

# Isomorphism Theorems between Models of Mixed Choice (Revised)

Jean Goubault-Larrecq  
 Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, ENS Paris-Saclay,  
 Laboratoire Méthodes Formelles, 91190, Gif-sur-Yvette, France.  
 jgl@lmf.cnrs.fr

November 21, 2024

## Abstract

We relate the so-called powercone models of mixed non-deterministic and probabilistic choice proposed by Tix, Keimel, Plotkin, Mislove, Ouaknine, Worrell, Morgan, and McIver, to our own models of previsions. Under suitable topological assumptions, we show that they are isomorphic. We rely on Keimel’s cone-theoretic variants of the classical Hahn-Banach separation theorems, using functional analytic methods, and on the Schröder-Simpson Theorem. **Lemma 3.4 in the original 2017 version, published at MSCS, had a wrong proof, and we prove a repaired, albeit slightly less general version here.**

MSC [2020] classification: 46E27; 60B05; 68Q87; 28C05; 46T99

## 1 Introduction

Consider the question of giving semantics to a programming language with *mixed choice*, i.e., with two interacting forms of choice, non-deterministic and probabilistic. For example, probabilistic choice can be the result of random coin flips, while non-deterministic choice can be the result of interaction with an environment, which decides which option to take in our place.

We shall be especially interested in domain-theoretic models, where the space of all choices over a directed complete poset (dcpo) of values is itself a dcpo.

Models of only one form of choice have been known for a long time. For non-deterministic choice, the best known models are the Hoare powerdomain of angelic non-determinism, the Smyth powerdomain of demonic non-determinism, and the Plotkin powerdomain of erratic non-determinism, see (Abramsky and Jung, 1994, Section 6.2) or (Gierz et al., 2003, Section IV.8): there, choices are represented as certain sets of values, from which the environment may choose. For probabilistic choice, a natural model is the Jones-Plotkin model of continuous valuations (Jones, 1990), where choices are represented as objects akin to

(sub)probability distributions over the set of possible values, called continuous valuations.

Several denotational models of mixed choice were proposed in the past. Let us list some of them:

1. In the *powercone models*, choices are modeled as certain sets  $E$  of continuous valuations. These sets are, in particular, convex, meaning that  $a\nu + (1 - a)\nu'$  is in  $E$  for all  $\nu, \nu' \in E$  and  $a \in [0, 1]$ . Choice proceeds by picking a valuation  $\nu$  from the set  $E$ , then drawing a value  $v$  at random according to  $\nu$ . The probability that  $v$  may fall in some set  $U$  is  $\sup_{\nu \in E} \nu(U)$ , while the probability that it must fall in  $U$  is  $\inf_{\nu \in E} \nu(U)$ . Such models were proposed and studied by Mislove (Mislove, 2000), by Tix *et al.* (Tix, 1999; Tix et al., 2009), and by Morgan and McIver (McIver and Morgan, 2001).
2. In the *prevision models*, choices are modeled as certain second-order functionals  $F$ , called previsions. They represent directly the probability that a value  $v$  may fall in  $U$ , or must fall in  $U$ , depending on the kind of prevision, as  $F(\chi_U)$ , where  $\chi_U$  is the characteristic function of  $U$ . These were proposed by the author in (Goubault-Larrecq, 2007), and also underlie the (generalized) predicate transformer semantics of (Keimel and Plotkin, 2009) or of (Morgan et al., 1996).
3. The models of indexed valuations (Varacca, 2003; Varacca, 2002) are alternate models for mere probabilistic choice. They combine well with angelic non-determinism, yielding models akin to the powercone models, except that we do not require the sets of indexed valuations/continuous random variables to be convex. Categorically, the combination is obtained via a distributivity law between monads.
4. The monad coproduct models of (Lüth, 1997), once instantiated to the monads of non-blocking non-deterministic and probabilistic choice (Ghani and Uustalu, 2004), also yield a model of mixed choice, which the latter authors argue is close to Varacca's.

Our goal is to relate the first two, and to show that, under mild assumptions, they are isomorphic. We have already announced this result in (Goubault-Larrecq, 2008). The proof was complex and was limited to continuous dcpos. Similar isomorphisms were proved, with the general aim of giving generalized predicate transformer semantics to powercone models, by Keimel and Plotkin (Keimel and Plotkin, 2009), again for continuous dcpos, and for unbounded continuous valuations, not (sub)probability valuations<sup>1</sup>. We generalize these results to much larger classes of topological spaces, using more streamlined and more general arguments than in (Goubault-Larrecq, 2008).

---

<sup>1</sup>While we were preparing the final version of this document, Klaus Keimel informed me of a newer paper by the same authors (Keimel and Plotkin, 2015), which, among other things, also deals with probability and subprobability valuations, relying on a novel notion of Kegelspitze.




Figure 1: Convex hulls

The basic idea is simple. There is a map  $r$  from the powercone model, which maps any set  $E$  of continuous valuations to  $F = r(E)$ , defined by  $F(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\nu \in E} \int_x h(x) d\nu$  (in the angelic case; replace sup by inf in the demonic case). One needs to show that it is continuous, and that it has a continuous inverse.

Our approach is typical of convex analysis. By a form of the Riesz representation theorem, which we shall make explicit below, there is an isomorphism between continuous valuations  $\nu$  and *linear* previsions, i.e., previsions  $F$  such that  $F(a \cdot h + (1 - a) \cdot h') = aF(h) + (1 - a)F(h')$  for all  $a \in [0, 1]$ : define  $F(h)$  as  $\int_x h(x) d\nu$ . It is useful to imagine such linear previsions by drawing the curve  $y = F(h)$ , where  $h$  serves as  $x$ -coordinate, and convincing oneself that such curves should be straight lines. Modulo this isomorphism,  $r$  maps a set  $E$  of linear previsions (the straight lines in Figure 1) to its pointwise sup, shown as a fat curve. This fat curve is always convex (meaning that  $F(a \cdot h + (1 - a) \cdot h') \leq aF(h) + (1 - a)F(h')$  for all  $a \in [0, 1]$ ), and will be our (angelic) prevision  $r(E)$ . Conversely, given any convex, fat curve  $F$ , the set of straight lines below it form a convex set of linear previsions  $s(F)$ .

Showing that  $s$  is a right inverse to  $r$ , i.e., that  $r(s(F)) = F$  is essentially the Hahn-Banach theorem (or the corresponding variant in our setting). The difficult part will be to show that  $s$  takes its values in the right space, and that it is continuous.

**Outline.** We present all needed domain-theoretic, topological, and cone-theoretic notions in Section 2. This is a fairly long section, and our only excuse is that we have tried to make the paper as self-contained as possible. Section 3 exhibits our prevision models as retracts of spaces of certain sets (closed, compact, or lenses) of certain continuous valuations (unbounded, subprobability, probability). The only difference that these sets exhibit compared to powercones is that we are not requiring them to be convex. The existence of these retractions has a certain number of interesting consequences, which we also list there. Finally, using the Schröder-Simpson Theorem, we establish the desired isomorphisms in Section 4. We conclude in Section 5.

This paper is a revised version of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017), fixing a mistake in Lemma 3.4 there and its consequences throughout the paper. The changes will be shown in color, as with the current paragraph. Some typos and minor errors have been corrected, too, most often without any particular highlighting. In an additional Section 6, we investigate the consequences of the mistake on papers in the literature. In short, no paper seems to be affected by the mistake.

## 2 Preliminaries

We refer the reader to (Gierz et al., 2003; Abramsky and Jung, 1994; Mislove, 1998) for background on domain theory and topology. We shall write  $x \in X \mapsto f(x)$  for the function that maps every element  $x$  of some space  $X$  to the value  $f(x)$ , sometimes omitting mention of the space  $X$ .

**Domain Theory.** A set with a partial ordering  $\leq$  is a *poset*. We write  $\uparrow E$  for  $\{y \in X \mid \exists x \in E \cdot x \leq y\}$ ,  $\downarrow E \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{y \in X \mid \exists x \in E \cdot y \leq x\}$ . A *dcpo* is a poset in which every directed family  $(x_i)_{i \in I}$  has a least upper bound (a.k.a., supremum or *sup*)  $\sup_{i \in I} x_i$ . Symmetrically, we call *inf* (or infimum) any greatest lower bound. A family  $(x_i)_{i \in I}$  is *directed* iff it is non-empty, and any two elements have an upper bound in the family. Any poset can be equipped with the *Scott topology*, whose opens are the upward closed sets  $U$  such that whenever  $(x_i)_{i \in I}$  is a directed family that has a least upper bound in  $U$ , then some  $x_i$  is in  $U$  already. A dcpo  $X$  is *pointed* iff it has a least element, which we shall always write  $\perp$ .

Given a poset  $X$ , we shall write  $X_\sigma$  for  $X$  seen as a topological space, equipped with its Scott topology.

We shall always consider  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , or  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ , as posets, and implicit endow them with the Scott topology of their ordering  $\leq$ . We shall still write  $\mathbb{R}_{+\sigma}$  or  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  to make this fact clear. The opens of  $\mathbb{R}_+$  in its Scott topology are the intervals  $(r, +\infty)$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , together with  $\mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\emptyset$ . Those of  $[0, 1]$  are  $\emptyset$ ,  $[0, 1]$ , and  $(r, 1]$ ,  $r \in [0, 1)$ . Those of  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  are  $\emptyset$ ,  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ , and  $(r, +\infty]$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .

Given two dcpos  $X$  and  $Y$ , a map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is *Scott-continuous* iff it is monotonic and  $f(\sup_{i \in I} x_i) = \sup_{i \in I} f(x_i)$  for every directed family  $(x_i)_{i \in I}$  in  $X$ .

We write  $[X \rightarrow Y]$  for the space of all Scott-continuous maps from  $X$  to  $Y$ , for two dcpos  $X$  and  $Y$ . This is again a dcpo, with the pointwise ordering. We also write  $\mathcal{L}X$  for  $[X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]$ . Instead of writing  $(\mathcal{L}X)_\sigma$ , we will implicitly assume that  $\mathcal{L}X$  is given its Scott topology, unless we say otherwise.

The *way-below* relation  $\ll$  on a poset  $X$  is defined by  $x \ll y$  iff, for every directed family  $(z_i)_{i \in I}$  that has a least upper bound  $z$  such that  $y \leq z$ , then  $x \leq z_i$  for some  $i \in I$  already. We also say that  $x$  *approximates*  $y$ . Note that  $x \ll y$  implies  $x \leq y$ , and that  $x' \leq x \ll y \leq y'$  implies  $x' \ll y'$ . However,  $\ll$  is not reflexive or irreflexive in general. Write  $\uparrow E \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{y \in X \mid \exists x \in E \cdot x \ll y\}$ ,  $\downarrow E \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{y \in X \mid \exists x \in E \cdot y \ll x\}$ .  $X$  is *continuous* iff, for every  $x \in X$ ,  $\downarrow x$  is

a directed family, and has  $x$  as least upper bound. A *basis* is a subset  $B$  of  $X$  such that any element  $x \in X$  is the least upper bound of a directed family of elements way-below  $x$  in  $B$ . Then  $X$  is continuous if and only if it has a basis, and in this case  $X$  itself is the largest basis.

In a continuous poset with basis  $B$ , *interpolation holds*: if  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  are finitely many elements way-below  $x$ , then there is a  $b \in B$  such that  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  are way-below  $b$ , and  $b \ll x$ . (See for example (Mislove, 1998, Section 4.2).) In this case, the Scott opens are exactly the unions of sets of the form  $\uparrow b$ ,  $b \in B$ .

**Topology.** A topology  $\mathcal{O}$  on a set  $X$  is a collection of subsets of  $X$ , called the *opens*, such that any union and any finite intersection of opens is open. The *interior*  $\text{int}(A)$  of a subset  $A$  of  $X$  is the largest open included in  $A$ . A *closed* subset is the complement of an open subset. The *closure*  $\text{cl}(A)$  of  $A$  is the smallest closed subset containing  $A$ . An *open neighborhood*  $U$  of a point  $x$  is merely an open subset that contains  $x$ .

A topology  $\mathcal{O}_1$  is *finer* than  $\mathcal{O}_2$  if and only if it contains all opens of  $\mathcal{O}_2$ . We also say that  $\mathcal{O}_2$  is *coarser* than  $\mathcal{O}_1$ .

A *base*  $\mathcal{B}$  (not a basis) of  $\mathcal{O}$  is a collection of opens such that every open is a union of elements of the base. Equivalently, a family  $\mathcal{B}$  of opens is a base iff for every  $x \in X$ , for every open  $U$  containing  $x$ , there is a  $V \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $x \in V \subseteq U$ . A *subbase* of  $\mathcal{O}$  is a collection of opens such that the finite intersections of elements of the subbase form a base; equivalently, the coarsest topology containing the elements of the subbase is  $\mathcal{O}$ , and then we say that  $\mathcal{O}$  is *generated* by the subbase.

The specialization preorder of a space  $X$  is defined by  $x \leq y$  if and only if for every open subset  $U$  of  $X$  that contains  $x$ ,  $U$  also contains  $y$ . For every subbase  $\mathcal{B}$  of the topology of  $X$ , it is equivalent to say that  $x \leq y$  if and only if every  $U \in \mathcal{B}$  that contains  $x$  also contains  $y$ . The specialization preorder of a dcpo  $X$ , with ordering  $\leq$ , in its Scott topology, is  $\leq$ . A topological space is  $T_0$  if and only if  $\leq$  is a partial ordering, not just a preorder. A subset  $A$  of  $X$  is *saturated* if and only if it is upward-closed in the specialization preorder  $\leq$ .

A map  $f$  from  $X$  to  $Y$  is *continuous* if and only if  $f^{-1}(V)$  is open in  $X$  for every open subset  $V$  of  $Y$ . The *characteristic* function  $\chi_A: X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  of a subset  $A$  of  $X$ , defined as mapping every  $x \in A$  to 1 and every  $x \notin A$  to 0, is continuous if and only if  $A$  is open in  $X$ . When  $X$  and  $Y$  are posets in their Scott topology,  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous if and only if it is Scott-continuous.

A subset  $K$  of a topological space  $X$  is *compact* if and only if every open cover of  $K$  has a finite subcover. The image  $f[K]$  of any compact subset of  $X$  by any continuous map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is compact in  $Y$ . A *homeomorphism* is a bijective continuous map whose inverse is also continuous.

The product of two topological spaces  $X, Y$  is the set  $X \times Y$  with the *product topology*, which is the coarsest that makes the projection maps  $\pi_1: X \times Y \rightarrow X$  and  $\pi_2: X \times Y \rightarrow Y$  continuous. Equivalently, a base of this topology is given by the *open rectangles*  $U \times V$ , where  $U$  is open in  $X$  and  $V$  is open in  $Y$ .

If  $X$  and  $Y$  are posets, viewed as topological spaces in their Scott topology,

then there is some ambiguity about the notation  $X \times Y$ . We might indeed see the latter as a topological product, with the just mentioned product topology, or as a product of two posets, with the Scott topology of the product ordering. In general, the Scott topology on the poset product is strictly finer than the product topology. This difficulty vanishes when  $X$  and  $Y$  are continuous posets: indeed, in this case the product poset is continuous as well, and a base of the Scott topology in the product is given by the subsets of the form  $\uparrow(x \times y)$ , which are also open in the product topology, as they coincide with  $\uparrow x \times \uparrow y$ .

A topological space  $X$  is *locally compact* if and only if for every  $x \in X$ , for every open subset  $U$  of  $X$  containing  $x$ , there is a compact subset  $K \subseteq U$  whose interior contains  $x$ . Then we can require  $K$  to be saturated as well, replacing  $K$  by its upward closure. In a locally compact space, every open subset  $U$  is the union of the directed family of all open subsets  $V$  such that  $V \subseteq Q \subseteq U$  for some compact saturated subset  $Q$ . A refinement of this is the notion of a *core-compact* space, which is by definition a space whose lattice of open subsets is a continuous dcpo. We shall agree to write  $\Subset$  for the way-below relation on the lattice of open sets of a space. Every locally compact space is core-compact, in which  $V \Subset U$  if and only if  $V \subseteq Q \subseteq U$  for some compact saturated subset  $Q$ .

Every continuous poset is locally compact, since whenever  $x \in U$ ,  $U$  open, there is an  $y \in U$  such that  $y \ll x$ , so that we can take  $K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \uparrow y$ , and  $V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \uparrow y$ .

A topological space  $X$  is *well-filtered* if and only if for every filtered family  $(Q_i)_{i \in I}$  of compact saturated subsets of  $X$  whose intersection is contained in some open subset  $U$ ,  $Q_i \subseteq U$  for some  $i \in I$  already. (A family of subsets is *filtered* if and only if it is directed in the reverse inclusion ordering  $\supseteq$ .) Every sober space is well-filtered (Gierz et al., 2003, Theorem II-1.21), and every continuous dcpo is sober in its Scott topology (Gierz et al., 2003, Corollary II-1.12). (We won't define sober spaces; but see the paragraph on Stone duality below.)

There are several topologies one can put on the space  $[X \rightarrow Y]$  of continuous maps from  $X$  to  $Y$ , and more generally on any space  $Z$  of continuous maps from  $X$  to  $Y$ . Looking at  $Z$ , resp.,  $[X \rightarrow Y]$ , as a subspace of the product  $Y^X$  (i.e., the space of *all* maps from  $X$  to  $Y$ ), we obtain the topology of *pointwise convergence*. This is also the coarsest topology that makes all the maps  $f \mapsto f(x)$  continuous, for each  $x \in X$ . We write  $[X \rightarrow Y]_{\text{p}}$  for  $[X \rightarrow Y]$  with the topology of pointwise convergence. Note that if  $Z \subseteq [X \rightarrow Y]$ , then the topology of pointwise convergence on  $Z$  is also the subspace topology from  $[X \rightarrow Y]_{\text{p}}$ .

When  $Y$  is  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  or  $\mathbb{R}_{+\sigma}$ , a subbasis of open sets of  $[X \rightarrow Y]_{\text{p}}$  is given by the subsets  $[x > r] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f \in [X \rightarrow Y] \mid f(x) > r\}$ ,  $x \in X$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Note that the latter are Scott open. In particular, the Scott topology on  $\mathcal{L}X$  is always finer than the topology of pointwise convergence.

**Coherence.** A space  $X$  is *coherent* if and only if the intersection of any two compact saturated subsets is again compact.

A related notion is the following. Say the the way-below relation  $\ll$  on a

lattice is *multiplicative* (see (Abramsky and Jung, 1994, Definition 7.2.18) or (Gierz et al., 2003, Proposition I.4.7)) if and only if for all  $x, y_1, y_2$  with  $x \ll y_1$  and  $x \ll y_2$ , we have  $x \ll \inf(y_1, y_2)$ . We have called *core-coherent* those spaces  $X$  such that the way-below relation  $\ll$  was multiplicative on the lattice of open subsets of  $X$  (Goubault-Larrecq, 2010, Comment before Definition 5.8).

It is easy to see that every locally compact, coherent space is (core-compact and) core-coherent. Indeed, assume  $V \in U_1, V \in U_2$ . By local compactness, there are compact saturated subsets  $Q_1, Q_2$  such that  $V \subseteq Q_1 \subseteq U_1, V \subseteq Q_2 \subseteq U_2$ . Then  $V \subseteq Q_1 \cap Q_2 \subseteq U_1 \cap U_2$ . Since  $X$  is coherent,  $Q_1 \cap Q_2$  is compact. So  $V \in U_1 \cap U_2$ . In fact, one can check that the sober, core-compact, and core-coherent spaces are exactly the sober, locally compact and coherent spaces (Abramsky and Jung, 1994, Theorem 7.2.19).

**Stable compactness.** A space that is sober, locally compact, and coherent is called *stably locally compact*. It is *stably compact* iff stably locally compact and compact. An equivalent definition of a stably locally compact space is a space that is  $T_0$ , locally compact, well-filtered, and coherent.

Stably compact spaces were first studied in (Nachbin, 1965), see also (Gierz et al., 2003, Section VI-6), or (Alvarez-Manilla et al., 2004, Section 2). They enjoy the following property, called de Groot duality. Let  $X^d$  be  $X$ , topologized by taking as opens the complements of compact saturated subsets of  $X$ . Then  $X^d$  is stably compact again, and  $X^{dd} = X$ . Moreover, the specialization ordering of  $X^d$  is  $\geq$ , the opposite of the specialization ordering of  $X$ .

The *patch topology* on a stably compact space  $A$  is the coarsest topology finer than those of  $A$  and  $A^d$ , i.e., it is generated by the opens of  $A$  and the complements of compact saturated subsets of  $A$ . Write  $A^{\text{patch}}$  for  $A$  with its patch topology: this is a compact  $T_2$  space, and the specialization ordering  $\leq$  on  $A$  has a closed graph in  $A^{\text{patch}} \times A^{\text{patch}}$ , making  $(A^{\text{patch}}, \leq)$  a compact pospace (Nachbin, 1965). We shall be specially interested in  $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ ; then  $A^{\text{patch}}$  is merely  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  with its ordinary  $T_2$  topology generated by the intervals  $(a, b)$ ,  $[0, b)$ , and  $(a, +\infty]$ . We shall also use the fact that any product of stably compact spaces is stably compact, and the  $\_{}^{\text{patch}}$  operation commutes with product (Alvarez-Manilla et al., 2004, Proposition 14). So  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^C$  is stably compact, and  $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^C)^{\text{patch}}$  is the compact  $T_2$  space  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ .

We agree to prefix with “patch-” any concept relative to patch topologies. E.g., a patch-closed subset of  $A$  is a closed subset of  $A^{\text{patch}}$ , and a patch-continuous map from  $A$  to  $B$  is a continuous map from  $A^{\text{patch}}$  to  $B^{\text{patch}}$ .

**Stone duality.** There is a functor  $\mathcal{O}$  from the category of topological spaces to the opposite of the category of frames (certain complete lattices), defined by: for every topological space  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  is the frame of its open subsets, and for every continuous map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(f)$  is the frame homomorphism that maps every  $V \in \mathcal{O}(Y)$  to  $f^{-1}(V) \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ . This functor has a right adjoint  $\text{pt}$ , which maps every frame to its set of completely prime filters, with the so-called

hull-kernel topology. For details, see (Abramsky and Jung, 1994, Section 7) or (Gierz et al., 2003, Section V-5).

This adjunction establishes a correspondence between properties of spaces  $X$  and properties of frames  $L$ . E.g.,  $X$  is core-compact if and only if  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  is continuous,  $X$  is core-coherent if and only if the way-below relation on  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  is multiplicative, and  $X$  is compact if and only if the top element of  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  is finite, i.e., way-below itself.

