psi$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we obtain $\|A\|_\psi \leq 2\mathbf{d}^*(A)$. On the other hand, observe that there exists $n_0 \in \omega$ such that $|A \cap n| \leq \frac{5}{4}\alpha n$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Also, there exists an infinite set $S \subseteq \omega$ such that $\min S \geq 2n_0$ and $|A \cap n| \geq \frac{3}{4}\alpha n$ for all $n \in S$. Now, pick $n \in S$ and $m \in \omega$ such that $n \in I_m$. Since $\frac{n}{2} \geq n_0$ it follows that $|A \cap \frac{n}{2}| \leq \frac{5}{8}\alpha n$, hence $|A \cap [\frac{n}{2}, n]| \geq \frac{1}{8}\alpha n$. Thus $\max\{|A \cap I_{m-1}|, |A \cap I_m|\} \geq \frac{1}{16}\alpha n \geq \frac{1}{16}2^m\alpha$. Hence there exist infinitely many $k \in \omega$ such that $|A \cap I_k| \geq \frac{1}{16}\alpha|I_k|$, so that $\|A\|_\psi \geq \frac{1}{16}\mathbf{d}^*(A)$. Consequently, $d_{\|\cdot\|_\psi}$ is complete if and only if $d_{\mathbf{d}^*}$ is complete (cf. Theorem 1.5).

However, it is not always the case that lscsms with the same exhaustive ideal induce metrically equivalent pseudometrics.

Proposition 3.4. *There exists a lscsm $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that:*

- (i) $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{Z}$;
- (ii) $\|\cdot\|_\varphi$ is an upper density;
- (iii) $d_{\|\cdot\|_\varphi}$ is not metrically equivalent to d_{d^*} .

Proof. For each real $\alpha > -1$, let $\varphi_\alpha : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be the lscsm defined by

$$\forall A \subseteq \omega, \quad \varphi_\alpha(A) := \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{\sum_{i \in A \cap [1, n]} i^\alpha}{\sum_{i=1}^n i^\alpha}.$$

Then φ_0 coincides with the lscsm φ used in Example 3.3 and $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_\alpha}$ is the classical upper α -density, cf. [38, Example 4]. In addition, it follows by [39, Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.3] that $\mathcal{Z} = \text{Exh}(\varphi_\alpha)$ for each $\alpha > -1$. Thus, define the map $\varphi_\infty : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by

$$\forall A \subseteq \omega, \quad \varphi_\infty(A) := \sum_{\alpha \in \omega} \frac{\varphi_{2^\alpha}(A)}{2^\alpha}.$$

Then φ_∞ is a lscsm that satisfies our claim.

It is immediate to see that φ_∞ is monotone, subadditive, and $\varphi_\infty(\omega) = 1$. Moreover, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\alpha > -1$ there exists $n_{\alpha, \varepsilon} \in \omega$ such that $\varphi_{2^\alpha}(A) \leq \varphi_{2^\alpha}(A \cap n_{\alpha, \varepsilon}) + \varepsilon$ for $n \geq n_{\alpha, \varepsilon}$ (since φ_{2^α} is an lscsm). Now, fix $\varepsilon > 0$, pick $\alpha_0 \in \omega$ such that $2^{-\alpha_0} \leq \varepsilon/3$, and define $n_\varepsilon := \max\{n_{\alpha, \varepsilon/3} : \alpha \in \alpha_0 + 1\}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\infty(A) &\leq \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\alpha_0} \frac{\varphi_{2^\alpha}(A)}{2^\alpha} + \sum_{\alpha > \alpha_0} \frac{1}{2^\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\alpha_0} \frac{\varphi_{2^\alpha}(A)}{2^\alpha} + \frac{1}{2^{\alpha_0}} \\ &\leq \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\alpha_0} \frac{\varphi_{2^\alpha}(A \cap n_{\alpha, \varepsilon/3}) + \varepsilon/3}{2^\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \\ &\leq \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\alpha_0} \frac{\varphi_{2^\alpha}(A \cap n_\varepsilon)}{2^\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \left(1 + \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\alpha_0} \frac{1}{2^\alpha} \right) \leq \varphi_\infty(A \cap n_\varepsilon) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that φ_∞ is a (bounded) lscsm.

By the Dominated Convergence theorem, we have that

$$\forall A \subseteq \omega, \quad \|A\|_{\varphi_\infty} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \omega} \frac{\varphi_{2^\alpha}(A \setminus n)}{2^\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha \in \omega} \frac{\|A\|_{\varphi_{2^\alpha}}}{2^\alpha}. \quad (10)$$

Since each $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_\alpha}$ is an upper density and the set of upper densities is countably convex by [38, Proposition 10], then $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_\infty}$ is an upper density as well, i.e., item (ii) holds. Moreover, by the above observations, identity (10) implies that $\mathcal{Z} = \text{Exh}(\varphi_\infty)$, i.e., item (i) holds.

Lastly, we claim that there is no constant $C > 0$ such that $\|A\|_{\varphi_\infty} \leq C\|A\|_\psi$ for all $A \subseteq \omega$, where ψ is the lscsm used in Example 3.3. For, define $A_n := \omega \cap \bigcup_{i \in \omega} [2^i, 2^i(1+2^{-n}))$ for each $n \in \omega$, and observe that $\|A_n\|_\psi = 2^{-n}$. Then, for each $n \in \omega$ and each $\alpha > -1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_n\|_{\varphi_\alpha} &= \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i \in A_n \cap [1, 2^k(1+2^{-n})]} i^\alpha}{\sum_{i=1}^{2^k(1+2^{-n})} i^\alpha} \\ &\geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=2^k}^{2^k(1+2^{-n})} i^\alpha}{\sum_{i=1}^{2^k(1+2^{-n})} i^\alpha} = 1 - (1+2^{-n})^{-\alpha-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting it all together, it follows that

$$\forall \alpha > -1, \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|A_n\|_{\varphi_\alpha}}{\|A_n\|_\psi} \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - (1+2^{-n})^{-\alpha-1}}{2^{-n}} = \alpha + 1. \quad (11)$$

Now, fix $C \in \omega$. Thanks to (11), there exists a sufficiently large $n_C \in \omega$ such that

$$\forall \alpha \in 2C, \quad \frac{\|A_{n_C}\|_{\varphi_{2\alpha}}}{\|A_{n_C}\|_\psi} \geq \frac{2^\alpha + 1}{2}.$$

Since $\frac{2^\alpha+1}{2} > 2^{\alpha-1}$, it follows by (10) that

$$\|A_{n_C}\|_{\varphi_\infty} \geq \sum_{\alpha \in 2C} \frac{\|A_{n_C}\|_{\varphi_{2\alpha}}}{2^\alpha} > \|A_{n_C}\|_\psi \sum_{\alpha \in 2C} \frac{2^{\alpha-1}}{2^\alpha} = C\|A_{n_C}\|_\psi.$$

Therefore $d_{\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_\infty}}$ and $d_{\|\cdot\|_\psi}$ are not metrically equivalent. Since $d_{\|\cdot\|_\psi}$ and d_{d^*} are metrically equivalent by Example 3.3, we conclude that item (iii) holds. \square

It is true that lscsms with the same exhaustive ideal induce pseudometrics that are topologically equivalent.

Proposition 3.5. *Let φ_1, φ_2 be two lscsms such that $\text{Exh}(\varphi_1) = \text{Exh}(\varphi_2)$. Then the pseudometrics $d_{\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_1}}$ and $d_{\|\cdot\|_{\varphi_2}}$ are topologically equivalent.*

Proof. It is easy to check that $\text{Exh}(\varphi_1) = \text{Exh}(\varphi_2)$ is equivalent to the fact that, for every disjoint sequence (F_n) of finite sets of ω , we have $\lim_n \varphi_1(F_n) = 0$ if and only if $\lim_n \varphi_2(F_n) = 0$, cf. [12, Remark 2.3]. Now, pick a sequence of sets (A_n)

and $A \subseteq \omega$. Since φ_1 and φ_2 are two lscsms, there exists a partition $(P_n : n \in \omega)$ of ω into nonempty finite sets such that

$$|\varphi_i((A_n \triangle A) \cap P_n) - \|A_n \triangle A\|_{\varphi_i}| \leq 2^{-n}$$

for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and for all sufficiently large n . It follows that $\lim_n \|A \triangle A_n\|_{\varphi_1} = 0$ if and only if $\lim_n \|A \triangle A_n\|_{\varphi_2} = 0$, concluding the proof. \square

Next we prove Proposition 2.4 and Theorem 2.5 using Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Proposition 2.4. Let $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ be an increasing sequence in $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ such that $\sum_n \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$. Define $S := \{n \in \omega : A_{n+1} \setminus A_n \in \mathcal{I}^+\}$, so that S is necessarily finite by the standing hypothesis. Define $A := A_0$ if $S = \emptyset$, otherwise $A := A_{1+\max S}$. It easily follows that $\nu(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$, and that the real sequence $(\nu(A \setminus A_n) : n \in \omega)$ is eventually 0. Therefore item (iii) holds. The claim follows by Theorem 2.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Let $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ be an increasing sequence of sets such that $\sum_n \|A_{n+1} \setminus A_n\|_{\varphi} < \infty$. Thanks to Theorem 2.1, it will be enough to show that there exists $A \subseteq \omega$ such that $A_n \setminus A$ is finite for all $n \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \|A \setminus A_n\|_{\varphi} = 0$ (note that this is stronger than item (iii) in Theorem 2.1).

