

**DUNFORD-HENSTOCK-KURZWEIL AND DUNFORD-MCSHANE INTEGRALS  
OF VECTOR-VALUED FUNCTIONS DEFINED ON  
 $m$ -DIMENSIONAL BOUNDED SETS**

SOKOL BUSH KALIAJ

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we define the Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil and the Dunford-McShane integrals of Banach space valued functions defined on a bounded Lebesgue measurable subset of  $m$ -dimensional Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . We will show that the new integrals are "natural" extensions of the McShane and the Henstock-Kurzweil integrals from  $m$ -dimensional closed non-degenerate intervals to  $m$ -dimensional bounded Lebesgue measurable sets. As applications, we will present full descriptive characterizations of the McShane and Henstock-Kurzweil integrals in terms of our integrals. Moreover, a relationship between new integrals will be proved in terms of the Dunford integral.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the paper [14], the Hake-Henstock-Kurzweil and the Hake-McShane integrals are defined. It is proved that those integrals are "natural" extensions of the Henstock-Kurzweil and the McShane integrals from  $m$ -dimensional closed non-degenerate intervals to  $m$ -dimensional open and bounded sets, see Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 in [14]. The motivation behind those new integrals is to obtain Hake-type theorems for the Henstock-Kurzweil and the McShane integrals of a Banach space valued function defined on a closed non-degenerate interval in  $m$ -dimensional Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , see Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 in [14].

In this paper, we define the Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil and the Dunford-McShane integrals of Banach space valued functions defined on a bounded subsets  $G \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $|G \setminus G^o| = 0$ . We will show that the new integrals are also "natural" extensions of the McShane and the Henstock-Kurzweil integrals from  $m$ -dimensional closed non-degenerate intervals to  $m$ -dimensional bounded Lebesgue measurable sets, see Theorems 3.3 and 3.6.

As applications, we will present full descriptive characterizations of the McShane and the Henstock-Kurzweil integrals in terms of our integrals, see Theorems 3.5 and 3.8.

In the paper [6] D. H. Fremlin proved the following result for the case of a compact non-degenerate subinterval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ .

**Theorem 1.1** (Fremlin's Theorem). *A function  $f : I \rightarrow X$  is McShane integrable on  $I$  if and only if it is Henstock-Kurzweil integrable and Pettis integrable on  $I$ .*

Checking Fremlin's proof it can be seen that it still holds when  $I$  is an  $m$ -dimensional closed non-degenerate subinterval in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , c.f. Theorem 6.2.6 in [20]. By using Fremlin's Theorem, we will show a relationship between Dunford-McShane and Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil integrals in terms of the Dunford integral, see Theorem 3.6.

2. NOTATIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper  $X$  denotes a real Banach space with the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $X^*$  its dual. The Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^m$  is equipped with the maximum norm.  $B_m(t, r)$  denotes the open ball in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  with center  $t$  and radius  $r > 0$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra of Lebesgue measurable subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and by  $\lambda$  the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ .  $|A|$  denotes the Lebesgue measure of  $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . We put

$$\mathcal{L}(A) = \{A \cap L : L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m)\},$$

for any  $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ .

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 28B05, 46B25; Secondary 46G10.

*Key words and phrases*. Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil integral, Henstock-Kurzweil integral, Dunford-McShane integral, McShane integral, Banach space,  $m$ -dimensional bounded Lebesgue measurable sets.

The subset  $\prod_{j=1}^m [a_j, b_j] \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  is said to be a *closed non-degenerate interval* in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , if  $-\infty < a_j < b_j < +\infty$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Two closed non-degenerate intervals  $I$  and  $J$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  are said to be *non-overlapping* if  $I^\circ \cap J^\circ = \emptyset$ , where  $I^\circ$  denotes the *interior* of  $I$ . By  $\mathcal{I}$  the family of all closed non-degenerate subintervals in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  is denoted and by  $\mathcal{I}_E$  the family of all closed non-degenerate subintervals in  $E \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ .

Let  $E \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . A function  $F : \mathcal{I}_E \rightarrow X$  is said to be an *additive interval function*, if for each two non-overlapping intervals  $I, J \in \mathcal{I}_E$  such that  $I \cup J \in \mathcal{I}_E$ , we have

$$F(I \cup J) = F(I) + F(J).$$

A pair  $(t, I)$  of a point  $t \in E$  and an interval  $I \in \mathcal{I}_E$  is called an  $\mathcal{M}$ -*tagged interval* in  $E$ ,  $t$  is the tag of  $I$ . Requiring  $t \in I$  for the tag of  $I$  we get the concept of an  $\mathcal{HK}$ -*tagged interval* in  $E$ . A finite collection  $\{(t_i, I_i) : i = 1, \dots, p\}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$ -tagged intervals ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -tagged intervals) in  $E$  is called an  $\mathcal{M}$ -*partition* ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -*partition*) in  $E$ , if  $\{I_i : i = 1, \dots, p\}$  is a collection of pairwise non-overlapping intervals in  $\mathcal{I}_E$ . Given  $Z \subset E$ , a positive function  $\delta : Z \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  is called a *gauge* on  $Z$ . We say that an  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition)  $\pi = \{(t_i, I_i) : i = 1, \dots, p\}$  in  $E$  is

- $\mathcal{M}$ -partition ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition) of  $E$ , if  $\cup_{i=1}^p I_i = E$ ,
- $Z$ -tagged if  $\{t_1, \dots, t_p\} \subset Z$ ,
- $\delta$ -fine if for each  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , we have  $I_i \subset B_m(t_i, \delta(t_i))$ .

