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## 1. Introduction

Let $F$ map $[0,1]$ into a Banach space $B$ and let $R(F)$ denote the set of all limits of Riemann sums of $F$. The set $R(F)$ need not be convex in general (Nakamura and Amemiya (1966)) but is always convex when $B$ is finite dimensional as first shown by Hartman (1947). A proof of Hartman's result, based on a description of $R(F)$ when the range of $F$ is finite, was given in Ellis (1959). In this note this description is refined, the extreme points of $R(F)$ are determined and the following complete characterization of $R(F)$ is obtained (where $N_{n}=\{1,2, \cdots, n\}$ ).

Theorem 1.1. Let $F:[0,1] \rightarrow\left\{\alpha_{i}, i \in N_{n}\right\}$ and let $E_{i}=\left\{t: F(t)=\alpha_{i}\right\}$, $i \in N_{n}$. Then $R(F)$ coincides with the points $\Sigma_{1}^{n} a_{i} \alpha_{i}$ for which the coefficients $a_{i}$ satisfy, for each $N^{\prime} \subset N_{n}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
m\left(\bigcup_{i \in N^{\prime}} E_{i}\right)^{0} \leqq \sum_{i \in N^{\prime}} a_{i} \leqq m\left(\overline{\bigcup_{i \in N^{\prime}} E_{i}}\right) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the theorem $A^{0}$ and $\bar{A}$ denote the interior and closure of a set $A$ respectively and $m$ denotes Lebesgue measure. Note that (1.1) implies that

$$
0 \leqq a_{i} \leqq 1, i \in N_{n} ; \sum_{1}^{n} a_{i}=1
$$

## 2. The closure of $\mathbf{R}^{\prime}(\mathbf{F})$

In Ellis (1959) it was shown that $R(F)$ is the closure of a set denoted by $R^{\prime}(F)$. In this section we show that $R^{\prime}(F)$ is closed.

We first describe the notation. By $\mathscr{D}$ we denote a partition $0=t_{0}<t_{1}<$ $\cdots<t_{n}=1 ; \mathscr{E}$ a set of intermediary values $\xi_{i}, t_{i} \leqq \xi_{i}<t_{i+1}, i=0,1, \cdots, n-1$; $t_{n-1} \leqq \xi_{n-1} \leqq t_{n} ;|\mathscr{D}|=\max \left(t_{i+1}-t_{i}\right)$, the norm of $\mathscr{D}$ and

$$
\Sigma(\mathscr{D}, \mathscr{E})=\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} F\left(\xi_{i}\right)\left(t_{i+1}-t_{i}\right)
$$

will be called a Riemann sum for $F$ on $\mathscr{D}$. Note that $F$ may be non-measurable. If Range $F$ is contained in the Banach space $B, P \in B$ will be called a limit of Riemann sums if for some sequence $\left\{\mathscr{D}_{n}, \mathscr{E}_{n}\right\},\left|\mathscr{D}_{n}\right| \rightarrow 0$ and $\left\|P-\Sigma\left(\mathscr{D}_{n}, \mathscr{E}_{n}\right)\right\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Our results are based on the following elementary result.
Lemma 2.1. Let $U$ be an arbitrary open subset of $[0,1]$ and, for $\mathscr{D}$ any partition of $[0,1]$, let $A(\mathscr{D})$ denote the union of those intervals of $\mathscr{D}$ that fall inside $U$. Then as $|\mathscr{D}| \rightarrow 0, m[A(\mathscr{D})] \rightarrow m(U)$.

In Ellis (1959) Lemma 2.1 was used in showing that if $N^{\prime} \subset N_{n}$ and $A_{N}(\mathscr{D})$ denotes the union of those intervals of $\mathscr{D}$ on each of which Range $F=\left\{\alpha_{i}, i \in N^{\prime}\right\}$ then $\lim _{|\mathscr{D}| \rightarrow 0} m\left[A_{N},(\mathscr{D})\right]$ exists. We now denote this limit by $K_{N^{\prime}}$. It is easy to verify that

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{N^{\prime}}=\lim _{|\mathscr{Q}| \rightarrow 0} m\left[A_{n}(\mathscr{O})\right]=m\left[\left(\bigcup_{i \in N^{\prime}} E_{i}\right)^{0}-\bigcup_{j \in N^{\prime}}\left(\bigcup_{i \in N^{\prime} \backslash j} E_{i}\right)^{0}\right] \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (2.1), $K_{i}=K_{(i)}=m\left(E_{i}^{0}\right)$. By induction, for any $N^{\prime}$ :

$$
\begin{gather*}
\sum_{N^{*} \subset N^{\prime}} K_{N *}=m\left(\bigcup_{i \in N^{\prime}} E_{i}\right)^{0} ;  \tag{2.2}\\
\sum_{N^{*} \subset N_{\mathrm{n}}} K_{N^{*}}=1 \tag{2.2}
\end{gather*}
$$