Going the other way around,  $\mathbf{pt}(L)$  is always a sober space. (In fact, it is legitimate to call sober any topological space that is homeomorphic to one of this form.) For every topological space  $X$ , the fact that  $\mathbf{pt}$  is right adjoint to  $\mathcal{O}$  entails that  $\mathbf{pt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$  obeys the following universal property: there is a continuous map  $\eta_X$  from  $X$  to  $\mathbf{pt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$  (namely, the unit of the adjunction), and every continuous map  $f$  from  $X$  to any given sober space  $Y$  extends to a unique continuous map  $f^!$  from  $\mathbf{pt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$  to  $Y$ , in the sense that  $f^! \circ \eta_X = f$ . A space obeying that universal property is called a *sobrification*  $\mathcal{S}(X)$  of  $X$ . Sobrification  $\mathcal{S}$  is left adjoint to the forgetful functor from sober spaces to topological spaces; in other words,  $\mathcal{S}(X)$  is a free sober space above  $X$ . In particular, all the sobrifications of  $X$  are naturally isomorphic.

If  $L$  is a continuous frame, then  $\mathbf{pt}(L)$  is a locally compact, sober space (Abramsky and Jung, 1994, Theorem 7.2.16). Equivalently, it is locally compact,  $T_0$ , and well-filtered (Gierz et al., 2003, Theorem II-1.21). It follows that if  $X$  is core-compact, then its sobrification is locally compact,  $T_0$  and well-filtered.

If  $L$  is arithmetic, i.e., is a continuous frame with a multiplicative way-below relation, then  $\mathbf{pt}(L)$  is stably locally compact (Abramsky and Jung, 1994, Theorem 7.2.19). So the sobrification of a core-compact, core-coherent space is stably locally compact. Similarly, the sobrification of a compact, core-compact, and core-coherent space is stably compact.

For any topological space  $X$ ,  $X$  and its sobrification  $\mathcal{S}(X) \cong \mathbf{pt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$  have isomorphic lattices of open subsets. This informally states that any construction, any property that can be expressed in terms of opens will apply to both.

One easy consequence, which we shall use in Section 3.3, is the following.

**Lemma 2.1** *The function  $!$  that maps  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$  to  $h^! \in [\mathcal{S}(X) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]$  is an order-isomorphism, a homeomorphism when the function spaces are equipped with their Scott topologies, and is natural in  $X$ .*

*Proof.*  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  is sober, hence  $h^!$  is well-defined. Since  $\mathcal{S}$  is left adjoint to the forgetful functor  $U$  from sober spaces to topological spaces, the correspondence between morphisms  $h: X \rightarrow U(\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma})$  and morphisms  $h^!: \mathcal{S}(X) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  is bijective, and is natural in  $X$ . Both  $!$  and its inverse  $h^! \mapsto h^! \circ \eta_X$  are monotonic, and therefore define an order-isomorphism, hence an isomorphism of spaces with their Scott topologies. (To show that  $!$  is monotonic, consider  $f \leq g$ , and realize that  $\sup(f^!, g^!)$  is a continuous map that extends  $\sup(f, g) = g$ , hence must coincide with  $g^!$  by uniqueness of extensions.)  $\square$

**Cones.** A cone  $C$  is an additive commutative monoid with a scalar multiplication by elements of  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , satisfying laws similar to those of vector spaces.



Precisely, a *cone*  $C$  is endowed with an addition  $+$  :  $C \times C \rightarrow C$ , a zero element  $0 \in C$ , and a scalar multiplication  $\cdot$  :  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times C \rightarrow C$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} (x + y) + z &= x + (y + z) & x + y &= y + x & x + 0 &= x \\ (rs) \cdot x &= r \cdot (s \cdot x) & 1 \cdot x &= x & 0 \cdot x &= 0 \\ r \cdot (x + y) &= r \cdot x + r \cdot y & (r + s) \cdot x &= r \cdot x + s \cdot x \end{aligned}$$

An *ordered cone* is a cone with a partial ordering that makes  $+$  and  $\cdot$  monotonic. Similarly, a *topological cone* is a cone equipped with a  $T_0$  topology that makes  $+$  and  $\cdot$  continuous, where  $\mathbb{R}_+$  is equipped with its Scott topology. In a *semitopological cone*, we only require  $+$  and  $\cdot$  to be separately continuous, not jointly continuous.

An important example of semitopological cone is given by the ordered cones in which  $+$  and  $\cdot$  are Scott-continuous (the *s-cones*), in particular by Tix, Keimel and Plotkin's *d-cones* (Tix et al., 2009), which are additionally required to be dpos. As noticed by Keimel (Keimel, 2008, Remark before Proposition 6.3), an s-cone  $C$  may fail to be a topological cone, unless  $C$  is a *continuous cone*, i.e., an ordered cone that is continuous as a poset, and where  $+$  and  $\cdot$  are Scott-continuous. In that case, the product of the Scott topologies is the Scott topology of the product ordering, and separate continuity implies joint continuity.

The most important cone we shall deal with is the ordered cone  $\mathcal{L}X$  of all continuous maps from  $X$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$ . With its Scott topology, it is a semitopological cone. It is a topological cone if  $X$  is core-compact, since it is a continuous dcpo in that case, as a special case of (Gierz et al., 2003, Theorem II-4.7). In previous work, we were using the sub-cone  $\langle X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{+\sigma} \rangle$  of all *bounded* continuous maps from  $X$  to  $\mathbb{R}_{+\sigma}$ . This is again a semitopological cone that happens to be topological when  $X$  is core-compact.

A subset  $Z$  of a topological cone  $C$  is *convex* iff  $r \cdot x + (1 - r) \cdot y$  is in  $Z$  whenever  $x, y \in Z$  and  $0 \leq r \leq 1$ .  $C$  is itself *locally convex* iff every point has a basis of convex open neighborhoods, i.e., whenever  $x \in U$ ,  $U$  open in  $C$ , then there is a convex open  $V$  such that  $x \in V \subseteq U$ .

This is the notion of local convexity used by K. Keimel (Keimel, 2008). Beware that there are others, such as Heckmann's (Heckmann, 1996), which are inequivalent.

Every continuous cone  $C$  is locally convex; this is a special case of (Keimel, 2008, Lemma 6.12). The argument, due to J. Lawson, is as follows: let  $x$  be a point in some open subset  $U$  of  $C$ , then there is a point  $x_1 \ll x$  that is also in  $U$ , hence also an  $x_2 \ll x_1$  that is again in  $U$ , and continuing this way we have a chain  $\dots \ll x_n \ll \dots \ll x_2 \ll x_1 \ll x$  of points of  $U$ . Now let  $V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \uparrow x_n$ :  $V$  is clearly open,  $x \in V \subseteq U$ , and  $V$  is also convex because  $V = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \uparrow x_n$ , as one can easily check.

We have already noticed that, given a core-compact space  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{L}X$  is a continuous d-cone. Therefore  $\mathcal{L}X$  is a locally convex topological cone in that case.

A map  $f : C \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  is *positively homogeneous* iff  $f(r \cdot x) = rf(x)$  for all  $x \in C$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . It is *additive* (resp. *super-additive*, resp. *sub-additive*) iff

$f(x+y) = f(x)+f(y)$  (resp.  $f(x+y) \geq f(x)+f(y)$ , resp.  $f(x+y) \leq f(x)+f(y)$ ) for all  $x, y \in C$ . It is *linear* (resp. *superlinear*, resp. *sublinear*) iff its is both positively homogeneous and additive (resp. super-additive, resp. sub-additive). Every pointwise supremum of sublinear maps is sublinear, and every pointwise infimum of superlinear maps is superlinear.

One of the key results in the theory of cones is Keimel's Sandwich Theorem (Keimel, 2008, Theorem 8.2), an analogue of the Hahn-Banach Theorem: in a semitopological cone  $C$ , given a continuous superlinear map  $q: C \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  and a sublinear map  $p: C \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  such that  $q \leq p$ , there is a continuous linear map  $\Lambda: C \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  such that  $q \leq \Lambda \leq p$ . Note that  $p$  need not be continuous or even monotonic for this to hold. This is a feature we shall make use of in the proof of Lemma 3.16, allowing us to dispense with an assumption of coherence.

Another construction we shall use is the *lower Minkowski functional*  $M_A$  of a non-empty closed subset  $A$  of a topological cone  $C$  (this was called  $F_A$  in (Keimel, 2008, Section 7), but this would conflict with some of our own notations). This is defined by:

$$M_A(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{b > 0 \mid (1/b) \cdot x \in A\} \quad (1)$$

where we agree that the infimum is equal to  $+\infty$  if no  $b$  exists such that  $(1/b) \cdot x \in A$ .  $M_A$  is continuous (Keimel, 2008, Proposition 7.3 (a)), superlinear if and only if  $C \setminus A$  is convex and proper (namely, if  $A$  is non-empty), and sublinear if and only if  $A$  is convex and non-empty (Keimel, 2008, Lemma 7.5).

Using this, Keimel's Sandwich Theorem immediately implies the following Separation Theorem (Keimel, 2008, Theorem 9.1): in a semitopological cone  $C$ , for every convex non-empty subset  $A$  and every convex open subset  $U$  such that  $A \cap U = \emptyset$ , there is a continuous linear map  $\Lambda: C \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  such that  $\Lambda(x) \leq 1$  for every  $x \in A$  and  $\Lambda(x) > 1$  for every  $x \in U$ . We shall also use the following Strict Separation Theorem (Keimel, 2008, Theorem 10.5): in a locally convex semitopological cone  $C$ , for every compact convex subset  $Q$  and every non-empty closed convex subset  $A$  such that  $Q \cap A = \emptyset$ , there is a continuous linear map  $\Lambda: C \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  and a real number  $r > 1$  such that  $\Lambda(x) \geq r$  for every  $x \in Q$ , and  $\Lambda(x) \leq 1$  for every  $x \in A$ .

**Valuations, Previsions, Forks.** A *valuation* on a topological space  $X$  is a map  $\nu$  from the lattice  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  of open subsets of  $X$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  that is *strict* ( $\nu(\emptyset) = 0$ ), *monotonic* (if  $U \subseteq V$  then  $\nu(U) \leq \nu(V)$ ), and *modular* ( $\nu(U \cup V) + \nu(U \cap V) = \nu(U) + \nu(V)$ ). A valuation is *continuous* if and only if it is Scott-continuous, i.e., for every directed family  $(U_i)_{i \in I}$  of opens,  $\nu(\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i) = \sup_{i \in I} \nu(U_i)$ . It is *subnormalized* iff  $\nu(X) \leq 1$ , and *normalized* iff  $\nu(X) = 1$ . A normalized continuous valuation is a continuous *probability* valuation.

Given any continuous map  $h: X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ , one can define the *integral*  $\int_{x \in X} h(x) d\nu$  of  $h$  with respect to  $\nu$  in various equivalent ways. One is by using a Choquet-type formula (Tix, 1995, Section 4.1):  $\int_{x \in X} h(x) d\nu$  is defined as  $\int_0^{+\infty} \nu(h^{-1}(t, +\infty]) dt$ , where the latter is a Riemann integral, which is well-defined since the integrated

function is non-increasing. Letting  $F(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{x \in X} h(x) d\nu$ , one realizes that  $F$  is linear and Scott-continuous on the cone  $\mathcal{L}X$  (Tix, 1995, Lemma 4.2).

In particular,  $F$  also defines a linear Scott-continuous map from the cone  $\langle X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{+\sigma} \rangle$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ . Such functionals were called (continuous) *linear previsions* in (Goubault-Larrecq, 2007), except that they were not allowed to take the value  $+\infty$ . Conversely, any linear Scott-continuous map  $F$  from  $\langle X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{+\sigma} \rangle$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  extends to a unique linear Scott-continuous map from  $\mathcal{L}X$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ , by  $F(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}_+} F(\min(h, a))$  for example.

In general, call *prevision* on  $X$  any positively homogeneous, Scott-continuous map  $F$  from  $\mathcal{L}X$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ . A prevision is *Hoare* (or *lower*) if and only if it is sublinear, and is *Smyth* (or *upper*) if and only if it is superlinear. We say that  $F$  is *subnormalized* (resp., *normalized*) iff  $F(\mathbf{1} + h) \leq 1 + F(h)$  (resp.,  $=$ ) for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ , where  $\mathbf{1}$  denotes the constant function with value 1. These conditions simplify to  $F(\mathbf{1}) \leq 1$  (resp.,  $F(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ ) in the case of linear previsions, but we shall need the more general form when  $F$  is not linear.

It is easy to see that the posets  $\mathbf{V}(X)$  of all continuous valuations on  $X$  (ordered by  $\nu \leq \nu'$  iff  $\nu(U) \leq \nu'(U)$  for every open  $U$ ) and  $\mathbb{P}_p(X)$  of all linear previsions on  $X$  (ordered by  $F \leq G$  iff  $F(h) \leq G(h)$  for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ ) are isomorphic. This is the variant of the Riesz representation theorem that we mentioned in the introduction. In one direction, we obtain  $F$  from  $\nu$  by  $F(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{x \in X} h(x) d\nu$ , and conversely we obtain  $\nu$  from  $F$  by letting  $\nu(U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\chi_U)$ . (E.g., this is a special case of (Tix, 1995, Satz 4.16).) This isomorphism maps (sub)normalized continuous valuations to (sub)normalized linear previsions and conversely.

To handle the mixture of probabilistic and *erratic* non-determinism, we rely on *forks* (Goubault-Larrecq, 2007). A fork on  $X$  is by definition a pair  $(F^-, F^+)$  of a Smyth prevision  $F^-$  and a Hoare prevision  $F^+$  satisfying *Walley's condition*:

$$F^-(h + h') \leq F^-(h) + F^+(h') \leq F^+(h + h')$$

for all  $h, h' \in \mathcal{L}X$ . (This condition was independently discovered by (Keimel and Plotkin, 2009).) By taking  $h' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ , or  $h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ , this in particular implies that  $F^- \leq F^+$ . A fork  $(F^-, F^+)$  is (sub)normalized if and only if both  $F^-$  and  $F^+$  are.

Using some notation that we introduced in (Goubault-Larrecq, 2015b), write  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}(X)$  for the set of all Hoare previsions on  $X$  (A for angelic non-determinism, P for probabilistic choice),  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}(X)$  for the set of all Smyth previsions on  $X$ . Write  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^1(X)$  for the set of normalized Hoare previsions,  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^{\leq 1}(X)$  for the set of subnormalized Hoare previsions, and similarly for Smyth (subscript DP) and linear (subscript P) previsions. In any case, the *weak topology* on any of these spaces  $Y$  is generated by subbasic open sets, which we write uniformly as  $[h > r]$ , and are defined as those  $F \in Y$  such that  $F(h) > r$ , where  $h$  ranges over  $\mathcal{L}X$  and  $r$  over  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . The specialization ordering of the weak topology is pointwise:  $F \leq F'$  iff  $F(h) \leq F'(h)$  for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ . We use a *wk* subscript, e.g.,  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^{\leq 1}{}_{wk}(X)$ , to refer to a space in its weak topology. Since  $[h > r] = [1/r.h > 1]$

when  $r \neq 0$ , and  $[h > 0] = \bigcup_{r>0} [h > r]$ , note that the subsets of the form  $[h > 1]$ ,  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$  form a smaller subbase.

Similarly, write  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}(X)$  for the set of all forks on  $X$  (A for angelic, D for demonic, and P for probabilistic), and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^{\leq 1}(X)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^1(X)$  for their subsets of subnormalized, resp. normalized, forks. On each, define the *weak topology* as the subspace topology induced from the larger space  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP } wk}(X) \times \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}(X)$ . It is easy to see that a subbase of the weak topology is composed of two kinds of open subsets:  $[h > b]^-$ , defined as  $\{(F^-, F^+) \mid F^-(h) > b\}$ , and  $[h > b]^+$ , defined as  $\{(F^-, F^+) \mid F^+(h) > b\}$ , where  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . The specialization ordering of spaces of forks is the product ordering  $\leq \times \leq$ , where  $\leq$  denotes the pointwise ordering on previsions. As usual, we adjoin a subscript “ $wk$ ” to denote spaces of forks with the weak topology.

Throughout, we shall use the convention of writing  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP } wk}^\bullet(X)$ , etc.  $\bullet$  is either the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “ $1$ ”. This will allow us to factor some notation. Later, we shall also use this scheme for maps  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$ ,  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$ , and so forth.

### 3 Retracting Powercones onto Previsions

Given a topological space  $X$ , let:

- the *Hoare powerdomain*  $\mathcal{H}(X)$  be the set of all closed, non-empty subsets of  $X$ ;
- the *Smyth powerdomain*  $\mathcal{Q}(X)$  be the set of all compact saturated, non-empty subsets of  $X$ ;
- the *Plotkin powerdomain*  $\mathcal{P}l(X)$  be the set of all lenses of  $X$ ; a *lens*  $L$  is a non-empty subset of  $X$  that can be written as the intersection of a compact saturated subset  $Q$  and a closed subset  $F$  of  $X$ . A canonical form is obtained by taking  $Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \uparrow L$  and  $F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} cl(L)$ .

$\mathcal{H}(X)$  is the traditional model for so-called *angelic* non-determinism. We write  $\mathcal{H}_V(X)$  for  $\mathcal{H}(X)$  with its *lower Vietoris topology*, generated by subbasic open sets  $\diamond V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{C \in \mathcal{H}(X) \mid C \cap V \neq \emptyset\}$ , where  $V$  ranges over the open subsets of  $X$ . Its specialization ordering is inclusion  $\subseteq$ , and we shall also consider  $\mathcal{H}(X)$  as a dcpo in this ordering. The Scott topology is always finer than the lower Vietoris topology, and coincides with it when  $X$  is a continuous dcpo in its Scott topology (Schalk, 1993, Section 6.3.3).

$\mathcal{Q}(X)$  is the traditional model for so-called *demonic* non-determinism. We write  $\mathcal{Q}_V(X)$  for  $\mathcal{Q}(X)$  with its *upper Vietoris topology*, generated by basic open sets  $\square V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}(X) \mid Q \subseteq V\}$ , where  $V$  ranges over the open subsets of  $X$ . Its specialization ordering is reverse inclusion  $\supseteq$ . When  $X$  is  $T_0$ , well-filtered, and locally compact,  $\mathcal{Q}(X)$  is a continuous dcpo, and the Scott and upper Vietoris topologies coincide (Schalk, 1993, Section 7.3.4).

$\mathcal{P}\ell(X)$  is the traditional model for *erratic* non-determinism. Write  $\mathcal{P}\ell_{\mathcal{V}}(X)$  for  $\mathcal{P}\ell(X)$  with its *Vietoris topology*, generated by subbasic open sets  $\square V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{L \in \mathcal{P}\ell(X) \mid L \subseteq V\}$  and  $\diamond V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{L \in \mathcal{P}\ell(X) \mid L \cap V \neq \emptyset\}$ . Its specialization ordering is the topological Egli-Milner ordering  $\sqsubseteq_{\text{EM}}$ , defined by  $L \sqsubseteq_{\text{EM}} L'$  iff  $\uparrow L \supseteq \uparrow L'$  and  $cl(L) \subseteq cl(L')$ .

When  $X$  is a semitopological cone  $C$ , it makes sense to consider the subsets  $\mathcal{H}^{cvx}(C)$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}^{cvx}(C)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}\ell^{cvx}(C)$  of those elements of  $\mathcal{H}(C)$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}(C)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}\ell(C)$  respectively that are convex. We again equip them with their respective (lower, upper, plain) Vietoris topologies, yielding spaces which we write with a  $\mathcal{V}$  subscript, and which happen to be subspaces of  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(C)$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(C)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}\ell_{\mathcal{V}}(C)$  respectively. Their specialization orderings are as for their non-convex variants, and again give rise to Scott topologies. But beware that the Scott topologies on the latter may fail to be subspace topologies.

We now define formally the maps that we named  $r$  and  $s$  in the introduction. They come in three flavors, angelic, demonic, and erratic; but we shall ignore the erratic forms for now. Since continuous valuations are isomorphic to spaces of linear of previsions, we reason with the latter; this is what we shall really need in proofs.

**Definition 3.1** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. For every non-empty set  $E$  of linear previsions on  $X$ , let  $r_{\text{AP}}(E): \mathcal{L}X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  (resp.,  $r_{\text{DP}}(E)$ ) map  $h$  to  $\sup_{G \in E} G(h)$  (resp.,  $\inf$ ).*

*Conversely, for every Hoare prevision (resp., subnormalized, normalized)  $F$  on  $X$ , let  $s_{\text{AP}}(F)$  (resp.,  $s_{\text{AP}}^{\leq 1}(F)$ ,  $s_{\text{AP}}^1(F)$ ) be the set of all linear previsions (resp., subnormalized, normalized)  $G$  such that  $G \leq F$ . For every Smyth prevision (resp., subnormalized, normalized)  $F$  on  $X$ , let  $s_{\text{DP}}(F)$  (resp.,  $s_{\text{DP}}^{\leq 1}(F)$ ,  $s_{\text{DP}}^1(F)$ ) be the set of all linear previsions (resp., subnormalized, normalized)  $G$  such that  $F \leq G$ .*

Our aim in this section is to show that the various matching pairs of maps  $r$  and  $s$  form retractions onto the adequate spaces. A *retraction* of  $X$  onto  $Y$  is a pair of two continuous maps  $r: X \rightarrow Y$  (also called, somewhat ambiguously, a retraction) and  $s: Y \rightarrow X$  (called the associated section) such that  $r \circ s = \text{id}_Y$ .

Some of our retractions will have the extra property that  $s \circ r \leq \text{id}_X$ , meaning that  $s$  is left-adjoint to  $r$ . We shall call such retraction *embedding-projection pair*, following a domain-theoretic tradition (Abramsky and Jung, 1994, Definition 3.1.15);  $r$  is the projection, and  $s$  is the embedding. Accordingly we shall say that  $X$  *projects onto*  $Y$  through  $r$  in that situation. There is also a dual situation where  $\text{id}_X \leq s \circ r$  instead, meaning that  $s$  is right-adjoint to  $r$ . In that case, we shall say that  $X$  *coprojects onto*  $Y$  through  $r$ , that the latter is a *coprojection*, and that  $s$  is the associated *coembedding*.

We start with the angelic case. We shall deal with the demonic case in Section 3.2, and with the erratic case in Section 3.3.

### 3.1 The Retraction in the Angelic Case

Our aim in this section is to prove that if  $X$  is a topological space satisfying certain conditions, then  $r_{\text{AP}}$  and  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$  form a retraction.

We proceed through a series of lemmata. The first one is clear.

**Lemma 3.2** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. For every  $C \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P } wk}^\bullet(X))$ ,  $r_{\text{AP}}(C) = (h \in \mathcal{L}X \mapsto \sup_{G \in C} G(h))$  is an element of  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(X)$ .*

For clarity, write  $[h > b]_{\text{AP}}$  or  $[h > b]_{\text{P}}$  for the subbasic open subset  $[h > b]$ , depending whether in a space of Hoare previsions or of linear previsions.

**Lemma 3.3** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. The map  $r_{\text{AP}}$  is continuous from  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P } wk}^\bullet(X))$  to  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$ .*

*Proof.* The inverse image of the subbasic open  $[h > b]_{\text{AP}} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$  by  $r_{\text{AP}}$  is  $\diamond[h > b]_{\text{P}}$ , hence is open in  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P } wk}^\bullet(X))$ .  $\square$

We will now need to consider spaces  $X$  of a certain kind, which we call **AP $_\bullet$ -friendly** in Definition 3.A below. A *locally convex-compact* cone is a semitopological cone in which every element has a base of convex compact neighborhoods (Keimel, 2008, Definition 4.9). An *LCS-complete* space is a space that is homeomorphic to a  $G_\delta$  subspace of a locally compact sober space; a  $G_\delta$  subset is an intersection of countably many open sets. The notion was introduced in (de Brecht et al., 2019).