We now recall the definitions of the McShane and the Henstock-Kurzweil integrals of a function  $f : W \rightarrow X$ , where  $W$  is a fixed interval in  $\mathcal{I}$ . The function  $f$  is said to be *McShane (Henstock-Kurzweil) integrable* on  $W$  if there is a vector  $x_f \in X$  such that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a gauge  $\delta$  on  $W$  such that for every  $\delta$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition)  $\pi$  of  $W$ , we have

$$\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} f(t)|I| - x_f \| < \varepsilon.$$

In this case, the vector  $x_f$  is said to be the *McShane (Henstock-Kurzweil) integral* of  $f$  on  $W$  and we set  $x_f = (M) \int_W f d\lambda$  ( $x_f = (HK) \int_W f d\lambda$ ). The function  $f$  is said to be *McShane (Henstock-Kurzweil) integrable* over a subset  $A \subset W$ , if the function  $f \cdot \mathbb{1}_A : W \rightarrow X$  is McShane (Henstock-Kurzweil) integrable on  $W$ , where  $\mathbb{1}_A$  is the characteristic function of the set  $A$ . The McShane (Henstock-Kurzweil) integral of  $f$  over  $A$  will be denoted by  $(M) \int_A f d\lambda$  ( $(HK) \int_A f d\lambda$ ). If  $f : W \rightarrow X$  is McShane integrable on  $W$ , then by Theorem 4.1.6 in [20] the function  $f$  is the McShane integrable on each  $A \in \mathcal{L}(W)$ , while by Theorem 3.3.4 in [20], if  $f$  is Henstock-Kurzweil integrable on  $W$ , then  $f$  is the Henstock-Kurzweil integrable on each  $I \in \mathcal{I}_W$ . Therefore, we can define an additive interval function  $F : \mathcal{I}_W \rightarrow X$  as follows

$$F(I) = (M) \int_I f d\lambda, \quad ( F(I) = (HK) \int_I f d\lambda ), \quad \text{for all } I \in \mathcal{I}_W,$$

which is called the primitive of  $f$ .

The basic properties of the McShane integral and the Henstock-Kurzweil integral can be found in [1], [2], [4], [6]-[8], [9]-[11], [12], [13], [15], [16], [17] and [20]. We do not present them here. The reader is referred to the above mentioned references for the details.

We now define the Dunford-McShane and the Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil integrals on a bounded Lebesgue measurable subset in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . Fix a bounded Lebesgue measurable subset  $E \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  such that  $E^\circ \neq \emptyset$ , where  $E^\circ$  is the interior of  $E$ . A sequence  $(I_k)$  of pairwise non-overlapping intervals in  $\mathcal{I}_E$  is said to be a *division in  $E$* . By  $\mathcal{P}_E$  the family of all divisions in  $E$  is denoted. A division  $(I_k) \in \mathcal{P}_E$  is said to be a *division of  $E$*  if

$$E = \bigcup_{k=1}^{+\infty} I_k.$$

We denote by  $\mathcal{D}_E$  the family of all divisions of  $E$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{D}_E \subset \mathcal{P}_E$ . By Lemma 2.43 in [5], the family  $\mathcal{D}_{E^\circ}$  is not empty, and since

$$\mathcal{D}_{E^\circ} \subset \mathcal{P}_{E^\circ} \subset \mathcal{P}_E,$$

it follows that  $\mathcal{P}_E$  is not empty.

**Definition 2.1.** A additive interval function  $F : \mathcal{I}_E \rightarrow X$  is said to be a *Dunford-function*, if given a division  $(I_k) \in \mathcal{P}_E$ , we have

- the series

$$\sum_{k:|I \cap I_k|>0} F(I \cap I_k)$$

is unconditionally convergent in  $X$ , for each  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ ,

- if  $(I_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{E^o}$ , then the equality

$$F(I) = \sum_{k:|I \cap I_k|>0} F(I \cap I_k),$$

holds for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}_E$ .

**Definition 2.2.** We say that the additive interval function  $F : \mathcal{I}_E \rightarrow X$  has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible variation ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -negligible variation) over a subset  $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ , if for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a gauge  $\delta_\varepsilon$  on  $Z$  such that for each  $Z$ -tagged  $\delta_\varepsilon$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition)  $\pi$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , we have

- the series

$$\sum_{k:|I \cap I_k|>0} F(I \cap I_k)$$

is unconditionally convergent in  $X$ , for each  $(t, I) \in \pi$ ,

- the inequality

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} \left( \sum_{k:|I \cap I_k|>0} F(I \cap I_k) \right) \right\| < \varepsilon,$$

holds,

whenever  $(I_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{E^o}$ . We say that  $F$  has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible variation ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -negligible variation) outside of  $E^o$  if  $F$  has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible variation ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -negligible variation) over  $(E^o)^c = \mathbb{R}^m \setminus E^o$ .

