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Introduction. Let $\Theta$ be a set. An experiment indexed by $\Theta$ is often described as a family $\{P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\}$ of probability measures on a given $\sigma$-field. Two experiments $\mathcal{E} = \{P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{Q_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\}$ indexed by the same $\Theta$ are called equivalent if, for all decision problems, the risk functions achievable for $\mathcal{E}$ or $\mathcal{F}$ are the same.

Following the terminology of [1] we shall call the equivalence class of an experiment $\mathcal{E}$ the type of $\mathcal{E}$. We shall make no notational distinction between experiments and their types. This abuse will not ordinarily lead to excessive confusion.

Let $E(\Theta)$ be the set of all experiment types indexed by a given $\Theta$. A distance, noted $\Delta$ was introduced on $E(\Theta)$ in the paper [2]. The number $\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ measures how closely one can match the risk functions available in the two experiments. One can also introduce on $E(\Theta)$ a weak topology as follows.

If $A \subseteq \Theta$, let $\mathcal{E}_A = \{P_\theta; \theta \in A\}$. When $A$ is finite, metrize $E(A)$ by the distance $\Delta$. Define the weak topology of $E(\Theta)$ as the weakest which renders continuous all the maps $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_A$, $A$ finite.

Proposition 2 of [3] asserts that for this weak topology the space $E(\Theta)$ is a compact Hausdorff space. Unfortunately the proof given there appears to be invalidated by an algebraic mistake, which was pointed out to me by M. W. Moussatat.
If the result itself was incorrect, several arguments in asymptotic theory would have to be reorganized. They would lose in simplicity. Even though the mathematical damage could be considered comparatively slight, the ensuing complications would be a thorough nuisance. What is perhaps even more annoying is that the general theory of comparison of experiments would acquire bizarre features not expressible in terms of finite dimensional distributions of likelihood ratios. These features would appear, in particular and perhaps surprisingly, in the theory of sampling from finite populations.

For these reasons we give here an alternate proof of compactness of $E(\theta)$. It is based on the correspondence between experiment types and the conical measures introduced by Choquet (see [4]).

These same conical measures can also be considered as a natural vehicle for the representation of the essential features of distributions of likelihood ratios.

After introduction of appropriate symbols, in Section 2, we give in Section 3 a description of some relations between the conical measures and the distributions of likelihood ratios.

Section 4 uses a transfinite induction argument to construct experiments from canonical measures.

2. Notational definitions. Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote a $\sigma$-field carried by a set $\mathcal{X}$. Let $A$ be a finite set. For each $\theta \in A$ let $P_\theta$
be a probability measure on \((\gamma, \beta)\). Blackwell [5] associates to
this family \(\sigma = \{P_\theta; \theta \in A\}\) a certain measure \(\beta\) as follows.
Take the sum \(S = \sum_\theta P_\theta\) and select Radon-Nikodym densities \(dP_\theta/dS\)
in such a way that \(dP_\theta/dS > 0\) and \(\sum_\theta (dP_\theta/dS) = 1\). Let \(V\) be
the vector \(V = \{(dP_\theta/dS); \theta \in A\}\). Consider the finite dimensional
space \(\mathbb{R}^A\) and its unit simplex \(U\) formed by vectors
\(v = \{v_\theta; \theta \in A\}\) such that \(v_\theta \geq 0\) and \(\Sigma v_\theta = 1\).

The likelihood vector \(V\) is a measurable map from \((\gamma, \beta)\) to
\(U\). The image of \(S\) by \(V\) is a finite measure \(\beta\) carried by \(U\).
It is called the Blackwell measure of \(\sigma = \{P_\theta; \theta \in A\}\). (In fact,
Blackwell uses the average \(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\theta \in A} P_\theta, \ n = \text{card } A\) instead of our
\(\sigma\) \(S\). This is an inessential difference.)

The measure \(\beta\) is the sum of the individual distributions
\(\xi(V|\theta)\) of the likelihood vector. It determines these distributions.