**Definition 3.A (AP $_\bullet$ -friendly)** *An AP-friendly space is a topological space  $X$  such that  $\mathcal{L}X$  is a locally convex semitopological cone when given its Scott topology. A space is AP $_{\leq 1}$ -friendly if and only if it is AP-friendly.*

*An AP $_1$ -friendly space is either:*

1. *a compact AP-friendly space  $X$ ,*
2. *or a space  $X$  such that  $\mathcal{L}X$  is a locally convex-compact, locally convex sober topological cone,*
3. *or an LCS-complete space.*

We will use the adjective **AP $_\bullet$ -friendly** to denote any of the notions, where  $\bullet$  is nothing, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”. It is immediate that AP $_1$ -friendliness implies AP-friendliness.

In the 2017 version of this paper (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017), of which this is a revised version, the conditions we imposed on  $X$  was simply that  $\mathcal{L}X$  was locally convex. We do not have any counterexample or result showing that the extra condition of AP $_1$ -friendliness is needed in case  $\bullet$  is “1”, but the proof of Lemma 3.4 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) is wrong, and the proofs below need **AP $_\bullet$ -friendliness**. We have arranged for definitions, lemmata, propositions and theorems of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) to keep their numbers; for example, this is the reason for the funny name “Definition 3.A”.

We discuss standard classes of **AP $_\bullet$ -friendly** spaces.

Given a space  $X$ , and a compact subset  $Q$  of  $X$ , the set  $\blacksquare Q$  of open neighborhoods of  $Q$  is Scott-open in  $\mathcal{O}X$ , the lattice of open subsets of  $X$ . A space

$X$  is *consonant* if and only those sets  $\blacksquare Q$  generate the Scott topology on  $\mathcal{O}X$ . Every locally compact space is consonant (see Exercise 5.4.12 in (Goubault-Larrecq, 2013)), every regular Čech-complete space is consonant (Dolecki et al., 1995, Theorem 4.1 and footnote 8), and every LCS-complete space is consonant (de Brecht et al., 2019, Proposition 12.1). The class of LCS-complete spaces contains M. de Brecht’s quasi-Polish spaces (de Brecht, 2013), which themselves contain all Polish spaces and all  $\omega$ -continuous dcpos in their Scott topology; the LCS-complete spaces also contain all the continuous dcpos.

A space  $X$  is  $\odot$ -consonant if and only if every finite copower of  $X$  is consonant (de Brecht et al., 2019, Definition 13.1). Since locally compact spaces and LCS-complete spaces are closed under finite coproducts (in the category of topological spaces), those spaces are  $\odot$ -consonant; see (de Brecht et al., 2019, Lemma 13.2) for the case of LCS-complete spaces.

By (de Brecht et al., 2019, Lemma 13.6), for every  $\odot$ -consonant space  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{L}X$  is locally convex (in its Scott topology). We have just illustrated how large the class of  $\odot$ -consonant spaces is, and they are all AP-friendly.

We turn to  $\text{AP}_1$ -friendliness, and specifically to conditions 2 and 3.

**Remark 3.B** *For every core-compact space  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{L}X$  is a locally convex, locally convex-compact, sober topological cone. In order to see this, we observe that  $\mathcal{L}X$  is a continuous complete lattice. This was mentioned at the end of Section 16 of (de Brecht et al., 2019), and can be deduced from (Gierz et al., 2003, Proposition II-4.6), which says that if  $X$  is core-compact and  $L$  (here,  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ ) is an injective  $T_0$  space (i.e., a continuous complete lattice by (Gierz et al., 2003, Theorem II-3.8)), then the poset  $[X \rightarrow L]$  of continuous functions from  $X$  to  $L$  is a continuous complete lattice.*

*A continuous dcpo, in particular a continuous complete lattice, is always sober in its Scott topology (Goubault-Larrecq, 2013, Proposition 8.2.12). It is also a c-space in its Scott topology (Goubault-Larrecq, 2013, Proposition 5.1.37). Together with its cone operations,  $\mathcal{L}X$  is then a c-cone in the sense of Keimel, which is then locally convex, locally convex-compact and topological (Keimel, 2008, Lemma 6.12). Hence every core-compact space  $X$  is  $\text{AP}_1$ -friendly, in that it satisfies condition 2 of Definition 3.A. This applies in particular to all locally compact spaces  $X$ , and therefore to all continuous dcpos in their Scott topology.*

**Remark 3.C** *As for condition 3, for every LCS-complete space  $X$ , we recall that  $X$  is  $\odot$ -consonant, hence that  $\mathcal{L}X$  is locally convex in its Scott topology (de Brecht et al., 2019, Lemma 13.6). Therefore every LCS-complete space  $X$  is AP-friendly. As a consequence, every  $\text{AP}_1$ -friendly space is AP-friendly (and  $\text{AP}_{\leq 1}$ -friendly).*

We sum up this discussion (and perhaps a bit more) by the diagram of implications of Figure 2.

The following is Lemma 3.4 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) in the case that  $\bullet$  is nothing or “ $\leq 1$ ”.




Figure 2: Implications between properties of spaces and  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -freeness

**Lemma 3.D** *Let  $\bullet$  be nothing or “ $\leq 1$ ”, and  $X$  be an  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendly space. For every  $F \in \mathbb{P}_\bullet^\bullet X$ , for every  $h_0 \in \mathcal{L}X$ , and every real number  $r > 0$  such that  $F(h_0) > r$ , there is a  $G \in \mathbb{P}_\bullet^\bullet X$  with  $G \leq F$  and  $G(h_0) > r$ .*

*Proof.* By Corollary 9.5 of (Keimel, 2008), every lower semi-continuous sub-linear map from a locally convex semitopological cone to  $\mathbb{R}_+$  is pointwise the supremum of lower semi-continuous linear maps.  $\square$

The situation is more complex when  $\bullet$  is “1”. We need a few technical lemmas. The first one deals with condition 1 of the definition of  $\text{AP}_1$ -freeness, namely when  $X$  is compact.

**Lemma 3.E** *For every compact topological space  $X$ , for every  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , the set  $\{h \in \mathcal{L}X \mid \exists b > a, h \geq b \cdot \mathbf{1}\}$  is Scott-open in  $\mathcal{L}X$ . For every Scott-open subset  $U$  of  $\mathcal{L}X$ , the set  $\{h \in \mathcal{L}X \mid \exists b > a, k \in U, h \geq b \cdot \mathbf{1} + k\}$  is open in  $\mathcal{L}X$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the second claim. The first claim will follow by taking  $U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}X$ . Let  $V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{h \in \mathcal{L}X \mid \exists b > a, k \in U, h \geq b \cdot \mathbf{1} + k\}$ . This is upwards-closed. Let  $(h_i)_{i \in I}$  be a directed family with supremum  $h \in V$ . Then  $h \geq b \cdot \mathbf{1} + k$  for some  $b > a$  and some  $k \in U$ . In particular,  $h \geq b \cdot \mathbf{1}$ . Let us pick a  $c \in ]a, b[$ .

We claim that there is an  $i \in I$  such that  $h_i \geq c \cdot \mathbf{1}$ . For every  $x \in X$ ,  $h(x) \geq b > c$ , so  $h_i(x) > c$  for some  $i \in X$ . It follows that the sets  $(h_i^{-1}(]c, \infty]))_{i \in I}$  form an open cover of  $X$ . Also, if  $h_i \leq h_j$  then  $h_i^{-1}(]c, \infty]) \subseteq h_j^{-1}(]c, \infty])$ , so the family  $(h_i^{-1}(]c, \infty]))_{i \in I}$  is directed. Since  $X$  is compact, it is therefore included in  $h_i^{-1}(]c, \infty])$  for some  $i \in I$ . Hence, for that choice of  $i$ ,  $h_i \geq c \cdot \mathbf{1}$ .



We have  $h \geq c \cdot \mathbf{1} + k$ . Let  $h'$  map every  $x \in X$  to  $\max(h(x) - c, 0)$ , and for every  $j \in I$ , let  $h'_j$  map every  $x \in X$  to  $\max(h_j(x) - c, 0)$ . Then  $h' = \sup_{j \in I} h'_j$ , and  $h' \geq k \in U$ . Since  $U$  is Scott-open, some  $h'_j$  is in  $U$ . Let  $k \in I$  be such that  $h_k \geq h_i, h_j$ . Then  $h'_k \geq h'_j$ , so  $h'_k$  is in  $U$ . Also,  $h_k \geq h_i \geq c \cdot \mathbf{1}$ , so for every  $x \in X$ ,  $h'_k(x) = \max(h_k(x) - c, 0) = h_k(x) - c$ . It follows that  $h_k = c \cdot \mathbf{1} + h'_k$ , so  $h_k \in V$ .  $\square$

Our second technical lemma will be used when conditions 2 or 3 of the definition of  $\text{AP}_1$ -friendliness are met. Given two elements  $k$  and  $h$  of  $\mathcal{L}X$ , we write  $[k, h]$  for the convex hull of  $\{k, h\}$ , namely the collection  $\{a \cdot k + (1 - a) \cdot h \mid a \in [0, 1]\}$ .

**Lemma 3.F** *Let  $X$  be a topological space such that  $\mathcal{L}X$  is a locally convex, locally convex-compact, sober topological cone. Let  $g_0 \geq g_1 \geq \dots \geq g_n \geq \dots$  be a descending sequence of elements of  $\mathcal{L}X$ , and  $h_0 \in \mathcal{L}X$ . Let also  $W$  be a Scott-open neighborhood of  $h_0$  in  $\mathcal{L}X$  such that  $[b \cdot g_n, h]$  is included in  $W$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , every  $b > 1$  and every  $h \in W$ . There is a convex Scott-open neighborhood  $V$  of  $h_0$  in  $\mathcal{L}X$  that contains every function  $b \cdot g_n$  with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $b > 1$  and that is included in  $W$ .*

*Proof.* Lemma 4.10 (c) of (Keimel, 2008) states that in a topological cone, the convex hull of a finite union of convex compact sets is compact; and therefore the upward closure of such a convex hull is compact saturated, and still convex. Since  $\mathcal{L}X$  is topological, every set  $[h, k]$  is therefore convex and compact saturated.

We build convex compact saturated sets  $Q_n$  containing  $\uparrow[(1 + 1/2^n) \cdot g_n, h_0]$  and included in  $W$ , so that  $Q_n$  is included in the interior  $\text{int}(Q_{n+1})$  of  $Q_{n+1}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , by induction on  $n$ , as follows.

We let  $Q_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \uparrow[2 \cdot g_0, h_0]$ . Since  $h_0 \in W$ , by assumption on  $W$ ,  $[2 \cdot g_0, h_0]$  is included in  $W$ . Since  $W$  is upwards-closed,  $Q_0 \subseteq W$ .

Having built  $Q_n \subseteq W$ , we let  $Q'_n$  be the upward closure of the convex hull of the union of  $\{(1 + 1/2^{n+1}) \cdot g_{n+1}\}$  and  $Q_n$ . By Lemma 4.10 (c) of (Keimel, 2008), which we have already used above,  $Q'_n$  is convex and compact saturated. Additionally, every element  $h$  of  $Q'_n$  is above some element in  $[(1 + 1/2^{n+1}) \cdot g_{n+1}, k]$  for some  $k \in Q_n$  (hence  $k \in W$ ). Indeed, every element of the convex hull of the union of two convex sets  $A$  and  $B$  can be written as  $\alpha \cdot a + (1 - \alpha) \cdot b$  for some  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ ,  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ .

By assumption on  $W$ ,  $[(1 + 1/2^{n+1}) \cdot g_{n+1}, k]$  is included in  $W$ , and since  $W$  is upwards closed, it follows that every element  $h \in Q'_n$  is in  $W$ . Therefore  $Q'_n \subseteq W$ . The first half of Proposition 10.6 of (Keimel, 2008) states that in a locally convex, locally convex-compact, sober topological cone, every non-empty convex compact saturated set has a base of convex compact saturated neighborhoods. Hence there is a convex compact saturated set  $Q_{n+1}$  included in  $W$  whose interior contains  $Q_n$ . The induction is complete.

Let  $V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_n$ .  $V$  contains  $h_0$ , since  $h_0 \in Q_0$ .  $V$  is convex since it is a directed union of convex sets. Then,  $V \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{int}(Q_{n+1}) \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_{n+1} \subseteq V$ , so  $V = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{int}(Q_{n+1})$ , and therefore  $V$  is open. Since  $Q_n \subseteq W$  for every

$n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $V$  is also included in  $W$ . Finally,  $(1 + 1/2^n) \cdot g_n$  is in  $Q_n$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , hence in  $V$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $b > 1$ , let us pick  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $m \geq n$  and  $1 + 1/2^m \leq b$ . Then  $(1 + 1/2^m) \cdot g_m$  is in  $V$ , and  $(1 + 1/2^m) \cdot g_m \leq b \cdot g_m \leq b \cdot g_n$ , and since  $V$  is upwards-closed,  $b \cdot g_n \in V$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.G** *Let  $X$  be a space satisfying condition 1 or 2 of the definition of  $\text{AP}_1$ -friendliness. Let  $h_0 \in \mathcal{L}X$  and  $W$  be a Scott-open neighborhood of  $h_0$  in  $\mathcal{L}X$  such that  $[b \cdot \mathbf{1}, h]$  is included in  $W$  for every  $b > 1$  and every  $h \in W$ . There is a convex Scott-open neighborhood  $V$  of  $h_0$  in  $\mathcal{L}X$  that contains every function  $b \cdot \mathbf{1}$  with  $b > 1$  and that is included in  $W$ .*

*Proof.* When  $X$  satisfies condition 2, namely when  $\mathcal{L}X$  is a locally convex-compact, locally convex sober topological cone, the result is simply Lemma 3.G with  $g_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{1}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Hence we concentrate on the case where  $X$  satisfies condition 1, namely when  $\mathcal{L}X$  is locally convex and  $X$  is compact. Since  $\mathcal{L}X$  is locally convex and  $h_0 \in W$ , there is a convex Scott-open neighborhood  $U$  of  $h_0$  included in  $W$ .

For every  $a \in ]0, 1[$ , the set  $(1 - a) \cdot U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(1 - a) \cdot h \mid h \in U\}$  is Scott-open, because it is equal to the inverse image of  $U$  by the map  $h \mapsto 1/(1 - a) \cdot h$ . Hence the set  $V_a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{h \in \mathcal{L}X \mid \exists b > a, k \in (1 - a) \cdot U, h \geq b \cdot \mathbf{1} + k\}$  is Scott-open by Lemma 3.E, which applies since  $X$  is compact. When  $a = 1$ , we define  $V_1$  as  $\{h \in \mathcal{L}X \mid \exists b > 1, h \geq b \cdot \mathbf{1}\}$ , and that is also Scott-open by the same lemma. When  $a = 0$ , we define  $V_0$  as  $U$ . For uniformity of treatment, we note that  $V_a$  is equal to  $\{h \in \mathcal{L}X \mid \exists b > 1, k \in U, h \geq ba \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1 - a) \cdot k\}$  for every  $a \in [0, 1]$ , including when  $a = 0$  or  $a = 1$ . Let  $V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{a \in [0, 1]} V_a$ . This is Scott-open, and we claim that  $V$  is convex. Let  $h$  and  $h'$  be two elements of  $V$ , say  $h \geq ba \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1 - a) \cdot k$  and  $h' \geq b'a' \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1 - a') \cdot k'$ , with  $b, b' > 1$ ,  $k, k' \in U$ , and  $a, a' \in [0, 1]$ . Let  $\alpha \in ]0, 1[$ . Then  $\alpha \cdot h + (1 - \alpha) \cdot h' \geq (\alpha ba + (1 - \alpha)b'a') \cdot \mathbf{1} + (\alpha(1 - a) \cdot k + (1 - \alpha)(1 - a') \cdot k')$ . Let  $a'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha a + (1 - \alpha)a'$ . Then  $a'' \in [0, 1]$ , and  $\alpha ba + (1 - \alpha)b'a' = b''a''$  for some  $b'' > 1$ . Indeed,  $\alpha ba + (1 - \alpha)b'a' \geq \alpha a + (1 - \alpha)a' = a''$ . If  $a'' \neq 0$ , then  $a \neq 0$  or  $a' \neq 0$ , and since  $\alpha \neq 0, 1$ , the inequality is strict, so we can take  $b'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\alpha ba + (1 - \alpha)b'a')/a''$ ; if  $a'' = 0$ , then  $a = a' = 0$ , and any  $b'' > 1$  fits. Also,  $\alpha(1 - a) \cdot k + (1 - \alpha)(1 - a') \cdot k' = (1 - a'') \cdot k''$ , where  $k'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\alpha(1 - a)}{1 - a''}k + \frac{(1 - \alpha)(1 - a')}{1 - a''}k'$  if  $a'' \neq 1$  (otherwise, we take for  $k''$  an arbitrary element of  $U$ , for example  $h_0$ ). Noting that  $\alpha(1 - a) + (1 - \alpha)(1 - a') = 1 - a''$ ,  $k''$  is a convex combination of  $k$  and  $k'$  (if  $a'' \neq 1$ ), hence is in the convex set  $U$ . To sum up,  $\alpha \cdot h + (1 - \alpha) \cdot h' \geq b''a'' \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1 - a'') \cdot k''$ , where  $b'' > 1$  and  $k'' \in U$  (even if  $a'' = 1$ ). It follows that  $\alpha \cdot h + (1 - \alpha) \cdot h'$  is in  $V_{a''}$ , hence in  $V$ . Therefore  $V$  is convex.

Every function  $b \cdot \mathbf{1}$  with  $b > 1$  is in  $V_1$ , hence in  $V$ , and  $h_0$  is in  $V_0 = U$  hence in  $V$ . We claim that  $V \subseteq W$ . For every  $h \in V$ , there is an  $a \in [0, 1]$ , a number  $b > 1$ , and a  $k \in U$  such that  $h \geq ba \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1 - a) \cdot k$ . The term  $ba \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1 - a) \cdot k$  is in  $[b \cdot \mathbf{1}, k]$ , which is included in  $W$  since  $k \in U \subseteq W$ , and by our assumption on  $W$ . Since  $W$  is open hence upwards-closed,  $h \in W$ .  $\square$

We now deal with the case of LCS-complete spaces.

For every continuous map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ , for every continuous valuation  $\nu$  on  $X$ , there is an *image* continuous valuation  $f[\nu]$ , which maps every open subset  $V$  of  $Y$  to  $\nu(f^{-1}(V))$ . There is a *change-of-variable formula*: for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}Y$ ,  $\int_{y \in Y} h(y) df[\nu] = \int_{x \in X} h(f(x)) d\nu$ . This is clear considering our definition of the integral by a Choquet-type formula.

A continuous valuation  $\nu$  on a space  $Y$  is *supported* on a subset  $X$  if and only if for all open subsets  $U$  and  $U'$  of  $Y$  such that  $U \cap X = U' \cap X$ ,  $\nu(U) = \nu(U')$  (Goubault-Larrecq, 2021, Definition 4.5). Giving  $X$  the subspace topology, and writing  $i$  for the inclusion map  $X \rightarrow Y$ , Lemma 4.6 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2021) states that a continuous valuation  $\nu$  on  $Y$  is supported on  $X$  if and only if there is a (unique) continuous valuation  $\mu$  on  $X$  such that  $\nu = i[\mu]$ .

The following lemma was already implicit in the proof of (de Brecht et al., 2019, Theorem 1.1). A continuous valuation  $\nu$  on  $Y$  is *bounded* if and only if  $\nu(Y) < \infty$ .

**Lemma 3.H** *Let  $Y$  be an LCS-complete space,  $V_n$  ( $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ) be countably many open subsets of  $Y$ , and  $\nu$  be a bounded continuous valuation on  $Y$ . If  $\nu$  is supported on every  $V_n$ , then  $\nu$  is supported on  $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} V_n$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $V_0 \supseteq V_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq V_n \dots$ , otherwise we replace each  $V_n$  by  $\bigcap_{i=0}^n V_i$ .

We will use a precursor to (de Brecht et al., 2019, Theorem 1.1): a theorem due to Mauricio Alvarez-Manilla (Alvarez-Manilla, 2000, Theorem 3.27) states that on a locally compact sober space, every locally finite continuous valuation extends to a (unique  $\tau$ -smooth) measure on the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. A continuous valuation is *locally finite* if and only if every point has an open neighborhood mapped to some finite number by the valuation. This applies to  $\nu$ , which is locally finite, since bounded. We write the unique extension of  $\nu$  we have just obtained as  $\mu$ .

In  $Y$ ,  $X$  is a countable intersection of open sets, hence lies in the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, so  $\mu(U \cap X)$  makes sense for every open subset  $U$  of  $Y$ . We then have  $\mu(U \cap X) = \mu(U \cap \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} V_n) = \mu(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (U \cap V_n)) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(U \cap V_n) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \nu(U \cap V_n)$ , since bounded measures map intersections of descending sequences of measurable sets to the infimum of their measures. Since  $\nu$  is supported on  $V_n$ , and  $(U \cap V_n) \cap V_n = U \cap V_n$ , we have  $\nu(U \cap V_n) = \nu(U)$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence  $\mu(U \cap X) = \nu(U)$ . This entails that for all open subsets  $U$  and  $U'$  of  $Y$  such that  $U \cap X = U' \cap X$ ,  $\nu(U)$  and  $\nu(U')$  are both equal to  $\mu(U \cap X) = \mu(U' \cap X)$ , so  $\nu$  is supported on  $X$ .  $\square$

Finally, here is Lemma 3.4 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) in repaired form. The conclusion is the same as originally published. The assumption that  $X$  is locally convex is replaced by  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendliness (Definition 3.A).

**Lemma 3.4** *Let  $\bullet$  be nothing, “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”, let  $X$  be an  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendly space, and let  $F$  be an element of  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(X)$ . For every  $h_0 \in \mathcal{L}X$ , and every real number  $r > 0$  such that  $F(h_0) > r$ , there is a  $G \in \mathbb{P}_\bullet(X)$  with  $G \leq F$  and  $G(h_0) > r$ .*

*Proof.* The cases where  $\bullet$  is nothing or “ $\leq 1$ ” were dealt with in Lemma 3.D.

We now deal with the case where  $\bullet$  is “1”. This decomposes into subcases, according to whether  $X$  satisfies condition 1, 2 or 3 of Definition 3.A.