**Definition 2.3.** We say that a function  $f : E \rightarrow X$  is *Dunford-McShane* (*Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil*) integrable on  $E$  with the primitive  $F : \mathcal{I}_E \rightarrow X$ , if we have

- for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a gauge  $\delta_\varepsilon$  on  $E^o$  such that for each  $\delta_\varepsilon$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition)  $\pi$  in  $E^o$ , we have

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} (f(t)|I| - F(I)) \right\| < \varepsilon,$$

- $F$  is a Dunford-function,
- $F$  has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -negligible) variation outside of  $E^o$ .

In this case, we define the Dunford-McShane (the Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil) integral of  $f$  over  $I$  as follows

$$(DM) \int_I f d\lambda = F(I), \quad \left( (DHK) \int_I f d\lambda = F(I) \right).$$

Clearly, if  $f : E \rightarrow X$  is Dunford-McShane (Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil) integrable on  $E$  with the primitive  $F$  and  $E = E^o$ , then  $f$  is Hake-McShane (Hake-Henstock-Kurzweil) integrable on  $E$  with the primitive  $F$ .

Finally, we recall the definition of the Dunford integral in the second dual  $X^{**}$  of  $X$ , c.f. [3]. A function  $f : E \rightarrow X$  is said to be *Dunford integrable*, if  $x^* f$  is Lebesgue integrable (or, equivalently McShane integrable) for all  $x^* \in X^*$ . In the case that  $f$  is Dunford integrable, by Dunford's Lemma, for each  $A \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ , there exists  $x_A^{**} \in X^{**}$  satisfying

$$x_A^{**}(x^*) = (M) \int_A x^* f d\lambda, \quad \text{for all } x^* \in X^*,$$

and we write  $x_A^{**} = (D) \int_A f d\lambda$ .

If  $(D) \int_A f d\lambda \in e(X) \subset X^{**}$ , for all  $A \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ , then  $f$  is called *Pettis integrable*, where  $e$  is the *canonical embedding* of  $X$  into  $X^{**}$ . In this case, we write  $(P) \int_A f d\lambda$  instead of  $(D) \int_A f d\lambda$  to denote *Pettis integral* of  $f$  over  $A \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ .

## 3. THE MAIN RESULTS

From now on  $G$  will be a bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $G^\circ \neq \emptyset$  and  $|G \setminus G^\circ| = 0$ . Since  $G$  is a bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , we can fix an interval  $I_0 \in \mathcal{I}$  such that  $G \subset I_0$ . Given a function  $f : G \rightarrow X$ , we denote by  $f_0 : I_0 \rightarrow X$  the function defined as follows

$$f_0(t) = \begin{cases} f(t) & \text{if } t \in G \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in I_0 \setminus G. \end{cases}$$

Assume that the functions  $f : G \rightarrow X$  and  $F : \mathcal{I}_G \rightarrow X$  are given. Then, given a division  $(C_k) \in \mathcal{P}_G$ , we denote

$$f_k = f|_{C_k} \text{ and } F_k = F|_{\mathcal{I}_{C_k}}, \text{ for each } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let us start with the following auxiliary lemmas.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $f : G \rightarrow X$  be a function. Then, given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a gauge  $\delta$  on  $Z = G \setminus G^\circ$  such that for each  $\delta$ -fine  $Z$ -tagged  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition (or  $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition)  $\pi$  in  $I_0$  we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} f(t)|I| \right\| < \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* Define a function  $g_0 : I_0 \rightarrow X$  as follows

$$g_0(t) = \begin{cases} f(t) & \text{if } t \in Z \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, by Theorem 3.3.1 (or Corollary 3.3.2) in [20],  $g_0$  is McShane (or Henstock-Kurzweil) integrable on  $I_0$  and

$$(M) \int_I g_0 d\lambda = 0 \quad ((HK) \int_I g_0 d\lambda = 0), \text{ for all } I \in \mathcal{I}_{I_0}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.4.2 (or Lemma 3.4.1) in [20], given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a gauge  $\delta$  on  $Z$  such that for each  $\delta$ -fine  $Z$ -tagged  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition (or  $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition)  $\pi$  in  $I_0$  we have

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} g_0(t)|I| \right\| < \varepsilon,$$

and since  $g_0(t) = f(t)$  for all  $t \in Z$ , the last result proves the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $f : G \rightarrow X$  be a function, and let  $F : \mathcal{I}_G \rightarrow X$  be an additive interval function. If  $F$  has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible (or  $\mathcal{HK}$ -negligible) variation outside of  $G^\circ$ , then given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a gauge  $\delta$  on  $Z = G \setminus G^\circ$  such that for each  $\delta$ -fine  $Z$ -tagged  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition (or  $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition)  $\pi$  in  $I_0$  we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} \left( f(t)|I| - \sum_{k: |I \cap I_k| > 0} F(I \cap I_k) \right) \right\| < \varepsilon,$$

whenever  $(I_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\circ}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $F$  has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -negligible) variation outside of  $G^\circ$ , given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a gauge  $\delta_\nu$  on  $(G^\circ)^c$  such that for each  $\delta_\nu$ -fine  $(G^\circ)^c$ -tagged  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition)  $\pi$  in  $I_0$ , we have

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} \left( \sum_{k: |I \cap I_k| > 0} F(I \cap I_k) \right) \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

whenever  $(I_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\circ}$ .

