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#### Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to present a simple characterization of the split-faces in a Choquet simplex $K$, i.e., those faces $F$ such that $K$ is a direct convex sum of $F$ and its complementary face. It is shown that a face $F$ is a split-face if and only if it is $\sigma$-convex, i.e., closed under infinite convex combinations. This is proved by means of a measure-theoretic characterization of the $\sigma$-convex faces of $K$. As a consequence, it is shown that the lattice of $\sigma$-convex faces of a Choquet simplex forms a complete Boolean algebra.


It is well-known that infinite convex combinations are always available in a compact convex subset $K$ of a locally convex, Hausdorff, linear topological space: given points $x_{1}, x_{2}, \cdots$ in $K$ and nonnegative real numbers $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \cdots$ such that $\Sigma \alpha_{k}=1$, the series $\Sigma \alpha_{k} x_{k}$ must converge to some point in $K$. We refer to $\Sigma \alpha_{k} x_{k}$ as a $\sigma$-convex combination of the $x_{k}$. We define $\sigma$-convex subsets of $K$ and $\sigma$-convex hulls in $K$ in the obvious manner. A face of $K$ which happens to be $\sigma$-convex is called a $\sigma$-convex face, and we note that given any subset $X \subseteq K$, there is a smallest $\sigma$-convex face containing $X$, called the $\sigma$-convex face generated by $X$. We also note that if $F$ is any face of $K$ ( $\sigma$-convex or not), and if we have a $\sigma$-convex combination $\Sigma \alpha_{k} x_{k} \in F$ with all $\alpha_{k}>0$, then all $x_{k} \in F$. (This follows from the defining property of a face, since

$$
\alpha_{\jmath} x_{j}+\left(1-\alpha_{j}\right)\left[\sum_{k \neq \jmath} \alpha_{k} x_{k} /\left(1-\alpha_{J}\right)\right]=\Sigma \alpha_{k} x_{k} \in F
$$

for all $j$.)

Definition. Let $F$ be a face of a compact convex set $K$. Then $F^{\prime}$ is defined to be the union of those faces of $K$ which are disjoint from $F$. We say that $F$ is a split-face of $K$ [2] provided $F^{\prime}$ is a face and for each $x \in K-\left(F \cup F^{\prime}\right)$ there is a unique convex combination $x=$ $\alpha y+(1-\alpha) z$ with $y \in F, z \in F^{\prime}$. In this event, $F^{\prime}$ is a complement for $F$ in the lattice of faces of $K$.

Theorem 1. Let $F$ be a face of a Choquet simplex $K$. Then $F^{\prime}$ is a face of $K$. For any $x \in K-\left(F \cup F^{\prime}\right)$, there is at most one convex combination $x=\alpha y+(1-\alpha) z$ with $y \in F$ and $z \in F^{\prime}$.

Proof. [1, Theorem 1 and Proposition 2].

Corollary 2. Let $F$ be a face of a Choquet simplex $K$. Then $F$ is a split-face of $K$ if and only if the convex hull of $F \cup F^{\prime}$ is $K$.

Definition. For any compact Hausdorff space $K$, we use $M_{1}^{+}(K)$ to denote the set of all probability measures on $K$, equipped with the vague (weak*) topology. There is also a natural norm topology on $M_{1}^{+}(K)$, obtained from the identification of the space $M(K)$ [of all signed regular Borel measures on $K$ ] with the dual Banach space $C(K)^{*}$. If $K$ is a compact convex set, then for any $\mu \in M_{1}^{+}(K)$ we use $x_{\mu}$ to denote the resultant (barycenter) of $\mu$ in $K$. If $K$ is a Choquet simplex, then for any $x \in K$ we use $\mu_{x}$ to denote the unique maximal measure in $M_{1}^{+}(K)$ whose resultant is $x$.