To this aim, define $B_j := A_{j+1} \setminus A_j$ for all $j \in \omega$. Let $(n_j : j \in \omega)$ be a strictly increasing sequence in ω such that

$$\forall j \in \omega, \quad \varphi(B_j \setminus n_j) \leq 2\|B_j\|_{\varphi}. \quad (12)$$

We claim that $A := A_0 \cup \bigcup_{j \in \omega} (B_j \setminus n_j)$ satisfies our claim. For, note that $A_k \setminus A \subseteq n_k$ for all $k \in \omega$. To complete the proof, we need to show that $\lim_n \|A \setminus A_n\|_{\varphi} = 0$. To this aim, fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and pick $k_0 \in \omega$ such that $\sum_{j \geq k_0} \|B_j\|_{\varphi} < \varepsilon/4$. Pick an integer $k \geq k_0$. Taking into account that $\|\cdot\|_{\varphi}$ is invariant under finite modifications and that the elements of (B_j) are pairwise disjoint, it follows that

$$\|A \triangle A_k\|_{\varphi} \leq \left\| n_k \cup \bigcup_{j \geq k} ((B_j \setminus n_j) \setminus A_k) \right\|_{\varphi} = \left\| \bigcup_{j \geq k} (B_j \setminus n_j) \right\|_{\varphi}. \quad (13)$$

Since φ is a lscsm, there exists an integer $m_k > n_{k+1}$ such that

$$\left\| \bigcup_{j \geq k} (B_j \setminus n_j) \right\|_{\varphi} \leq 2\varphi \left(m_k \cap \bigcup_{j \geq k} (B_j \setminus n_j) \right). \quad (14)$$

Fix an integer $i_k \in \omega$ such that $n_{i_k} > m_k$. Since $\min(B_j \setminus n_j) \geq n_j > m_k$ for all $j \geq i_k$, it follows by (12), (13), (14), and the above observations that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A \triangle A_k\|_\varphi &\leq 2\varphi\left(\bigcup_{k \leq j < i_k} (B_j \setminus n_j)\right) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k \leq j < i_k} \varphi(B_j \setminus n_j) \leq 2 \sum_{j \geq k} \varphi(B_j \setminus n_j) \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{j \geq k} \|B_j\|_\varphi \leq 4 \sum_{j \geq k_0} \|B_j\|_\varphi < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\lim_n \|A \triangle A_n\|_\varphi = 0$. \square

Remark 3.6. Solecki proved also in [45, Theorem 3.1] that, if $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a lscsm, then $\text{Exh}(\varphi)$ is d_φ -closed and separable. Since $d_{\|\cdot\|_\varphi}(A, B) \leq d_\varphi(A, B)$ for all $A, B \subseteq \omega$, then $\text{Exh}(\varphi)$ is $d_{\|\cdot\|_\varphi}$ -closed and separable as well. Alternatively, this can be seen directly: since $\|\cdot\|_\varphi$ is $d_{\|\cdot\|_\varphi}$ -continuous, then the $\|\cdot\|_\varphi$ -preimage of $\{0\}$, that is, $\text{Exh}(\varphi)$, is closed (in this case, the separability is obvious).

We proceed with the proofs of our main results.

Proof of Proposition 2.6. Let us suppose for the sake of contradiction that the space $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), d_\nu)$ is complete. Set $A_n := \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ for each $n \in \omega$, and observe that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) \leq \sum_n a_n < \infty$. It follows by Theorem 2.1 that there exists $A \subseteq \omega$ such that $\nu(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \nu(A \setminus A_n) = 0$. By the definition of ν , the former condition implies that $A_n \subseteq A$ for all $n \in \omega$. Hence necessarily $A = \omega$. On the other hand, we have $\nu(A \setminus A_n) \geq \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{I}^+}(\omega \setminus n + 1) = 1$ for all $n \in \omega$. This provides the claimed contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.7. Let μ^* be an upper density on ω such that $\text{bd}^*(A) \leq \mu^*(A)$ for all $A \subseteq \omega$. Thanks to Theorem 2.1, it will be enough to show that for each $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ there exists an increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ of subsets of ω such that $\sum_n \mu^*(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$ and, if a set $A \subseteq \omega$ satisfies $\mu^*(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$, then $\mu^*(A \setminus A_n) \geq \kappa$ for all $n \in \omega$.

To this aim, fix $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and a positive integer $N > e^2$ such that

$$\frac{\log^2(N)}{N} < \frac{1 - \kappa}{2}. \quad (15)$$

Define the positive integer $C := \lceil 1/\kappa \rceil$ and let $(a_n : n \in \omega)$ be a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers with the property that

$$\sum_{j \in \omega} \frac{j}{a_j!} < \frac{1-\kappa}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad a_n! > \max \left\{ \frac{n}{\kappa}, Ce^{2(n+1)}, (N+1)^2 \right\} \quad (16)$$

for all $n \in \omega$. Thus, define recursively three sequences of sets of nonnegative integers $(A_n : n \in \omega)$, $(B_n : n \in \omega)$ and $(H_n : n \in \omega)$ as follows:

- (i) Set $H_0 := B_0 := \emptyset$.
- (ii) Set $H_1 := \{0\}$, $A_0 := B_1 := a_1! \cdot (\omega \setminus \{0\})$.

Observe that $A_0 = a_2! \cdot \omega + \{a_1!j : j \in \{1, 2, \dots, a_2!/a_1!\}\}$ and $\mathbf{d}(A_0) = \mathbf{d}(B_1) = 1/a_1!$; in addition, we have $|A_0 \cap n|/n < 1/a_1!$ for all $n \geq 1$, hence choosing $n = a_2!$ we get

$$|a_2! \setminus A_0| > a_2!(1 - 1/a_1!) \geq a_2 > 2.$$

- (iii) Given a positive integer $n \geq 1$, suppose that all sets $(A_i : i \in n)$, $(B_i : i \in n+1)$, and $(H_i : i \in n+1)$ have been defined satisfying the following properties:
 - (a) all sets B_i are pairwise disjoint;
 - (b) $H_i \subseteq a_i!$ and $|H_i| = i$ for all $i \in n+1$;
 - (c) $i \geq \kappa \ell_i$ for all nonzero $i \in n+1$, where

$$\ell_i := 1 + \max H_i - \min H_i;$$

- (d) $B_i = a_i! \cdot (\omega \setminus \{0\}) + H_i$ for all $i \in n+1$;
 - (e) $A_i = B_0 \cup \dots \cup B_{i+1}$ for all $i \in n$;
 - (f) $|A_i \cap m|/m < \mathbf{d}(A_i) = \sum_{j \in i+2} j/a_j!$ for all $m \geq 1$ and $i \in n$;
- (In particular, such conditions hold for $n = 1$, thanks to item (ii).)

- (iv) It follows by item (iii) that there exists a unique $K_{n+1} \subseteq a_{n+1}!$ such that

$$A_{n-1} \setminus a_{n+1}! = \bigcup_{i \in n+1} B_i \setminus a_{n+1}! = a_{n+1}! \cdot (\omega \setminus \{0\}) + K_{n+1}$$

and, by hypothesis (16), also

$$a_{n+1}! - |K_{n+1}| = a_{n+1}! \left(1 - \sum_{i \in n+1} \frac{i}{a_i!} \right) \geq \kappa a_{n+1}! > n+1.$$

Hence it is possible to pick a set $H_{n+1} \subseteq a_{n+1}! \setminus K_{n+1}$ such that $|H_{n+1}| = n+1$ and $\max H_{n+1}$ is minimized.

(v) Lastly, define

$$B_{n+1} := a_{n+1}! \cdot (\omega \setminus \{0\}) + H_{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad A_n := \bigcup_{i \in n+2} B_i. \quad (17)$$

To complete the induction, we have to show that the conditions in item (iii) hold for $n+1$. For, observe by item (iv) that $B_{n+1} \cap A_{n-1} = \emptyset$, hence $B_{n+1} \cap B_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in n+1$. Together with the inductive step, this proves condition (a). Condition (b) follows by the construction in item (iv), while conditions (d) and (e) follow by the above definitions of B_{n+1} and A_n in (17). Since B_{n+1} is a finite union of infinite arithmetic progressions (i.e., $B_{n+1} \in \mathcal{A}$) and it is disjoint from A_{n-1} , we obtain

$$d(A_n) = d(A_{n-1}) + d(B_{n+1}) = \sum_{j \in n+1} \frac{j}{a_j!} + \frac{|H_{n+1}|}{a_{n+1}!} = \sum_{j \in n+2} \frac{j}{a_j!},$$

cf. also [38, Proposition 7 and Proposition 8]. In addition, by the definitions in (17), it is not difficult to observe (since $B_i \cap a_i! = \emptyset$ for all i) that $|A_n \cap m|/m < d(A_n)$ for all $m \geq 1$, proving also condition (f). Now, note that for all nonzero $i \in n+2$ we have by (16) that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_i &\leq \max H_i \leq \sum_{j=0}^i j \left\lceil \frac{\ell_i}{a_j!} \right\rceil \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^i j + \ell_i \sum_{j \in \omega} \frac{j}{a_j!} \leq i^2 + \ell_i(1 - \kappa), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\ell_i \leq \frac{i^2}{\kappa} \quad \text{and} \quad \max H_i \leq i^2 + \ell_i(1 - \kappa) \leq \frac{i^2}{\kappa}.$$

Recalling that $C = \lceil 1/\kappa \rceil$, it follows that

$$\forall i \in n+2, \quad B_i \subseteq a_i! \cdot \omega + \{0, 1, \dots, Ci^2\}. \quad (18)$$

In addition, since $a_0! > (N+1)^2$ by (16), it follows by the construction of the sets H_i that

$$\forall i \in N+2, \quad B_i = a_i! \cdot (\omega \setminus 0) + \left\{ \binom{i}{2} + j : j \in i \right\}.$$

The latter identity implies that, if $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, then $A_{n-1} \subseteq a_0! \cdot \omega + [0, 1, \dots, \max H_n]$ and $(a_{n+1}! + [\min H_{n+1}, \max H_{n+1}]) \subseteq a_0! \cdot \omega +$

$[\min H_{n+1}, \max H_{n+1}]$. Considering also that $\max H_n < \min H_{n+1}$ by construction, we get

$$\forall n \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad A_{n-1} \cap (a_{n+1}! + [\min H_{n+1}, \max H_{n+1}]) = \emptyset.$$