By Lemma 3.1, there exists a gauge  $\delta_0$  on  $Z$  such that for each  $\delta_0$ -fine  $Z$ -tagged  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition)  $\pi$  in  $I_0$ , we have

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} f(t)|I| \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Define a gauge  $\delta$  on  $Z$  by  $\delta(t) = \min\{\delta_v(t), \delta_0(t)\}$  for all  $t \in Z$ . Let  $\pi$  be a  $\delta$ -fine  $Z$ -tagged  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition ( $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition)  $\pi$  in  $I_0$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} \left( f(t)|I| - \sum_{k:|I \cap I_k| > 0} F(I \cap I_k) \right) \right\| &\leq \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} f(t)|I| \right\| \\ &+ \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} \left( \sum_{k:|I \cap I_k| > 0} F(I \cap I_k) \right) \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and this ends the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $f : G \rightarrow X$  be a function and let  $F : \mathcal{I}_G \rightarrow X$  be an additive interval function. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $f$  is Dunford-McShane integrable on  $G$  with the primitive  $F$ ,
- (ii)  $f_0$  is McShane integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F_0$  such that  $F_0(I) = F(I)$ , for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}_G$ ,
- (iii)  $F$  is a Dunford-function and has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible variation outside of  $G^\circ$ , and given any division  $(C_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\circ}$ , each  $f_k$  is McShane integrable on  $C_k$  with the primitive  $F_k$ .

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) Assume that  $f$  is Dunford-McShane integrable on  $G$  with the primitive  $F$  and let  $(C_k)$  be any division of  $G^\circ$ . Then, given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a gauge  $\delta$  on  $G^\circ$  such that for each  $\delta$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition  $\pi$  in  $G^\circ$ , we have

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} ( f(t)|I| - F(I) ) \right\| < \varepsilon.$$

By Definition 2.3,  $F$  is a Dunford-function and has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible variation outside of  $G^\circ$ . Thus, it remains to prove that each  $f_k$  is McShane integrable on  $C_k$  with the primitive  $F_k$ . Let  $\pi_k$  be a  $\delta_k$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition of  $C_k$ , where  $\delta_k = \delta|_{C_k}$ . Then,  $\pi_k$  is a  $\delta$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition in  $G^\circ$  and, therefore,

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_k} ( f_k(t)|I| - F_k(I) ) \right\| = \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_k} ( f(t)|I| - F(I) ) \right\| < \varepsilon.$$

This means that  $f_k$  is McShane integrable on  $C_k$  with the primitive  $F_k$ .

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) Assume that (iii) holds. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and let  $(C_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\circ}$ . Then, since each function  $f_k$  is McShane integrable on  $C_k$  with the primitive  $F_k$ , by Lemma 3.4.2 in [20], there exists a gauge  $\delta_k$  on  $C_k$  such that for each  $\delta_k$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition  $\pi_k$  in  $C_k$ , we have

$$(3.1) \quad \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_k} ( f_k(t)|I| - F_k(I) ) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

Note that for any  $t \in G^\circ = \cup_k C_k$ , we have the following possible cases:

- there exists  $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $t \in (C_{i_0})^\circ$ ,
- there exists  $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $t \in C_{j_0} \setminus (C_{j_0})^\circ$ . In this case, there exists a finite set  $\mathcal{N}_t = \{j \in \mathbb{N} : t \in C_j \setminus (C_j)^\circ\}$  such that  $t \in \bigcap_{j \in \mathcal{N}_t} C_j$  and  $t \notin C_k$ , for all  $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{N}_t$ . Hence,  $t \in (\cup_{j \in \mathcal{N}_t} C_j)^\circ$ .

For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , choose  $\delta_k$  so that for any  $t \in G^\circ$ , we have

$$t \in (C_k)^\circ \Rightarrow B_m(t, \delta_k(t)) \subset C_k$$

and

$$t \in C_k \setminus (C_k)^\circ \Rightarrow B_m(t, \delta_k(t)) \subset \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{N}_t} C_j.$$

Since  $F$  has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible variation outside of  $G^\circ$ , there exists a gauge  $\delta_v$  on  $I_0 \setminus G^\circ$  such that for each  $(I_0 \setminus G^\circ)$ -tagged  $\delta_v$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition  $\pi_v$  in  $I_0$ , we have

$$(3.2) \quad \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_v} \left( \sum_{k:|I \cap C_k| > 0} F(I \cap C_k) \right) \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

By Lemma 3.2, we can choose  $\delta_v$  so that for each  $(G \setminus G^o)$ -tagged  $\delta_v$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition  $\pi$  in  $I_0$ , we have

$$(3.3) \quad \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} \left( f(t)|I| - \sum_{k:|I \cap C_k| > 0} F(I \cap C_k) \right) \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

By hypothesis, we have also that  $F$  is a Dunford-function. Therefore, we can define an additive interval function  $F_0 : \mathcal{I}_{I_0} \rightarrow X$  as follows

$$(3.4) \quad F_0(I) = \sum_{k:|I \cap C_k| > 0} F(I \cap C_k), \text{ for all } I \in \mathcal{I}_{I_0}.$$