The existence of $\sigma$-convex combinations is more straightforward in $M_{1}^{+}(K)$ than in general compact convex sets. Given measures $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \cdots$ in $M_{1}^{+}(K)$ and nonnegative real numbers $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \cdots$ such that $\Sigma \alpha_{k}=1$, we may define a Borel measure $\mu$ on $K$ by setting $\mu(A)=\Sigma \alpha_{k} \mu_{k}(A)$ for all Borel sets $A \subseteq K$. It is clear that $\mu \in M_{1}^{+}(K)$. Observing that $\mu(f)=$ $\Sigma \alpha_{k} \mu_{k}(f)$ for all $f \in C(K)$, we see that $\Sigma \alpha_{k} \mu_{k}$ converges to $\mu$ in the vague topology. Therefore $\mu$ coincides with the $\sigma$-convex combination $\Sigma \alpha_{k} \mu_{k}$ in $M_{1}^{+}(K)$.

Proposition 3. Let $K$ be a compact Hausdorff space, $\mu \in M_{1}^{+}(K)$, $X \subseteq M_{1}^{+}(K)$. Then $\mu$ lies in the face generated by $X$ if and only if there exists $\nu$ in the convex hull of $X$ such that $\mu \leqq \alpha \nu$ for some $\alpha>0$.

Proof. Analogous to [4, Proposition 1.2].
Theorem 4. Let $K$ be a compact Hausdorff space, $\mu \in M_{1}^{+}(K)$, $X \subseteq M_{1}^{+}(K)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:
(a) $\mu$ lies in the $\sigma$-convex face generated by $X$.
(b) $\mu$ lies in the $\sigma$-convex hull of the face generated by $X$.
(c) There is some $\nu$ in the $\sigma$-convex hull of $X$ for which $\mu \ll \nu$.

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (c): Let $F$ denote the set of those measures $\mu^{\prime} \in$ $M_{1}^{+}(K)$ which are absolutely continuous with respect to some $\nu^{\prime}$ (depending on $\mu^{\prime}$ ) in the $\sigma$-convex hull of $X$. We claim that $F$ is a $\sigma$-convex face of $M_{1}^{+}(K)$.

First consider a $\sigma$-convex combination $\mu^{\prime}=\Sigma \alpha_{k} \mu_{k}$ in $M_{1}^{+}(K)$ such that each $\mu_{k} \in F$. For each $k$, there is some $\nu_{k}$ in the $\sigma$-convex hull of $X$ such that $\mu_{k} \ll \nu_{k}$. Then $\nu^{\prime}=\Sigma \alpha_{k} \nu_{k}$ lies in the $\sigma$-convex hull of $X$, and we infer that $\mu^{\prime} \ll \nu^{\prime}$, whence $\mu^{\prime} \in F$. Thus $F$ is $\sigma$-convex.

Next consider a proper convex combination $\mu^{\prime}=\alpha \mu_{1}+(1-\alpha) \mu_{2}$ in $M_{1}^{+}(K)$ such that $\mu^{\prime} \in F$. There is some $\nu^{\prime}$ in the $\sigma$-convex hull of $X$ such
that $\mu^{\prime} \ll \nu^{\prime}$. Since $\mu_{1} \leqq \alpha^{-1} \mu^{\prime}$ and $\mu_{2} \leqq(1-\alpha)^{-1} \mu^{\prime}$, we find that $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2} \ll$ $\nu^{\prime}$, and consequently $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2} \in F$. Thus $F$ is a face of $M_{1}^{+}(K)$.

Clearly $X \subseteq F$, hence $F$ must contain the $\sigma$-convex face generated by $X$. Therefore $\mu \in F$.
(c) $\Rightarrow(\mathrm{b}):$ There is a $\sigma$-convex combination $\nu=\Sigma \alpha_{k} \nu_{k}$ with each $\nu_{k} \in X$. Renumbering if necessary, we may assume that $\alpha_{1}>0$. For each $k$, set $\alpha_{k}^{\prime}=\alpha_{1}+\cdots+\alpha_{k}$ and $\nu_{k}^{\prime}=\left(\alpha_{1} \nu_{1}+\cdots+\alpha_{k} \nu_{k}\right) / \alpha_{k}^{\prime}$, and note that $\nu_{k}^{\prime}$ is a measure in $M_{1}^{+}(K)$ which lies in the convex hull of $X$.