*If condition 1 or 2 is satisfied.* We let  $W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F^{-1}(]1, \infty])$ . We verify the assumptions of Lemma 3.F. For every  $b > 1$  and every  $h \in W$ , we consider an arbitrary element  $ba \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1-a)h$  of  $[b \cdot \mathbf{1}, h]$ , with  $a \in [0, 1]$ . Since  $F$  is normalized and positively homogeneous,  $F(ba \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1-a) \cdot h) = ba + (1-a)F(h)$ . If  $a \neq 1$ , using the fact that  $h \in W = F^{-1}(]1, \infty])$ , this is strictly larger than  $ba + (1-a) \geq a + (1-a) = 1$ ; otherwise, this is equal to  $b$ , which is also strictly larger than 1. In any case, it follows that  $ba \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1-a)h$  is in  $W$ . Hence we may apply Lemma 3.F (with  $(1/r) \cdot h_0$  taking the place of  $h_0$ , so that  $(1/r) \cdot h_0 \in W = F^{-1}(]1, \infty])$ ), and we obtain that there is a convex Scott-open neighborhood  $V$  of  $(1/r) \cdot h_0$  in  $\mathcal{L}X$  that contains every function  $b \cdot \mathbf{1}$  with  $b > 1$  and that is included in  $W$ .

We note that  $V$  is proper (namely, not the whole of  $\mathcal{L}X$ ), since  $W$  is itself proper. Indeed, the constant 0 map  $0 \cdot \mathbf{1}$  is not in  $V$ , because  $F(0 \cdot \mathbf{1}) = 0$ . We form the upper Minkowski functional  $q$  of  $V$ , which is by definition the lower Minkowski function  $M_{\mathcal{L}X \setminus V}$  of its complement: by (Keimel, 2008, Proposition 7.6 (b)),  $q$  is a superlinear lower semi-continuous map from  $\mathcal{L}X$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ , such that  $q^{-1}(]1, \infty]) = V$ . In fact, taking upper Minkowski functionals defines an order-isomorphism between the collection of proper open convex sets and superlinear lower semi-continuous maps. Since  $V \subseteq W = F^{-1}(]1, \infty])$ ,  $q \leq F$ .

Keimel’s sandwich theorem (Keimel, 2008, Sandwich Theorem 8.2) states that given any superlinear lower semi-continuous map  $q: C \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  on a semi-topological cone  $C$ , given any sublinear map (not necessarily lower semi-continuous)  $p: C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  pointwise above  $q$ , there is a linear lower semi-continuous map  $G: C \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  such that  $q \leq G \leq p$ . We apply this to  $q$  defined above and to  $p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F$ , and we obtained the corresponding  $G$ .

The map  $(1/r) \cdot h_0$  is in  $V$ , so  $q((1/r) \cdot h_0) > 1$ ; then  $q(h_0) > r$ , and hence  $G(h_0) > r$ . We have  $G(\mathbf{1}) \leq F(\mathbf{1}) = 1$  because  $F$  is normalized, so  $G$  is subnormalized. Finally, for every  $b > 1$ ,  $b \cdot \mathbf{1}$  is in  $V$ , so  $q(b \cdot \mathbf{1}) \geq 1$ , namely  $q(\mathbf{1}) \geq 1/b$  for every  $b > 1$ . It follows that  $q(\mathbf{1}) \geq 1$ , so  $G(\mathbf{1}) \geq 1$ , hence  $G$  is normalized. Therefore  $G$  is in  $\mathbb{P}_p^1 X$ .

*If condition 3 is satisfied.* Then  $X$  embeds as a  $G_\delta$  subspace of a locally compact sober space  $Y$ . In particular,  $Y$  is core-compact, so  $\mathcal{L}Y$  is a locally convex, locally convex-compact, sober topological cone, by Remark 3.B. We equate  $X$  with the intersection  $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} V_n$  of a descending sequence of open subsets  $V_n$  of  $Y$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and we write  $i: X \rightarrow Y$  for the inclusion map.

Let  $F': \mathcal{L}Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  map every  $h' \in \mathcal{L}Y$  to  $F(h' \circ i)$ . It is easy to see that  $F'$  is a normalized sublinear prevision on  $Y$ .

Every  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$  extends to some  $h^* \in \mathcal{L}Y$ , in the sense that  $h^* \circ i = h$ , namely that  $h^*(x) = h(x)$  for every  $x \in X$ . This is due to the fact that  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  is a continuous lattice, and to Scott’s theorem that the continuous lattices are exactly the injective spaces (Gierz et al., 2003, Theorem II-3.8); namely, the spaces  $R$  such that every continuous map from a subspace (here,  $X$ ) of a space (here  $Y$ ) to  $R$  has a continuous extension to the whole of  $Y$ .

We have  $F'(h_0^*) = F(h_0^* \circ i) = F(h_0) > r$ . Let also  $W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F'^{-1}([1, \infty])$ . We will apply Lemma 3.F, this time with  $g_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \chi_{V_n}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We note that  $g_n \circ i = \mathbf{1}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , since  $X \subseteq V_n$ . We check that every function  $ba \cdot g_n + (1-a) \cdot h$  where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $b > 1$ ,  $a \in [0, 1]$  and  $h \in W$  is in  $W$ :  $F'(ba \cdot g_n + (1-a) \cdot h) = F'(ba \cdot (g_n \circ i) + (1-a) \cdot (h \circ i)) = F'(ba \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1-a) \cdot (h \circ i)) = ba + (1-a)F'(h) > 1$ , since  $b > 1$  and  $F'(h) > 1$ . By Lemma 3.F, therefore, there is a convex Scott-open neighborhood  $V$  of  $(1/r) \cdot h_0^*$  in  $\mathcal{L}Y$  that contains every function  $b \cdot \chi_{V_n}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $b > 1$ , and such that  $V \subseteq W$ .

$V$  is proper, since  $W$  is proper, because the constant 0 map is not in  $W$ . As before, there is a unique superlinear lower semi-continuous map  $q: \mathcal{L}Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  such that  $q^{-1}([1, \infty]) = V$ . By Keimel's sandwich theorem on  $\mathcal{L}Y$ , there is a lower semi-continuous linear map  $G': \mathcal{L}Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  such that  $q \leq G' \leq F'$ .

Hence  $G'$  is the integration functional of a unique continuous valuation  $\nu'$  on  $Y$ ; by integration functional we mean that  $G'(h) = \int_{y \in Y} h(y) d\nu'$  for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}Y$ . For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and every  $b > 1$ , we have  $G'(b \cdot \chi_{V_n}) \geq q(b \cdot \chi_{V_n}) > 1$ , since  $G' \geq q$  and  $b \cdot \chi_{V_n} \in V = q^{-1}([1, \infty])$ . Hence  $\nu'(V_n) = G'(\chi_{V_n}) > 1/b$  for every  $b > 1$ . Since  $G' \leq F'$ ,  $G'(\chi_{V_n}) \leq F'(\chi_{V_n}) = F(\chi_{V_n} \circ i) = F(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ , so  $\nu'(V_n) \leq 1$ . It follows that  $\nu'(V_n) = 1$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We also note that  $\nu'(Y) = 1$ : by a similar argument involving  $G' \leq F'$ ,  $\nu'(Y) \leq 1$ , and  $\nu'(Y) \geq \nu'(V_0) = 1$ .

For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , since  $\nu'(V_n) = 1$ ,  $\nu$  is supported on  $V_n$ . We argue as follows. We start with  $1 = \nu'(V_n) \leq \nu'(U \cup V_n) \leq \nu'(Y) = 1$ , so all terms in the sequence of inequalities are equal. In particular,  $\nu'(U \cup V_n) = \nu'(V_n) = 1$ . We use this with  $\nu'(U \cup V_n) + \nu'(U \cap V_n) = \nu'(U) + \nu'(V_n)$  and we obtain that  $\nu'(U \cap V_n) = \nu'(U)$ , for every open subset  $U$  of  $Y$ . In particular, for all open subsets  $U$  and  $U'$  of  $Y$  such that  $U \cap V_n = U' \cap V_n$ ,  $\nu'(U) = \nu'(U')$ . Using Lemma 3.H, then,  $\nu'$  is supported on  $X$ , and is therefore equal to the image continuous valuation  $i[\nu]$  of a unique continuous valuation  $\nu$  on  $X$ .

Additionally,  $\nu(X) = i[\nu](Y) = \nu'(Y) = 1$ . Let  $G$  be the integration functional of  $\nu$  on  $X$ , namely  $G(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{x \in X} h(x) d\nu$  for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ . For all  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ ,  $G(a \cdot \mathbf{1} + h) = a\nu(X) + G(h) = a + G(h)$  for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ , so  $G$  is normalized.

Next,  $G'(h) = G(h \circ i)$  for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}Y$ . Indeed,  $G'(h) = \int_{y \in Y} h(y) d\nu' = \int_{y \in Y} h(y) di[\nu] = \int_{x \in X} h(i(x)) d\nu$  (by the change-of-variable formula)  $= G(h \circ i)$ . In particular,  $G'(h_0^*) = G(h_0^* \circ i) = G(h_0)$ . But  $G' \geq q$ , and since  $(1/r) \cdot h_0^*$  is in  $V = q^{-1}([1, \infty])$ ,  $q((1/r) \cdot h_0^*) > 1$ , so  $G'(h_0^*) \geq q(h_0^*) > r$ . It follows that  $G(h_0) > r$ . Finally,  $G' \leq F'$ , so for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ ,  $G'(h^* \circ i) \leq F'(h^* \circ i)$ , meaning that  $G(h) \leq F(h)$ ; whence  $G \leq F$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5** *Let  $\bullet$  be nothing, " $\leq 1$ " or " $1$ ", and  $X$  be an  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendly space. Then  $r_{\text{AP}} \circ s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$  is the identity map on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* We must show that for every  $F \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}(X)$ , for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ ,  $F(h) = \sup_{G \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(X), G \leq F} G(h)$ . The inequality  $F(h) \leq \sup_{G \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X), G \leq F} G(h)$  follows directly from Lemma 3.4, while the converse inequality is obvious.  $\square$

The following lemma assumed  $\mathcal{L}X$  to be locally convex in (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017), but this is not needed.

**Lemma 3.6** *Let  $\bullet$  be nothing, “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”, and  $X$  be a topological space. For every  $F \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$ ,  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F) = \{G \in \mathbb{P}_p^\bullet(X) \mid G \leq F\}$  is a closed subset of  $\mathbb{P}_p^\bullet(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Consider any  $G \notin s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F)$ . There is an  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$  such that  $G(h) > F(h)$ . Then,  $[h > r]$  (where  $r \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(h)$ ) is an open neighborhood of  $G$  that does not meet  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F)$ . So the complement of  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F)$  is open.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7** *Let  $\bullet$  be nothing, “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”, and  $X$  be an  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendly space. For every  $F \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$ ,  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F) = \{G \in \mathbb{P}_p^\bullet(X) \mid G \leq F\}$  is an element of  $\mathcal{H}_V(\mathbb{P}_p^\bullet(X))$ .*

*Proof.* It is closed by Lemma 3.6. When  $\bullet$  is the empty superscript or “ $\leq 1$ ”,  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F)$  is non-empty since it contains the zero prevision. When  $\bullet$  is “1”, non-emptiness follows from Lemma 3.4 with  $h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{1}$ , and taking  $r = 0$  for example.  $\square$

The fact that  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$  is continuous is the most complicated result of this section. One of the needed ingredients is von Neumann’s original minimax theorem (von Neumann, 1928). That theorem was vastly generalized since then, and in numerous ways, but the original form will be sufficient to us.

**Lemma 3.8 (Von Neumann’s Minimax)** *For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\Delta_n$  be the set of  $n$ -tuples of non-negative real numbers  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = 1$ . For every  $n \times m$  matrix  $M$  with real entries,*

$$\min_{\vec{\alpha} \in \Delta_m} \max_{\vec{\beta} \in \Delta_n} \vec{\beta}^t M \vec{\alpha} = \max_{\vec{\beta} \in \Delta_n} \min_{\vec{\alpha} \in \Delta_m} \vec{\beta}^t M \vec{\alpha}.$$

Note that an implicit fact in that lemma, hidden in the notation min, max, is that the suprema over  $\vec{\beta}$  and the infima over  $\vec{\alpha}$  are attained. This is a consequence of the fact that  $\Delta_m$  and  $\Delta_n$  are compact, and that multiplication by  $M$  is continuous. For that, it is important that  $M$  has real-valued entries, and in particular, not  $+\infty$ .

**Lemma 3.9** *Let  $\bullet$  be nothing, “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”, and  $X$  be an  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendly space. Then  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$  is continuous from  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$  to  $\mathcal{H}_V(\mathbb{P}_p^\bullet(X))$ .*

*Proof.* Among the subbases of the weak topology on  $\mathbb{P}_p^\bullet(X)$ , one is given by subsets of the form  $[h > b]_p$ ,  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Since  $[h > 0]_p = \bigcup_{r>0} [h > r]_p$ , we may restrict to  $b \neq 0$ . When  $b \neq 0$ ,  $[h > b]_p = [h/b > 1]_p$ , so another subbase is given by the subsets of the form  $[h > 1]_p$ . Finally, since  $h$  is the directed supremum of the maps  $\min(h, r)$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , we can even restrict  $h$  to be bounded.

Since  $\diamond$  commutes with unions, a subbase of the topology of  $\mathcal{H}_V(\mathbb{P}_p^\bullet(X))$  is then given by the subsets of the form  $\diamond W$ , where  $W$  is a finite intersection  $\bigcap_{i=1}^m [h_i > 1]_p$ , where each  $h_i$  is continuous and bounded. Moreover, we may require  $m > 0$ .

We must show that the inverse image of  $\diamond W$  by  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$ , where  $W$  is as above, is open in  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$ . Let  $F$  be an arbitrary element of  $s_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet -1}(\diamond W)$ . By definition, there is an element  $G \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$  such that  $G \leq F$  and  $G \in \bigcap_{i=1}^m [h_i > 1]_{\mathbb{P}}$ .

Fix a positive real number  $\epsilon$  such that  $G(h_i) > 1 + \epsilon$  for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . We claim that we can find a finite set  $A$  of  $m$ -tuples of non-negative real numbers  $\vec{a} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m)$  such that  $\bigcap_{\vec{a} \in A} [\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i > (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i]_{\text{AP}}$  is an open neighborhood of  $F$  included in  $s_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet -1}(\diamond W)$ .

To this end, we shall define  $A$  as the set of  $m$ -tuples of non-negative real numbers  $\vec{a} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m)$  such that  $0 < \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \leq 1$  and each  $a_i$  is an integer multiple of  $1/N$ , for some fixed, large enough natural number  $N$ . Taking  $N$  so that  $\frac{m}{N} < \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}$  will be enough for our purposes.

The fact that  $F$  is in  $\bigcap_{\vec{a} \in A} [\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i > (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i]_{\text{AP}}$  is obvious. For every  $\vec{a} \in A$ ,  $F(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i) \geq G(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i G(h_i)$ , and this is larger than or equal to  $(1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$ . To show that it is strictly larger, recall that some  $a_i$  is non-zero, since  $0 < \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$ .

To show that  $\bigcap_{\vec{a} \in A} [\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i > (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i]_{\text{AP}}$  is included in  $s_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet -1}(\diamond W)$  is more technical. The main observation is the following:

**Fact A.** For every positively homogeneous map  $\Phi: \mathcal{L}X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  such that  $\Phi(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i) > (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$  for every  $\vec{a} \in A$ , it holds that  $\Phi(\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i h_i) > 1$  for every  $\vec{\alpha} \in \Delta_m$ .

This fact is proved by elementary computation. Fix  $\vec{\alpha} \in \Delta_m$ , and let  $a_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{N} \lfloor N\alpha_i \rfloor$  be the largest multiple of  $1/N$  below  $\alpha_i$ , for each  $i$ . Notice that  $\frac{1}{1+\epsilon} < \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \leq 1$ ; the inequality on the left follows from the consideration that  $a_i > \alpha_i - 1/N$ , and  $\frac{m}{N} < 1 - \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} = \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}$ , remembering that  $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i = 1$ . In particular,  $\vec{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m)$  is in  $A$ , so  $\Phi(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i) > (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$ . Since  $\alpha_i \geq a_i$  for each  $i$ ,  $\Phi(\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i h_i) \geq \Phi(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i) > (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$ , and we have just seen that the latter is strictly greater than 1.

Now consider any element  $F'$  of  $\bigcap_{\vec{a} \in A} [\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i > (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i]_{\text{AP}}$ . By Lemma 3.5,  $F'$  is a pointwise supremum of elements of  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$ . Write this supremum as a directed supremum of finite suprema, and observe that  $\bigcap_{\vec{a} \in A} [\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i > (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i]_{\text{AP}}$  is Scott open. As a consequence, it contains one of the finite suprema, viz., there are finitely many elements  $G'_1, G'_2, \dots, G'_n$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$  below  $F'$  such that, for every  $\vec{a} \in A$ , there is a  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , such that  $\sum_{i=1}^m a_i G'_j(h_i) > (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$ . We can even take  $G'_j$  bounded in the sense that  $G'_j(\mathbf{1}) < +\infty$ : this is clear when  $\bullet$  is “ $\leq 1$ ” or “ $1$ ”, otherwise we use (Heckmann, 1996, Theorem 4.2), which says that every linear prevision on  $X$  is a directed supremum of bounded linear previsions, allowing us to replace each  $G'_j$  by a bounded linear prevision whose value on  $h_i$  is close enough to  $G'_j(h_i)$ .

For every  $\vec{a} \in A$ , there is a  $j$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^m a_i G'_j(h_i) > (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$ , so trivially, there is a  $\vec{\beta} \in \Delta_n$  such that  $\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq n}} \beta_j G'_j(h_i) > (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$ .

Applying Fact A to  $\Phi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\vec{\beta} \in \Delta_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j G'_j$ , we obtain that for every  $\vec{\alpha} \in \Delta_m$ ,  $\sup_{\vec{\beta} \in \Delta_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j G'_j(\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i h_i) > 1$ , so  $\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq n}} \alpha_i \beta_j G'_j(h_i) > 1$  for some

$\vec{\beta} \in \Delta_n$ . Since  $G'_j$  is bounded, and  $h_i$  is bounded too,  $G'_j(h_i) < +\infty$ , so  $M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (G'_j(h_i))_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq n \\ 1 \leq i \leq m}}$  is a matrix of real numbers. Rephrasing what we have just obtained, for every  $\vec{\alpha} \in \Delta_m$ , there is a  $\vec{\beta} \in \Delta_n$  such that  $\vec{\beta}^t M \vec{\alpha} > 1$ . In particular (and using the fact that infima are attained)  $\min_{\vec{\alpha} \in \Delta_m} \max_{\vec{\beta} \in \Delta_n} \vec{\beta}^t M \vec{\alpha} > 1$ . By von Neumann's minimax theorem (Lemma 3.8),  $\max_{\vec{\beta} \in \Delta_n} \min_{\vec{\alpha} \in \Delta_m} \vec{\beta}^t M \vec{\alpha} > 1$ . Therefore, there is a tuple  $\vec{\beta} \in \Delta_n$  such that, for every  $\vec{\alpha} \in \Delta_m$ ,  $\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq n}} \alpha_i \beta_j G'_j(h_i) >$

1. Take  $G' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j G'_j$ . Since  $\sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j = 1$ ,  $G'$  is in  $\mathbb{P}_\bullet(X)$ , and  $G' \leq F'$ . Also, we have just proved that  $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i G'(h_i) > 1$  for every  $\vec{\alpha} \in \Delta_m$ , in particular,  $G'$  is in  $\bigcap_{i=1}^m [h_i > 1]_\mathbb{P}$ . Therefore  $F'$  is, indeed, in  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet{}^{-1}(\diamond W)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.10** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. For every  $C \in \mathcal{H}_V(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P } wk}^\bullet(X))$ ,  $C \subseteq s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{AP}}(C))$ .*

*Proof.* That amounts to checking that for every  $G \in C$ ,  $G(h) \leq \sup_{G' \in C} G'(h)$ , which is obvious.  $\square$

We sum up these results in the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.11** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, " $\leq 1$ ", or " $1$ ".*

*Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $r_{\text{AP}}$  is a continuous map from  $\mathcal{H}_V(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P } wk}^\bullet(X))$  to  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$ , and  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet \circ r_{\text{AP}}$  is above the identity.*

*If  $X$  is  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendly, then  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$  is a continuous map from  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$  to  $\mathcal{H}_V(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P } wk}^\bullet(X))$  such that  $r_{\text{AP}} \circ s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$  equals the identity.*

Recall that a coembedding-coprojection pair is a pair of continuous maps  $s$ ,  $r$ , such that  $r \circ s = \text{id}$  and  $\text{id} \leq s \circ r$ .

**Corollary 3.12**  $(\mathcal{H}_V(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P } wk}^\bullet(X)) \text{ coprojects onto } \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X))$  *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, " $\leq 1$ ", or " $1$ ". Let  $X$  be an  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendly space, for example, a locally compact space (or, more generally, a core-compact space), or an LCS-complete space.*

*Then  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$  and  $r_{\text{AP}}$  together define an coembedding-coprojection pair of  $\mathcal{H}_V(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P } wk}^\bullet(X))$  onto  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$ .*

## 3.2 The Retraction in the Demonic Case

In the demonic cases, we have defined  $r_{\text{DP}}(Q)(h)$  as  $\inf_{G \in Q} G(h)$ . We shall be interested in cases where  $Q$  is in a Smyth powerdomain. We can then say more:

**Lemma 3.13** *The map  $r_{\text{DP}}$ , once restricted to the Smyth powerdomain of some space of linear previsions, is defined by  $r_{\text{DP}}(Q)(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{G \in Q} G(h)$ .*

*Proof.* The evaluation map  $G \mapsto G(h)$  is continuous from the given space of linear previsions to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$ , by the very definition of the weak topology. Such continuous maps are called lower semi-continuous real maps in the mathematical literature, and it is standard that lower semi-continuous real maps attain their infimum on every compact set.  $\square$



We wish to show that  $r_{\text{DP}}, s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  forms a retraction. We again progress through a series of lemmata. In each,  $\bullet$  may be the empty subscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”.

We use a similar proof as sketched in (Goubault-Larrecq, 2008) to show that  $r_{\text{DP}} \circ s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  is the identity map (for whichever superscripts  $\bullet$ ). An additional trick allows us to dispense with an assumption of stable compactness, in Lemma 3.16 below.

**Lemma 3.14** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $r_{\text{DP}}$  is a map from  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X))$  to  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X))$ . Writing  $F(h)$  for  $r_{\text{DP}}(Q)(h) = \min_{G \in Q} G(h)$ , we must show that  $F$  is a Smyth prevision. Clearly,  $F$  is positively homogeneous, monotonic and superlinear. It is also subnormalized in case  $\bullet$  is “ $\leq 1$ ” and normalized when  $\bullet$  is “1”. It remains to show that  $F$  is Scott-continuous. This follows from the fact that the pointwise infimum of a compact family of lower semi-continuous functions is lower semi-continuous (Keimel, 1984). For completeness, here is a short argument. For any directed family  $(h_i)_{i \in I}$  with supremum  $h$ , we must show that  $F(h) \leq \sup_{i \in I} F(h_i)$ , since the other inequality stems from monotonicity. If that were not the case, let  $b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{i \in I} F(h_i)$ , so that  $F(h) > b$ . The open subsets  $[h_i > b]$ ,  $i \in I$ , form a directed open cover of  $Q$ , since for every  $G \in Q$ ,  $\sup_{i \in I} G(h_i) = G(h) \geq F(h) > b$ . By compactness,  $Q \subseteq [h_i > b]$  for some  $i$ , whence  $F(h_i) = \min_{G \in Q} G(h_i) > b$ , contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.15** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $r_{\text{DP}}$  is a continuous map from  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X))$  to  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* For clarity, write  $[h > b]_{\text{DP}}$  or  $[h > b]_{\mathbb{P}}$  for the subbasic open subset  $[h > b]$ , depending whether in a space of Smyth previsions or of linear previsions.