Clearly,  $F_0(I) = F(I)$ , for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}_G$ . We will show that  $f_0$  is McShane integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F_0$ . To see this, we first define a gauge  $\delta_0 : I_0 \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  as follows. For each  $t \in G^o$ , we choose

$$\delta_0(t) = \begin{cases} \delta_{i_0}(t) & \text{if } t \in (C_{i_0})^o \\ \min\{\delta_j(t) : j \in \mathcal{N}_t\} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

while for  $t \in I_0 \setminus G^o$ ,  $\delta_0(t) = \delta_v(t)$ . Let  $\pi$  be an arbitrary  $\delta_0$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition of  $I_0$ . Then,

$$\pi = \pi_1 \cup \pi_2 \cup \pi_3 \cup \pi_4,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &= \{(t, I) \in \pi : (\exists i_0 \in \mathbb{N})[t \in (C_{i_0})^o]\} \\ \pi_2 &= \{(t, I) \in \pi : (\exists j_0 \in \mathbb{N})[t \in C_{j_0} \setminus (C_{j_0})^o]\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_3 &= \{(t, I) \in \pi : t \in G \setminus G^o\} \\ \pi_4 &= \{(t, I) \in \pi : t \in I_0 \setminus G\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} (f_0(t)|I| - F_0(I)) \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_1} (f(t)|I| - F(I)) \right\| \\ & + \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_2} (f(t)|I| - F(I)) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_3} (f(t)|I| - F_0(I)) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_4} F_0(I) \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, if we define

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1^k &= \{(t, I) : (t, I) \in \pi_1, t \in (C_k)^o\}, \\ \pi_2^k &= \{(t, I \cap C_k) : (t, I) \in \pi_2, t \in C_k \setminus (C_k)^o, |I \cap C_k| > 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

then  $\pi_1^k$  and  $\pi_2^k$  are  $\delta_k$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partitions in  $C_k$ . Therefore, by (3.1), it follows that

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_1} (f(t)|I| - F(I)) \right\| &= \left\| \sum_k \sum_{\substack{(t,I) \in \pi_1 \\ t \in (C_k)^o}} (f(t)|I| - F(I)) \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_k \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_1^k} (f_k(t)|I| - F_k(I)) \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{\varepsilon}{4} = \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.7) \quad & \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_2} (f(t)|I| - F(I)) \right\| = \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_2} \left( \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_t \\ |I \cap C_j| > 0}} (f(t) \cdot |I \cap C_j| - F(I \cap C_j)) \right) \right\| \\
& = \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_2} \left( \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{N}_t \\ |I \cap C_j| > 0}} (f_j(t) \cdot |I \cap C_j| - F_j(I \cap C_j)) \right) \right\| \\
& = \left\| \sum_k \left( \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_2^k} (f_k(t) \cdot |I \cap C_k| - F_k(I \cap C_k)) \right) \right\| \\
& \leq \sum_k \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_2^k} (f_k(t) \cdot |I \cap C_k| - F_k(I \cap C_k)) \right\| \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{\varepsilon}{4} = \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

We have also that  $\pi_3$  is a  $(G \setminus G^o)$ -tagged  $\delta_v$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition in  $I_0$  and  $\pi_4$  is  $(I_0 \setminus G)$ -tagged  $\delta_v$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition in  $I_0$ . Therefore, (3.2) and (3.3) together with (3.4) yield

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_3} (f(t)|I| - F_0(I)) \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_4} F_0(I) \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

The last result together with (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7) yields

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} (f_0(t) \cdot |I| - F_0(I)) \right\| < \varepsilon,$$

and since  $\pi$  was an arbitrary  $\delta_0$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition of  $I_0$ , it follows that  $f_0$  is McShane integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F_0$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) Assume that (ii) holds. Then, by Lemma 3.4.2 in [20], given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a gauge  $\delta_0$  on  $I_0$  such that for each  $\delta_0$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition  $\pi_0$  in  $I_0$ , we have

$$(3.8) \quad \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} (f_0(t)|I| - F_0(I)) \right\| < \varepsilon.$$

The gauge  $\delta_0$  can be chosen so that for each  $t \in I_0$ , we have

$$t \in G^o \Rightarrow B_m(t, \delta_0(t)) \subset G^o.$$

By Lemma 3.1, we can also choose  $\delta_0$  so that

$$(3.9) \quad \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} f_0(t)|I| \right\| < \varepsilon,$$

whenever  $\pi$  is  $(G \setminus G^o)$ -tagged  $\delta_0$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition in  $I_0$ .

Hence, if we define  $\delta = \delta_0|_{G^o}$ , then for each  $\delta$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition  $\pi$  in  $G^o$ , we have

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} (f(t)|I| - F(I)) \right\| < \varepsilon.$$

Thus, it remains to show that  $F$  is a Dunford-function and has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible variation outside of  $G^o$ .

We first show that  $F$  is a Dunford-function. Let  $(I_k) \in \mathcal{P}_G$ .

Since for any  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k:|I \cap I_k|>0} F(I \cap I_k) &= \sum_{k:|I \cap I_k|>0} F_0(I \cap I_k) = \sum_{k:|I \cap I_k|>0} (M) \int_{I \cap I_k} f_0 d\lambda \\ &= (M) \int_{I \cap (\cup_k I_k)} f_0 d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

the series  $\sum_{k:|I \cap I_k|>0} F(I \cap I_k)$  is unconditionally convergent in  $X$ .