For each positive integer $n$, take a Hahn Decomposition of the signed measure $n \alpha_{n}^{\prime} \nu_{n}^{\prime}-\mu$. This gives us a Borel set $K_{n} \subseteq K$ such that $\mu(A) \leqq n \alpha_{n}^{\prime} \nu_{n}^{\prime}(A)$ for all Borel sets $A \subseteq K_{n}$ and $n \alpha_{n}^{\prime} \nu_{n}^{\prime}(A) \leqq \mu(A)$ for all Borel sets $A \subseteq K-K_{n}$.

Since $2 \alpha_{2}^{\prime} \nu_{2}^{\prime}\left(K_{1}-K_{2}\right) \leqq \mu\left(K_{1}-K_{2}\right) \leqq \alpha_{1}^{\prime} \nu_{1}^{\prime}\left(K_{1}-K_{2}\right) \leqq \alpha_{2}^{\prime} \nu_{2}^{\prime}\left(K_{1}-K_{2}\right)$, we see that $\mu\left(K_{1}-K_{2}\right)=\nu_{2}^{\prime}\left(K_{1}-K_{2}\right)=0$. Thus we may replace $K_{2}$ by $K_{1} \cup K_{2}$, so that now $K_{1} \subseteq K_{2}$. Continuing in, this manner, we see that we may assume that $K_{n} \subseteq K_{n+1}$ for all $n$.

Set $J=K-\left(\cup K_{n}\right)$, and note that $\alpha_{n}^{\prime} \nu_{n}^{\prime}(J) \leqq \mu(J) / n$ for all $n$. For all $k \geqq n, \alpha_{k}^{\prime} \nu_{k}^{\prime}(J) \leqq \mu(J) / k \leqq \mu(J) / n$, hence $\nu(J)=\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{k}^{\prime} \nu_{k}^{\prime}(J) \leqq$ $\mu(J) / n$. Since this holds for all $n$, we obtain $\nu(J)=0$. Since $\nu_{n}^{\prime} \leqq \nu / \alpha_{n}^{\prime}$ and $\mu \ll \nu$, it follows that $\nu_{n}^{\prime}(J)=0$ for all $n$ and $\mu(J)=0$. Thus we may replace each $K_{n}$ by $K_{n} \cup J$, without affecting the properties obtained above. As a result, we now have $\cup K_{n}=K$.

Now set $L_{1}=K_{1}$ and $L_{n}=K_{n}-K_{n-1}$ for all $n>1$, so that $L_{1}, L_{2}, \cdots$ are pairwise disjoint Borel sets whose union is $K$. Set $I=\left\{n \mid \mu\left(L_{n}\right)>\right.$ $0\}$. For $n \in I$, define $\mu_{n} \in M_{1}^{+}(K)$ by setting $\mu_{n}(A)=\mu\left(A \cap L_{n}\right) / \mu\left(L_{n}\right)$ for all Borel sets $A \subseteq K$. For such $A$, we have $A \cap L_{n} \subseteq L_{n} \subseteq K_{n}$ and so

$$
\mu_{n}(A)=\mu\left(A \cap L_{n}\right) / \mu\left(L_{n}\right) \leqq n \alpha_{n}^{\prime} \nu_{n}^{\prime}\left(A \cap L_{n}\right) / \mu\left(L_{n}\right) \leqq n \alpha_{n}^{\prime} \nu_{n}^{\prime}(A) / \mu\left(L_{n}\right) .
$$

Consequently, $\mu_{n} \leqq\left[n \alpha_{n}^{\prime} / \mu\left(L_{n}\right)\right] \nu_{n}^{\prime}$, whence Proposition 3 shows that $\mu_{n}$ lies in the face generated by $X$.

We have $\Sigma_{n \in I} \mu\left(L_{n}\right)=1$ and $\mu(A)=\Sigma_{n \in I} \mu\left(A \cap L_{n}\right)=$ $\Sigma_{n \in I} \mu\left(L_{n}\right) \mu_{n}(A)$ for all Borel sets $A \subseteq K$. Therefore $\mu=\Sigma_{n \in I} \mu\left(L_{n}\right) \mu_{n}$ is a $\sigma$-convex combination of the $\mu_{n}$, hence $\mu$ lies in the $\sigma$-convex hull of the face generated by $X$.
(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) is clear.