For each $N^{\prime} \subset N_{n}$ let $c_{N^{\prime} i}, i \in N^{\prime}$, be any set of non-negative real numbers satisfying $\sum_{i \in N^{\prime}}, c_{N^{\prime} i}=1$. As in Ellis (1959) let $R^{\prime}(F)$ be the set of points $P \in B$ of the form

$$
\begin{align*}
P & =\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{\substack{N^{\prime} \subset N_{n} \\
i \in N^{\prime}}} c_{N^{\prime} i} K_{N^{\prime}}\right) \alpha_{i}  \tag{2.3}\\
& =\sum_{N^{\prime} \in N_{n}} \sum_{i \in N^{\prime}}\left(c_{N^{\prime} i} K_{N^{\prime}} \alpha_{i}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

In Ellis (1959) it was shown that $R(F)=\bar{R}^{\prime}(F)$.
Proposition 2.1. $R^{\prime}(F)$ is closed and thus every $P \in R(F)$ is of the form (2.3).
Proof. Let $R_{0}(F)$ denote the set of points $P$ satisfying (2.3) for which each $c_{N^{\prime} i}$ is 0 or 1 , a finite set of points. By Day (1962) (Lemma 2, p. 79) the convex hull of $R_{0}(F)$ is compact and therefore closed. Since $R_{0}(F) \leqq R^{\prime}(F)$ and $R^{\prime}(F)$ is convex, the convex hull of $R_{0}(F)$ is contained in $R^{\prime}(F)$. On the other hand it is easy to verify that each $\mathrm{P} \in R^{\prime}(F)$ can be expressed as a convex combination of points in $R_{0}(F)$ and thus is contained in and so coincides with the convex hull of $R_{0}(F)$.

## 3. The extreme points of $R(F)$ and Theorem 1.1

We denote by $R^{*}(F)$ the set of points in $B$ for which (1.1) holds for every $N^{\prime} \subset N_{n}$. It is easy to verify that $R^{*}(F)$ is convex.

PROPOSITION 3.1. $R^{*}(F) \supset R(F)$.
Proof. From (2.3), if $P \in R(F)$,

$$
P=\sum_{1}^{n} a_{i} x_{i}: a_{i}=\sum_{N^{\prime} \subset N_{n} ; i \in N^{\prime}} c_{N^{\prime} i} K_{N^{\prime}}, i \in N_{n} .
$$

Thus, for any $N^{\prime} \subset N_{n}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i \in N^{\prime}} a_{i}=\sum_{i \in N^{\prime}}\left(\sum_{N^{\prime \prime} \subset N_{n} ; i \in N^{\prime \prime}} c_{N^{\prime \prime} i} K_{N^{\prime \prime}}\right) \\
\geqq & \sum_{N^{\prime \prime} \subset N^{\prime}} \sum_{i \in N^{\prime \prime}} c_{N^{\prime \prime} i} K_{N^{\prime \prime}}=\sum_{N^{\prime \prime} \subset N^{\prime}} K_{N^{\prime \prime}}=m\left(\bigcup_{i \in N^{\prime}} E_{i}\right)^{\circ},
\end{aligned}
$$

using (2.2).
On the other hand

$$
\sum_{i \in N^{\prime}} a_{i}=1-\sum_{i \notin N^{\prime}} a_{i} \leqq 1-m\left(\bigcup_{i \notin N^{\prime}} E_{i}\right)^{0}=m\left(\overline{\bigcup_{i \in N^{\prime}} E_{i}}\right)
$$

For $\left\{p_{i}, i \in N_{n}\right\}$ any permutation of $N_{n}$ let $P=\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{p_{i}} \alpha_{p i}$, where for each $k \leqq n$,

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{p_{i}}=m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} E_{p_{i}}\right)^{0}
$$

Then

$$
\sum_{i=k+1}^{n} a_{p_{i}}=m\left(\overline{\bigcup_{i=k+1} E_{p_{i}}}\right)
$$

and $P$ is a limit of Riemann sums for which $\alpha_{p_{i}}$ is used as intermediary value in $\mathscr{E}$ only when necessary (i.e. on intervals falling inside $E_{p_{i}}^{0}$ ), $\alpha_{p_{2}}$ only where necessary after the intermediary values $\alpha_{P_{1}}$ have been assigned, etc. Likewise $P$ is a limit of Riemann sums for waich $\alpha_{p_{n}}$ is used as intermediary value whenever possible, $\alpha_{p_{n-1}}$ whenever possible after the values $\alpha_{p_{n}}$ have been assigned, etc. Let $E(F)$. be the set of all such $P$ for all permutations of $N_{n}$.