If  $(I_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^o}$  and  $I \in \mathcal{I}_G$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k:|I \cap I_k|>0} F(I \cap I_k) &= (M) \int_{I \cap G^o} f_0 d\lambda = (M) \int_{I \cap G} f_0 d\lambda \\ &= (M) \int_I f_0 d\lambda = F_0(I) = F(I). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $F$  is a Dunford-function.

Finally, we show that  $F$  has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible variation outside of  $G^o$ . To see this, we define a gauge  $\delta_v$  on  $(G^o)^c$  by  $\delta_v(t) = \delta_0(t)$  if  $t \in I_0 \setminus G^o$ , while for  $t \notin I_0$ , we choose  $\delta_v(t)$  so that  $B_m(t, \delta_v(t)) \cap I_0 = \emptyset$ . Assume that  $\pi_v$  is a  $(G^o)^c$ -tagged  $\delta_v$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . Hence,

$$\pi_0 = \{(t, I) \in \pi_v, t \in I_0 \setminus G^o, |I \cap I_0| > 0\}$$

is a  $\delta_0$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition in  $I_0$ . Note that  $\pi_0 = \pi_a \cup \pi_b$ , where

$$\pi_a = \{(t, J) \in \pi_0 : t \in I_0 \setminus G\} \text{ and } \pi_b = \{(t, J) \in \pi_0 : t \in (G \setminus G^o)\}.$$

Since  $\pi_a$  and  $\pi_b$  are  $\delta_0$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partitions in  $I_0$ , by (3.8) and (3.9), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_0} F_0(J) \right\| &\leq \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_a} F_0(J) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_b} F_0(J) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_a} (f_0(t)|J| - F_0(J)) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_b} (f_0(t)|J| - F_0(J)) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_b} f_0(t)|J| \right\| < 3\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have also

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_0} F_0(J) \right\| &= \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_0} (M) \int_J f_0 d\lambda \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_0} \left( (M) \int_{J \setminus G} f_0 d\lambda + (M) \int_{J \cap (G \setminus G^o)} f_0 d\lambda + (M) \int_{J \cap G^o} f_0 d\lambda \right) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_0} (M) \int_{J \cap G^o} f_0 d\lambda \right\| = \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_0} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} (M) \int_{J \cap I_k} f_0 d\lambda \right) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_0} \left( \sum_{k:|J \cap I_k|>0} F_0(J \cap I_k) \right) \right\| = \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_0} \left( \sum_{k:|J \cap I_k|>0} F(J \cap I_k) \right) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_v} \left( \sum_{k:|I \cap I_k|>0} F(I \cap I_k) \right) \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

whenever  $(I_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^o}$ . It follows that

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_v} \left( \sum_{k:|I \cap I_k|>0} F(I \cap I_k) \right) \right\| < 3\varepsilon.$$

This means that  $F$  has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible variation outside of  $G^o$ , and this ends the proof.  $\square$



Theorem 3.3 together with Theorem 3(c) in [12] yields immediately the following statement.

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $f : G \rightarrow X$  be a Dunford-McShane integrable function on  $G$  with the primitive  $F$  and let  $h : G \rightarrow X$  be a Dunford-McShane integrable function on  $G$  with the primitive  $H$ . Then,*

- (i)  $f + h$  is Dunford-McShane integrable function on  $G$  with the primitive  $F + H$ ,
- (ii)  $r.f$  is Dunford-McShane integrable function on  $G$  with the primitive  $r.F$ , where  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The next theorem follows from Theorem 3.3 with  $G = I_0$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $f : I_0 \rightarrow X$  be a function and let  $F : \mathcal{I}_{I_0} \rightarrow X$  be an additive interval function. Then,  $f$  is McShane integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F$  if and only if we have*

- for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a gauge  $\delta_\varepsilon$  on  $(I_0)^\circ$  such that for each  $\delta_\varepsilon$ -fine  $\mathcal{M}$ -partition  $\pi$  in  $(I_0)^\circ$ , we have

$$\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} (f(t)|I| - F(I)) \| < \varepsilon,$$

- $F$  is a Dunford-function,
- $F$  has  $\mathcal{M}$ -negligible variation on  $Z = I_0 \setminus (I_0)^\circ$ .

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $f : G \rightarrow X$  be a function and let  $F : \mathcal{I}_G \rightarrow X$  be an additive interval function. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $f$  is the Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil integrable on  $G$  with the primitive  $F$ ,
- (ii)  $f_0$  is the Henstock-Kurzweil integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F_0$  such that

$$(3.10) \quad F_0(I) = \sum_{k: |I \cap C_k| > 0} F(I \cap C_k), \text{ for all } I \in \mathcal{I}_{I_0}$$

whenever  $(C_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\circ}$ , and  $F$  is a Dunford-function,

- (iii)  $F$  is a Dunford-function and has  $\mathcal{HK}$ -negligible variation outside of  $G^\circ$ , and given any division  $(C_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\circ}$ , each  $f_k$  is Henstock-Kurzweil integrable on  $C_k$  with the primitive  $F_k$ .