Conversely, let \(\beta\) be a positive measure carried by \(U\) and
such that \(\int v_\theta d\beta = 1\) for all \(\theta \in A\). To such a Blackwell measure
one may associate a family \(\{P_\theta; \theta \in A\}\), taking for \(P_\theta\) that
measure on \(\mathbb{R}^A\) which has density \(v_\theta\) with respect to \(\beta\). In
symbols \(dP_\theta = v_\theta d\beta\), or in a simpler notation \(P_\theta = v_\theta \cdot \beta\).

Give to \(\mathbb{R}^A\) its maximum coordinate norm and define a metric
on Blackwell measures by the dual Lipschitz norm
\[
\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_D = \sup_{f} |\int f d(\beta_1 - \beta_2)|
\]
where \(f\) is allowed to range through the set of functions
satisfying \(|f| \leq 1\) and \(|f(v) - f(v')| \leq \|v - v'\|\).
Since $U$ is compact, the set of all Blackwell measures is obviously compact for the metric so defined.

Consider more generally an arbitrary set $\Theta$ and an experiment $\mathcal{E} = \{P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\}$ in the sense of [1].

In this text experiments are defined as maps $\Theta \to P_\theta$, $P_\theta > 0$, $\|P_\theta\| = 1$ from $\Theta$ to a space $L$ which is an $L$-space in the sense of Kakutani [6]. Any experiment in this abstract sense can be represented by a family $\{P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\}$ of probability measures on a suitable space $(X, \mathcal{F})$. Thus, even though the abstract definition is preferable, we shall proceed here as if $\mathcal{E} = \{P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\}$ was such a family of probability measures.

For infinite sets $\Theta$ one cannot readily construct Blackwell measures. The entity which replaces them is a "conical measure" in the sense of Choquet [4]. In the present context it is convenient to introduce these measures as follows.

Consider the space $R^\Theta$ of all functions from $\Theta$ to the line $R = (-\infty, +\infty)$ and the cone $\Omega = [0, \infty)^\Theta$ which consists of the nonnegative elements of $R^\Theta$. If $\omega \in \Omega$, the value of $\omega$ at will be denoted $\omega(\theta)$ and also $l_\theta(\omega)$, the symbol $l_\theta$ being the name of the linear functional defined on $R^\Theta$ by evaluation at $\theta$.

The finite linear combinations $\Sigma_{\theta} c_\theta l_\theta$, $\theta \in A$, with $A$ finite form a linear space dual of $R^\Theta$.

We shall call $H_0$ the space of functions defined on $\Omega$ as pointwise suprema of finite sets of linear functions of the type
\[ \sum c_\theta \ell_\theta, \theta \in A \text{ with } c_\theta \geq 0. \] The linear space \( H \) spanned by \( H_0 \) is the space of differences \( h = h_1 - h_2 \) with \( h_1 \in H_0 \).

Definition. A positive linear functional \( \mu \) defined on \( H \) is called a conical measure on \( \Omega \). The resultant of \( \mu \) is the function defined on \( \theta \) which takes value \( \mu(\ell_\theta) \) at \( \theta \).

It will be shown in the following sections that one can establish a one-to-one correspondence between the set \( E(\Theta) \) experiment types and the set of conical measures on \( \Omega \) whose resultant is identically unity.

For the present, note that if \( \Theta \) is finite and if \( \beta \) is a Blackwell measure on the unit simplex of \( R^\Theta \) then the integral \( \int h d\beta \) is a conical measure of resultant unity on \( \Omega \). Conversely any conical measure on \( \Omega \) has a unique localization on the unit simplex of \( R^\Theta \) and this localization is a Blackwell measure. Our task, in the infinite case, is to bypass the Blackwell localization to construct directly the bijection between conical measures and experiment types.

Before passing to this note that, for arbitrary \( \Theta \), one may metrize the space of conical measures having resultant unity, by a distance between experiments introduced in [2]. The construction is as follows.