The inverse image of the subbasic open  $[h > b]_{\text{DP}} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X)$  by  $r_{\text{DP}}$  is  $\{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X)) \mid \min_{G \in Q} G(h) > b\} = \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X)) \mid \forall G \in Q \cdot G(h) > b\}$  (that this is a min, and not just an inf, is important here)  $= \square[h > b]_{\mathbb{P}}$ . This is open in  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X))$ . Therefore  $r_{\text{DP}}$  is continuous.  $\square$

To show that  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  maps Smyth previsions to compact saturated subsets of linear previsions, we shall use the following piece of logic.

Let  $A$  be a fixed stably compact space. (This will be  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  in our case.) Let  $T$  be a set. A *patch-continuous inequality* on  $T, A$  is any formula of the form:

$$f(-(t_1), \dots, -(t_m)) \dot{\leq} g(-(t'_1), \dots, -(t'_n)),$$

where  $f$  and  $g$  are patch-continuous maps from  $A^m$  to  $A$  and from  $A^n$  to  $A$  respectively, and  $t_1, \dots, t_m, t'_1, \dots, t'_n$  are  $m + n$  fixed elements of  $T$ .  $E$  holds at  $\alpha: T \rightarrow A$  iff  $f(\alpha(t_1), \dots, \alpha(t_m)) \leq g(\alpha(t'_1), \dots, \alpha(t'_n))$ , where  $\leq$  is the specialization quasi-ordering of  $A$ . A *patch-continuous system*  $\Sigma$  on  $T, A$  is a set of patch-continuous inequalities on  $T, A$ , and  $\Sigma$  holds at  $\alpha: T \rightarrow A$  if every element of  $\Sigma$  holds at  $\alpha$ . By convention, we shall allow equations  $a \doteq b$  in such systems, and agree that they stand for the pair of inequalities  $a \dot{\leq} b$  and

$b \dot{\leq} a$ . Then the set  $[\Sigma]$  of maps  $\alpha: T \rightarrow A$  such that  $\Sigma$  holds at  $\alpha$  is patch-closed in  $A^T$ , and in particular stably compact. This is (Goubault-Larrecq, 2010, Proposition 5.5), but also a fairly simple exercise.

**Lemma 3.16** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. For every  $F \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{DP } wk}^\bullet(X)$ ,  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F)$  is a compact saturated subset of  $\mathbb{P}_P^\bullet(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  maps every  $F \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(X)$  to the set of all  $G \in \mathbb{P}_P^\bullet(X)$  such that  $G \geq F$ .

Let  $Y^\bullet$  be the space of all linear, monotonic maps from  $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}X$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  that are subnormalized if  $\bullet$  is “ $\leq 1$ ”, and normalized if  $\bullet$  is “1”. Compared to  $\mathbb{P}_P^\bullet(X)$ , we are no longer requiring Scott-continuity. Equip  $Y^\bullet$  with the weak topology, which is again generated by subbasic open sets  $[h > b]_Y$ , defined as  $\{\alpha \in Y \mid \alpha(h) > b\}$ .  $Y^\bullet$  is then a subspace of the space  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}^C$  with its product topology, and  $\mathbb{P}_P^\bullet(X)$  is a subspace of  $Y^\bullet$ .

Now  $Y^\bullet$  is  $[\Sigma^\bullet]$ , where  $\Sigma^\bullet$  is the set of (polynomial, hence patch-continuous) inequalities:

- $\_ (ah) \doteq a \_ (h)$ , for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $h \in C$  (positive homogeneity);
- $\_ (h + h') \doteq \_ (h) + \_ (h')$  for all  $h, h' \in C$  (additivity);
- $\_ (h) \dot{\leq} \_ (h')$  for all  $h, h' \in C$  with  $h \leq h'$  (monotonicity);
- if  $\bullet$  is “ $\leq 1$ ”,  $\_ (a + h) \dot{\leq} a + \_ (h)$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $h \in C$ ;
- if  $\bullet$  is “1”,  $\_ (a + h) \doteq a + \_ (h)$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $h \in C$ .

So  $Y^\bullet$  is a patch-closed subset of  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}^C$ , and a stably compact space.

Consider the set  $s(F)$  of all  $\alpha \in Y^\bullet$  such that  $\alpha \geq F$ , meaning  $\alpha(h) \geq F(h)$  for every  $h \in C$ . This is again patch-closed in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}^C$  (consider  $\Sigma^\bullet$  plus the inequalities  $F(h) \dot{\leq} \_ (h)$ ), hence also in  $Y^\bullet$ . Note that  $s(F)$  is almost  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F)$ : the latter is the subset of those elements of  $s(F)$  that are Scott-continuous maps.

At this point, the natural next move would be to show that  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F)$  arises as a retract of  $s(F)$ , and conclude that  $s(F)$  is (stably) compact, using the fact that every retract of a stably compact space is stably compact. This idea was pioneered by (Jung, 2004), and taken again in (Goubault-Larrecq, 2010). But this requires  $X$  to be stably compact, and does not use the fact that  $F$  is superlinear and Scott-continuous. We use a different argument.

Note that  $s(F)$  is upward closed. But the patch-closed upward closed subsets of a stably compact space are exactly its compact saturated subsets (Gierz et al., 2003, Theorem VI.6.18 (3)), so  $s(F)$  is compact saturated in  $Y^\bullet$ .

To show that  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F)$  is compact saturated in  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(X)$ , we shall appeal to Alexander’s Subbase Lemma (Kelley, 1955, Theorem 5.6), which states that in a space  $X$  with subbase  $\mathcal{A}$ , a subset  $K$  is compact if and only if one can extract a finite subcover from every cover of  $K$  consisting of elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ . In our case, assume  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F)$  is included in a union of open subsets  $\bigcup_{i \in I} [h_i > b_i]$ . We wish

to show that there is a finite subset  $J$  of  $I$  such that  $s_{\text{dp}}^{\bullet}(F) \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in J} [h_i > b_i]$ . We do it by contraposition: we assume that  $s_{\text{dp}}^{\bullet}(F) \not\subseteq \bigcup_{i \in J} [h_i > b_i]$  for any  $J$ , namely, we assume that for every finite subset  $J$  of  $I$ , there is a  $G_J \in s_{\text{dp}}^{\bullet}(F)$  such that  $G_J(h_i) \leq b_i$  for every  $i \in J$ ; and we build an element  $G$  of  $s_{\text{dp}}^{\bullet}(F)$  such that  $G(h_i) \leq b_i$  for every  $i \in I$ . Note that, for every finite  $J$ ,  $F \leq G_J$ , so  $G_J$  is in  $s(F)$ .

We claim that there is an  $\alpha \in s(F)$  such that  $\alpha(h_i) \leq b_i$  for every  $i \in I$ . Otherwise, every  $\alpha \in s(F)$  would be in some  $[h_i > b_i]_Y$ ,  $i \in I$ . Since  $s(F)$  is compact in  $Y^{\bullet}$ , there would be a finite subset  $J$  of  $I$  such that  $s(F) \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in J} [h_i > b_i]_Y$ . In particular,  $G_J \in \bigcup_{i \in J} [h_i > b_i]_Y$ , contradicting the fact that  $G_J(h_i) \leq b_i$  for every  $i \in J$ .

Since  $\alpha$  is linear, it is in particular sublinear. Since  $\alpha \in s(F)$ , we have  $F \leq \alpha$ . So we can apply Keimel's Sandwich Theorem on the semitopological cone  $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}X$ , with the Scott topology: there is a *continuous* linear map  $G$  such that  $F \leq G \leq \alpha$ . (Yes, we are using Keimel's Sandwich Theorem only to buy continuity. It is crucial that the larger map,  $\alpha$  here, need not be continuous to apply this theorem.) When  $\bullet$  is " $\leq 1$ ",  $\alpha(\mathbf{1}) \leq 1$  implies that  $G$  is subnormalized, and when  $\bullet$  is " $1$ ", this together with  $F(\mathbf{1}) = 1$  implies that  $G$  is normalized. So  $G$  is in  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{p-}wk}^{\bullet}(X)$ . Also, since  $F \leq G$ ,  $G$  is in  $s_{\text{dp}}^{\bullet}(F)$ . Finally,  $G(h_i) \leq b_i$  for every  $i \in I$ , because  $G \leq \alpha$ .  $\square$

The most difficult part now is the following lemma, which will be used in particular to show that  $s_{\text{dp}}^{\bullet}$  is well defined.

**Lemma 3.17** *Let  $X$  be a topological space,  $F \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{dp}}^{\bullet}(X)$ , and  $h_0 \in \mathcal{L}X$ . Then there is a  $G \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{p-}wk}^{\bullet}(X)$  such that  $F \leq G$  and  $F(h_0) = G(h_0)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $F$  is the constant 0 prevision, this is clear. Indeed, first,  $\bullet$  cannot be " $1$ " in this case (since we must have  $F(\mathbf{1}) = 1$  for example). Then we can take  $G$  to be the constant 0 prevision again. So assume  $F$  is not constantly 0.

Write  $C$  for  $\mathcal{L}X$ . Let  $c$  be the smallest non-negative real number such that  $F(a \cdot \mathbf{1} + h) \leq ac + F(h)$  for every  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $h \in C$ , if one exists, and  $+\infty$  otherwise. Notice that if  $\bullet$  is " $\leq 1$ ", then  $c \leq 1$ . If  $\bullet$  is " $1$ ", then  $c = 1$ , as one sees by taking  $a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$ ,  $h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ . We also note that  $c > 0$ , in any case. Indeed, if  $c = 0$ , then we would have  $F(a \cdot \mathbf{1} + h) \leq F(h)$ , hence  $F(a \cdot \mathbf{1} + h) = F(h)$  for all  $a, h$ , in particular  $F(a) = 0$  for every  $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$  (taking  $h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ ). Since  $F$  is Scott-continuous, for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ ,  $F(h) = \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}_+} F(\min(h, a)) \leq \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}_+} F(a) = 0$ , contradicting the fact that  $F$  is not constantly 0.

For every real  $\lambda > 0$ , let  $A_\lambda$  be the closed convex hull of the pair of points  $\{\lambda/c \cdot \mathbf{1}, h_0\}$  in  $C$ ;  $\lambda/c \cdot \mathbf{1}$  is the constant function with value  $\lambda/c$ . By (Keimel, 2008, Lemma 4.10 (a)),  $A_\lambda$  is the closure of the convex hull  $H_\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a\lambda/c \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1-a)h_0 \mid a \in [0, 1]\}$  of  $\{\lambda/c \cdot \mathbf{1}, h_0\}$ . Define  $p_\lambda: C \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  by  $p_\lambda(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda M_{A_\lambda}(h)$ . (Notice that this makes sense only for  $\lambda > 0$ : this is undefined when  $\lambda = 0$  if  $M_{A_\lambda}(h) = +\infty$ . As before,  $M_{A_\lambda}$  is the lower Minkowski functional, see (1) in the Cones subsection of Section 2.) Since  $A_\lambda$  is non-empty, closed and convex,  $p_\lambda$  is continuous and sublinear for every  $\lambda > 0$ . Let  $p(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\lambda > 0} p_\lambda(h)$ .

It may fail to be continuous, but we don't need  $p$  to be continuous to apply Keimel's Sandwich Theorem.

We shall see below that  $p$  is sublinear. (Beware that an infimum of sublinear maps is not in general sublinear.) Before we prove this, we notice that whenever  $0 < \lambda \leq \mu$ : (\*) for every  $h \in C$ , for every  $r > 0$  such that  $(1/r) \cdot h \in H_\mu$ , there is an  $r' > 0$  such that  $(1/r') \cdot h \in H_\lambda$  and  $r'\lambda \leq r\mu$ . Indeed, by assumption  $(1/r) \cdot h = a\mu/c + (1-a)h_0$  for some  $a \in [0, 1]$ , i.e.,  $h = ra\mu/c + r(1-a)h_0$ . Let  $r' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ra\frac{\mu}{\lambda} + r(1-a)$ . We have  $r'\lambda = ra\mu + r(1-a)\lambda \leq r\mu$ . Moreover, letting  $a' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{ra\mu}{r'\lambda}$ , we check that  $1 - a' = \frac{r(1-a)}{r'}$ , so that  $h = r'a'\lambda/c \cdot \mathbf{1} + r'(1-a')h_0$ , and in particular  $(1/r') \cdot h = a'\lambda/c \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1-a')h_0$  is in  $H_\lambda$ . This finishes the proof of (\*). In turn, (\*) implies that for every  $r > 0$ , for every  $h \in C$  such that  $(1/r) \cdot h \in H_\mu$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} p_\lambda(h) = \lambda M_{A_\lambda}(h) &= \lambda \inf\{r' > 0 \mid (1/r') \cdot h \in A_\lambda\} \\ &\leq \lambda \inf\{r' > 0 \mid (1/r') \cdot h \in H_\lambda\} \quad (\text{since } H_\lambda \subseteq A_\lambda) \\ &\leq r\mu \quad (\text{since we can pick } r' \text{ so that } r'\lambda \leq r\mu). \end{aligned}$$

So  $H_\mu$  is included in the set of those maps  $(1/r) \cdot h$  such that  $p_\lambda(h) \leq r\mu$ , i.e., in  $r \cdot p_\lambda^{-1}([0, r\mu]) = p_\lambda^{-1}[0, \mu]$ . Since the latter is closed ( $p_\lambda$  is continuous),  $A_\mu$  is also included in this set. So, working backwards, we obtain that for every  $h \in C$ , for every  $r > 0$  such that  $(1/r) \cdot h \in A_\mu$ ,  $p_\lambda(h) \leq r\mu$ . Taking infima over  $r$ ,  $p_\lambda(h) \leq p_\mu(h)$ . We have proved that  $p_\lambda$  was a monotonic function of  $\lambda$ .

It follows that the family  $(p_\lambda)_{\lambda > F(h_0)}$  is a chain. In particular,  $(p_\lambda)_{\lambda > F(h_0)}$  is filtered, i.e., directed in the opposite ordering  $\geq$ . Since addition commutes with filtered infima,  $p(h) + p(h') = \inf_{\lambda > F(h_0)} [p_\lambda(h) + p_\lambda(h')] \geq \inf_{\lambda > F(h_0)} p_\lambda(h + h') = p(h + h')$ , using the fact that  $p_\lambda$  is sublinear. So  $p$  is sub-additive, and it follows easily that it is sublinear.

For every  $\lambda > 0$ , since  $\lambda/c \cdot \mathbf{1}$  is in  $A_\lambda$ ,  $M_{A_\lambda}(\lambda/c \cdot \mathbf{1}) \leq 1$ , so  $p_\lambda(\lambda/c \cdot \mathbf{1}) \leq \lambda$ . Since  $p_\lambda$  is positively homogeneous and  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $p_\lambda(\mathbf{1}) \leq c$ . It follows that  $p(\mathbf{1}) \leq c$ , a fact we shall need later.

Since  $h_0$  is in  $A_\lambda$ ,  $M_{A_\lambda}(h_0) \leq 1$ , so  $p_\lambda(h_0) \leq \lambda$ . Taking infs over  $\lambda > F(h_0)$ , it follows that  $p(h_0) \leq F(h_0)$ , another fact we shall need later.

For every  $\lambda > F(h_0)$ , for all  $r > 0$  and  $h \in C$  such that  $(1/r) \cdot h \in H_\lambda$ , write  $(1/r) \cdot h$  as  $a\lambda/c \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1-a)h_0$ ,  $a \in [0, 1]$ . If  $c \neq +\infty$ , then  $F(h) = rF(a\lambda/c \cdot \mathbf{1} + (1-a)h_0) \leq r(a\lambda + (1-a)F(h_0))$  (by definition of  $c$ )  $\leq r(a\lambda + (1-a)\lambda) = \lambda r$ . If  $c = +\infty$ , then  $F(h) = rF((1-a)h_0) \leq rF(h_0) \leq \lambda r$ . Taking infs over  $r$ ,  $F(h) \leq \lambda M_{A_\lambda}(h) = p_\lambda(h)$ . So, taking infs over  $\lambda > F(h_0)$ ,  $F(h) \leq p(h)$ . So  $F \leq p$ .

So we can apply Keimel's Sandwich Theorem: there is a continuous linear map  $G$  such that  $F \leq G \leq p$ . Also,  $G(\mathbf{1}) \leq p(\mathbf{1})$ , and we have seen that  $p(\mathbf{1}) \leq c$ , and that  $c \leq 1$  whenever  $\bullet$  is “ $\leq 1$ ” or “ $1$ ”: so, in these cases,  $G(\mathbf{1}) \leq 1$ , implying that  $G$  is subnormalized. If  $\bullet$  is “ $1$ ”, additionally,  $F(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ , so  $G(\mathbf{1}) = 1$  and  $G$  is normalized. In any case,  $G$  is in  $\mathbb{P}_{p, wk}^\bullet(X)$ .

We have also seen that  $p(h_0) \leq F(h_0)$ . Since also  $F(h_0) \leq G(h_0) \leq p(h_0)$ ,  $G(h_0) = F(h_0)$ , and we are done.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.18** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  is a map from  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(X)$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X))$ .*

*Proof.* For every  $F \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(X)$ ,  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F)$  is compact saturated by Lemma 3.16. Lemma 3.17 implies that it is non-empty.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.19** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $r_{\text{DP}} \circ s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  is the identity map on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP wk}}^\bullet(X)$ .*

*Proof.* We must show that for every  $F \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(X)$ , for every  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ ,  $F(h) = \min_{G \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X), F \leq G} G(h)$ . The difficult part is to show that  $F(h) \geq \min_{G \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X), F \leq G} G(h)$  for every  $h$ , and this is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.17, taking  $h_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.20** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  is a continuous map from  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP wk}}^\bullet(X)$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X))$ .*

*Proof.* As we already mentioned in the proof of Lemma 3.9, every open subset  $V$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X)$  can be written  $\bigcup_{i \in I} \bigcap_{j \in J_i} V_{ij}$ , where each  $V_{ij}$  is of the form  $[h > 1]_{\text{P}}$ ,  $h \in \mathcal{L}X$ , and each  $J_i$  is finite. We can also write this as the directed union, over all finite subsets  $I'$  of  $I$ , of  $\bigcup_{i \in I'} \bigcap_{j \in J_i} V_{ij}$ . Now we can distribute unions over intersections, and write  $V$  as a directed union of finite intersections of finite unions of subsets of the form  $[h > b]_{\text{P}}$ . It is easy to check that  $\square$  distributes over directed unions (using the fact that the elements of a Smyth powerdomain are compact, and that from every open cover of a compact subset  $K$  by a directed family, one can extract a single element of the family containing  $K$ ), and over finite intersections. It follows that a subbase of the topology on  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X))$  is given by the subsets of the form  $\square W$  with  $W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i=1}^m [h_i > 1]_{\text{P}}$ ,  $U_i$  open in  $X$ .

To show that  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  is continuous, we fix such an open  $W$ , and we claim that  $s_{\text{DP}}^{\bullet -1}(\square W)$  is open in the weak topology. It will be easier to show that its complement  $D$  is closed. Observe that  $F$  is in  $D$  if and only if there is a linear prevision  $G$  such that  $F \leq G$ , and for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $G(h_i) \leq 1$ .

**Case 1:  $\bullet$  is neither “ $\leq 1$ ” nor “1”.** We claim that  $D$  is the intersection of the complements of the subbasic weak opens  $[\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i > 1]_{\text{DP}}$  over all  $m$ -tuples of non-negative real numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_m$ , such that  $\sum_{i=1}^m a_i = 1$ , which will prove the claim. Clearly  $D$  is included in this intersection: if  $F \leq G$ ,  $G$  is linear, and  $G(h_i) \leq 1$  for every  $i$ , then  $F(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i) \leq G(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m a_i = 1$ . Conversely, let  $F \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(X)$  be such that  $F(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i) \leq 1$  for all  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^m a_i = 1$ , and let us show that  $F$  is in  $D$ . Define  $p(h)$  as  $\inf\{\sum_{i=1}^m a_i \mid a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{R}_+, \sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i \geq h\}$ . This is easily seen to be a sublinear map such that  $F \leq p$ . By Keimel’s Sandwich Theorem, there is a continuous linear map  $G$  between  $F$  and  $p$ . By taking  $a_i = 1$  and  $a_j = 0$  for all  $j \neq i$ , we see that  $p(h_i) \leq 1$ , whence  $G(h_i) \leq 1$  for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . So  $F$  is in  $D$ . This is all we need to show that  $D$  is closed in the weak topology, hence that  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  is weakly continuous.

**Case 2: • is “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”.** Underlining the changes, we claim that  $D$  is the intersection of the complements of the subbasic weak opens  $[\underline{a_0} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i > 1]_{\text{DP}}$  over all  $(m+1)$ -tuples of non-negative real numbers  $\underline{a_0}, a_1, \dots, a_m$  such that  $\sum_{i=0}^m a_i = 1$ , which will prove the claim. Clearly  $D$  is included in this intersection: if  $F \leq G$ ,  $G$  is linear and subnormalized, and  $G(h_i) \leq 1$  for every  $i$ , then  $F(\underline{a_0} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i) \leq G(\underline{a_0} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i) \leq \underline{a_0} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i = 1$ . Conversely, let  $F \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}(X)$  be such that  $F(\underline{a_0} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i) \leq \underline{a_0} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$  for all  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\sum_{i=0}^m a_i = 1$ , and let us show that  $F$  is in  $D$ . Define  $p(h)$  as  $\inf\{\underline{a_0} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \mid \underline{a_0}, a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{R}_+, \underline{a_0} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i \geq h\}$ . This is a sublinear map such that  $F \leq p$ . By Keimel’s Sandwich Theorem, there is a continuous linear map  $G$  between  $F$  and  $p$ . Additionally, since  $G(\mathbf{1}) \leq p(\mathbf{1})$  and  $p(\mathbf{1}) \leq 1$  (take  $a_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1, a_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ ),  $G$  is subnormalized; if in addition • is “1”, then  $F(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ , so  $F(\mathbf{1}) \leq G(\mathbf{1})$ , so  $G$  is normalized. In any case,  $G$  is in  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X)$ . By taking  $a_i = 1$  and  $a_j = 0$  for all  $j \neq i$ , we see that  $p(h_i) \leq 1$ , whence  $G(h_i) \leq 1$  for every  $i, 1 \leq i \leq m$ . So  $F$  is in  $D$ . This is all we need to show that  $D$  is closed in the weak topology, hence that  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  is continuous.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.21** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. For every  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X))$ ,  $Q \subseteq s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{DP}}(Q))$ .*

*Proof.* For every  $G \in Q$ ,  $G(h) \geq \inf_{G' \in Q} G'(h)$ .  $\square$

We sum up the above results as follows. More than a retraction, we now have a projection, by Lemma 3.21: remember that the ordering on Smyth powerdomains is reverse inclusion  $\supseteq$ , so  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet \circ r_{\text{DP}}$  is below the identity.