In particular, if $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, then $\ell_{n+1} = n + 1$. Suppose now that $n \geq N + 1$ and note by (15) that $\log^2(n)/n \leq \log^2(N)/N < (1 - \kappa)/2$. Observe that, if $i > \log(n)$ then $i > \log((n + 1)/e)$, which is equivalent to $n + 1 < e^{i+1}$. Hence it follows by (16) and (18) that, if $i > \log(n)$, then

$$\max H_{n+1} \leq C(n + 1)^2 < Ce^{2(i+1)} \leq a_i!.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & |A_{n-1} \cap (a_{n+1}! + [\min H_{n+1}, \max H_{n+1}])| \\ & \leq \sum_{i=0}^n |B_i \cap (a_{n+1}! + [\min H_{n+1}, \max H_{n+1}])| \\ & \leq \ell_{n+1} \left(\sum_{i=0}^n \frac{i}{a_i!} \right) + \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \log(n) \rfloor} i \\ & \leq \ell_{n+1} \left(\sum_{i \in \omega} \frac{i}{a_i!} + \frac{\log^2(n)}{\ell_{n+1}} \right) \\ & \leq \ell_{n+1} \left(\frac{1 - \kappa}{2} + \frac{\log^2(n)}{n} \right) \\ & \leq \ell_{n+1}(1 - \kappa). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in both cases (i.e., if $n \leq N$ or if $n \geq N + 1$), we get that $|A_{n-1} \cap (a_{n+1}! + [\min H_{n+1}, \max H_{n+1}])| \leq \ell_{n+1}(1 - \kappa)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} n + 1 & = |H_{n+1}| = |B_{n+1} \cap (a_{n+1}! + [\min H_{n+1}, \max H_{n+1}])| \\ & = \ell_{n+1} - |A_{n-1} \cap (a_{n+1}! + [\min H_{n+1}, \max H_{n+1}])| \geq \kappa \ell_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves condition (c) and completes the induction.

To complete the proof, we claim that the sequence of sets $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in the above construction satisfies our claim. For, we have by construction that $A_{n+1} \setminus A_n = B_{n+2} \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $n \in \omega$. Since $\mu^*(B_n) = |H_n|/a_n!$ by [38, Proposition 7], it follows by (16) and the conditions in item (v) that

$$\sum_{n \in \omega} \mu^*(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) \leq \sum_{n \in \omega} \mu^*(B_n) = \sum_{n \in \omega} \frac{n}{a_n!} < \infty.$$

Now, pick a set $A \subseteq \omega$ such that $\mu^*(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$. Define also

$$\forall n \in \omega, \quad C_n := B_n \setminus A \quad \text{and} \quad D_n := B_n \setminus C_n,$$

so that $\{C_n, D_n\}$ is a partition of B_n , and $D_n \subseteq A$ for all $n \in \omega$. In addition, we get by monotonicity of μ^* that $\mu^*(C_n) \leq \mu^*(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$, hence $\mu^*(C_n) = 0$. Thanks to (5), we get $\mathbf{d}^*(C_n) = 0$, i.e.,

$$\forall n \in \omega, \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N_{n,\varepsilon} \geq 1, \forall m \geq N_{n,\varepsilon}, \quad \frac{|C_n \cap m|}{m} < \varepsilon. \quad (19)$$

It follows that for any positive integer n and sufficiently large m we have $|C_n \cap m|/m < 1/a_n!$. This implies there exists $j_n \in \omega$ such that

$$C_n \cap (a_n!j_n + [\min H_n, \max H_n]) = \emptyset.$$

Hence, by the condition (c) in item (iii), we get

$$\frac{|D_n \cap (a_n!j_n + [\min H_n, \max H_n])|}{\ell_n} = \frac{|H_n|}{\ell_n} \geq \kappa.$$

It follows by the definition of the upper Banach density that

$$\forall n \geq 1, \quad \mathbf{bd}^* \left(\bigcup_{i \geq n} D_i \right) \geq \kappa. \quad (20)$$

Therefore, for each $n \in \omega$, we get

$$\mu^*(A \setminus A_n) \geq \mu^* \left(\bigcup_{i \geq n+2} D_i \right) \geq \mathbf{bd}^* \left(\bigcup_{i \geq n+2} D_i \right) \geq \kappa,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.7. The argument provided in the proof of Theorem 2.7 shows that, if \mathcal{A}_∞ stands for the family of countably infinite unions of infinite arithmetic progressions $k \cdot \omega + h$, then

$$\mathcal{A}_\infty \setminus \text{dom}(\mathbf{bd}) \neq \emptyset.$$

In fact, suppose that $\kappa = 1/2$, so that $\sum_n n/a_n! \leq 1/4$ by (16). Then the set $B := \bigcup_n B_n \in \mathcal{A}_\infty$ contains $\bigcup_{i \geq 1} D_n$, hence $\mathbf{bd}^*(B) \geq 1/2$ by (20). On the other hand, for each $m \geq 1$, there exists $k_m \geq 1$ for which $B \cap m = \bigcup_{i \in k_m} B_i \cap m$, so that by the definition of the sets B_i we get

$$\frac{|B \cap m|}{m} \leq \sum_{i \in k_m} \frac{|B_i \cap m|}{m} \leq \sum_{i \in k_m} \frac{i}{a_i!} \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

This implies that $\text{bd}_*(B) \leq \mathbf{d}_*(B) \leq 1/4$, cf. (5). Therefore $B \notin \text{dom}(\text{bd})$.

This example also shows that the restriction of the upper Banach density bd^* to $\mathcal{P}(\omega) \setminus \{A \subseteq \omega : \text{bd}^*(A) = 0\}$ is not σ -subadditive. This comment applies to all upper densities μ^* for which $\mu^*(A) \geq \text{bd}^*(A)$ for all $A \subseteq \omega$.

Proof of Lemma 2.8. Suppose that (Σ, d_ν) is complete, and let $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ be a Cauchy sequence in $(\overline{\Sigma}, d_{\nu^*})$. Passing if needed to a suitable subsequence, we can suppose without loss of generality that $d_{\nu^*}(A_n, A_m) \leq 2^{-\min\{n,m\}}$ for all $n, m \in \omega$. Now, for each $n \in \omega$, the set A_n belongs to $\overline{\Sigma}$, hence there exists $C_n \in \Sigma$ such that $d_{\nu^*}(A_n, C_n) \leq 2^{-n}$. Observe that the sequence $(C_n : n \in \omega)$ is d_ν -Cauchy since, for all $n, m \in \omega$, we have

$$d_\nu(C_n, C_m) \leq d_{\nu^*}(C_n, A_n) + d_{\nu^*}(A_n, A_m) + d_{\nu^*}(A_m, C_m) < 2^{2-\min\{n,m\}}.$$

Since (Σ, d_ν) is complete, the sequence $(C_n : n \in \omega)$ is d_ν -convergent to some $C \in \Sigma$. To complete the proof, it is enough to note that $d_{\nu^*}(A_n, C) \leq d_{\nu^*}(A_n, C_n) + d_{\nu^*}(C_n, C)$ for all $n \in \omega$, hence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ is d_{ν^*} -convergent to C as well. Therefore $(\overline{\Sigma}, d_{\nu^*})$ is complete. \square

Remark 3.8. Let Σ and ν be as in the statement of Theorem 2.1, and let $\overline{\Sigma}$ be the closure of Σ in $(\mathcal{P}(X), d_{\nu^*})$, as in Section 2.3. Then

$$\overline{\Sigma} = \{B \subseteq X : \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists A, C \in \Sigma, \quad A \subseteq B \subseteq C \text{ and } \nu(C \setminus A) < \varepsilon\}.$$

In fact, it is clear that the family on the right hand side is contained in $\overline{\Sigma}$. To show the converse, pick $B \in \overline{\Sigma}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there is $D \in \Sigma$ such that $\nu^*(B \Delta D) < \varepsilon$. By definition of ν^* , there is $E \in \Sigma$ such that $B \Delta D \subseteq E$ and $\nu(E) < \varepsilon$. Define $A := D \setminus E \in \Sigma$ and $C := D \cup E \in \Sigma$. Then $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ and $\nu(C \setminus A) = \nu(E) < \varepsilon$.

Lemma 3.9. *With the notations of Section 2.3, we have*

$$\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}} \subseteq \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}}).$$

Proof. The first inclusion is clear. To show the second inclusion, pick $A \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $B \in \mathcal{C}$ and a sequence $(C_n : n \in \omega)$ in \mathcal{C} such that $A \Delta B \subseteq \bigcup_n C_n$ and $\sum_n \hat{\nu}(C_n) < \varepsilon$. Define $C := \bigcup_n C_n \in \sigma(\mathcal{C})$, hence $B \setminus C \subseteq A \subseteq B \cup C$ and $\hat{\nu}((B \cup C) \setminus (B \setminus C)) = \hat{\nu}(C) < \varepsilon$. Since this holds for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $D, E \in \sigma(\mathcal{C})$ such that $D \subseteq A \subseteq E$ and $\hat{\nu}(E \setminus D) = 0$. Therefore $A \in \sigma(\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}})$. \square

We remark that $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ is, in general, *not* a σ -field. More precisely, the following example shows that $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$ might not be contained in $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$, even if the underlying pseudometric space is complete.

Example 3.10. Set $X := \omega$, $\Sigma := \mathcal{P}(\omega)$, and define $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\forall A \subseteq X, \quad \nu(A) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A \text{ is finite,} \\ 1 & \text{if } A \text{ is infinite.} \end{cases}$$

Note that (Σ, d_ν) is complete. We use the same notations of Section 2.3, e.g., S is the Stone space of Σ/ν and \mathcal{C} is its field of clopen subsets.