By definition an element \( h \) of \( H_0 \) is a pointwise supremum
\[ h(\omega) = \sup_j h_j(\omega) \text{ for } h_j, j=1,2,\ldots,k \text{ finite sums of the form } \]
\[ h_j = \sum_\theta c_j, \theta \ell_\theta. \]
We shall say that such an \( h \) belongs to \( H_1 \) if there is some finite sum \( h_0 = \Sigma c_{0, \theta} \theta \) such that (i) \( c_{0, \theta} \geq 0 \) and \( \Sigma c_{0, \theta} \theta = 1 \) and (ii) for all \( j \) and \( \omega \) one has \( h_j(\omega) \leq h_0(\omega) \).

If \( \mu_i, i = 1, 2 \) are two conical measures of resultant unity one can define their distance by

\[
\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\| = \sup\{ |\mu_1(h) - \mu_2(h)| ; h \in H_1 \}.
\]

It is then easily verifiable that, for finite \( \theta \), this distance is not larger than the dual Lipschitz distance \( \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_D \) of the corresponding Blackwell measures. Hence the two distances are topologically equivalent (see [7] and [8]). The reasons for the equality between \( \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\| \) and the distance of the corresponding experiments are described, in some detail, in [1].

3. Conical measures and likelihood ratios. Take an arbitrary \( \theta \) and the space \( \Omega = [0, \infty) \subset R^\theta \) of Section 2. Let \( E \) denote a \( \sigma \)-field carried by some set \( \mathcal{X} \). For each \( \theta \in \Theta \), let \( Q_\theta \) be a finite positive measure on \( E \).

If \( \lambda \) is any other positive finite measure on \( E \), one can always define the Radon-Nikodym density \( dQ_\theta / d\lambda \) of the part of \( Q_\theta \) which is dominated by \( \lambda \).

Consider then some element \( h \) of the space \( H \) of functions used to define conical measures. The linear functionals which define \( h \) all arise from some set \( \{ \ell_\theta ; \theta \in A \} \) where \( A \) is a finite subset of \( \Theta \). Thus \( h \) may also be identified to a function on the component \( \Omega_A = [0, \infty)^A \) of the product \( \Omega \).

Take a \( \lambda \) which dominates all the \( Q_\theta ; \theta \in A \) and compute
the integral \( \varphi(h) = \int h[v(x)]\lambda(dx) \) where \( v(x) \) is the evaluation at \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) of the vector \( v = \{dQ_\theta/d\lambda; \theta \in A\} \) of Radon-Nikodym densities.

Note that every \( h \in H \) is positively homogeneous in the sense that for \( \alpha \) real and positive one has \( h(\alpha \omega) = \alpha h(\omega) \).

From this it follows readily that the above integral \( \varphi(h) \) remains unchanged if one replaces \( \lambda \) by any other measure \( \lambda' \) which dominates all the \( Q_\theta; \theta \in A \). Replacing the set \( A \) by a larger set \( A' \) does not modify the result. Thus, in this manner, we have assigned a number \( \varphi(h) \) to each \( h \in H \).

**Definition.** The function \( \varphi \) defined on \( H \) by the procedure just described is called the conical measure induced by the family \( \{Q_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\} \).

We have shown that \( \varphi \) is well defined. It is very easily verified that it is indeed a conical measure and that its resultant is given by the formula

\[
\varphi(\ell_\Theta) = \|Q_\Theta\|.
\]

For conical measures defined by such families we shall also need the following easy result.