**Proposition 3.22** ( $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X))$  **projects onto**  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP wk}}^\bullet(X)$ ) *Let • be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”. Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $r_{\text{DP}}$  defines a projection of  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X))$  onto  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP wk}}^\bullet(X)$ , with associated embedding  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$ .*

### 3.3 The Retraction in the Erratic Case

In the erratic cases, recall that a fork  $(F^-, F^+)$  is a pair of a Smyth prevision  $F^-$  and of a Hoare prevision  $F^+$  satisfying Walley’s condition.

**Definition 3.23** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. For every non-empty set  $E$  of linear previsions on  $X$ , let  $r_{\text{ADP}}(E) \in (\mathcal{L}X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+)^2$  be  $(r_{\text{DP}}(E), r_{\text{AP}}(E))$ .*

*Conversely, for every (subnormalized, normalized) fork  $(F^-, F^+)$  on  $X$ , let  $s_{\text{ADP}}(F^-, F^+)$  (resp.,  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\leq 1}(F^-, F^+)$ ,  $s_{\text{ADP}}^1(F^-, F^+)$ ) be the set of all (subnormalized, normalized) linear previsions  $G$  such that  $F^- \leq G \leq F^+$ .*

So  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(F^-, F^+) = s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F^-) \cap s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F^+)$ , whatever the superscript •. We shall now prove that  $r_{\text{ADP}}, s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet$  form a retraction, once again.

This will require not only that  $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}X$  (with its Scott topology) be locally convex, as in the Hoare cases, but also that that addition on  $C$  be almost open. Following (Keimel, 2008, Definition 4.6), we say that addition is *almost open*

on a semitopological cone if and only if  $\uparrow(U + V)$  is open for every pair of open subsets  $U, V$  of  $C$ .

For every monotonic map  $q$  from  $C$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ , there is a (pointwise) largest continuous map  $\check{q}$  less than or equal to  $q$ :  $\check{q}(h)$  is the least upper bound of all real numbers  $r$  such that  $h$  is in the interior of  $q^{-1}(r, +\infty]$ . When  $C$  is almost open, and  $q$  is superlinear,  $\check{q}$  is again superlinear (Keimel, 2008, Lemma 5.7). This will be our main new ingredient.

There is a canonical situation in which all the above assumptions are satisfied:

**Lemma 3.24** *Let  $X$  be a core-compact, core-coherent space (for example, a stably locally compact space). Then  $\mathcal{L}X$  is a locally convex topological cone in which addition is almost open.*

*Proof.* Since  $X$  is core-compact, we already know that  $\mathcal{L}X$  is a locally convex topological cone.  $\mathcal{L}X$  is a continuous d-cone, too, and in that case, the fact that addition is almost open is equivalent to the property that the way-below relation  $\ll$  on  $C$  is *additive*, namely,  $f \ll f'$  and  $g \ll g'$  together imply  $f + g \ll f' + g'$  (Keimel, 2008, Lemma 6.14).

The space  $Y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{S}(X)$  is stably locally compact, and Proposition 2.28 of (Tix et al., 2009) then states that  $\ll$  is additive on  $[Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]$ . By Lemma 2.1,  $\ll$  is also additive on the homeomorphic space  $\mathcal{L}X$ , which allows us to conclude. (Note that core-coherence is required here. Using the same sobrification trick, Proposition 2.29 of (Tix et al., 2009) says that if  $X$  is core-compact, and  $\ll$  is additive on  $\mathcal{L}X$ , then  $X$  must in fact be core-coherent.)  $\square$

**Lemma 3.25** *Let  $X$  be a compact space. For every  $a \in [0, 1)$ ,  $a \cdot \mathbf{1} \ll \mathbf{1}$  in  $\mathcal{L}X$ , hence  $\uparrow(a \cdot \mathbf{1})$  is an open neighborhood of  $\mathbf{1}$  in  $\mathcal{L}X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(f_i)_{i \in I}$  be a directed family of continuous maps such that  $\sup_{i \in I} f_i \geq \mathbf{1}$ . So  $(\sup_{i \in I} f_i)^{-1}(a, +\infty] = \bigcup_{i \in I} f_i^{-1}(a, +\infty]$  contains the compact set  $X$ . Since the union is directed,  $X \subseteq f_i^{-1}(a, +\infty]$  for some  $i \in I$ , proving the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.26** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $r_{\text{ADP}}$  is a continuous map from  $\mathcal{P}l_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^{\bullet}(X))$  to  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP wk}}^{\bullet}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* We check that  $r_{\text{ADP}}(L)$  satisfies Walley's condition for every lens  $L$ . Let  $(F^-, F^+) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} r_{\text{ADP}}(L)$ . Then  $F^-(h + h') = \inf_{G \in L} G(h + h') = \inf_{G \in L} (G(h) + G(h')) \leq \inf_{G \in L} (G(h) + \sup_{G' \in L} G'(h')) = \inf_{G \in L} G(h) + \sup_{G' \in L} G'(h')$  (since  $L$  is non-empty)  $= F^-(h) + F^+(h')$ . We prove  $F^-(h) + F^+(h') \leq F^+(h + h')$  similarly. That  $r_{\text{ADP}}(L)$  is then a fork, and that  $r_{\text{ADP}}$  is continuous, then follows from Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.15.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.27** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet}$  is a map from  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet}(X)$  to  $\mathcal{P}l_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^{\bullet}(X))$ .*

*Proof.* We check that  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(F^-, F^+)$  is non-empty for every (subnormalized, normalized) fork  $(F^-, F^+)$ , i.e., that there is a (subnormalized, normalized) linear prevision  $G$  such that  $F^- \leq G \leq F^+$ : this is a trivial consequence of Keimel's Sandwich Theorem on the semitopological cone  $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{L}X$ . Then  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(F^-, F^+) = s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F^-) \cap s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F^+)$  is a lens, by Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.16.  $\square$

Before we continue, we establish two consequences of Walley's condition. Those are akin to the Main Lemma (Lemma 5.1) of (Keimel and Plotkin, 2009).

**Lemma 3.28** *Let  $X$  be a topological space, and  $(F^-, F^+) \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(X)$ . For every  $G' \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{P}}^\bullet(X)$  such that  $F^- \leq G'$ , there is a  $G \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{P}}^\bullet(X)$  such that  $F^- \leq G \leq F^+$  and  $G \leq G'$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $C$  for  $\mathcal{L}X$ . Let  $p(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\substack{h_1, h_2 \in C \\ h \leq h_1 + h_2}} (F^+(h_1) + G'(h_2))$ . This is a sublinear map, notably, subadditivity is proved as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p(h) + p(h') &= \inf_{\substack{h_1, h_2, h'_1, h'_2 \in C \\ h \leq h_1 + h_2 \\ h' \leq h'_1 + h'_2}} (F^+(h_1) + F^+(h'_1) + G'(h_2) + G'(h'_2)) \\ &\geq \inf_{\substack{h_1, h_2, h'_1, h'_2 \in C \\ h \leq h_1 + h_2 \\ h' \leq h'_1 + h'_2}} (F^+(h_1 + h'_1) + G'(h_2 + h'_2)) \\ &\geq \inf_{\substack{h''_1, h''_2 \in C \\ h + h' \leq h''_1 + h''_2}} (F^+(h''_1) + G'(h''_2)) = p(h + h'). \end{aligned}$$

Note also that  $p \leq F^+$  (take  $h_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h$ ,  $h_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ ) and  $p \leq G'$  (take  $h_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ ,  $h_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h$ ). We check that  $F^- \leq p$ , i.e., that for all  $h_1, h_2 \in C$  such that  $h \leq h_1 + h_2$ ,  $F^-(h) \leq F^+(h_1) + G'(h_2)$ . This is by Walley's condition, since  $F^-(h) \leq F^-(h_1 + h_2) \leq F^+(h_1) + F^-(h_2)$ , and  $F^- \leq G'$ . By Keimel's Sandwich Theorem, there is a continuous linear map  $G$  such that  $F^- \leq G \leq p$ . When  $\bullet$  is " $\leq 1$ ",  $G(\mathbf{1}) \leq p(\mathbf{1}) \leq F^+(\mathbf{1}) \leq 1$ , so  $G$  is subnormalized, and when  $\bullet$  is " $\mathbf{1}$ ",  $p(\mathbf{1}) \geq F^-(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ , so  $G$  is normalized. In any case,  $G$  is in  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{P}}^\bullet(X)$ . Moreover,  $F^- \leq G \leq p \leq F^+$ , and  $G \leq p \leq G'$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.29** *Let  $X$  be a topological space such that  $\mathcal{L}X$  is locally convex and has an almost open addition map. Assume that  $X$  is also compact in case  $\bullet$  is " $\mathbf{1}$ ". Let  $(F^-, F^+) \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(X)$ . For every  $G' \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{P}}^\bullet(X)$  such that  $G' \leq F^+$ , there is a  $G \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{P}}^\bullet(X)$  such that  $F^- \leq G \leq F^+$  and  $G' \leq G$ .*

*Proof.* Write again  $C$  for  $\mathcal{L}X$ . Let  $q_1(h)$  be defined as  $\sup_{\substack{h_1, h_2 \in C \\ h_1 + h_2 \leq h}} (F^-(h_1) + G'(h_2))$ . By an argument similar to the one we used in the proof of Lemma 3.28 on  $p$ ,  $q_1$  is superlinear, and  $F^- \leq q_1$ ,  $G' \leq q_1$ . Moreover, we check that  $q_1 \leq F^+$ , i.e., that for all  $h_1, h_2 \in C$  such that  $h_1 + h_2 \leq h$ ,  $F^-(h_1) + G'(h_2) \leq F^+(h)$ : this is by Walley's condition again, since  $F^+(h) \geq F^+(h_1 + h_2) \geq F^-(h_1) + F^+(h_2) \geq F^-(h_1) + G'(h_2)$ .



However, to apply Keimel's Sandwich Theorem to  $q_1$  and  $F^+$ , we would need  $q_1$  to be continuous. Instead, consider  $\check{q}_1$ . We have already noted that, since addition on  $\mathcal{L}X$  is almost open,  $\check{q}_1$  is not only continuous, but also superlinear (Keimel, 2008, Lemma 5.7). Since  $\check{q}_1$  is the largest Scott-continuous map below  $q_1$ , and  $F^-, G'$  are Scott-continuous and below  $q_1$ , we also have  $F^- \leq \check{q}_1$ ,  $G' \leq \check{q}_1$ . Since  $\check{q}_1 \leq q_1 \leq F^+$ , we can now apply Keimel's Sandwich Theorem, and obtain a linear prevision  $G$  such that  $\check{q}_1 \leq G \leq F^+$ .

If  $\bullet$  is " $\leq 1$ ", then  $G(\mathbf{1}) \leq F^+(\mathbf{1}) \leq 1$ , so  $G$  is subnormalized. If  $\bullet$  is " $1$ ", remember that we have assumed that  $X$  was also compact. By Lemma 3.25,  $\hat{\uparrow}(a \cdot \mathbf{1})$  is an open neighborhood of  $\mathbf{1}$  for every  $a \in [0, 1)$ . We check that is included in  $q_1^{-1}(r, +\infty]$  for every  $r < a$ : for every  $h \in \hat{\uparrow}(a \cdot \mathbf{1})$ ,  $q_1(h) \geq q_1(a \cdot \mathbf{1}) \geq F^-(a \cdot \mathbf{1}) = a > r$ . In particular, for every  $r \in [0, 1)$ , we have just shown that  $\mathbf{1}$  is in the interior of  $q_1^{-1}(r, +\infty]$  (pick any  $a \in (r, 1)$ ). Since  $\check{q}_1(\mathbf{1})$  is the least upper bound of all real numbers  $r$  with that property,  $\check{q}_1(\mathbf{1}) \geq 1$ . Since  $G(\mathbf{1}) \geq \check{q}_1(\mathbf{1})$ ,  $G$  is normalized in the " $1$ " case. To sum up, whatever  $\bullet$  is,  $G$  is in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{p}}^{\bullet}(X)$ .

Finally,  $F^- \leq \check{q}_1 \leq G \leq F^+$ , and  $G' \leq \check{q}_1 \leq G$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.30** *Let  $X$  be a topological space such that  $\mathcal{L}X$  is locally convex and has an almost open addition map. Assume that  $X$  is also compact in case  $\bullet$  is " $1$ ". Then  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet}$  is a continuous map from  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP } wk}^{\bullet}(X)$  to  $\mathcal{P}l_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{p}}^{\bullet}(X))$ .*

*Proof.* For every open subset  $V$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{p}}^{\bullet}(X)$ ,  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\square V)$  is the set of (subnormalized, normalized) forks  $(F^-, F^+)$  such that every  $G \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{p}}^{\bullet}(X)$  such that  $F^- \leq G \leq F^+$  is in  $V$ . We claim that this is exactly  $\pi_1^{-1}(s_{\text{DP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\square V))$ , where  $\pi_1$  is first projection. The inclusion  $\pi_1^{-1}(s_{\text{DP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\square V)) \subseteq s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\square V)$  is trivial. Conversely, for every element  $(F^-, F^+)$  of  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\square V)$ , we must show that every  $G' \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{p}}^{\bullet}(X)$  such that  $F^- \leq G'$  is in  $V$ . By Lemma 3.28, one can find  $G \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{p}}^{\bullet}(X)$  such that  $F^- \leq G \leq F^+$  and  $G \leq G'$ . In particular, since  $(F^-, F^+)$  is in  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\square V)$ ,  $G$  is in  $V$ . Since  $V$  is upward closed,  $G'$  is also in  $V$ .

For every open subset  $V$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{p}}^{\bullet}(X)$ ,  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\diamond V)$  is the set of (subnormalized, normalized) forks  $(F^-, F^+)$  such that there is a  $G \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{p}}^{\bullet}(X)$  such that  $F^- \leq G \leq F^+$  that is also in  $V$ . We claim that this is exactly  $\pi_2^{-1}(s_{\text{DP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\diamond V))$ , where  $\pi_2$  is second projection. The inclusion  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\diamond V) \subseteq \pi_2^{-1}(s_{\text{DP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\diamond V))$  is trivial. Conversely, for every element  $(F^-, F^+)$  of  $\pi_2^{-1}(s_{\text{DP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\diamond V))$ , i.e., such that there is a  $G' \in V$  with  $G' \leq F^+$ , we must show that there is a  $G \in V$  such that  $F^- \leq G \leq F^+$ . We use Lemma 3.29 to this end: this yields such a  $G$ , since  $V$  is upward closed.

To sum up, we have shown that both  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\square V) = \pi_1^{-1}(s_{\text{DP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\square V))$  and  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\diamond V) = \pi_2^{-1}(s_{\text{DP}}^{\bullet^{-1}}(\diamond V))$  are open, so  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet}$  is continuous.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.31** *Let  $X$  be topological space such that  $[X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]_{\sigma}$  is locally convex and has an almost open addition map. Assume that  $X$  is also compact in case  $\bullet$  is " $1$ ". Then  $r_{\text{ADP}} \circ s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet}$  is the identity map on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP } wk}^{\bullet}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* For every (subnormalized, normalized) fork  $(F^-, F^+)$ , let  $L \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet}(F^-, F^+)$ . One may write  $L$  as  $Q \cap F$ , where  $Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s_{\text{DP}}^{\bullet}(F^-)$ , and  $F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet}(F^+)$ , and by

Proposition 3.22 and Proposition 3.11,  $r_{\text{DP}}(Q) = F^-$ ,  $r_{\text{AP}}(F) = F^+$ . To show that  $r_{\text{ADP}}(s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(F^-, F^+)) = (F^-, F^+)$ , we must show that  $r_{\text{DP}}(L) = F^-$  and  $r_{\text{AP}}(L) = F^+$ .

Since  $L \subseteq Q$ , using the definition of  $r_{\text{DP}}$  (Definition 3.1),  $r_{\text{DP}}(L) \geq F^-$ . Since  $r_{\text{DP}}(Q) = F^-$  (and using Lemma 3.13), for every  $h \in C$ , there is a  $G' \in Q$  such that  $G'(h) = F^-(h)$ . By definition of  $Q$ ,  $F^- \leq G'$ . By Lemma 3.28, there is a  $G \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^\bullet(X)$  such that  $F^- \leq G \leq F^+$  (i.e., such that  $G \in L$ ) and  $G \leq G'$ . So  $r_{\text{DP}}(L)(h) \leq G(h) \leq G'(h) = F^-(h)$ . It follows that  $r_{\text{DP}}(L) \leq F^-$ , hence  $r_{\text{DP}}(L) = F^-$ .

Since  $L \subseteq F$ , using the definition of  $r_{\text{AP}}$ ,  $r_{\text{AP}}(L) \leq F^+$ . Since  $r_{\text{AP}}(F) = F^+$ , for every  $h \in C$ , and for every real number  $r < F^+(h)$ , there is a  $G' \in F$  such that  $G'(h) \geq r$ . By definition of  $F$ ,  $G' \leq F^+$ . By Lemma 3.29, there is a  $G \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^\bullet(X)$  such that  $F^- \leq G \leq F^+$  (i.e., such that  $G \in L$ ) and  $G' \leq G$ . So  $r_{\text{AP}}(L)(h) \geq G(h) \geq G'(h) \geq r$ . Taking sups over  $r$ ,  $r_{\text{AP}}(L)(h) \geq F^+(h)$ . So  $r_{\text{AP}}(L) \geq F^+$ , whence  $r_{\text{AP}}(L) = F^+$ , and we are done.  $\square$

We sum up these results as follows.

**Proposition 3.32** ( $\mathcal{P}\ell_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X))$  retracts onto  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP wk}}^\bullet(X)$ ) *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”. Let  $X$  be a topological space such that  $[X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]_{\sigma}$  is locally convex and has an almost open addition map, for example a stably locally compact space, or more generally, a core-compact, core-coherent space. Assume also that  $X$  is compact in case  $\bullet$  is “1”.*

*Then  $r_{\text{ADP}}$  defines a retraction of  $\mathcal{P}\ell_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X))$  onto  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP wk}}^\bullet(X)$ , with associated section  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet$ .*

### 3.4 Domain-Theoretic Consequences

The focus in domain theory is on Scott topologies rather than on weak topologies. But Scott-continuity quickly follows provided we use the following result (Goubault-Larrecq, 2012, Lemma 3.8): for every quasi monotone convergence space  $Z$ , and every  $T_0$  topological space  $Z'$ , every continuous map from  $Z$  to  $Z'$  is continuous from  $Z_{\sigma}$  to  $Z'_{\sigma}$ . Here  $Z_{\sigma}$  is  $Z$  with the Scott topology of its specialization preorder, and a quasi monotone convergence space is a space where this topology is finer than the original one on  $Z$ . The specialization ordering of any space of previsions with the weak topology is the pointwise ordering  $\leq$ , and each of these spaces is quasi monotone convergence, because  $[h > r]$  is Scott open. So, given any space of previsions  $Z$ ,  $Z_{\sigma}$  is just the same space with the Scott topology of its ordering. Similarly for spaces of forks. Also,  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}(Y)_{\sigma} = \mathcal{Q}(Y)$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(Y)_{\sigma} = \mathcal{H}(Y)$ . To stress that we are using Scott-continuity, call a *Scott retraction* any retraction between posets equipped with their Scott topologies.

Applying this reasoning to Proposition 3.11, we obtain:

**Proposition 3.33** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”. Let  $X$  be a core-compact space. Then  $r_{\text{AP}}$  defines a Scott retraction of  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^\bullet \text{wk}(X))$  onto  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(X)$ , with associated section  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$ . Moreover  $r_{\text{AP}} \circ s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet \geq \text{id}$ .*

Indeed, we recall from Remark 3.B that every core-compact space is  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendly.

Applying this reasoning to Proposition 3.22, we obtain:

**Proposition 3.34** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”. Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $r_{\text{DP}}$  defines a Scott retraction of  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{P}_P^\bullet(X))$  onto  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(X)$ , with associated section  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$ . Moreover  $r_{\text{DP}} \circ s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet \leq \text{id}$ .*

Applying it to Proposition 3.32, finally, we obtain:

**Proposition 3.35** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”. Let  $X$  be a core-compact, core-coherent space (and compact if  $\bullet$  is “1”). Then  $r_{\text{ADP}}$  defines a Scott retraction of  $\mathcal{P}\ell(\mathbb{P}_P^\bullet(X))$  onto  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(X)$ , with associated section  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet$ .*

There is still a bit of the weak topology lying around in the latter three propositions, in the various spaces  $\mathbb{P}_P^\bullet(X)$  of linear previsions involved.

The Scott topology is finer than the weak topology on any space of previsions. Up to the canonical isomorphism between  $\mathbb{P}_P^\bullet(X)$  and  $\mathbf{V}^\bullet(X)$  (for whichever superscript  $\bullet$ ), the *Kirch-Tix Theorem* states that, whenever  $X$  is a continuous dcpo, the Scott and weak topologies coincide on  $\mathbb{P}_P(X)$  (Tix, 1995, Satz 4.10), and on  $\mathbb{P}_P^{\leq 1}(X)$  (Kirch, 1993, Satz 8.6).

Given a poset  $X$ , let  $X_\perp$  be  $X$  plus a fresh bottom element  $\perp$ , below all points of  $X$ . By a trick due to Edalat (Edalat, 1995, Section 3), the spaces  $\mathbf{V}^1(X_\perp)$  of all normalized continuous valuations on  $X_\perp$  and  $\mathbf{V}^{\leq 1}(X)$  of all subnormalized continuous valuations on  $X$  are order-isomorphic, and also homeomorphic in their weak topologies. (For  $\nu \in \mathbf{V}^1(X_\perp)$ , define a subnormalized valuation on  $X$  by considering  $\nu$  restricted to the opens contained in  $X$ . Conversely, for  $\nu \in \mathbf{V}^{\leq 1}(X)$ , define  $\nu' \in \mathbf{V}^1(X_\perp)$  by  $\nu'(U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \nu(U)$  if  $U$  is open in  $X$ , and  $\nu'(X_\perp) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$ .) It follows that, on pointed continuous dcpos, that is, on continuous dcpos that we can write as  $X_\perp$  for some, necessarily continuous, dcpo  $X$ , the Scott and weak topologies also coincide on  $\mathbb{P}_P^1(X)$ .

Every continuous dcpo is locally compact, and every pointed poset is compact in its Scott topology. We therefore obtain the following purely domain-theoretic statements (all spaces come with their Scott topologies) from Proposition 3.33, Proposition 3.34, and Proposition 3.35 respectively.