If $B = \emptyset$ then $\hat{\nu}(B) = 0$. If $B \neq \emptyset$ and $(A_n) \in \Delta(B)$, then at least one $\phi(\pi(A_n))$ is nonempty, hence $\pi(A_n) \neq \pi(\emptyset)$ and $\nu(A_n) = 1$. Thus $\sum_n \nu(A_n) \geq 1$, and consequently $\hat{\nu}(B) \geq 1$. On the other hand, $B \subseteq S = \phi(\pi(X))$ and $\nu(X) = 1$, so $\hat{\nu}(B) \leq 1$. It follows that

$$\forall B \subseteq S, \quad \hat{\nu}(B) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } B = \emptyset, \\ 1 & \text{if } B \neq \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

This implies that the topology induced by d_ν on $\mathcal{P}(S)$ is the discrete one. In particular, $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}$. Hence, it is enough to show that \mathcal{C} is not a σ -field. To this end, fix a sequence $(I_n : n \in \omega)$ of ω of pairwise disjoint infinite sets and define $G_n := \phi(\pi(I_n))$ for each $n \in \omega$. Since $(G_n : n \in \omega)$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint nonempty clopen subsets of S and S is compact, it follows that $G := \bigcup_n G_n \notin \mathcal{C}$. Therefore \mathcal{C} is not a σ -field.

Taking into account that both $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$ and $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ are stable under complements and choosing $S \setminus G$, it follows that there exists a complete pseudometric space which admits a compact G_δ set in $\sigma(\mathcal{C}) \setminus \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$.

Additional properties of $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ are given below, provided that ν is finite.

Lemma 3.11. *With the notations of Section 2.3, suppose that $\nu(X) < \infty$, and let $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$ be the family of Carathéodory $\hat{\nu}$ -measurable sets, that is,*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}} := \{B \subseteq S : \forall C \subseteq S, \quad \hat{\nu}(C) = \hat{\nu}(C \cap B) + \hat{\nu}(C \setminus B)\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$ is a σ -field, $\hat{\nu}$ is σ -additive on $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$, and $\mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}} \subseteq \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$.

Proof. Recall that $\hat{\nu}$ is an outer measure on $\mathcal{P}(S)$ (that is, it is monotone, σ -additive, and satisfies $\hat{\nu}(\emptyset) = 0$). Hence it follows by Carathéodory's Theorem that $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$ is a σ -field which contains $\mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}}$, and the restriction of $\hat{\nu}$ on $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$ is σ -additive, cf. e.g. [26, Theorem 1.11].

CLAIM 1. $\nu = \hat{\nu} \circ \phi \circ \pi$.

Proof. Pick $A \in \Sigma$. Since $(A, \emptyset, \emptyset, \dots) \in \Delta(\phi(\pi(A)))$, we have $\hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A))) \leq \nu(A)$. Conversely, suppose $(A_n : n \in \omega) \in \Delta(\phi(\pi(A)))$. Since $\{\phi(\pi(A_n)) : n \in \omega\}$ is an open cover of the compact set $\phi(\pi(A))$, there exists $F \in \text{Fin}$ such that $\phi(\pi(A)) \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in F} \phi(\pi(A_n))$. Since ϕ is a Boolean isomorphism and ν is a submeasure, we get $\nu(A) \leq \sum_{n \in F} \nu(A_n) \leq \sum_{n \in \omega} \nu(A_n)$. Therefore $\nu(A) \leq \hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A)))$. \square

To show the last inclusion $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}} \subseteq \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$, fix a set $B \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$ and a real $\varepsilon > 0$. Observe by Claim 1 that $\hat{\nu}(B) \leq \hat{\nu}(S) = \nu(X) < \infty$. By the definition of $\hat{\nu}$, there exists a sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega) \in \Delta(B)$ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_n) < \hat{\nu}(B) + \varepsilon/2$. In particular, the latter series is convergent and we can pick $n_0 \in \omega$ such that $\sum_{n \geq n_0} \nu(A_n) < \varepsilon/2$. By σ -subadditivity of $\hat{\nu}$ and Claim 1 we get

$$\hat{\nu}(B_{\infty}) \leq \sum_{n \in \omega} \hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A_n))) = \sum_{n \in \omega} \nu(A_n) < \hat{\nu}(B) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

where $B_{\infty} := \bigcup_n \phi(\pi(A_n))$. In addition, since $B \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$ and $B \subseteq B_{\infty}$, we get $\hat{\nu}(B_{\infty}) = \hat{\nu}(B) + \hat{\nu}(B_{\infty} \setminus B)$, hence $\hat{\nu}(B_{\infty} \setminus B) < \varepsilon/2$. At this point, define the clopen set $C := \bigcup_{n \in n_0} \phi(\pi(A_n))$. It follows by the above premises that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\nu}(B \Delta C) &\leq \hat{\nu}(B \setminus C) + \hat{\nu}(C \setminus B) \\ &\leq \hat{\nu}(B_{\infty} \setminus C) + \hat{\nu}(B_{\infty} \setminus B) < \sum_{n \geq n_0} \nu(A_n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since ε is arbitrary, it follows that $B \in \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. Therefore $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}} \subseteq \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. \square

As an application, we show that $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ coincides with $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$ if and only if ν is additive.

Proposition 3.12. *Let $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a submeasure such that $\nu(X) < \infty$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) ν is finitely additive;
- (ii) $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$;
- (iii) $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$.

Proof. (i) \implies (ii). Pick $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A \in \Sigma$ such that $C = \phi(\pi(A))$. We need to show that $C \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$. To this aim, fix a subset $B \subseteq S$. We proceed as in [26, Proposition 1.13(b)]: for each $k \in \omega$, there exists $(A_{k,n} : n \in \omega) \in \Delta(B)$ such that

$\sum_n \nu(A_{k,n}) \leq \hat{\nu}(B) + 2^{-k}$. By the additivity of ν , we obtain

$$\hat{\nu}(B) + 2^{-k} \geq \sum_{n \in \omega} \nu(A_{k,n} \cap A) + \sum_{n \in \omega} \nu(A_{k,n} \setminus A) \geq \hat{\nu}(B \cap C) + \hat{\nu}(B \setminus C),$$

where the last inequality follows by the definition of $\hat{\nu}$. Since $\hat{\nu}$ is subadditive and k is arbitrary, we conclude that $C \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$.

(ii) \implies (iii). Thanks to Lemma 3.11 and the standing hypothesis, $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$ is a σ -field containing both $\mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}}$ and \mathcal{C} . Hence $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$ by Lemma 3.9. The opposite inclusion is contained also in Lemma 3.11.

(iii) \implies (i). Pick disjoint sets $A, B \in \Sigma$. Then $\phi(\pi(A))$ and $\phi(\pi(B))$ are disjoint clopen subsets of S . In particular, by item (iii), the latter sets belong to $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$. At this point, recall that $\hat{\nu}$ is, in particular, additive on $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\nu}}$, thanks to Lemma 3.11. Therefore

$$\nu(A \cup B) = \hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A \cup B))) = \hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A))) + \hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(B))) = \nu(A) + \nu(B),$$

where we used Claim 1. □

As it follows by Example 3.10, it is possible that $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ is a proper subset of $\mathcal{P}(S)$. Below, we show that same conclusion holds also in the additive case.

Corollary 3.13. (AC) *Let $\mu : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a normalized shift-invariant finitely additive map. Then $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathcal{C}) \neq \mathcal{P}(S)$.*

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{P}(S)$. We will use a Vitaly-type construction. Let $\lambda : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ be the shift map $n \mapsto n+1$. This induces a homeomorphism $\tau : S \rightarrow S$. Observe that, for each clopen $B = \phi(\pi(A))$ with $A \in \Sigma$, $\tau[B] = \phi(\pi(\lambda[A]))$ and $\mu(A) = \mu(\lambda[A])$. Consequently $\hat{\mu}$ is τ -invariant. Now, let \sim be the equivalence relation on S so that $x \sim y$ if and only if $x = \tau^k(y)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Using the Axiom of Choice, we can construct a set $V \subseteq S$ which selects exactly one element from each equivalence class. It follows by Lemma 3.11 that $\hat{\mu}$ is σ -additive on $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mu}} = \text{Cl}_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{P}(S)$. Taking into account that $\{\tau^k[V] : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a partition of S by construction, we obtain that

$$1 = \hat{\mu}(S) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{\mu}(\tau^k[V]) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{\mu}(V),$$

which is impossible for every value of $\hat{\mu}(V)$. □

Examples of finitely additive maps μ satisfying the hypothesis of Corollary 3.13 (which are upper densities as in Section 2.2) can be found in [38, Remark 3].

Several properties of the analogous families with respect to $\tilde{\nu}$ are listed below. To this aim, given a set $B \subseteq S$, we denote by B° its interior and \overline{B} its closure.

Lemma 3.14. *The following properties hold:*

- (i) $\tilde{\nu}(\partial B) = 0$ for every $B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$;
- (ii) ∂B , B° , and \overline{B} are elements of $\text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ for every $B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$;
- (iii) $\tilde{\nu}(\overline{B}) = \tilde{\nu}(B)$ for every $B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$;
- (iv) $\mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\nu}} = \text{nwd}(S) \cap \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$;
- (v) A subset of S is the boundary of some element of $\text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if it is closed and $\tilde{\nu}$ -null;
- (vi) If $B \subseteq S$ is a compact G_δ set, then $B \in \sigma(\mathcal{C})$;
- (vii) For every $B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$, there are sets $A, C \in \sigma(\mathcal{C})$ such that $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ and $\tilde{\nu}(C \setminus A) = 0$;
- (viii) For every $B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$, there are sets $A, C \subseteq S$ such that A is a countable union of clopen sets, C is a countable intersection of clopen sets, $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$, and $\tilde{\nu}(C \setminus A) = 0$.

Proof. (i) Fix $B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ and $k \in \omega$. By Remark 3.8, there are $A_k, C_k \in \mathcal{C}$ with $A_k \subseteq B \subseteq C_k$ and $\tilde{\nu}(C_k \setminus A_k) \leq 2^{-k}$. But since A_k and C_k are clopen, we have $A_k \subseteq B^\circ$ and $\overline{B} \subseteq C_k$. Hence $\partial B \subseteq C_k \setminus A_k$ and $\tilde{\nu}(\partial B) \leq 2^{-k}$. The conclusion follows by the arbitrariness of k .