Proposition 3.2. If Range $F=\left\{\alpha_{i}, i \in N_{n}\right\}$ and the points $\left\{\alpha_{i}\right\}$ are linearly independent then every point of $E(F)$ is an extreme point of $R^{*}(F)$.

Proof. We assume for convenience that $P=\Sigma_{1}^{n} a_{i} \alpha_{i}$, with

$$
\sum_{1}^{k} a_{i}=m\left(\bigcup_{1}^{k} E_{i}\right)^{0}, k=1,2, \cdots, n . \quad \text { Let } P_{j}=\sum_{1}^{n} a_{i}^{j} \alpha_{i}, \quad j=1,2
$$

be in $R^{*}(F)$ and suppose that $P=\left(P_{1}+P_{2}\right) / 2$. The linear independence implies that $a_{i}=\left(a_{i}^{1}+a_{i}^{2}\right) / 2, i=1,2, \cdots, n$. Since $P_{j} \in R^{*}(F), j=1,2 ; a_{i}^{j} \geqq m\left(E_{i}^{0}\right)$ $=a_{i}, j=1,2$ so that $a_{1}=a_{1}^{1}=a_{1}^{2}$. Similarly $a_{i}=a_{i}^{1}, a_{i}^{2} ; i=2,3, \cdots, n$. Thus $P_{1}=P_{2}=P$ and $P$ is an extreme point of $R^{*}(F)$.

Note that when the set $\left\{\alpha_{i}\right\}$ is not linearly independent, $E(F)$ may contain points that are not extreme points. For example if $\boldsymbol{B}=\boldsymbol{R}, R(F)$ is a point or line segment and contains one or two distinct extreme points. However, $E(F)$ may contain $n!$ distinct points.

Proposition 3.3. For $P \in R^{*}(F)$ assume that there exist $i, j \in N_{n}$ with strict inequality holding in (1.1) for $N^{\prime}=\{i, j\}$ and for every $N^{\prime} \subset N_{n}$ that contains one but not both of $i, j$. Then $P$ is not an extreme point of $R^{*}(F)$.

Proof. Let $P=\Sigma_{1}^{n} a_{r} \alpha_{r}$, assume the hypotheses satisfied for $i, j$ and let $d>0$ be less than the minimum difference in the inequalities in (1.1) for all $N^{\prime}$ in the hypotheses. Define

$$
P_{k}=\sum_{1}^{n} a_{r}^{k} \alpha_{r}, \quad k=1,2
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a_{r}^{k}=a_{r}, r \neq i, j ; \quad k=1,2 \\
& a_{i}^{1}=a_{i}+d, a_{j}^{1}=a_{j}-d ; \\
& a_{i}^{2}=a_{i}-d, a_{j}^{2}=a_{j}+d .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, if $i, j \in N^{\prime} \subset N_{n}$ or $(i, j) \cap N^{\prime}=\varnothing, \Sigma_{N}, a_{r}^{k}=\Sigma_{N} a_{r} . k=1,2$ and (1.1) is satisfied for $N^{\prime}$. For the remaining $N^{\prime} \subset N_{n}(1.1)$ is a consequence of the choice of $d$. Thus $P_{1}, P_{2} \in R^{*}(F)$. From the definition, $P=\left(P_{1}+P_{2}\right) / 2$. Assume that $P_{1}=P$. Then $P_{1}-P=d\left(\alpha_{i}-\alpha_{j}\right)=0$, implying that $\alpha_{i}=\alpha_{j}$, a contradiction.

Proposition 3.4. $E(F)$ contains the extreme points of $R^{*}(F)$.
Proof. The proof is trivial for $n=2$. Assume that $n>2$, that $P$ $=\Sigma_{1}^{n} a_{r} \alpha_{r} \in R^{*}(F)$ and that, for every $N^{\prime} \subset N_{n}$,

$$
m\left(\bigcup_{r \in N^{\prime}} E_{r}\right)^{0}<\sum_{r \in N^{\prime}} a_{r}
$$

By complementation

$$
\sum_{r \in N^{\prime}} a_{r}<m\left(\overline{\bigcup_{r \in N^{\prime}} E_{r}}\right)
$$

The hypotheses of Proposition 3.3 are satisfied for any pair $i, j$ and thus $P$ is not an extreme point.