**Proposition 3.36** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”. Let  $X$  be a continuous dcpo (and pointed if  $\bullet$  is “1”). Then  $r_{\text{AP}}$  defines a Scott retraction (even a coembedding-coprojection pair) of  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{P}_P^\bullet(X))$  onto  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(X)$ , with associated section  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$ .*

**Proposition 3.37** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”. Let  $X$  be a continuous dcpo. Then  $r_{\text{DP}}$  defines a Scott retraction (even an embedding-projection pair) of  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{P}_P^\bullet(X))$  onto  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(X)$ , with associated section  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$ .*

**Proposition 3.38** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”. Let  $X$  be a coherent, continuous dcpo (and pointed if  $\bullet$  is “1”). Then  $r_{\text{ADP}}$  defines a Scott retraction of  $\mathcal{P}\ell(\mathbb{P}_P^\bullet(X))$  onto  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(X)$ , with associated section  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet$ .*

Let us draw a few domain-theoretic consequences of the above results. All of these will state that, under suitable conditions, spaces of Smyth, resp. Hoare previsions, and of forks are continuous dcpos, with natural bases; and that the Scott and the weak topologies will coincide on such spaces.

When  $X$  is a continuous dcpo,  $\mathbf{V}(X)$  is a continuous dcpo, with a basis of *simple valuations*, i.e., valuations of the form  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \delta_{x_i}$ , where  $a_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $x_i \in X$  (Gierz et al., 2003, Theorem IV.9.16). This is an extension of Jones' original theorem, that  $\mathbf{V}^{\leq 1}(X)$  is a continuous dcpo, with a basis of subnormalized simple valuations (Jones, 1990, Chapter 5). Using Edalat's trick, we obtain a similar result for  $\mathbf{V}^1(X)$  and normalized simple valuations, provided  $X$  is also pointed. Notice that the isomorphism with linear previsions yields bases of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}(X)$  (resp.,  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^{\leq 1}(X)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^1(X)$ ) consisting of *simple linear previsions* (resp., subnormalized, normalized) of the form  $h \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n a_i h(x_i)$ .

In turn, if  $Y$  is a continuous dcpo, with basis  $B$ , then  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  is a continuous dcpo, too, and a basis is given by the subsets of the form  $\downarrow E$ , where  $E$  is a finite non-empty subset of  $B$ . (See (Gierz et al., 2003, Corollary IV.8.7), which does not mention the basis explicitly, or (Abramsky and Jung, 1994, Theorem 6.2.10, Item 1), which does, but in less explicit a form; in the latter case, one should also note that our version of the Hoare powerdomain coincides with theirs, by their own Theorem 6.2.13.) Now, for any retraction  $r: D \rightarrow E$ , where  $D$  is a continuous dcpo,  $E$  is also a continuous dcpo, and a basis of  $E$  is given by the image under  $r$  of a basis of  $D$  (Abramsky and Jung, 1994, Lemma 3.1.3). Using Proposition 3.36, we obtain:

**Proposition 3.39** *Let  $X$  be a continuous dcpo. Then  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}(X)$  (resp.,  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^{\leq 1}(X)$ ) is a continuous dcpo, with basis given by the finite non-empty sups of simple (resp., and subnormalized) linear previsions:*

$$h \mapsto \max_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} a_{ij} h(x_{ij})$$

where  $m \geq 1$  (resp., and  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} a_{ij} \leq 1$  for every  $i$ ).

If  $X$  is a pointed continuous dcpo, then  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^1(X)$  is a pointed continuous dcpo, with basis given by the finite sups of simple normalized previsions (i.e.,  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} a_{ij} = 1$  for every  $i$ ). The least element is  $h \mapsto h(\perp)$ , where  $\perp$  is the least element of  $X$ .

Recall that, when  $Y$  is a continuous dcpo, then the Scott and the lower Vietoris topologies coincide on  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  (Schalk, 1993, Section 6.3.3). In particular, under the assumptions of Proposition 3.39,  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}(X)) = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}(X)) = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$  (by the Kirch-Tix Theorem), and similarly in the subnormalized and normalized cases.

Now, every section is a topological embedding. Under the same assumptions as above, Proposition 3.11 and Proposition 3.36 imply that  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP} \text{ wk}}(X)$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}(X)$  both embed into the same space  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}(X)) = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$ . Hence they have the same topology:

**Proposition 3.40** *Let  $X$  be a continuous dcpo. The Scott topology coincides with the weak topology on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}(X)$ , on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^{\leq 1}(X)$ ; also on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^1(X)$  if  $X$  is additionally assumed to be pointed.*

Similarly, if  $Y$  is a continuous dcpo with basis  $B$ , then  $\mathcal{Q}(Y)$  is a continuous dcpo, with basis given by the subsets of the form  $\uparrow E$ ,  $E$  a finite and non-empty subset of  $B$  (Abramsky and Jung, 1994, Theorem 6.2.10, Item 2) (and our Smyth powerdomain is the same as theirs, by their Theorem 6.2.14).

**Proposition 3.41** *Let  $X$  be a continuous dcpo. Then  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}(X)$  (resp.,  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^{\leq 1}(X)$ ) is a continuous dcpo, with basis given by the finite non-empty infs of simple (resp., and subnormalized) linear previsions:*

$$h \mapsto \min_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} a_{ij} h(x_{ij})$$

where  $m \geq 1$  (resp., and  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} a_{ij} \leq 1$  for every  $i$ ).

If  $X$  is a pointed continuous dcpo, then  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^1(X)$  is a pointed continuous dcpo, with basis given by the finite mins of simple normalized previsions (i.e.,  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} a_{ij} = 1$  for every  $i$ ). The least element is  $h \mapsto h(\perp)$ , where  $\perp$  is the least element of  $X$ .

The Scott and the upper Vietoris topologies coincide on  $\mathcal{Q}(Y)$  on every  $T_0$ , well-filtered, locally compact space (Schalk, 1993, Section 7.3.4), in particular on every continuous dcpo  $Y$ . By the same argument as for Proposition 3.40:

**Proposition 3.42** *Let  $X$  be a continuous dcpo. The Scott topology coincides with the weak topology on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}(X)$ , on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^{\leq 1}(X)$ ; also on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^1(X)$  if  $X$  is additionally assumed to be pointed.*

When  $Y$  is a continuous, coherent dcpo with basis  $B$ , then  $\mathcal{P}\ell(Y)$  is again a continuous dcpo, with basis given by the subsets of the form  $\uparrow E \cap \downarrow E$ ,  $E$  a finite and non-empty subset of  $B$ . This is Theorem 6.2.3 of (Abramsky and Jung, 1994), together with Theorem 6.2.22, which states that our Plotkin powerdomain is the same as theirs.

**Proposition 3.43** *Let  $X$  be a continuous, coherent dcpo. Then  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}(X)$  (resp.,  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^{\leq 1}(X)$ ) is a continuous dcpo, with basis given by the simple (resp., and subnormalized) forks of the form:*

$$(h \mapsto \min_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} a_{ij} h(x_{ij}), h \mapsto \max_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} a_{ij} h(x_{ij}))$$

where  $m \geq 1$  (resp., and  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} a_{ij} \leq 1$  for every  $i$ ).

If  $X$  is a pointed continuous, coherent dcpo, then  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^1(X)$  is a pointed continuous dcpo, with basis the simple normalized forks (i.e.,  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} a_{ij} = 1$  for every  $i$ ). The least element is  $(h \mapsto h(\perp), h \mapsto h(\perp))$ , where  $\perp$  is the least element of  $X$ .

We conclude this section with a result similar to Proposition 3.40 and Proposition 3.42. This time, we use the fact that the way-below relation  $\ll_{\mathcal{P}\ell}$  on  $\mathcal{P}\ell(Y)$ , when  $Y$  is a continuous, coherent dcpo, is given by  $L \ll_{\mathcal{P}\ell} L'$  iff  $\uparrow L \ll_{\mathcal{Q}} \uparrow L'$  and  $cl(L) \ll_{\mathcal{H}} cl(L')$  (Abramsky and Jung, 1994, Section 6.2.1); so our sub-basic Scott open subsets are  $\{L' \in \mathcal{P}\ell(Y) \mid L' \subseteq \uparrow E \text{ and } L' \cap \downarrow E' \neq \emptyset\} = \square \uparrow E \cap \bigcap_{y \in E'} \diamond \downarrow y$ , where  $E$  and  $E'$  are finite and non-empty. Since they are all open in the Vietoris topology, the Scott and Vietoris topologies coincide on  $\mathcal{P}\ell(Y)$ . As before, we use the fact that our spaces of forks with the weak and the Scott topologies are subspaces of the same space to conclude:

**Proposition 3.44** *Let  $X$  be a continuous, coherent dcpo. The Scott topology coincides with the weak topology on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}(X)$ , on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^{\leq 1}(X)$ ; also on  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^1(X)$  is  $X$  is additionally assumed to be pointed.*

## 4 The Isomorphisms

Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, or “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”, depending on the case. When  $X$  is **AP $\bullet$ -friendly**, we know that  $r_{\text{AP}} \circ s_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet}$  is the identity map, where  $r_{\text{AP}}: \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X)) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X)$  and  $s_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet}: \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X))$  (Corollary 3.12).

Now write  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}^{cvx}(D)$  for the subspace of  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(D)$  consisting of *convex* closed, non-empty, subsets of  $D \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X)$ , and similarly  $\mathcal{H}^{cvx}(D)$  is the underlying poset, with the inclusion ordering. Note that although  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X)$  is not a cone (when  $\bullet$  is “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”), convexity makes sense. We also write  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}^{cvx}(D)$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}^{cvx}(D)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}\ell^{cvx}(D)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}\ell_{\mathcal{V}}^{cvx}(D)$  with the obvious meaning.

Clearly, for every  $F \in \mathbb{P}_{\text{AP} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X)$ ,  $s_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet}(F) = \{G \in D \mid G \leq F\}$  is convex, and similarly for  $s_{\text{DP}}^{\bullet}(F) = \{G \in D \mid F \leq G\}$  and  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet}(F^-, F^+) = \{G \in D \mid F^- \leq G \leq F^+\}$ . So  $s_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet}$  corestricts to a continuous map from  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X)$  to  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X))$ , and similarly for  $s_{\text{DP}}^{\bullet}$  and  $s_{\text{ADP}}^{\bullet}$ . We wish to show that this is a homeomorphism, with inverse the corresponding restriction of  $r_{\text{AP}}$  to  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X))$ , resp., of  $r_{\text{DP}}$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X))$ , resp., of  $r_{\text{ADP}}$  to  $\mathcal{P}\ell_{\mathcal{V}}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X))$ .

### 4.1 The case of unbounded previsions

The case where  $\bullet$  is the empty superscript, i.e., where general previsions are considered, was already dealt with in (Keimel and Plotkin, 2009, Section 6.1). We improve on their result, which required  $X$  to be a continuous dcpo. The general plan of the proof is the same.

The key to the generalization is the following *Schröder-Simpson Theorem*.

**Theorem 4.1 (Schröder-Simpson)** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. For every continuous linear map  $\psi$  from  $\mathbf{V}(X)$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  (resp., from  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X)$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$ ), there is a unique continuous map  $h: X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  such that, for every  $\nu \in \mathbf{V}(X)$ ,  $\psi(\nu) = \int_{x \in X} h(x) d\nu$  (resp., for every  $G \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X)$ ,  $\psi(G) = G(h)$ ).*

The converse direction, that given a unique continuous map  $h: X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$ , the map  $G \mapsto G(h)$  is continuous and linear from  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X)$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$ , is obvious.

Theorem 4.1 is due to Schröder and Simpson. It was announced at the end of the presentation (Schröder and Simpson, 2006), and a full proof was given in another talk (Schröder and Simpson, 2009). Another proof was discovered by Keimel, who stresses the role of Hahn-Banach-like extension theorems in quasi-uniform cones (Keimel, 2012). A short, elementary proof of this theorem can be found in (Goubault-Larrecq, 2015a).

**Lemma 4.2** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. For all  $A, B \in \mathcal{H}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$ , if  $r_{\text{AP}}(A) \leq r_{\text{AP}}(B)$  then  $A \subseteq B$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $A \not\subseteq B$ , so there is a  $G \in A$  that is not in  $B$ .  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X)$  is a locally convex topological cone, since every subbasic open set  $[h > b]$  is convex. Therefore, there is a convex open subset  $U$  containing  $G$  that does not intersect  $B$ . By the Separation Theorem (Keimel, 2008, Theorem 9.1), there is a continuous linear map  $\Lambda: C \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$  such that  $\Lambda(G') \leq 1$  for every  $G' \in B$ , and  $\Lambda(G') > 1$  for every  $G' \in U$ ; in particular,  $\Lambda(G) > 1$ . By the Schröder-Simpson Theorem,  $\Lambda$  is the map  $G' \mapsto G'(h)$  for some  $h \in [X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]$ . So  $\Lambda(G') = G'(h) \leq 1$  for every  $G' \in B$ , which implies that  $r_{\text{AP}}(B) \leq 1$ . And  $\Lambda(G) = G(h) > 1$ , which implies that  $r_{\text{AP}}(A) > 1$ , contradiction.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.3** *Let  $X$  be a topological space such that  $[X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]_{\sigma}$  is locally convex, for example, a core-compact space. Then  $r_{\text{AP}}$  defines a homeomorphism between  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{V}}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP} \text{ wk}}(X)$  and an order-isomorphism between  $\mathcal{H}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.11,  $r_{\text{AP}}$  is continuous hence monotonic, and  $r_{\text{AP}} \circ s_{\text{AP}}$  equals the identity. In particular,  $r_{\text{AP}}$  is surjective, and Lemma 4.2 implies in particular that it is injective. So  $r_{\text{AP}}$  is a bijection, with inverse  $s_{\text{AP}}$ . Both are continuous, by Proposition 3.11, hence define a homeomorphism. The final part follows from the fact that every homeomorphism induces an order-isomorphism with respect to the underlying specialization preorders.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. For all  $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$ , if  $r_{\text{DP}}(Q) \leq r_{\text{DP}}(Q')$  then  $Q \supseteq Q'$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $Q \not\supseteq Q'$ , so there is a  $G \in Q'$  that is not in  $Q$ .  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X)$  is a locally convex topological cone, and  $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \downarrow G$  is a closed convex set disjoint from  $Q$ . By the Strict Separation Theorem (Keimel, 2008, Theorem 10.5), there is a continuous linear map  $\Lambda: \mathcal{L}X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}$  and a real number  $r > 1$  such that  $\Lambda(G') \geq r$  for every  $G' \in Q$ , and  $\Lambda(G') \leq 1$  for every  $G' \in A$ . In particular,  $\Lambda(G) \leq 1$ . By the Schröder-Simpson Theorem,  $\Lambda = G(h)$  for some  $h \in [X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]$ , so  $G(h) \leq 1$ , which implies  $r_{\text{DP}}(Q')(h) \leq 1$ . Also,  $r_{\text{DP}}(Q)(h) = \min_{G' \in Q} G'(h) = \min_{G' \in Q} \Lambda(G') \geq r > 1$ , contradiction.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $r_{\text{DP}}$  defines a homeomorphism between  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{V}}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP} \text{ wk}}(X)$ , and an order-isomorphism between  $\mathcal{Q}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Same argument as in Proposition 4.3, using Proposition 3.22 and Lemma 4.4.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. For every  $L \in \mathcal{P}\ell(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$ ,  $r_{\text{AP}}(L) = r_{\text{AP}}(\text{cl}(L))$ , and  $r_{\text{DP}}(L) = r_{\text{DP}}(\uparrow L)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $L \subseteq \text{cl}(L)$ ,  $r_{\text{AP}}(L)(h) = \sup_{G \in L} G(h) \leq r_{\text{AP}}(\text{cl}(L))(h)$  for every  $h \in [X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]$ . Assume the inequality were strict: for some  $h \in [X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]$ , there would be a  $G \in \text{cl}(L)$  such that  $r_{\text{AP}}(L)(h) < G(h)$ . Let  $b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} r_{\text{AP}}(L)(h)$ . Then  $G$  is in the open subset  $[h > b]$ , and since  $G \in \text{cl}(L)$ ,  $[h > b]$  must meet  $L$ . So there is a  $G' \in L$  such that  $G'(h) > b$ , which implies  $r_{\text{AP}}(L)(h) > b$ , contradiction. The second claim is obvious.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. For all  $L, L' \in \mathcal{P}\ell^{\text{cvx}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$ , if  $r_{\text{ADP}}(L) \leq r_{\text{DP}}(L')$  then  $L \sqsubseteq_{\text{EM}} L'$ .*

*Proof.* By assumption,  $r_{\text{AP}}(L) \leq r_{\text{AP}}(L')$ , and  $r_{\text{DP}}(L) \leq r_{\text{DP}}(L')$ . Using Lemma 4.6, Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.4, we obtain  $\text{cl}(L) \subseteq \text{cl}(L')$  and  $\uparrow L \supseteq \uparrow L'$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.8** *Let  $X$  be a topological space such that  $[X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]_{\sigma}$  is locally convex and has an almost open addition map, for example, a stably locally compact space, or more generally, a core-compact, core-coherent space.*

*Then  $r_{\text{ADP}}$  defines a homeomorphism between  $\mathcal{P}\ell_{\mathcal{V}}^{\text{cvx}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP} \text{ wk}}(X)$ , and an order-isomorphism between  $\mathcal{P}\ell^{\text{cvx}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Same argument as in Proposition 4.3, using Proposition 3.32 and Lemma 4.7.  $\square$

## 4.2 Subnormalized and normalized previsions

The subnormalized and normalized cases reduce to the unbounded case.

**Lemma 4.9** *Let  $\bullet$  be “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”. Let  $X$  be a topological space. For every non-empty closed subset  $C$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}^{\bullet}(X)$ ,  $r_{\text{AP}}(C) = r_{\text{AP}}(\text{cl}_{\mathbb{P}}(C))$ , where  $\text{cl}_{\mathbb{P}}(C)$  denotes the closure of  $C$  in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $C \subseteq \text{cl}_{\mathbb{P}}(C)$ , for every  $h \in [X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]$ ,  $r_{\text{AP}}(C)(h) = \sup_{G \in C} G(h) \leq r_{\text{AP}}(\text{cl}_{\mathbb{P}}(C))(h)$ . Assume by contradiction that  $r_{\text{AP}}(C)(h) < r_{\text{AP}}(\text{cl}_{\mathbb{P}}(C))(h)$  for some  $h$ . Let  $a$  be a real number such that  $r_{\text{AP}}(C)(h) < a < r_{\text{AP}}(\text{cl}_{\mathbb{P}}(C))(h)$ . So  $\text{cl}_{\mathbb{P}}(C)$  is in  $r_{\text{AP}}^{-1}[h > a]$ , which is open in  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$ , since  $r_{\text{AP}}$  is continuous (Lemma 3.3). Every open subset of  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$  is also Scott open, and  $\text{cl}_{\mathbb{P}}(C)$  is the least upper bound in  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X))$  of the directed family of closed subsets of the form  $\downarrow_{\mathbb{P}} E$ , where  $E$  ranges over the finite subsets of  $C$ . (We write  $\downarrow_{\mathbb{P}}$  for downward closure in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} \text{ wk}}(X)$ .) So there is a finite subset  $E$  of  $C$  such that  $\downarrow_{\mathbb{P}} E \in r_{\text{AP}}^{-1}[h > a]$ , i.e., such that  $\sup_{G \in E} G(h) > a$ . It follows that there is a  $G \in E$  (hence  $G \in C$ ) such that  $G(h) > a$ . But  $r_{\text{AP}}(C)(h) = \sup_{G \in C} G(h) < a$ , contradiction. So  $r_{\text{AP}}(C)(h) = r_{\text{AP}}(\text{cl}_{\mathbb{P}}(C))(h)$  for every  $h$ .  $\square$



**Lemma 4.10** *Let  $\bullet$  be “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”. Let  $X$  be a topological space. For all  $C, C' \in \mathcal{H}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}^{\bullet}(X))$ , if  $r_{\text{AP}}(C) \leq r_{\text{AP}}(C')$  then  $C \supseteq C'$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $r_{\text{AP}}(C) \leq r_{\text{AP}}(C')$ . By Lemma 4.9,  $r_{\text{AP}}(cl_{\mathbb{P}}(C)) \leq r_{\text{AP}}(cl_{\mathbb{P}}(C'))$ . Now  $cl_{\mathbb{P}}(C)$  and  $cl_{\mathbb{P}}(C')$  are closed and non-empty. They are convex, because the closure of any convex subset of a semitopological cone is convex again (Keimel, 2008, Lemma 4.10 (a)). So Lemma 4.2 applies:  $cl_{\mathbb{P}}(C) \subseteq cl_{\mathbb{P}}(C')$ . In particular,  $C \subseteq cl_{\mathbb{P}}(C')$ . Since  $C'$  is closed in the subspace  $Y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}^{\bullet}(X)$  of  $Z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}(X)$ , one can write it as  $Y \cap A$  for some closed subset  $A$  of  $Z$ . Clearly  $cl_{\mathbb{P}}(C') \subseteq A$ , so  $C' = Y \cap A \supseteq Y \cap cl_{\mathbb{P}}(C')$ . Since  $C \subseteq cl_{\mathbb{P}}(C')$  and  $C \subseteq Y$ , it follows that  $C \subseteq C'$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.11 (Isomorphism, Angelic Cases)** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”. Let  $X$  be an  $\text{AP}_{\bullet}$ -friendly space, for example, a locally compact space (or, more generally, a core-compact space), or an LCS-complete space.*

*Then  $r_{\text{AP}}$  defines a homeomorphism with inverse  $s_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet}$  between  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Y}}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}^{\bullet}(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP} wk}^{\bullet}(X)$  and an order-isomorphism between  $\mathcal{H}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}^{\bullet}(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* When  $\bullet$  is the empty superscript, this is Proposition 4.3. Otherwise, we use the same argument as in its proof, replacing Lemma 4.2 by Lemma 4.10. I.e.,  $r_{\text{AP}}$  is an injective retraction, hence an isomorphism.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.12** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”. Let  $X$  be a continuous dcpo. Then  $r_{\text{AP}}$  define an isomorphism with inverse  $s_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet}$  between  $\mathcal{H}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}^{\bullet}(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP}}^{\bullet}(X)$ .*

The demonic cases are slightly simpler.

**Lemma 4.13** *Let  $\bullet$  be “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”. Let  $X$  be a topological space. For every non-empty compact saturated subset  $Q$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}^{\bullet}(X)$ ,  $r_{\text{DP}}(Q) = r_{\text{DP}}(\uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q)$ , where  $\uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q$  denotes the upward closure of  $Q$  in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}(X)$ .*

Note that  $\uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q$  is compact saturated in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}(X)$ . Indeed  $Q$  is compact in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}^{\bullet}(X)$ , which is a subspace of  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}(X)$ . In particular Lemma 3.13 applies, and  $r_{\text{DP}}(\uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q)(h) = \min_{G \in \uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q} G(h)$  for every  $h$ .