(ii) Since any $\tilde{\nu}$ -null set is the $d_{\tilde{\nu}}$ -limit of a sequence of empty sets, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\nu}} \subseteq \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C}). \quad (21)$$

Now, fix $B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. Since $\partial B \in \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\nu}}$ by item (i), then $\partial B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. Since $\text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ is a field of sets, then also $B^\circ = B \setminus \partial B$ and $\overline{B} = B \cup \partial B$ belong to $\text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$.

(iii) Taking into account that $\tilde{\nu}$ is a submeasure, this is immediate by item (i).

(iv) Pick $B \in \text{nwd}(S) \cap \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. Then $\overline{B} \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ by item (ii). In addition $\overline{B} = \partial B$ since B is nowhere dense, hence $\tilde{\nu}(B) = 0$ by item (i). This shows that $\text{nwd}(S) \cap \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\nu}}$.

To show the converse inclusion, pick $B \in \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\nu}}$. Observe that $0 = \tilde{\nu}(B) = \tilde{\nu}(\overline{B})$ by item (iii), hence \overline{B} cannot contain a nonempty clopen set (since they have positive $\tilde{\nu}$ -measure). Hence B is nowhere dense. Taking into account also (21), we obtain that $\mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\nu}} \subseteq \text{nwd}(S) \cap \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$.

(v) Suppose that $B \subseteq S$ is closed and $\tilde{\nu}$ -null. Thanks to item (iv), we have B is a closed set in $\text{nwd}(S) \cap \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. Then B is the boundary of the dense open set $B^c \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. This proves the IF part. The ONLY IF part follows by item (i).

(vi) Pick a compact G_δ set $B \subseteq S$. Since S is compact Hausdorff, it follows by [16, Corollary 1.5.2 and Theorem 3.1.9] that there exists a continuous function $f : S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $B = f^{-1}(0)$. Let \mathcal{F} be the family of functions $g \in \mathbb{R}^S$ such that the image $g[S]$ is finite and $g^{-1}(x) \in \mathcal{C}$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Of course, such maps belong to the Banach lattice $C(S)$ of continuous functions $S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Since \mathcal{F} is dense in $C(S)$ (with respect to uniform convergence) by Stone–Weierstrass theorem, see e.g. [16, Theorem 3.2.21], it follows that $f \in C(S)$ is the limit of a sequence of elements in \mathcal{F} . Taking into account the maps in \mathcal{F} are $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$ -measurable, we conclude that f is $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$ -measurable, hence $B \in \sigma(\mathcal{C})$.

(vii) Fix $B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\epsilon > 0$. By definition of $\text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$, there is $D \in \mathcal{C}$ and a sequence $(E_n)_{n \in \omega}$ in \mathcal{C} such that $B \Delta D \subseteq \bigcup_n E_n$ and $\sum_n \hat{\nu}(E_n) < \epsilon$. Define $E := \bigcup_n E_n \in \sigma(\mathcal{C})$, so that

$$D \setminus E \subseteq B \subseteq D \cup E \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\nu}((D \cup E) \setminus (D \setminus E)) = \hat{\nu}(E) \leq \sum_{n \in \omega} \hat{\nu}(E_n) < \epsilon.$$

By the arbitrariness of $\epsilon > 0$, we conclude that there exist $A, C \in \sigma(\mathcal{C})$ such that $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ and $\hat{\nu}(C \setminus A) = 0$.

(viii) Fix $B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$ and, for each $k \in \omega$, choose A_k and C_k as in the proof of item (i). Then $A^c := \bigcap_k A_k^c$ and $C := \bigcap_k C_k$ are countable intersections of clopen sets since $A_k, C_k \in \mathcal{C}$ for each $k \in \omega$. Therefore $A = \bigcup_k A_k \subseteq B \subseteq C$ and $\tilde{\nu}(C \setminus A) = 0$. \square

We conclude with the proofs of Theorem 2.9 and Corollary 2.10.

Proof of Theorem 2.9. Let us start defining also the following condition:

(A1') For every increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in $\bar{\Sigma}$ such that $\sum_n \nu^*(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$, there exists $A \in \bar{\Sigma}$ such that $\nu^*(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \nu^*(A \setminus A_n) = 0$.

Thus, it will be enough to prove all the implications depicted in Figure 1 below (here, the implication (A3) \implies (A1') may seem superfluous, but it is a step in the proof of (B4) \implies (C1)).

(A1) \iff (A1'). It follows by Theorem 2.1.




FIGURE 1. Implications in the proof of Theorem 2.9.

$(A1') \implies (A2)$. Pick an increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$, and fix $A \in \bar{\Sigma}$ as in item $(A1')$. By the definition of ν^* , for each $m \in \omega$ there exists $E_m \in \Sigma$ such that $A \setminus A_m \subseteq E_m$ and $\nu^*(E_m) \leq \nu^*(A \setminus A_m) + 2^{-m}$. Define the decreasing sequence $(D_m : m \in \omega)$ with values in Σ by $D_m := \bigcap_{k \leq m} (A_k \cup E_k)$ for each $m \in \omega$. Since $A \subseteq A_k \cup E_k$ for each $k \in \omega$, we have that $A \subseteq D_m$ for all $m \in \omega$. This implies that $\nu(A_n \setminus D_m) \leq \nu^*(A_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n, m \in \omega$. Lastly, since

$$\nu(D_n \setminus A_n) \leq \nu((A_n \cup E_n) \setminus A_n) \leq \nu(E_n) \leq \nu^*(A \setminus A_n) + 2^{-n}$$

for all $n \in \omega$, it follows that $\lim_n \nu(D_n \setminus A_n) = 0$.

$(A2) \implies (A3)$. Pick an increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$. By item $(A2)$, there exists $(D_m : m \in \omega)$ in Σ such that

$\nu(A_n \setminus D_m) = 0$ for all $n, m \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \nu(D_n \setminus A_n) = 0$. We claim that

$$C := \bigcup_{k \in \omega} (A_k \cap D_k) \quad (22)$$

satisfies the required property in item (A3). Since $A_n \setminus C \subseteq A_n \setminus D_n$, it follows by monotonicity that $\nu^*(A_n \setminus C) = 0$ for each $n \in \omega$. Moreover, since $C \subseteq A_m \cup D_m$ for all $m \in \omega$ and ν^* is a submeasure, we get that $\nu^*(C \setminus A_n) \leq \nu^*((A_n \cup D_n) \setminus A_n) = \nu(D_n \setminus A_n)$, which converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(A3) \implies (A1'). Pick an increasing $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in $\bar{\Sigma}$ such that $\sum_n \nu^*(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$. For each $n \in \omega$, there exists $B_n \in \Sigma$ such that $\nu^*(A_n \triangle B_n) < 2^{-n}$. Then there is also $C_n \in \Sigma$ such that $A_n \triangle B_n \subseteq C_n$ and $\nu(C_n) < 2^{-n}$. At this point, set $D_n := A_n \setminus C_n$ for each $n \in \omega$ and note that $D_n \subseteq A_n$ and $D_n = B_n \setminus C_n \in \Sigma$. Hence the sequence $(E_n : n \in \omega)$ defined by $E_n := \bigcup_{k \in n+1} D_k$ is increasing with values in Σ . Now, observing that $E_n \subseteq A_n$ and $A_n \setminus E_n \subseteq C_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(E_{n+1} \setminus E_n) &\leq \nu^*(E_{n+1} \setminus A_{n+1}) + \nu^*(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) + \nu^*(A_n \setminus E_n) \\ &\leq \nu^*(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) + \nu^*(C_n) < \nu^*(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) + 2^{-n}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\sum_n \nu(E_{n+1} \setminus E_n) < \infty$. It follows, thanks to item (A3), that there exists $A \subseteq X$ such that $\nu^*(E_n \setminus A) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \nu^*(A \setminus E_n) = 0$.

To complete the implication, it is enough to show that the set A satisfies the property given in item (A1'). First, observe that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\nu^*}(E_n, A) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\nu^*(E_n \setminus A) + \nu^*(A \setminus E_n)) = 0.$$

Therefore $A \in \bar{\Sigma}$. Moreover, since $A_n \triangle E_n = A_n \setminus E_n \subseteq A_n \setminus D_n \subseteq C_n$ for all $n \in \omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu^*(A_n \triangle A) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu^*(A_n \triangle E_n) + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu^*(E_n \triangle A) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(C_n) + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu^*(E_n \triangle A) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\lim_n \nu^*(A \setminus A_n) = 0$ and, since $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ is increasing, also $\nu^*(A_n \setminus A) \leq \limsup_k \nu^*(A_k \setminus A) = 0$ for each $n \in \omega$.

(A3) \implies (B4). Pick $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ as in item (B4). Hence by (A3) there exists $C \subseteq X$ such that $\nu^*(A_n \setminus C) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\lim_n \nu^*(C \setminus A_n) = 0$. Now, observe that

$$\forall n \in \omega, \quad \nu(A_n) \leq \nu^*(A_n \cup C) \leq \nu^*(C) + \nu^*(A_n \setminus C) = \nu^*(C). \quad (23)$$

In addition, we have that $\nu^*(C) \leq \nu^*(C \setminus A_n) + \nu^*(A_n \cap C)$ for each $n \in \omega$. Together with $\nu^*(A_n \setminus C) = 0$ and Inequality (23), we get

$$0 \leq \nu^*(C) - \nu^*(A_n) \leq \nu^*(C \setminus A_n) + \nu^*(A_n \cap C) - \nu^*(A_n) = \nu^*(C \setminus A_n)$$

for each $n \in \omega$. Considering that $\lim_n \nu^*(C \setminus A_n) = 0$ and $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ is increasing, we conclude that $\nu^*(C) = \sup_n \nu^*(A_n)$.

(B1) \implies (B2). This is clear.