Excluding this case there is a maximal $N^{\prime} \underset{\neq}{\subsetneq} N_{n}$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{r \in N^{\prime}} a_{r}=m\left(\bigcup_{r \in N^{\prime}} E_{r}\right)^{0} ; \sum_{r \notin N^{\prime}} a_{r}=m\left(\overline{\bigcup_{r \notin N^{\prime}} E_{i}}\right) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For convenience of notation we assume that $N^{\prime}=N_{k}, 1 \leqq k<n$. We first show that if $n-k \geqq 3$ then $P$ is not an extreme point of $R^{*}(F)$.

We note that with each point in $R^{*}(F)$ and each $N^{\prime} \subset N_{n}$ we can associate numbers $K_{N^{\prime}}$ by (2.1) (in terms of the sets $E_{r}$ ). These numbers will satisfy (2.2) and (2.2)' and, by complementation,

$$
\begin{equation*}
m\left(\overline{\bigcup_{r \in N^{\prime}} E_{r}}\right)=\Sigma\left\{K_{N^{*}}: N^{*} \cap N^{\prime} \neq \varnothing\right\} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $N^{*} \subset N_{n} \backslash N_{k}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{r \in N^{*}} a_{r}+ & \sum_{r \in N_{k}} a_{r}>m\left(\bigcup_{r \in N_{k} \cup N^{*}} E_{r}\right)^{0}=\sum_{N^{\prime} \subset N_{k} \cup N^{*}} K_{N^{\prime}} \\
& \sum_{N^{\prime} \subset N_{k}} K_{N^{\prime}}+\Sigma\left\{K_{N^{\prime}}: N^{\prime} \subset\left(N_{k} \cup N^{*}\right) ; N^{\prime} \cap N^{*} \neq \varnothing\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

since $\geqq$ holds by (1.1) and equality would contradict the maximality of $N_{k}$. Thus

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{r \in N^{*}} a_{r} & >\sum\left\{K_{N^{\prime}}: N^{\prime} \subset\left(N_{k} \cup N^{*}\right) ; N^{\prime} \cap N^{*} \neq \varnothing\right\} \\
& \geqq \sum_{N^{\prime} \subset N^{*}} K_{N^{\prime}}=m\left(\bigcup_{r \in N^{*}} E_{r}\right)^{0} \tag{3.3}
\end{align*}
$$

Now let $N^{\prime} \subset N_{k}, \varnothing \neq N^{*} \subset N_{n} \backslash N_{k}, N^{\#}=N^{\prime} \cup N^{* \prime}$ Then

$$
\begin{align*}
m\left(\bigcup_{r \in N^{\#}} E_{r}\right)^{0} & =\sum_{N^{\prime} \subset N^{\#}}=\sum_{N^{\prime} \subset N^{\prime \prime}} K_{N^{\prime}}+\Sigma\left\{K_{N^{\prime}}: N^{\prime} \subset N^{\#} ; N^{\prime} \cup N^{*} \neq \varnothing\right\}  \tag{3.4}\\
& <\sum_{i \in N^{\prime \prime}} a_{i}+\sum_{i \in N^{*}} a_{i}
\end{align*}
$$

using (3.3). It follows that if $i, j \in N_{n} \backslash N_{k}$ and $N^{\#}=\{i, j\}$ or contains one but not both of $i, j$, then

$$
m\left(\bigcup_{r \in N \#} E_{r}\right)^{0}<\sum_{r \in N \#} a_{r}
$$

With $N^{\#}=N^{\prime \prime} \cup N^{*}, N^{*} \neq \varnothing$ as before;

$$
N_{n} \backslash N^{\#}=\left(N_{k} \mid N^{\mu}\right) \cup\left[\left(N_{n} \backslash N_{k}\right) \backslash N^{*}\right]
$$

(3.4) holds for $N_{n} \backslash N^{\#}$ and

$$
\left.\sum_{r \in N^{\#}} a_{r}=1-\sum_{r \in N_{n} \mid N \#} a_{r}<1-m\left(\bigcup_{r \in N_{n} \mid N \#}\right) E_{r}\right)^{0}=m\left(\overline{\bigcup_{r \in N \#} E_{r}}\right)
$$

Proposition 3.3 then implies that $P$ is not an extreme point.