**Lemma 1.** Let \( Q_{\theta,3} = Q_{\theta,1} + Q_{\theta,2} \) where the \( Q_{\theta,1} \) are positive finite measures on \( (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}) \). For each \( i=1,2,3 \), let \( \varphi_i \) be the corresponding conical measure. Assume that for each \( t \in \Theta \) the measure \( Q_{t,2} \) is disjoint from all the measures \( Q_{\theta,1}, \theta \in \Theta \). Then \( \varphi_3 \) is the sum \( \varphi_3 = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 \).
Proof. Since each $h \in H$ depends only on a finite set of coordinates $\ell_\theta; \theta \in A$ it is enough to prove this for $\theta$ finite. Let then $\lambda_1 = \Sigma_\theta Q_{\theta,1}$ and let $V$ be the vector of densities $V = \{dQ_{\theta,3}/d\lambda_3; \theta \in A\}$. Note that the space $\chi$ splits into two disjoint parts, say $B_1$ and $B_2$ such that on $B_1$, the density $dQ_{\theta,3}/d\lambda_3$ is equal to $dQ_{\theta,1}/d\lambda_1$. The result follows.

Finally, note that since each $h \in H$ depends only on a finite set $A \subset \Theta$ one can construct the conical measure $\varphi$ knowing only relations in finite sets $\{Q_\theta; \theta \in A\}$. This leads to the following remarks.

Suppose given for each finite $A \subset \Theta$ an experiment type $s(A) \in E(A)$.

**Definition.** The family $\{s(A); A \subset \Theta\}$ is called coherent if the inclusion $A_1 \subset A_2$ implies that $s_{A_1}(A_2)$ of $s(A_2)$ to $A_1$.

If $h \in H$ depends only on the coordinates $\theta \in A$, the above described construction assigns to $h$ well-defined number $\varphi(h)$ which depends only on the experiment type $s(A)$.

Summarizing the relations, one obtains the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** The construction described induces a one-to-one correspondence between the set of conical measures of resultant one on $\Omega = [0, \infty)^\Theta$ and the set of coherent families $\{s(A); A \subset \Theta,$ $A$ finite $\}$ of experiment types.

4. Constructing an experiment from a conical measure. In this section we assume given a particular set $\Theta$. In order to carry
out some of the arguments it will be convenient to assume that \( \theta \) is well ordered and is in fact an initial segment \( \theta = \{ \alpha; \alpha < \kappa \} \) of the ordinal numbers. The possibility of such a well ordering depends, of course, on the axiom of choice.

We begin with some lemmas on the structure of the elements \( h \) of the space \( H \) and on the structure of the conical measures.

Consider a partition \( \theta = \theta_1 \cup \theta_2 \) of the set \( \theta \) and let \( C(\theta_1) \) be the cone formed by elements \( \omega \in \Omega = [0, \omega]^{\theta} \) such that \( \omega(\theta) = 0 \) for all \( \theta \in \theta_1 \).

**Lemma 3.** Let \( h \) be an element of \( H \). Then \( h \) can be written, in a unique way, as a sum \( h = h_1 + h_2 \) such that

(i) \( h_1 \) vanishes on \( C(\theta_1) \),

(ii) \( h_2 \) is independent of the coordinates \( l_\theta; \theta \in \theta_1 \),

(iii) \(|h_1|\) is bounded by a finite sum \( \sum_{\theta \in A} c_\theta l_\theta; \theta \in A, \ \text{with} \ A \subset \theta_1 \).

**Proof.** By independence of the \( l_\theta, \theta \in \theta_1 \) is meant, as usual, that if \( \omega_1, i = 1, 2 \) are elements of \( \Omega \) such that \( l_\theta(\omega_1) = l_\theta(\omega_2) \) for all \( \theta \in \theta_1 \); then \( h_2(\omega_1) = h_2(\omega_2) \).

Let us first show that the decomposition, if it exists, is necessarily unique. For the purpose, if \( \omega \in \Omega \) let \( \omega' \) be the element of \( \Omega \) such that \( \omega'(\theta) = 0 \) for all \( \theta \in \theta_1 \) and \( \omega'(\theta) = \omega(\theta) \) for all \( \theta \in \theta_2 \).

If \( h = h_1 + h_2 \) is a decomposition satisfying the required conditions, then \( h_1(\omega) = 0 \) for \( \omega \in C(\theta_1) \) and \( h_2(\omega) = h_2(\omega') \).