(B2) \implies (B3). Pick an increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ in Σ such that $A_0 = \emptyset$ and $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$, and define the countable union of clopen sets

$$U := \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \phi(\pi(A_n)).$$

Considering that $(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n : n \in \omega) \in \Delta(U)$, it follows that

$$\hat{\nu}(\bar{U}) = \hat{\nu}(U) \leq \sum_{n \in \omega} \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty. \quad (24)$$

By the definition of $\hat{\nu}$, for each $k \in \omega$ there exists a sequence $(C_{k,n} : n \in \omega) \in \Delta(\bar{U})$ such that $\sum_n \nu(C_{k,n}) \leq \hat{\nu}(\bar{U}) + 2^{-k}$. Taking into account that $(\phi(\pi(C_{k,n})) : n \in \omega)$ is an open cover of the compact set \bar{U} , there exists $I_k \in \text{Fin}$ such that $\bar{U} \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in I_k} \phi(\pi(C_{k,n}))$. Thus, it is sufficient to show that the decreasing sequence $(D_m : m \in \omega)$ given by

$$\forall m \in \omega, \quad D_m := \bigcap_{k \in m+1} \bigcup_{n \in I_k} C_{k,n}$$

satisfies the required properties.

To this aim, note that $D_m \in \Sigma$ and $\bar{U} \subseteq \phi(\pi(D_m))$ for each $m \in \omega$. In addition, for each $n, m \in \omega$, we have $\phi(\pi(A_n)) \setminus \phi(\pi(D_m)) \subseteq U \setminus \bar{U} = \emptyset$, hence $\pi(A_n) \subseteq \pi(D_m)$, which implies $\nu(A_n \setminus D_m) = 0$. Lastly, for each $k \in \omega$, using also Claim 1 and the fact that $(A_k, A_{k+1} \setminus A_k, A_{k+2} \setminus A_{k+1}, \dots) \in \Delta(U)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \nu(D_k) - \nu(A_k) &= \hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(D_k))) - \nu(A_k) \\ &\leq \hat{\nu}(\bar{U}) - \nu(A_k) + 2^{-k} \\ &= \hat{\nu}(U) - \nu(A_k) + 2^{-k} \leq \sum_{n \geq k} \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) + 2^{-k}. \end{aligned}$$

The implication follows by the fact the right hand side converges to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

(B3) \implies (B4). Pick $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ and $(D_m : m \in \omega)$ as in item (B3), and define $C := \bigcup_k (A_k \cap D_k)$. Since $A_n \setminus C \subseteq A_n \setminus D_n$, it follows by monotonicity

that $\nu^*(A_n \setminus C) = 0$ for each $n \in \omega$. Now, observe that by Inequality (23) we get $\sup_n \nu(A_n) \leq \nu^*(C)$. Conversely, since $C \subseteq A_m \cup D_m$ for all $m \in \omega$ and ν^* is a submeasure, we get that $\nu^*(C) \leq \nu(A_m \setminus D_m) + \nu(D_m) = \nu(D_m)$. Hence by item (B3) we conclude that $\nu^*(C) \leq \inf_m \nu(D_m) = \sup_n \nu(A_n)$.

(B4) \implies (B1). Fix a set $U \subseteq S$. Since $\hat{\nu}$ is a capacity, it is obvious that $\hat{\nu}(\bar{U}) = \infty$ if $\hat{\nu}(U) = \infty$. Hence, let us suppose hereafter that $\hat{\nu}(U) < \infty$.

Fix $k \in \omega$. By the definition of $\hat{\nu}$, there exists $(F_{k,n} : n \in \omega) \in \Delta(U)$ such that

$$\sum_{n \in \omega} \nu(F_{k,n}) \leq \hat{\nu}(U) + 2^{-k}. \quad (25)$$

Assume without loss of generality that $F_{k,0} = \emptyset$. For each $n \in \omega$, define $A_{k,n} := F_{k,0} \cup \dots \cup F_{k,n}$, so that $(A_{k,n} : n \in \omega)$ is increasing in Σ and $\sum_n \nu(A_{k,n+1} \setminus A_{k,n}) \leq \sum_n \nu(F_{k,n}) < \infty$, where the latter follows by (25). By item (B4), there exists $C_k \subseteq X$ such that $\nu^*(A_{k,n} \setminus C_k) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\sup_n \nu(A_{k,n}) = \nu^*(C_k)$. In particular, there exists $n_k \in \omega$ such that $\nu^*(C_k) \leq \nu(A_{k,n_k}) + 2^{-k}$. In addition, by the definition of ν^* , there exists $D_k \in \Sigma$ such that $C_k \subseteq D_k$ and $\nu(D_k) \leq \nu^*(C_k) + 2^{-k}$.

CLAIM 2. $\nu^*(C_k) \leq \hat{\nu}(U) + 2^{1-k}$.

Proof. Since $A_{k,n_k} = \bigcup_{n \in n_k} A_{k,n+1} \setminus A_{k,n}$ and ν is a submeasure, we obtain that

$$\nu(A_{k,n_k}) \leq \sum_{n \in \omega} \nu(A_{k,n+1} \setminus A_{k,n}) \leq \sum_{n \in \omega} \nu(F_{k,n}).$$

The claim follows taking into account also Inequality (25) and that $\nu^*(C_k) \leq \nu(A_{k,n_k}) + 2^{-k}$. \square

CLAIM 3. $\bar{U} \subseteq \phi(\pi(D_k))$.

Proof. Observe, for each $n \in \omega$, that $\nu(A_{k,n} \setminus D_k) \leq \nu^*(A_{k,n} \setminus C_k) = 0$ which implies that $\pi(A_{k,n}) \subseteq \pi(D_k)$, hence $\phi(\pi(A_{k,n})) \subseteq \phi(\pi(D_k))$. Since $(F_{k,n} : n \in \omega) \in \Delta(U)$, we obtain

$$U \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \phi(\pi(F_{k,n})) \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \phi(\pi(A_{k,n})) \subseteq \phi(\pi(D_k)).$$

The claim follows by the fact that the set on the right hand side is closed in S . \square

It follows by Claim 1, Claim 2, Claim 3, and the above observations that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^*(C_k) &\leq \hat{\nu}(U) + 2^{1-k} \leq \hat{\nu}(\bar{U}) + 2^{1-k} \\ &\leq \hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(D_k))) + 2^{1-k} = \nu(D_k) + 2^{1-k} \leq \nu^*(C_k) + 2^{2-k}. \end{aligned}$$

By letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $\hat{\nu}(U) = \hat{\nu}(\bar{U})$.

(B4) \implies (C1). Pick an increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ of subsets of X such that $\sum_n \nu^*(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$. Then $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ is a Cauchy sequence and in $(\mathcal{P}(X), d_{\nu^*})$ and we can suppose without loss of generality that $\nu^*(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < 2^{-n}$ for all $n \in \omega$. By the definition of ν^* , for each $n \in \omega$ there exists $V_n \in \Sigma$ such that $A_{n+1} \setminus A_n \subseteq V_n$ and $\nu(V_n) < 2^{-n}$. Fix $k \in \omega$ and define $(W_{k,n} : n \in \omega)$ by

$$\forall n \in \omega, \quad W_{k,n} := V_k \cup V_{k+1} \cup \dots \cup V_{k+n}.$$

Of course, $W_{k,n} \in \Sigma$ and $\sum_n \nu(W_{k,n+1} \setminus W_{k,n}) \leq \sum_n \nu(V_n) < \infty$. It follows by item (B4) that there exists $C_k \subseteq X$ such that $\nu^*(W_{k,n} \setminus C_k) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$ and $\nu^*(C_k) = \sup_n \nu(W_{k,n}) \leq \sum_{n \geq k} \nu(V_n) < 2^{1-k}$.

CLAIM 4. $\nu^*(A_i \setminus (A_j \cup C_j)) = 0$ for all $i, j \in \omega$.

Proof. Fix $i, j \in \omega$. If $i \leq j$ the claim is clear since $A_i \subseteq A_j$. Hence, suppose hereafter that $i > j$. Then

$$A_i \setminus (A_j \cup C_j) \subseteq \bigcup_{k=j}^{i-1} (A_{k+1} \setminus A_k) \setminus C_j \subseteq \bigcup_{k=j}^{i-1} V_k \setminus C_j \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in i-j} W_{j,n} \setminus C_j.$$

The claim follows since ν^* is a submeasure and $\nu^*(W_{j,n} \setminus C_j) = 0$ for all $n \in \omega$. \square

At this point, consider the decreasing sequence $(D_m : m \in \omega)$ of subsets of X defined by $D_m := \bigcap_{i \in m+1} (A_i \cup C_i)$. Since $D_m \subseteq A_m \cup C_m$, we get by Claim 4

$$\nu^*(A_n \setminus D_m) \leq \sum_{i \in m+1} \nu^*(A_n \setminus (A_i \cup C_i)) = 0$$

for all $n, m \in \omega$. Lastly, we have also

$$\nu^*(D_n \setminus A_n) \leq \nu^*((A_n \cup C_n) \setminus A_n) \leq \nu^*(C_n) < 2^{1-n}$$

for all $n \in \omega$. Therefore $\lim_n \nu^*(D_n \setminus A_n) = 0$, and the pseudometric space $(\mathcal{P}(X), d_{\nu^*})$ satisfies its corresponding item (A2). Since we already proved that (A1) \iff (A2) then $(\mathcal{P}(X), d_{\nu^*})$ is complete.

(C2) \implies (C3). This is clear.

(C1) \implies (C2) and (C3) \implies (A1). They follow by the fact that a closed subset of a complete pseudometric space is a complete subspace.

(B4) \implies (D1). Pick a set $U \subseteq S$. Since $\hat{\nu} \leq \tilde{\nu}$, we can suppose hereafter that $\hat{\nu}(U) < \infty$. Proceeding verbatim and with the same notations as in the proof

of the implication (B4) \implies (B1), for each $k \in \omega$ it is possible to pick a set $D_k \in \Sigma$ such that $U \subseteq \overline{U} \subseteq \phi(\pi(D_k))$ and $\nu(D_k) \leq \hat{\nu}(U) + 2^{2-k}$. It follows that $\tilde{\nu}(U) \leq \inf_k \nu(D_k) \leq \hat{\nu}(U)$, which proves the converse inequality $\tilde{\nu} \leq \hat{\nu}$.