In particular, Theorem 4 shows that a measure $\mu \in M_{1}^{+}(K)$ lies in the $\sigma$-convex face generated by a measure $\nu \in M_{1}^{+}(K)$ if and only if $\mu \ll \nu$. The corresponding statement for norm-closed faces is given in [4, Proposition 1.3]: $\mu$ lies in the norm-closure of the face generated by $\nu$ if and only if $\mu \ll \nu$. Thus the $\sigma$-convex face generated by $\nu$ coincides with the norm-closure of the face generated by $\nu$. In general, the $\sigma$-convex faces in $M_{1}^{+}(K)$ coincide with the norm-closed faces, as the next theorem shows.

Theorem 5. Let $K$ be a compact Hausdorff space. For any face $F$ of $M_{1}^{+}(K)$, the following conditions are equivalent:
(a) $F$ is a split-face.
(b) $F$ is norm-closed.
(c) $F$ is $\sigma$-convex.

Proof. (a) $\Leftrightarrow(\mathrm{b})$ follows from [3, Corollary to Theorem 1], and also appears in [4, Theorem 2.4].
(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c) follows from the observation that infinite convex combinations in $M_{1}^{+}(K)$ must also converge in the norm topology.
(c) $\Rightarrow$ (b): Suppose that $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}, \cdots \in F$ and $\mu \in M_{1}^{+}(K)$ such that $\left\|\mu_{n}-\mu\right\| \rightarrow 0$. It follows easily from Urysohn's Lemma and the regularity of the measures that $\mu_{n}(A) \rightarrow \mu(A)$ for all Borel sets $A \subseteq K$. Setting $\nu=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_{n} / 2^{n}$, we thus see that $\nu \in F$ and $\mu \ll \nu$. According to Theorem $4, \mu \in F$.

Definition. As in [2], any compact convex set $K$ (in a locally convex, Hausdorff, linear topological space) is affinely homeomorphic to a weak*-compact convex subset of the dual space $A(K)^{*}$ (where $A(K)$ denotes the Banach space of all real-valued affine continuous functions on $K$ ). Because of this, $K$ inherits a norm topology from $A(K)^{*}$.

Proposition 6. Let $K$ be a Choquet simplex, and let $K^{*}$ denote the set of maximal measures in $M_{1}^{+}(K)$. Then $K^{*}$ is a $\sigma$-convex face of $M_{1}^{+}(K)$, and the rule $\phi(\mu)=x_{\mu}$ defines a continuous affine isomorphism $\phi$ of $K^{*}$ onto $K$. The maps $\phi$ and $\phi^{-1}$ both preserve $\sigma$-convex combinations and norms.

Proof. It is well-known that $K^{*}$ is a face of $M_{1}^{+}(K)$, and that $\phi$ is a continuous affine isomorphism. The $\sigma$-convexity of $K^{*}$ follows easily from Mokobodzki's characterization of maximal measures [2, Proposition I.4.5].

Since $\phi$ is continuous and affine, it must preserve $\sigma$-convex combinations, hence so does $\phi^{-1}$.

According to [4, Lemma 2.6], $\phi^{-1}$ preserves norms, hence $\phi$ does also.

With the help of Proposition 6, Theorems 4 and 5 imply the corresponding results for arbitrary Choquet simplexes.

Theorem 7. Let $K$ be a Choquet simplex, $x \in K, Y \subseteq K$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:
(a) $x$ lies in the $\sigma$-convex face generated by $Y$.
(b) $x$ lies in the $\sigma$-convex hull of the face generated by $Y$.
(c) There is some $y$ in the $\sigma$-convex hull of $Y$ such that $\mu_{x} \ll \mu_{y}$.

Corollary 8. If $F$ is a face of a Choquet simplex $K$, then the $\sigma$-convex hull of $F$ is also a face of $K$.

Theorem 9. If $F$ is a face of a Choquet simplex $K$, then the following conditions are equivalent:
(a) $F$ is a split-face.
(b) $F$ is norm-closed.
(c) $F$ is $\sigma$-convex.