*Proof.* By the same manner as in Theorem 3.3, it can be proved (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) and (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii).

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) Assume that (ii) holds. Then, by Lemma 3.4.1 in [20] and by Lemma 3.1, given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a gauge  $\delta_0$  on  $I_0$  such that for each  $\delta_0$ -fine  $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition  $\pi$  in  $I_0$ , we have

$$(3.11) \quad \| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} (f_0(t)|I| - F_0(I)) \| < \varepsilon,$$

and for each  $\delta_0$ -fine  $(G \setminus G^\circ)$ -tagged  $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition  $\pi$  in  $I_0$ , we have

$$(3.12) \quad \| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} f_0(t)|I| \| < \varepsilon.$$

We can also choose  $\delta_0$  so that  $B_m(t, \delta_0(t)) \subset G^\circ$ , for all  $t \in G^\circ$ . Hence, if we define  $\delta = \delta_0|_{G^\circ}$ , then for each  $\delta$ -fine  $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition  $\pi$  in  $G^\circ$ , we have

$$\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} (f(t)|I| - F(I)) \| < \varepsilon.$$

Thus, it remains to show that  $F$  has  $\mathcal{HK}$ -negligible variation outside of  $G^\circ$ . To see this, define a gauge  $\delta_v$  on  $(G^\circ)^c$  by  $\delta_v(t) = \delta_0(t)$  if  $t \in I_0 \setminus G^\circ$ , while for  $t \notin I_0$ , we choose  $\delta_v(t)$  so that  $B_m(t, \delta_v(t)) \cap I_0 = \emptyset$ . Assume that  $\pi_v$  is a  $(G^\circ)^c$ -tagged  $\delta_v$ -fine  $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . Hence,

$$\pi_0 = \{(t, I \cap I_0) : (t, I) \in \pi_v, t \in I_0 \setminus G^\circ, |I \cap I_0| > 0\}$$

is a  $\delta_0$ -fine  $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition in  $I_0$ . Note that  $\pi_0 = \pi_a \cup \pi_b$ , where

$$\pi_a = \{(t, J) \in \pi_0 : t \in I_0 \setminus G\} \text{ and } \pi_b = \{(t, J) \in \pi_0 : t \in (G \setminus G^\circ)\}.$$

Since  $\pi_a$  and  $\pi_b$  are  $\delta_0$ -fine  $\mathcal{HK}$ -partitions in  $I_0$ , by (3.11) and (3.12), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_0} F_0(J) \right\| &\leq \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_a} F_0(J) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_b} F_0(J) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_a} (f_0(t)|J| - F_0(J)) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_b} (f_0(t)|J| - F_0(J)) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_b} f_0(t)|J| \right\| < 3\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (3.10), we have also

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_0} F_0(J) \right\| &= \left\| \sum_{(t,J) \in \pi_0} \left( \sum_{k: |J \cap C_k| > 0} F(J \cap C_k) \right) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_v} \left( \sum_{k: |I \cap C_k| > 0} F(I \cap C_k) \right) \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

whenever  $(C_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^o}$ . It follows that

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi_v} \left( \sum_{k: |I \cap C_k| > 0} F(I \cap C_k) \right) \right\| < 3\varepsilon.$$

This means that  $F$  has  $\mathcal{HK}$ -negligible variation outside of  $G^o$ , and this ends the proof.  $\square$

It easy to see that Theorem 3.6 together with Theorem 3.3.6 in [20] yields the following statement.

**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $f : G \rightarrow X$  be a Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil integrable function on  $G$  with the primitive  $F$  and let  $h : G \rightarrow X$  be a Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil integrable function on  $G$  with the primitive  $H$ . Then,*

- (i)  $f + h$  is Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil integrable function on  $G$  with the primitive  $F + H$ ,
- (ii)  $r.f$  is Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil integrable function on  $G$  with the primitive  $r.F$ , where  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The next theorem follows from Theorem 3.6 with  $G = I_0$ .

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $f : I_0 \rightarrow X$  be a function and let  $F : \mathcal{I}_{I_0} \rightarrow X$  be a Dunford-function. Then,  $f$  is Henstock-Kurzweil integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F$ , if and only if we have*

- for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a gauge  $\delta_\varepsilon$  on  $(I_0)^o$  such that for each  $\delta_\varepsilon$ -fine  $\mathcal{HK}$ -partition  $\pi$  in  $(I_0)^o$ , we have

$$\left\| \sum_{(t,I) \in \pi} (f(t)|I| - F(I)) \right\| < \varepsilon,$$

- $F$  has  $\mathcal{HK}$ -negligible variation on  $Z = I_0 \setminus (I_0)^o$ .

Finally, we are going to prove a relationship between the Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil and Dunford-McShane integrals in terms of the Dunford integral.

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let  $f : I_0 \rightarrow X$  be a function and let  $F : \mathcal{I}_{I_0} \rightarrow X$  be an additive interval function. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $f$  is Dunford integrable and Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F$ ,
- (ii)  $f$  is Dunford-McShane integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F$ .

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) Assume that (i) holds.