(D1) \iff (D2). The equivalence follows by the facts that $\hat{\nu} \leq \tilde{\nu}$, $\hat{\nu}$ is σ -subadditive, and, by definition, it is also the maximum σ -subadditive (and monotone) extension of the submeasure $\phi(\pi(A)) \mapsto \nu(A)$ to $\mathcal{P}(S)$, cf. Claim 1, whereas $\tilde{\nu}$ is the maximum monotone (and subadditive) extension of the same submeasure.

(D1) \implies (D5). This is obvious.

(D5) \implies (D3). Since $\hat{\nu} \leq \tilde{\nu}$, we have $\text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. Conversely, it follows by Remark 3.8 that item (D3) holds if and only if $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$.

(D3) \implies (E1). Pick $B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. By hypothesis, for each $k \in \omega$, there exist $A_k, C_k \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $A_k \subseteq B \subseteq C_k$ and $\tilde{\nu}(C_k \setminus A_k) < 2^{-k}$. Since A_k and C_k are clopen, the interior of B contains A_k and the closure of B is contained in C_k . Hence $\partial B \subseteq C_k \setminus A_k$. It follows that $\tilde{\nu}(\partial B) \leq \inf_k \tilde{\nu}(C_k \setminus A_k) = 0$.

(E1) \implies (E2). This is clear since $\hat{\nu} \leq \tilde{\nu}$.

(D1) \implies (D4). This follows by Lemma 3.14(viii).

(D4) \implies (E2). Fix $B \in \text{Cl}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. By hypothesis, it is possible to pick sets $A, B \subseteq S$ such that A is open, C is closed, $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ and $\hat{\nu}(C \setminus A) = 0$. It follows that $A \subseteq B^\circ$ and $\overline{B} \subseteq C$. Since $\partial B \subseteq \overline{B} \setminus B^\circ \subseteq C \setminus A$, we conclude that $\hat{\nu}(\partial B) \leq \hat{\nu}(C \setminus A) = 0$.

(D1) \implies (D6). This follows by Lemma 3.14(v).

(D1) \implies (D7). It follows by Lemma 3.14(ii) and Lemma 3.14(iv).

(D7) \implies (E2). This follows by the fact that every ∂B is nowhere dense.

(D6) \implies (E2) \implies (E3). They are obvious.

(E3) \implies (A2). Pick an increasing sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ with values in Σ such that $A_0 = \emptyset$ and $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$, and define

$$U := \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \phi(\pi(A_n)).$$

Then U is a countable union of clopen sets. Hence by item (E3) we get $\hat{\nu}(\partial U) = 0$. Moreover, $\hat{\nu}(U) < \infty$, as in (24). By the definition of $\hat{\nu}$, for each $k \in \omega$ there exists a sequence $(G_{k,n} : n \in \omega) \in \Delta(\overline{U} \setminus \phi(\pi(A_k)))$ such that $\sum_n \nu(G_{k,n}) \leq$

$\hat{\nu}(\bar{U} \setminus \phi(\pi(A_k))) + 2^{-k}$. Taking into account that $(\phi(\pi(G_{k,n})) : n \in \omega)$ is an open cover of the compact set $\bar{U} \setminus \phi(\pi(A_k))$, there exists $J_k \in \text{Fin}$ such that $\bar{U} \setminus \phi(\pi(A_k)) \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in J_k} \phi(\pi(G_{k,n}))$. Now, for each $k \in \omega$, define the set

$$V_k := U \cup \bigcup_{n \in J_k} \phi(\pi(G_{k,n}))$$

Considering that $\{\phi(\pi(G_{k,n})) : n \in J_k\}$ is also a cover of ∂U , it follows that $V_k = \bar{U} \cup \bigcup_{n \in J_k} \phi(\pi(G_{k,n}))$. Therefore each V_k is a clopen subset of S containing \bar{U} . Replacing, if necessary, V_k with $\bigcap_{j \in k+1} V_j$, we can also assume without loss of generality that $(V_k : k \in \omega)$ is decreasing. Also, since $V_k \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\phi : \Sigma/\nu \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a Boolean isomorphism, there exists a decreasing sequence $(D_k : k \in \omega)$ in Σ such that

$$\forall k \in \omega, \quad V_k = \phi(\pi(D_k)).$$

We claim that the above sequence satisfies the required properties. In fact, for each $n, m \in \omega$, we have $\phi(\pi(A_n)) \setminus \phi(\pi(D_m)) = \phi(\pi(A_n)) \setminus V_m \subseteq U \setminus \bar{U} = \emptyset$, hence $\pi(A_n) \subseteq \pi(D_m)$, which implies $\nu(A_n \setminus D_m) = 0$. Lastly, using also Claim 1, for each $k \in \omega$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(D_k \setminus A_k) &= \hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(D_k)) \setminus \phi(\pi(A_k))) \\ &= \hat{\nu}\left(U \cup \bigcup_{n \in J_k} \phi(\pi(G_{k,n})) \setminus \phi(\pi(A_k))\right) \leq \hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(\bigcup_{n \in J_k} G_{k,n}))) \\ &\leq \sum_{n \in J_k} \nu(G_{k,n}) \leq \sum_{n \in \omega} \nu(G_{k,n}) \leq \hat{\nu}(\bar{U} \setminus \phi(\pi(A_k))) + 2^{-k} \\ &\leq \hat{\nu}(U \setminus \phi(\pi(A_k))) + \hat{\nu}(\partial U) + 2^{-k} = \hat{\nu}\left(\bigcup_{n \geq k} \phi(\pi(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n))\right) + 2^{-k} \\ &\leq \sum_{n \geq k} \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) + 2^{-k}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\lim_k \nu(D_k \setminus A_k) = 0$. □

Proof of Corollary 2.10. (i) \implies (ii). Suppose that (Σ, d_ν) is complete, and fix $B \in \text{Cl}_\nu(\mathcal{C})$. By the equivalence (A1) \iff (D3) in Theorem 2.9, for each $n \in \omega$, there exist $A_n, C_n \in \Sigma$ such that $\phi(\pi(A_n)) \subseteq B \subseteq \phi(\pi(C_n))$ and $\tilde{\nu}(\phi(\pi(C_n \setminus A_n))) = \nu(C_n \setminus A_n) < 2^{-n}$. Hence, $\lim_n \tilde{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A_n)) \triangle B) = 0$. Without loss of

generality, it is possible to assume that $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ is increasing and $(C_n : n \in \omega)$ is decreasing. It follows that

$$\nu(A_m \setminus A_n) \leq \sum_{k \in \omega} \nu(A_{n+k+1} \setminus A_{n+k}) \leq \sum_{k \in \omega} \nu(C_{n+k} \setminus A_{n+k}) < 2^{1-n}$$

for all $n, m \in \omega$ with $m \geq n$, hence $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ is d_ν -Cauchy. Thus it is convergent to some $A \in \Sigma$, which can be rewritten as $\lim_n \tilde{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A_n)) \triangle \phi(\pi(A))) = 0$. Therefore $\tilde{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A)) \triangle B) = 0$.

(ii) \implies (iii). This is clear since $\hat{\nu} \leq \tilde{\nu}$.

(iii) \implies (iv). This is immediate.

(iv) \implies (i). Pick an increasing sequence $(A_n)_{n \in \omega}$ with values in Σ such that $\sum_n \nu(A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) < \infty$. Define $B_n := \phi(\pi(A_n)) \in \mathcal{C}$ for all $n \in \omega$ and note that $(B_n : n \in \omega)$ converges to $B := \bigcup_n B_n$ in $(\mathcal{P}(S), d_{\hat{\nu}})$ by Claim 1 and the σ -subadditivity of $\hat{\nu}$. Hence B is a countable union of clopen sets, and belongs to $\text{Cl}_{\hat{\nu}}(\mathcal{C})$. By item (iv) it is possible to pick $A \in \Sigma$ such that $\hat{\nu}(\phi(\pi(A)) \triangle B) = 0$. It follows by Claim 1 that $(A_n : n \in \omega)$ is d_ν -convergent to A . Thanks to Theorem 2.1, the pseudometric space (Σ, d_ν) is complete. \square

Finally, in Remark 3.15 and Remark 3.16 below we provide a necessary condition and a sufficient condition for the completeness of $(\bar{\Sigma}, d_{\nu^*})$, respectively. However, in both cases, the implications cannot be reversed.

Remark 3.15. By the equivalence (A1) \iff (D7) of Theorem 2.9, the following implication holds:

$$(\bar{\Sigma}, d_{\nu^*}) \text{ complete} \implies \mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}} \subseteq \text{nwd}(S). \quad (26)$$

However, the converse implication of (26) fails in general. To this aim, let $(a_n : n \in \omega)$ be a strictly positive sequence of reals such that $\sum_n a_n = 1$, and let $\nu : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ be the submeasure defined by

$$\forall A \subseteq \omega, \quad \nu(A) := \begin{cases} \sum_{n \in A} a_n & \text{if } A \text{ is finite;} \\ 1 + \sum_{n \in A} a_n & \text{if } A \text{ is infinite.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, $\Sigma = \bar{\Sigma} = \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and $\nu = \nu^*$. We get by Proposition 2.6 that $(\bar{\Sigma}, d_{\nu^*})$ is not complete. Now, observe that $\nu(A) = 0$ if and only if $A = \emptyset$, hence the Stone space S is isomorphic to the classical Stone-Ćech compactification of ω , that is, the set of principal ultrafilters P and free ultrafilters F on ω , so that $S = P \cup F$ (hence, P and F are identified with their images under isomorphism). Let us

fix $B \subseteq S$. First, suppose that $B \subseteq P = \bigcup_n P_n$ where $P_n := \phi(\pi(\{n\}))$ is the singleton containing the unique principal ultrafilter at $\pi(\{n\})$. Define $J := \{j \in \omega : P_j \subseteq B\}$, so that $B = \bigcup_{j \in J} P_j$ and $(\{j\} : j \in J) \in \Delta(B)$. It follows that $\hat{\nu}(B) = \sum_{j \in J} \nu(\{j\}) = \sum_{j \in J} a_j$, hence

$$\forall B \subseteq S, \quad B \cap F = \emptyset \implies 0 \leq \hat{\nu}(B) \leq 1. \quad (27)$$