*Proof.* Since  $Q \subseteq \uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q$ ,  $r_{\text{DP}}(\uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q)(h) \leq r_{\text{DP}}(Q)(h)$ . Conversely, for every  $G \in \uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q$ , there is a  $G_1 \in Q$  such that  $G_1 \leq G$ , so  $r_{\text{DP}}(\uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q)(h) = \min_{G \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}(X), G_1 \in Q, G_1 \leq G} G(h) \geq \min_{G_1 \in Q} G_1(h) = r_{\text{DP}}(Q)(h)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.14** *Let  $\bullet$  be “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”. Let  $X$  be a topological space. For all  $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}^{\bullet}(X))$ , if  $r_{\text{DP}}(Q) \leq r_{\text{DP}}(Q')$  then  $Q \supseteq Q'$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $r_{\text{DP}}(Q) \leq r_{\text{DP}}(Q')$ . By Lemma 4.13,  $r_{\text{DP}}(\uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q) \leq r_{\text{DP}}(\uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q')$ . Now  $\uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q$  is compact saturated, non-empty, and it is easy to see that it is convex, since  $Q$  is convex. We can therefore apply Lemma 4.4 and conclude that  $\uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q \supseteq \uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q'$ . In particular,  $\uparrow_{\mathbb{P}} Q \supseteq Q'$ . So, for every element  $G'$  of  $Q'$ , there is a  $G \in Q$  such that  $G \leq G'$ . But  $G'$  is in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}^{\bullet}(X)$  since in  $Q'$ , and  $Q$  is upward closed in  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P} wk}^{\bullet}(X)$ , so  $G'$  itself is in  $Q$ . It follows that  $Q \supseteq Q'$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.15 (Isomorphism, Demonic Cases)** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”. Let  $X$  be a topological space. Then  $r_{\text{DP}}$  defines a homeomorphism with inverse  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  between  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\text{cvx}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP wk}}^\bullet(X)$ , and an order-isomorphism between  $\mathcal{Q}^{\text{cvx}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(X)$ .*

*Proof.* When  $\bullet$  is the empty superscript, this is Proposition 4.5. Otherwise, we use the same argument as in its proof, replacing Lemma 4.4 by Lemma 4.14. I.e.,  $r_{\text{DP}}$  is an injective retraction, hence an homeomorphism.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.16** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”. Let  $X$  be a continuous dcpo. Then  $r_{\text{DP}}$  defines an isomorphism with inverse  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  between  $\mathcal{Q}^{\text{cvx}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P}}^\bullet(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(X)$ .*

There is nothing left to do to conclude in the erratic cases.

**Theorem 4.17 (Isomorphism, Erratic Cases)** *Let  $\bullet$  be “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”. Let  $X$  be a topological space such that  $[X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]_\sigma$  is locally convex and has an almost open addition map, for example a stably locally compact space, or more generally, a core-compact, core-coherent space. Assume also that  $X$  is compact in case  $\bullet$  is “1”.*

*Then  $r_{\text{ADP}}$  defines an homeomorphism with inverse  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet$  between  $\mathcal{P}\ell_{\mathcal{V}}^{\text{cvx}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP wk}}^\bullet(X)$ , and an order-isomorphism between  $\mathcal{P}\ell^{\text{cvx}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(X)$ .*

*Proof.* The only thing left to prove is that  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{ADP}}(L)) = L$  for every  $L \in \mathcal{P}\ell^{\text{cvx}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X))$ . But  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{ADP}}(L)) = s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{DP}}(L), r_{\text{AP}}(L)) = s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{DP}}(\uparrow L), r_{\text{AP}}(cl(L)))$  (by Lemma 4.6)  $= s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{DP}}(\uparrow L)) \cap s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{AP}}(cl(L))) = \uparrow L \cap cl(L)$  (by Theorem 4.15 and Theorem 4.11)  $= L$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.18** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ” or “1”. Let  $X$  be a coherent, continuous dcpo (and pointed if  $\bullet$  is “1”). Then  $r_{\text{ADP}}$  defines an isomorphism with inverse  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet$  between  $\mathcal{P}\ell^{\text{cvx}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P}}^\bullet(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(X)$ .*

### 4.3 Hulls

When  $A$  is not convex,  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{AP}}(A))$  cannot be equal to  $A$ , since the former is always convex. Similarly in the demonic cases. It is a natural question to ask what the compositions  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet \circ r_{\text{AP}}$ , and similar compositions, compute.

The *convex hull*  $\text{conv}(A)$  of a set  $A$  in a topological cone (or in a convex subspace) is the smallest convex set that contains  $A$ . This is also the set of linear combinations of the form  $ax + (1 - a)y$ , where  $x, y \in A$ ,  $a \in [0, 1]$ .

The *closed convex hull* of a set  $A$  in a semitopological cone is the smallest closed and convex set containing  $A$ . This is the closure of the convex hull of  $A$  (Keimel, 2008, Lemma 4.10 (a)).

**Proposition 4.19** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”. Let  $X$  be an  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendly space, for example, a locally compact space (or, more generally, a core-compact space), or an LCS-complete space.*

*For every non-empty closed subset  $A$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X)$ ,  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{AP}}(A))$  is the closed convex hull  $cl(\text{conv}(A))$  of  $A$  in  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X)$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.11,  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{AP}}(A))$  is non-empty and closed. It is convex, and clearly contains  $A$ . Conversely, for every closed convex subset  $A'$  that contains  $A$ ,  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{AP}}(A)) \subseteq s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{AP}}(A')) = A'$ , where the last equality follows from Theorem 4.11. Therefore  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{AP}}(A))$  is the smallest closed convex set containing  $A$ , namely  $cl(conv(A))$ .  $\square$

Symmetrically, one can define the *compact saturated convex hull* of a set  $A$  as the smallest compact saturated, convex subset containing  $A$ , if it exists. The following shows that this exists if  $A$  is any non-empty compact saturated subset of  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X)$ , in particular.

**Proposition 4.20** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”.*

*For every non-empty compact saturated subset  $Q$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X)$ ,  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{DP}}(Q))$  is the compact saturated convex hull of  $Q$  in  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X)$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.22,  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{DP}}(Q))$  is compact saturated. It is convex, and clearly contains  $Q$ . If  $Q'$  is any convex, compact saturated superset of  $Q$ , then  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{DP}}(Q'))$  contains  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{DP}}(Q))$ . However,  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{DP}}(Q')) = Q'$  since  $r_{\text{DP}}$  is an isomorphism with inverse  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  on non-empty convex compact saturated sets, by Theorem 4.15; so  $Q'$  contains  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{DP}}(Q))$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.21** *Let  $\bullet$  be the empty superscript, “ $\leq 1$ ”, or “1”. Let  $X$  be an  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendly space, for example, a locally compact space (or, more generally, a core-compact space), or an LCS-complete space.*

*For every lens  $L$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{P wk}}^\bullet(X)$ ,  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{ADP}}(L))$  is a lens, and is the smallest convex lens that contains  $L$ .*

*Proof.* We know that  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{ADP}}(L)) = s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F^+) \cap s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F^-)$  where  $(F^+, F^-) = r_{\text{ADP}}(L)$ . By Lemma 4.6,  $F^+ = r_{\text{AP}}(cl(L))$  and  $F^- = r_{\text{DP}}(\uparrow L)$ . By Proposition 4.19,  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F^+)$  is the closed convex hull of  $cl(L)$ , hence also the smallest closed convex subset that contains  $L$ . By Proposition 4.20,  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F^-)$  is the compact saturated convex hull of  $\uparrow L$ , hence also the smallest compact saturated convex subset that contains  $L$ . As a consequence, their intersection is a convex lens.

For the final part of the Proposition, if  $L'$  is any convex lens that contains  $L$ , then  $cl(L')$  contains  $L$ , is closed, and is convex (Keimel, 2008, Lemma 4.10 (a)), so  $cl(L')$  contains  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F^+)$ ; also,  $\uparrow L'$  contains  $L$ , is compact saturated and convex, hence contains  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F^-)$ . It follows that  $L' = cl(L') \cap \uparrow L'$  contains  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet(F^+) \cap s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet(F^-) = s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet(r_{\text{ADP}}(L))$ .  $\square$

## 5 Conclusion

We have proved that, under some natural conditions, the powercone models and the prevision models of mixed non-deterministic and probabilistic choice coincide. This involved functional analytic methods that heavily rely on Keimel’s

cone-theoretic variants of the classical Hahn-Banach separation theorems, plus the Schröder-Simpson Theorem.

The demonic cases are the nicest, and require absolutely no assumption on the underlying topological space  $X$ . As should be expected, the erratic cases demand stronger assumptions. An intermediate case is given by the angelic cases, which require  $[X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]_\sigma$  to be locally convex. We know that this is the case when  $X$  is locally compact, and more generally, core-compact, and we do not know of an example of a space  $X$  for which  $[X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+\sigma}]_\sigma$  would fail to be locally convex. Can we characterize those spaces  $X$  for which  $\mathcal{L}X$  is locally convex?

**Acknowledgments.** I thank the anonymous referees for many useful comments. More than anything, I must thank them for their urging me to try to do away with an assumption of coherence that I had made in some results concerning the Hoare cases, which I had found surprising, but could not do away with initially. That assumption has now disappeared, after some more hard work. I also thank them, as well as the editor, Prakash Panangaden, for their patience. I did not have time to work on this paper for more than two years, between March 2013 and June 2015, and they are to be commended for having waited for so long: my sincere apologies to them.

## 6 Review of papers citing (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017)

Since the present paper fixes a mistake in (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017), we review whether and how this mistake propagates in the literature. To jump to the conclusion, let me say right away that no published paper is affected by the mistake as of November 1st, 2024.

As of November 1st, 2024, Google Scholar reports on 17 papers citing (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017). Most of them only cite (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) without using its results, except for the following.

- (de Brecht et al., 2019) uses Theorem 4.11 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) in its Corollary 13.7, which states that  $r_{\text{AP}}$  defines a homeomorphism with inverse  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$  between  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}^{cvx}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{P } wk}^\bullet(X))$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\text{AP } wk}^\bullet(X)$  when  $X$  is LCS-complete. Our corrected version (Theorem 4.11 of the present version) confirms that this is indeed true.

We have used a few results from (de Brecht et al., 2019) in the present revised version. The danger is of course that of circular reasoning. Those results are Proposition 12.1 of (de Brecht et al., 2019), which states that every LCS-complete space is consonant, and Lemma 13.2 of (de Brecht et al., 2019), which states that every LCS-complete space is  $\odot$ -consonant. Those are proofs that are entirely independent of any result of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017).

- (Goubault-Larrecq, 2015b) uses Propositions 3.41, 3.42 and 3.44 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017), which are unaffected.
- (Goubault-Larrecq, 2022b) collects several properties about  $r_{\text{AP}}$  and  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$  at the beginning of its Section 3, in order to use them without mention later on. This includes the faulty Corollary 3.12 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017). But no result of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2022b) is affected, since  $r_{\text{AP}}$  and  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$  are only used on continuous complete quasi-metric spaces in their  $d$ -Scott topology, and all such spaces are LCS-complete (de Brecht et al., 2019, Theorem 4.1).
- (Goubault-Larrecq, 2022a), which is a superset of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2022b), is similarly unaffected.
- (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024b) (versions 1 and 2) relies on the faulty results of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) in its Section 13. One has to replace the categories  $\mathbf{K}$  by categories of  $\text{AP}_\bullet$ -friendly spaces. This is corrected in version 3 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024b). (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024b) does not appear to be cited by any paper yet, according to Google Scholar.
- (Lopez and Simpson, 2018) uses (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) in its Lemma 22. This is unaffected by the mistake, since it only uses results on the demonic cases, namely, on  $r_{\text{DP}}$  and  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$ . Alternatively, the primary justification used in Lemma 22 is really (Keimel and Plotkin, 2015), which is unaffected by the mistake, for obvious reasons.
- (Goubault-Larrecq and Jia, 2019) uses only one result from (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017), namely that  $\mathcal{L}X = \mathcal{L}(X^s)$ , where  $X^s$  is the sobrification of  $X$ , in its Example 3.14; this is unaffected.
- (Goubault-Larrecq, 2023) cites (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) at several places. Lemma 3.24 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) is used before Proposition 4.1; this result is unaffected by the mistake. The proof of Proposition 4.1 uses a variety of results from (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017), namely Lemma 3.28, Lemma 3.29, Proposition 4.5 and Proposition 4.3, none of which is affected by the mistake; it also references the faulty Corollary 3.12 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017), but only in order to inform the reader of the roots of the results of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2022b) used in the proof and, as we have seen, none of the results of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2022b) are affected. At any rate, Proposition 4.1 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2023) requires not only  $\mathcal{L}X$  to be locally convex (and to have an almost addition map) but also  $X$  to be compact, and that is condition 1 of the definition of  $\text{AP}_1$ -friendliness, under which all results of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) hold. Remark 4.2 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2023) makes use of Proposition 4.8 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017), which is not affected.

We have used one result from (Goubault-Larrecq, 2021) in the present revised version. This is the fact that a continuous valuation  $\nu$  on a space  $Y$  is supported on a subset  $X$  if and only if  $\nu = i[\mu]$  for some (unique)

continuous valuation  $\mu$  on the subspace  $Y$ , where  $i$  is the inclusion map (Goubault-Larrecq, 2021, Lemma 4.6). This does not rely on any result of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017), avoiding the pitfall of circular reasoning, just like in the case of (de Brecht et al., 2019).

- (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024a) only uses results on  $r_{\text{DP}}$  and  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  (e.g., Lemma 3.20 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017) before Lemma 3.2, and Proposition 3.22 and Theorem 4.15 in the conclusion), not  $r_{\text{AP}}$  and  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$ , and is unaffected by the mistake.

Finally, I know about the following paper citing (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017), but not reported by Google Scholar:

- (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024c) versions 1 through 3 are affected by the mistake, through the definition of the category **Top**<sup>b</sup> (Definition 5.6; Definition 5.7 in version 4), which must consist of **AP**<sub>•</sub>-friendly spaces, instead of spaces  $X$  such that  $\mathcal{L}X$  is locally convex. This is corrected in version 4. (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024c) does not appear to be cited by any paper yet, according to Google Scholar.

I would like to mention that (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024c) contains simpler proofs of the continuity of  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024c, Lemma 4.6) and of  $s_{\text{AP}}^\bullet$  (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024c, Lemma 6.3). I have not included them here, although a revised version would be an opportunity to do so, because I wanted to concentrate on fixing the mistake in Lemma 3.4 of (Goubault-Larrecq, 2017). Certain other proofs, such as that of Lemma 3.29, could also be made simpler, and I have left them as is for the same reason. Finally, (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024b) contains needed results on the natural of  $r_{\text{DP}}$  and  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024b, Lemma 11.2), of  $r_{\text{AP}}$  and  $s_{\text{DP}}^\bullet$  (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024b, Lemma 13.2), of  $r_{\text{ADP}}$  and  $s_{\text{ADP}}^\bullet$  (Goubault-Larrecq, 2024b, Lemma 15.1), which have been left out of this revised version for similar reasons.

## References

- Abramsky, S. and Jung, A. (1994). Domain theory. In Abramsky, S., Gabbay, D. M., and Maibaum, T. S. E., editors, *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science*, volume 3, pages 1–168. Oxford University Press.
- Alvarez-Manilla, M. (2000). *Measure Theoretic Results for Continuous Valuations on Partially Ordered Spaces*. PhD thesis, Imperial College, London.
- Alvarez-Manilla, M., Jung, A., and Keimel, K. (2004). The probabilistic powerdomain for stably compact spaces. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 328(3):221–244.
- de Brecht, M. (2013). Quasi-Polish spaces. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 164(3):356–381.

- de Brecht, M., Goubault-Larrecq, J., Jia, X., and Lyu, Z. (2019). Domain-complete and LCS-complete spaces. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 345:3–35. Proc. 8th International Symposium on Domain Theory (ISDT'19).
- Dolecki, S., Greco, G. H., and Lechicki, A. (1995). When do the upper Kuratowski topology (homeomorphically, Scott topology) and the co-compact topology coincide? *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 347(8):2869–2884.
- Edalat, A. (1995). Domain theory and integration. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 151(1):163–193.
- Ghani, N. and Uustalu, T. (2004). Coproducts of ideal monads. *Theoretical Informatics and Applications*, 38(4):321–342.
- Gierz, G., Hofmann, K. H., Keimel, K., Lawson, J. D., Mislove, M., and Scott, D. S. (2003). Continuous lattices and domains. In *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, volume 93. Cambridge University Press.
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2007). Continuous previsions. In Duparc, J. and Henzinger, Th. A., editors, *Proceedings of the 16th Annual EACSL Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL'07)*, volume 4646 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 542–557, Lausanne, Switzerland. Springer.
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2008). Prevision domains and convex powercones. In Amadio, R., editor, *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures (FoSSaCS'08)*, volume 4962 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 318–333, Budapest, Hungary. Springer.
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2010). De Groot duality and models of choice: Angels, demons, and nature. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 20(2):169–237.
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2012). QRB-domains and the probabilistic powerdomain. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 8(1:14).
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2013). *Non-Hausdorff Topology and Domain Theory—Selected Topics in Point-Set Topology*, volume 22 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-1-107-03413-6.
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2015a). A short proof of the Schröder-Simpson theorem. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 25(1):1–5.
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2015b). Full abstraction for non-deterministic and probabilistic extensions of PCF I: the angelic cases. *Journal of Logic and Algebraic Methods in Programming*, 84(1):155–184.

- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2017). Isomorphism theorems between models of mixed choice. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 27(6):1032–1067.
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2021). Kantorovich-Rubinstein quasi-metrics I: Spaces of measures and of continuous valuations. *Topology and its Applications*, 295:107673.
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2022a). Complete quasi-metrics for hyperspaces, continuous valuations, and previsions. arXiv report 1707.03784 [math.GN].
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2022b). Kantorovich-Rubinstein quasi-metrics III: Spaces of sublinear and superlinear previsions. *Topology and its Applications*, 321:108259.
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2023). Kantorovich-Rubinstein quasi-metrics IV: Lenses, quasi-lenses and forks. *Topology and its Applications*, 332:108513.
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2024a). On local compactness of spaces of continuous valuations. Submitted to Topology Proceedings.
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2024b). On the preservation of projective limits by functors of non-deterministic, probabilistic, and mixed choice. arXiv report 2407.10235 [math.GN].
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. (2024c). Weak distributive laws between monads of continuous valuations and of non-deterministic choice. arXiv report 2408.15977 [math.CT].
- Goubault-Larrecq, J. and Jia, X. (2019). Algebras of the extended probabilistic powerdomain monad. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 345:37–61. Proc. 8th International Symposium on Domain Theory (ISDT'19).
- Heckmann, R. (1996). Spaces of valuations. In Andima, S., Flagg, R. C., Itzkowitz, G., Kong, Y., Kopperman, R., and Misra, P., editors, *Papers on General Topology and Applications: 11th Summer Conference at the University of Southern Maine*, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 806, pages 174–200.
- Jones, C. (1990). *Probabilistic Non-Determinism*. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh. Technical Report ECS-LFCS-90-105.
- Jung, A. (2004). Stably compact spaces and the probabilistic powerspace construction. In Desharnais, J. and Panangaden, P., editors, *Domain-theoretic Methods in Probabilistic Processes*, volume 87 of *Electronic Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Elsevier. 15pp.
- Keimel, K. (1984). Remarks on pointwise infima of lower semicontinuous functions. <http://www.mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de/~keimel/Papers/note84.pdf>. Notes complementing the paper: Gerhard Gierz and Klaus



- Keimel, Halbstetige Funktionen und stetige Verbände, in *Continuous Lattices and Related Topics, Mathematik Arbeitspapiere*, 27 (1982), Universität Bremen, pp. 59-67.
- Keimel, K. (2008). Topological cones: Functional analysis in a  $T_0$ -setting. *Semigroup Forum*, 77(1):109–142.
- Keimel, K. (2012). Locally convex cones and the Schroeder-Simpson theorem. *Quaestiones Mathematicae*, 35(3):353–390.
- Keimel, K. and Plotkin, G. (2009). Predicate transformers for convex powerdomains. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 19(3):501–539.
- Keimel, K. and Plotkin, G. (2015). Mixed powerdomains for probability and nondeterminism. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*. Submitted.
- Kelley, J. L. (1955). *General Topology*. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.
- Kirch, O. (1993). *Bereiche und Bewertungen*. Master’s thesis, Technische Hochschule Darmstadt.
- Lopez, A. and Simpson, A. (2018). Basic operational preorders for algebraic effects in general, and for combined probability and nondeterminism in particular. In Ghica, D. and Jung, A., editors, *27th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2018)*, volume 119 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 29:1–29:17. Schloss Dagstuhl Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.
- Lüth, C. (1997). *Categorical Term Rewriting: Monads and Modularity*. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- McIver, A. and Morgan, C. (2001). Demonic, angelic and unbounded probabilistic choices in sequential programs. *Acta Informatica*, 37(4/5):329–354.
- Mislove, M. (1998). Topology, domain theory and theoretical computer science. *Topology and Its Applications*, 89(1–2):3–59.
- Mislove, M. (2000). Nondeterminism and probabilistic choice: Obeying the law. In *Proc. 11th Conf. Concurrency Theory (CONCUR’00)*, pages 350–364. Springer Verlag LNCS 1877.
- Morgan, C., McIver, A., and Seidel, K. (1996). Probabilistic program transformers. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, 18(3):325–353.
- Nachbin, L. (1965). *Topology and Order*. Van Nostrand, Princeton, NJ. Translated from the 1950 monograph “Topologia e Ordem” (in Portuguese). Reprinted by Robert E. Kreiger Publishing Co. Huntington, NY, 1967, 1976.

- Schalk, A. (1993). *Algebras for Generalized Power Constructions*. PhD thesis, Technische Universität Darmstadt.
- Schröder, M. and Simpson, A. (2006). Probabilistic observations and valuations. In *Proc. 21st Annual Conference on Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics (MFPS XXI)*, volume 155 of *Electronic Notes in Computer Science*, pages 605–615. Elsevier.
- Schröder, M. and Simpson, A. (2009). Probabilistic observations and valuations. Invited talk at *New Interactions between Analysis, Topology and Computation*, Birmingham, UK. Slides available from <http://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/als/Talks/birmingham09.pdf>.
- Tix, R. (1995). *Stetige Bewertungen auf topologischen Räumen*. Diplomarbeit, TH Darmstadt.
- Tix, R. (1999). *Continuous D-Cones: Convexity and Powerdomain Constructions*. PhD thesis, Technische Universität Darmstadt.
- Tix, R., Keimel, K., and Plotkin, G. (2009). Semantic domains for combining probability and non-determinism. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 222:3–99. feb.
- Varacca, D. (2002). The powerdomain of indexed valuations. In *Proc. 17th Annual IEEE Symp. on Logic in Computer Science (LICS'02)*, pages 299–308, Copenhagen. IEEE Computer Society Press.
- Varacca, D. (2003). *Probability, Nondeterminism and Concurrency: Two Denotational Models for Probabilistic Computation*. PhD thesis, Dept. of Computer Science, U. Aarhus. BRICS Dissertation Series DS-03-14.
- von Neumann, J. (1928). Zur Theorie der Gesellschaftspiele. *Mathematische Annalen*, 100:295–320.