Therefore \( h_2(\omega) \) is simply equal to the value \( h(\omega') \).
To prove the existence of the decomposition it is enough to consider elements \( h \in H \) which are in \( H_0 \). Then \( h \) has the form

\[
h = \sup_{j, \theta \in A} \sum_{j, \theta \in \theta_1} c_{j, \theta} \ell_{\theta}
\]

for some finite set \( A \), some finite set of values \( j=1,2,\ldots,k \) and for numbers \( c_{j,\theta} \geq 0 \). Partition \( A \) in the form \( A = A_1 \cup A_2 \) with \( A_1 = A \cap \theta_1 \).

Define \( h_{j,1} \) by the formula \( h_{j,1} = \sum_{\theta \in A_1} c_{j,\theta} \ell_{\theta}(\omega) \) and let \( h_2 \) be defined by

\[
h_2(\omega) = \sup_{j} h_{j,2}(\omega).
\]

Then \( h(\omega) = h_2(\omega) \) for all \( \omega \in C(\theta_1) \). Also, for arbitrary \( \omega \), one can write

\[
h(\omega) = \sup_{j} [h_{j,1}(\omega) + h_{j,2}(\omega)]
\]

\[
\leq \sup_{j} [h_{j,1}(\omega)] + \sup_{j} [h_{j,2}(\omega)].
\]

Thus \( h_1(\omega) = h(\omega) - h_2(\omega) \leq \sup_{j} [h_{j,1}(\omega)] \), and \( h_1 \) is certainly bounded above by a sum \( \sum_{\theta} (c_{\theta} \ell_{\theta}; \theta \in A_1) \) with \( c_\theta = \sum_j c_{j,\theta} \).

On the other hand, since all the coefficients \( c_{j,\theta} \) used here are nonnegative, one certainly can write \( h(\omega) \geq h_2(\omega) \) for all \( \omega \). This gives \( h_1 \geq 0 \) and the result follows.

Note. The fact that we use only positive linear functionals in the definition of \( H_0 \) is used here. One should note however that the space \( H \) itself is still a vector lattice for the
pointwise operations. Indeed, if $h \in H$ is written $h = h_1 - h_2$ with $h_1 \in H_0$ then $h_1 \lor h_2 \in H_0$ and $h^+ = h \lor 0 = (h_1 \lor h_2) - h_2$ belongs to $H$.

Going back to the partition $\Theta = \Theta_1 \cup \Theta_2$, consider a conical measure $\mu$ on $\Omega$. Following Choquet [4] (Vol. II, page 194) we shall split $\mu$ into two parts $\mu_i$, $i=1,2$ with $\mu_2$ "carried" by the cone $C(\Theta_1)$ and $\mu_1$ situated "outside" of that cone.

**Lemma 4.** Let $\mu$ be a conical measure on $\Omega$. Then $\mu$ can be written (in a unique way) as a sum $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$ of two disjoint conical measures $\mu_i$, $i=1,2$ such that $\mu_2(h) = 0$ for every $h \in H$ which vanishes on $C(\Theta_2)$.

**Proof.** One defines $\mu_1(h)$ for $h \in H$, $h > 0$ by the formula

$$\mu_1(h) = \sup \{\mu(g); 0 \leq g \leq h, g(\omega) = 0 \text{ for } \omega \in C(\Theta_1)\}.$$ 

The remainder of the proof consists in verifying that $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ have the required properties. This follows from the lattice structure of $H$.

As explained at the beginning of this section we can assume that $\Theta$ is a segment $\Theta = (\alpha; \alpha < \kappa)$ of the ordinals. Then, for an ordinal $\beta < \kappa$ we can define cones $C_\beta$ and $C'_\beta$ as follows:

$$C_\beta = \{\omega; \ell_\theta(\omega) = 0 \text{ for all } \theta < \beta\},$$

$$C'_\beta = \{\omega; \ell_\theta(\omega) = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \leq \beta\}.$$ 

If $\mu$ is a conical measure on $\Omega$, the preceding Lemma 4 allows us to split $\mu$ into two disjoint parts, say $\mu_\beta$ and $\mu'_\beta$, with $\mu_\beta$ situated out of $C_\beta$ and $\mu'_\beta$ carried by $C'_\beta$. 