In the opposite case that $B \cap F \neq \emptyset$, i.e., B contains a free ultrafilter x . Pick an arbitrary sequence $(A_n : n \in \omega) \in \Delta(B)$. Then $x \in B \subseteq \bigcup_n \phi(\pi(A_n))$, so we can pick $m \in \omega$ such that $x \in \phi(\pi(A_m))$. Equivalently, this means that $\pi(A_m) \in x$, which is possible only if A_m is infinite since $x \notin P$. Considering that $\nu(A_m) > 1$, it follows that $\hat{\nu}(B) \geq \hat{\nu}(\{x\}) \geq 1$. Together with the monotonicity of $\hat{\nu}$ and the fact by Claim 1 that $\hat{\nu}(S) = \nu(\omega) = 2$, we obtain

$$\forall B \subseteq S, \quad B \cap F \neq \emptyset \implies 1 \leq \hat{\nu}(B) \leq 2. \quad (28)$$

At this point, pick $B \subseteq S$ with $\hat{\nu}(B) = 0$. It follows by (27) and (28) that $B \subseteq P$. By the minimality argument above, we get $B = \emptyset$, that is, $\mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}} = \{\emptyset\}$. Therefore $\mathcal{N}_{\hat{\nu}}$ is a proper subset of $\text{nwd}(S)$, while $(\bar{\Sigma}, d_{\nu^*})$ is not complete.

Remark 3.16. Since countable unions of clopen sets are open, one might considering the following strenghtening of item (E3):

$$(E4) \quad \hat{\nu}(\partial U) = 0 \text{ for every open set } U \subseteq S.$$

Thanks to Theorem 2.9, the following implication holds:

$$(E4) \implies (\bar{\Sigma}, d_{\nu^*}) \text{ complete.} \quad (29)$$

However, the converse implication of (29) fails in general. In fact, in the complete pseudometric space given in Example 3.10 we proved that there exists an open set $U \subseteq S$ which is a countable union of clopen sets and $U \notin \mathcal{C}$. This implies that $\partial U \neq \emptyset$, so that $\hat{\nu}(\partial U) = 1$. Therefore item (E4) does not hold.

3.1. Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful to K. P. S. Bhaskara Rao (Indiana University Northwest, US) and Ilijas Farah (York University, CA) for several helpful communications during the preparation of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. T. E. Armstrong and K. Prikry, *On the semimetric on a Boolean algebra induced by a finitely additive probability measure*, Pacific J. Math. **99** (1982), no. 2, 249–264.
2. B. Balcar, F. Franek, and J. Hruška, *Exhaustive zero-convergence structures on Boolean algebras*, Acta Univ. Carolin. Math. Phys. **40** (1999), no. 2, 27–41.

3. B. Balcar, W. Główczyński, and T. Jech, *The sequential topology on complete Boolean algebras*, *Fund. Math.* **155** (1998), no. 1, 59–78.
4. M. Balcerzak, P. Das, M. Filipczak, and J. Swaczyna, *Generalized kinds of density and the associated ideals*, *Acta Math. Hungar.* **147** (2015), no. 1, 97–115.
5. M. Balcerzak and P. Leonetti, *A Tauberian theorem for ideal statistical convergence*, *Indag. Math. (N.S.)* **31** (2020), no. 1, 83–95.
6. A. Basile and K. P. S. Bhaskara Rao, *Completeness of L_p -spaces in the finitely additive setting and related stories*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **248** (2000), no. 2, 588–624.
7. W. C. Bell and J. W. Hagoood, *Completeness of \mathcal{L}^p spaces and Radon-Nikodym theorems for unbounded finitely additive measures*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **218** (1998), no. 1, 82–96.
8. M. Bhaskara Rao and K. P. S. Bhaskara Rao, *Topological properties of charge algebras*, *Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl.* **22** (1977), no. 3, 363–375.
9. ———, *Theory of charges*, *Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 109, Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York, 1983, A study of finitely additive measures, With a foreword by D. M. Stone.
10. A. Blass, R. Frankiewicz, G. Plebanek, and C. Ryll-Nardzewski, *A note on extensions of asymptotic density*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **129** (2001), no. 11, 3313–3320.
11. P. Borodulin-Nadzieja and B. Farkas, *Analytic P -ideals and Banach spaces*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **279** (2020), no. 8, 108702, 31.
12. P. Borodulin-Nadzieja, B. Farkas, and G. Plebanek, *Representations of ideals in Polish groups and in Banach spaces*, *J. Symb. Log.* **80** (2015), no. 4, 1268–1289.
13. P. Borodulin-Nadzieja and D. Sobota, *On sequences of homomorphisms into measure algebras and the Efimov problem*, *J. Symb. Log.* **88** (2023), no. 1, 191–218.
14. M. Di Nasso and R. Jin, *Abstract densities and ideals of sets*, *Acta Arith.* **185** (2018), no. 4, 301–313.
15. N. Dunford and J. T. Schwartz, *Linear operators. Part I*, *Wiley Classics Library*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1988, General theory, With the assistance of William G. Bade and Robert G. Bartle, Reprint of the 1958 original, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
16. R. Engelking, *General topology*, second ed., *Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics*, vol. 6, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989, Translated from the Polish by the author.
17. I. Farah, *Rigidity of Analytic Quotients*, revised version on Jan 11, 2026 (ifarah.mathstats.yorku.ca/analytic-quotients-revisited/).
18. ———, *Analytic quotients: theory of liftings for quotients over analytic ideals on the integers*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **148** (2000), no. 702, xvi+177.
19. ———, *Combinatorial set theory of C^* -algebras*, *Springer Monographs in Mathematics*, Springer, Cham, [2019] ©2019.
20. I. Farah, S. Ghasemi, A. Vaccaro, and A. Vignati, *Corona Rigidity*, *Bull. Symb. Log.* **31** (2025), no. 2, 195–287.
21. I. Farah and S. Shelah, *Rigidity of continuous quotients*, *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* **15** (2016), no. 1, 1–28.
22. I. Farah and S. Solecki, *Two $F_{\sigma\delta}$ ideals*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **131** (2003), no. 6, 1971–1975.

23. R. Filipów and J. Tryba, *Ideal convergence versus matrix summability*, *Studia Math.* **245** (2019), no. 2, 101–127.
24. ———, *Densities for sets of natural numbers vanishing on a given family*, *J. Number Theory* **211** (2020), 371–382.
25. ———, *Representation of ideal convergence as a union and intersection of matrix summability methods*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **484** (2020), no. 2, 123760, 21.
26. G. B. Folland, *Real analysis*, second ed., *Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York)*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1999, Modern techniques and their applications, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
27. S. Gangopadhyay, *On the completeness of \mathcal{L}_p -spaces over a charge*, *Colloq. Math.* **58** (1990), no. 2, 291–300.
28. S. Gangopadhyay and B. V. Rao, *Completeness of L_1 spaces over finitely additive probabilities*, *Colloq. Math.* **80** (1999), no. 1, 83–95.
29. S. Graf, *A Radon-Nikodým theorem for capacities*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **320** (1980), 192–214.
30. E. Green, *Completeness of L_p -spaces over finitely additive set functions*, *Colloq. Math.* **22** (1971), 257–261.
31. T. Jech, *Convergence and submeasures in Boolean algebras*, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.* **59** (2018), no. 4, 503–511.
32. W. Just and A. Krawczyk, *On certain Boolean algebras $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/I$* , *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **285** (1984), no. 1, 411–429.
33. N. J. Kalton and J. W. Roberts, *Uniformly exhaustive submeasures and nearly additive set functions*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **278** (1983), no. 2, 803–816.
34. J. M. Keith, *The pseudometric topology induced by upper asymptotic density*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **153** (2025), no. 4, 1501–1509.
35. R. Kunisada, *Density measures and additive property*, *J. Number Theory* **176** (2017), 184–203.
36. A. Kwela and P. Leonetti, *Density-like and generalized density ideals*, *J. Symb. Log.* **87** (2022), no. 1, 228–251.
37. P. Leonetti, *A characterization of Cesàro convergence*, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **128** (2021), no. 6, 559–562.
38. P. Leonetti and S. Tringali, *On the notions of upper and lower density*, *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. (2)* **63** (2020), no. 1, 139–167.
39. P. Letavaj, L. Mišík, and M. Slezniak, *Extreme points of the set of density measures*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **423** (2015), no. 2, 1150–1165.
40. A. Louveau and B. Veličković, *A note on Borel equivalence relations*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **120** (1994), no. 1, 255–259.
41. D. Maharam, *An algebraic characterization of measure algebras*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **48** (1947), 154–167.
42. M. Marinacci and L. Montrucchio, *Introduction to the mathematics of ambiguity, Uncertainty in Economic Theory*, Routledge, New York, 2004.
43. D. Schmeidler, *Cores of exact games. I*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **40** (1972), 214–225.

44. R. Sikorski, *Boolean algebras*, third ed., Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas], vol. Band 25, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1969.
45. S. Solecki, *Analytic ideals and their applications*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **99** (1999), no. 1-3, 51–72.
46. M. Talagrand, *A simple example of pathological submeasure*, Math. Ann. **252** (1979/80), no. 2, 97–102.
47. ———, *Maharam's problem*, Ann. of Math. (2) **168** (2008), no. 3, 981–1009.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, MONASH UNIVERSITY, WELLINGTON RD, CLAYTON VIC
3800, AUSTRALIA

Email address: jonathan.keith@monash.edu

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DELL'INSUBRIA, VIA MONTE
GENEROSO 71, 21100 VARESE, ITALY

Email address: leonetti.paolo@gmail.com