We first claim that

$$(3.13) \quad (D) \quad \int_I f d\lambda = x_I^{**} \in e(X), \text{ for all } I \in \mathcal{I}_{I_0}.$$

To see this, let  $I$  be an arbitrary closed non-degenerate interval in  $\mathcal{I}_{I_0}$ . Then,

$$x_I^{**}(x^*) = (M) \quad \int_I x^* f d\lambda, \text{ for all } x^* \in X^*,$$

and since McShane integrable functions are Henstock-Kurweil integrable, it follows that

$$(3.14) \quad x_I^*(x^*) = (HK) \int_I x^* f d\lambda, \text{ for all } x^* \in X^*.$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 3.6,  $f$  is Henstock-Kurzweil integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F$  and, therefore, by Theorem 6.1.1 in [20], it follows that

$$(HK) \int_I x^* f d\lambda = x^* \left( (HK) \int_I f d\lambda \right), \text{ for all } x^* \in X^*.$$

The last result together with (3.14) yields that (3.13) holds.

We now claim that for any  $(I_k) \in \mathcal{P}_{I_0}$  the series

$$(3.15) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} (D) \int_{I_k} f d\lambda$$

is norm convergent in  $e(X)$ . Indeed, since  $F$  is a Dunford-function and the equality

$$\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} (D) \int_{I_k} f d\lambda = \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} e(F(I_k))$$

holds, it follows that (3.15) is norm convergent in  $e(X)$ .

By virtue of Lemma 6 in [13],  $f$  is Pettis integrable. Thus, we have  $f$  is Pettis integrable and Henstock-Kurzweil integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F$ . Therefore, by Theorem's Fremlin, Theorem 6.2.6 in [20], we obtain that  $f$  is McShane integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F$ . Further, by Theorem 3.3, it follows that  $f$  is Dunford-McShane integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) Assume that  $f$  is Dunford-McShane integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F$ . Then, by Definition 2.3, it follows that  $f$  is Dunford-Henstock-Kurzweil integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F$ .

By Theorem 3.3, it follows that  $f$  is McShane integrable on  $I_0$  with the primitive  $F$ . Hence, by Theorem 6.2.6 in [20],  $f$  is Pettis integrable and, therefore,  $f$  is Dunford integrable, and this ends the proof.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Bongiorno, B., *The Henstock-Kurzweil integral, Handbook of measure theory*, Vol. I, II, 587-615, North-Holland, Amsterdam, (2002).
- [2] Cao, S. S., *The Henstock integral for Banach-valued functions*, SEA Bull. Math., **16** (1992), 35-40.
- [3] J. Diestel and J. J. Uhl, *Vector Measures*, Math. Surveys, vol. 15, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1977.
- [4] Di Piazza, L. and Musial, K., *A characterization of variationally McShane integrable Banach-space valued functions*, Illinois J.Math., **45** (2001), 279-289.
- [5] Folland, G. B., *Modern techniques and their applications*. Second edition. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1999).
- [6] Fremlin, D. H., *The Henstock and McShane integrals of vector-valued functions*, Illinois J.Math. **38** (1994), 471-479.
- [7] Fremlin, D. H., Mendoza, J., *The integration of vector-valued functions*, Illinois J. Math. **38** (1994) 127-147.
- [8] Fremlin, D. H., *The generalized McShane integral*, Illinois J. Math. **39** (1995), 39-67.
- [9] Gordon, R. A., *The McShane integral of Banach-valued functions*, Illinois J. Math. **34** (1990), 557-567.
- [10] Gordon, R. A., *The Denjoy extension of the Bochner, Pettis, and Dunford integrals*, Studia Math. T.XCII (1989), 73-91.
- [11] Gordon, R. A., *The Integrals of Lebesgue, Denjoy, Perron, and Henstock*, Amer. Math. Soc., (1994).
- [12] Guoju, Y., and Schwabik, Š., *The McShane integral and the Pettis integral of Banach space-valued functions defined on  $\mathbb{R}^m$* , Illinois J. Math. **46** (2002), 1125-1144.
- [13] Guoju, Y., *On Henstock-Kurzweil and McShane integrals of Banach space-valued functions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **330** (2007), 753-765.
- [14] Kaliaj, S. B., *The New Extensions of the Henstock-Kurzweil and the McShane Integrals of Vector-Valued Functions*, Mediterr. J. Math. (2018) 15: 22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00009-018-1067-2>.
- [15] Kurzweil, J., Schwabik, Š., *On the McShane integrability of Banach space-valued functions*, Real Anal. Exchange **2** (2003-2004), 763-780.
- [16] Lee P. Y., *Lanzhou Lectures on Henstock Integration*, Series in Real Analysis 2, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., (1989).
- [17] Lee P. Y., and Vyborny, R., *The Integral: An Easy Approach after Kurzweil and Henstock*, Australian Mathematical Society Lecture Series 14, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2000).
- [18] Lee. T. Y., *Henstock-Kurzweil Integration on Euclidean Spaces*, Series in Real Analysis 12, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., (2011).
- [19] McShane, E. J., *Unifed integration*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1983.

- [20] Schwabik, Š. and Guoju, Y., *Topics in Banach Space Integration*, Series in Real Analysis, vol. 10, World Scientific, Hackensack, NJ, (2005).

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, SCIENCE NATURAL FACULTY, UNIVERSITY OF ELBASAN, ELBASAN, ALBANIA.  
*E-mail address:* sokol\_bush@yahoo.co.uk