Lemma 5. Assume that $\beta$ is a limit ordinal. Then the component $\mu_{\beta}$ of $\mu$ situated out of $C_{\beta}$ is the supremum $\mu_{\beta} = \sup{\mu_{\alpha}; \alpha < \beta}$.

Proof. The inequality $\alpha < \gamma$ implies $C_{\alpha} \supset C_{\gamma}$ and therefore $\mu_{\alpha} \leq \mu_{\gamma}$. Thus it is clear that $\varphi = \sup{\mu_{\alpha}; \alpha < \beta}$ satisfies the inequality $0 \leq \varphi \leq \mu_{\beta}$.

Take an $\alpha < \beta$ and a $\theta < \alpha$. Then $\mu_{\alpha}(l_\theta)$ is equal to $\mu(l_\theta)$, since $l_\theta$ vanishes on $C_{\alpha}$. It follows that, for all $\theta < \beta$ the value of the resultant $\varphi(l_\theta)$ is precisely equal to $\mu(l_\theta)$. Now consider $\psi = \mu_{\beta} - \varphi$. This is a conical measure whose resultant $\psi(l_\theta)$ vanishes for $\theta < \beta$. However, according to Lemma 3 if an element $h \in H$, $h \geq 0$ vanishes on $C_{\beta}$, then $h \leq c\Sigma_{\theta}(l_\theta; \theta \in A)$ for some real $c$ and some finite set $A$ contained in the set $\{\alpha; \alpha \times \beta\}$. It follows that $\psi(h) = 0$. The desired result is then a consequence of the definition of $\mu_{\beta}$.

To prove the next lemma, we shall need the fact that a conical measure $\mu$ on $\Omega$ is always $\sigma$-smooth. Specifically, if $\{h_n\}, n=1,2,\ldots$ is a sequence of elements of $H$ which decreases pointwise to zero on $\Omega$, then $\mu(h_n)$ decreases to zero. This is proved in Choquet [4] (Vol. III, page 19) and results from the fact that the sequence $h_n$ depends only on a countable set of coordinates $l_\theta$. Thus, one can reduce the problem to the case where $\theta$ is countable. In this case $\mu$ is localizable [4] (Vol. II, page 207) by a Radon measure.
Proposition 1. Let \( \mu \) be a conical measure on \( \Omega \) and let \( \beta \) be a particular ordinal \( \beta \in \Theta \). Assume that

(i) \( \mu \) is equal to its component carried by \( C_\beta = \{ \omega ; \ell_\theta(\omega) = 0, \theta < \beta \} \), and

(ii) the component of \( \mu \) carried by \( C_\beta' = \{ \omega ; \ell_\theta(\omega) = 0; \theta \leq \beta \} \) vanishes.

Then there is a finite \( \sigma \)-additive measure \( m \) carried by the set \( K_\beta = \{ \omega ; \ell_\theta(\omega) = 0 \text{ for } \theta < \beta \text{ and } \ell_\beta(\omega) = 1 \} \) such that

\[
\mu(h) = \int h(\omega) m(d\omega) \quad \text{for all } h \in H.
\]

Note. The set \( \Omega = (0, \infty)^\Theta \) carries its ordinary product \( \sigma \)-field, say \( \mathcal{A} \). The set \( K_\beta \) defined above is not an element of \( \mathcal{A} \). The measure \( m \) will be defined on the \( \sigma \)-field trace of \( \mathcal{A} \) on \( K_\beta \), or equivalently, on the \( \sigma \)-field defined on \( \Omega \) by \( \mathcal{A} \) and the set \( K_\beta \) itself, with the added requirement that the complement of \( K_\beta \) has measure zero.