Thus if $P$ is an extreme point of $R^{*}(F), k$ is either $n-1$ or $n-2$. Assume that $k=n-2$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_{n-1}+a_{n}= & m \overline{\left(E_{n-1} \cup E_{n}\right)}=\Sigma\left\{K_{N^{\prime}}: N^{\prime} \subset N_{n}, N^{\prime} \cap(n-1, n) \neq \varnothing\right\} \\
= & \Sigma\left\{K_{N^{\prime}}:(n-1, n) \subset N^{\prime}\right\}+\Sigma\left\{K_{N^{\prime}}: n \in N^{\prime}, n-1 \notin N^{\prime}\right\} \\
& +\Sigma\left\{K_{N^{\prime}}: n-1 \in N^{\prime} ; n \notin N^{\prime}\right\}, \\
= & A+A_{n}+A_{n-1},
\end{aligned}
$$

defining $A, A_{n}$ and $A_{n-1}$.
From (3.2) $A+A_{i}=m\left(\bar{E}_{i}\right), \quad i=n-1, n$. Thus if $A=0, a_{n-1}+a_{n}$ $=m\left(\bar{E}_{n-1}\right)+m\left(E_{n}\right)$ and (1.1) implies that $a_{i}=m\left(E_{i}\right), i=n-1, n$. This contradicts the assumption that $k=n-2$. Thus we may assume that $A \neq 0$.

Assuming that $A \neq 0$ let $P=\sum_{r=1}^{n} a_{r}^{i} \alpha_{r}, i=1,2 ;$ where $a_{r}^{i}=a_{r}, i=1,2$; $r<n-1 ; a_{n}^{1}=A+A_{n} a_{n-1}^{1}=A_{n-1} ; a_{n}^{2}=A_{n}, a_{n-1}^{2}=A+A_{n-1}$. Then $P_{i} \in R^{*}(F), \quad i=1,2$ and there exists $\lambda, 0<\lambda<1$ with $a_{n}=A_{n}+\lambda A$; $a_{n-1}=A_{n-1}+(1-\lambda) A$. It follows that $P=\lambda P_{1}+(1-\lambda) P_{2}$, showing that $P$ is not an extreme point.

We have shown that the assumption that $P$ is an extreme point of $R^{*}(F)$ implies that for some $n_{1} \leqq n, a_{n_{1}}=m\left(\bar{E}_{n_{1}}\right), \Sigma_{r \neq n_{1}} a_{r}=m\left(\bigcup_{r \neq n_{1}} E_{r}\right)^{0}$. Similar considerations applied to $\Sigma_{r \neq n_{1}} a_{r}$ show that if $P$ is an extreme point of $R^{*}(F)$ there exists $n_{2} \neq n_{1}$ with $a_{n_{1}}+a_{n_{2}}=m\left(\overline{E_{n_{1}} \cup E_{n_{2}}}\right)$ and, continuing this process, that $P \in E(F)$.

Corollary. The set of extreme points of $R^{*}(F)$ is contained in $E(F)$ and coincides with $E(F)$ when the set $\left\{\alpha_{i}, i \in N_{n}\right\}$ is linearly independent.

Proposition 3.5. $R^{*}(F)$ is compact.
Proof. The part $B$ of $R^{n}$ defined by the points ( $a_{1}, a_{2}, \cdots, a_{n}$ ), $a_{i} \geqq 0$; $\Sigma_{1}^{n} a_{i}=1$ is compact. The subset $B^{*}$ of $B$ for which the additional inequalities in (1.1) are satisfied is compact as a closed subset of $B$.

If the function $\phi$ mapping $B \times \Pi_{1}^{n}\left(\alpha_{i}\right) \subset R^{n} \times B^{n}$ into $B$ is defined by the formula

$$
\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \cdots a_{n}, \alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \cdots \alpha_{n}\right) \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} \alpha_{i},
$$

(Bourbaki (1953), Proposition 1, p. 80) then $\phi$ is continuous and $R^{*}(F)$ is compact as the image of the compact subset $B^{*} \times \Pi_{1}^{n}\left\{\alpha_{i}\right\}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Since $R^{*}(F)$ is a compact, convex subset of the locally convex space $B$ it is the closed convex hull of its extreme points by the Krein-Mil'man Theorem (Day (1962), Theorem 1, p. 78) and thus of $E(F)$ since
$E(F)$ contains the set of extreme points of $R^{*}(F)$. Since $R_{0}(F) \supset E(F)$ and $R(F)$ is the closed convex hull of $R_{0}(F), R^{*}(F) \subset R(F)$ and thus $R(F)$ and $R^{*}(F)$ coincide.
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