The equivalence (a) $\Leftrightarrow$ (b) of Theorem 9 has appeared in [3, Corollary to Theorem 1] and [4, Theorem 2.8]. We note that the characterization (a) $\Leftrightarrow$ (c) has an apparent advantage, in that it depends only on the topology intrinsic to $K$, rather than on the (external) norm topology. While we have utilized the norm results as the fastest means of proving Theorems 5 and 9 , it is also possible to prove the equivalence (a) $\Leftrightarrow$ (c) in these theorems without any use of norms.

Theorem 10. The lattice $\mathscr{F}$ of $\sigma$-convex faces of a Choquet simplex $K$ forms a complete Boolean algebra. For $\left\{F_{1}\right\} \subseteq \mathscr{F}, \wedge F_{i}=\cap F_{i}$. For $F, G \in \mathscr{F}, F \vee G$ is the convex hull of $F \cup G$.

Proof. Obviously $\mathscr{F}$ is a complete lattice in which arbitrary infima are given by intersections. For $F, G \in \mathscr{F}$, we see from Theorem 9 and [2, Corollary II.6.8] that the convex hull of $F \cup G$ is a $\sigma$-convex face of $K$. (This is also easy to prove directly, using [1, Proposition 3].) Thus the convex hull of $F \cup G$ equals $F \vee G$.

Given $F, G, H \in \mathscr{F}$, we automatically have $(F \wedge G) \vee(F \wedge H) \subseteq$ $F \wedge(G \vee H)$. Now consider any $x \in F \wedge(G \vee H)$. Inasmuch as $G \vee H$ is the convex hull of $G \cup H$, there must be a convex combination $x=$ $\alpha y+(1-\alpha) z$ with $y \in G, z \in H$. If $\alpha=0$ or 1 , then either $x \in F \wedge H$ or $x \in F \wedge G$. If $0<\alpha<1$, then since $F$ is a face we obtain $y \in F \wedge G$, $z \in F \wedge H$. Thus $\quad x \in(F \wedge G) \vee(F \wedge H) \quad$ in any case, whence $F \wedge(G \vee H)=(F \wedge G) \vee(F \wedge H)$. Therefore $\mathscr{F}$ is a distributive lattice.

Given $F \in \mathscr{F}$, we see from Theorem 9 that $F^{\prime} \in \mathscr{F}$ as well (which is also easy to prove directly). Obviously $F^{\prime}$ is a complement for $F$ in $\mathscr{F}$, whence $\mathscr{F}$ is a complemented lattice.

Therefore $\mathscr{F}$ is a complete, complemented, distributive lattice, i.e., a complete Boolean algebra.

Definition. Let $K$ be a Choquet simplex, let $\left\{x_{i}\right\} \subseteq K$, and for each $i$ let $F_{1}$ be the face generated by $x_{1}$ in $K$. If $F_{1}$ and $F_{l}$ are disjoint for all $i \neq j$, we shall say that the points $x_{i}$ are facially independent (in $K$ ).

Corollary 11. Any $\sigma$-convex face $F$ in a Choquet simplex $K$ can be generated by facially independent points of $K$.

Proof. Let $\mathscr{F}$ denote the lattice of $\sigma$-convex faces of $K$, and let $\mathscr{F}_{0}$ be the set of those faces in $\mathscr{F}$ which can be obtained as the $\sigma$-convex face generated by a single point of $K$. Note that every nonempty face in $\mathscr{F}$ contains a (nonempty) face from $\mathscr{F}_{0}$. Thus, since $\mathscr{F}$ is a complete Boolean algebra, there exists a family $\left\{F_{i}\right\}$ of pairwise disjoint faces in $\mathscr{F}_{0}$ such that $F=\vee F_{t}$ in $\mathscr{F}$. For each $i, F_{t}$ is the $\sigma$-convex face generated by some $x_{t} \in K$. Then the $x_{t}$ are facially independent points of $K$, and $F$ is the $\sigma$-convex face generated by $\left\{x_{1}\right\}$.
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