Proof. Since \( \mu \) is carried by \( C_\beta \), two elements \( h_i, i=1,2 \) of \( H \) which agree on \( C_\beta \) yield the same value \( \mu(h_1) = \mu(h_2) \). Thus it is sufficient to consider \( \mu \) on the vector lattice \( H_\beta \) generated by finite sums \( \Sigma(c_\theta \ell_\theta, \theta \in A) \) with \( c_\theta \geq 0 \) and \( A \) contained in the subset \( \{ \theta; \theta \geq \beta \} \) of \( \Theta \). This space \( H_\beta \) contains a subspace, say \( F_\beta \) which consists of those \( h \in H_\beta \) such that \( \ell_\beta(\omega) = 0 \) implies \( h(\omega) = 0 \). In other words, the elements of \( F_\beta \) are the elements of \( H_\beta \) which vanish on \( C_\beta' \).
Any \( f \in F_\beta \) is determined by its restriction \( f' \) to \( K_\beta \) according to the relation

\[
f(\omega) = \ell_\beta(\omega) f' \frac{\omega}{\ell_\beta(\omega)}.
\]

The space \( F'_\beta \) of restrictions of elements of \( F_\beta \) to \( K_\beta \) is a vector lattice which contains the constant function \( \ell'_\beta(\omega) \equiv 1 \).

Consider a sequence \( \{h_n\}, h_n \in F_\beta \) which decreases pointwise to zero on \( K_\beta \). Then \( h_n \) decreases to zero pointwise on the entire set \( \Omega \).

Define a linear functional \( m \) on \( F'_\beta \) by the prescription \( m(f') = \mu(f) \). According to the above, this is a well-defined, positive \( \sigma \)-smooth functional. Thus it can be written in the form \( m(f') = \int f(\omega) m(d\omega) \) for some \( \sigma \)-additive measure \( m \) on \( K_\beta \). The measure \( m \) is well defined on the \( \sigma \)-field of \( K_\beta \) generated by the elements of \( F'_\beta \). It is easily seen that the \( \sigma \)-field in question is simply the trace on \( K_\beta \) of the product \( \sigma \)-field \( \sigma \).

Now consider an arbitrary element \( h \) of \( H_\beta \). If \( h(\omega) \geq 0 \) for \( \omega \in K_\beta \), then \( h(\omega) \geq 0 \) for all \( \omega \in \Omega \). Indeed \( h(\omega) \geq 0 \) for all \( \omega \) which are multiples \( \omega = s\omega_1, s > 0, \omega_1 \in K_\beta \) of elements of \( K_\beta \), that is, for all \( \omega \in \Omega \) such that \( \ell_\beta(\omega) > 0 \). The positivity of \( h \) on \( \Omega \) itself follows then by continuity.

For the same reason, \( h \) is well determined by its values on \( K_\beta \).

Since we have assumed that \( \mu \) has no component carried by \( C'_\beta \), for every \( h \geq 0, h \in H_\beta \), one can write
\[ \mu(h) = \sup_{f} \{ \mu(f); 0 \leq f \leq h; f \in F_{\beta} \}. \]

In this expression the inequalities \( 0 \leq f \leq h \) are supposed to hold on the entire set \( \Omega \), but we have just seen that they do so hold already if they are satisfied on \( K_{\beta} \) itself. Since each \( h \in H_{\beta} \) involves only a finite number of coordinates, the supremum used can be made countable in each case. It follows that for every \( h \in H_{\beta} \) the value \( \mu(h) \) is also equal to the Daniell integral

\[ \mu(h) = \int h(\omega) m(d\omega). \]

This completes the proof of the proposition.

We are now in a position to complete the proof of the bijective correspondence between the set of conical measures and coherent families of experiment types.

For this purpose, let \( \mathcal{E} \) denote the \( \sigma \)-field generated on \( \Omega \) by the product \( \sigma \)-field \( \sigma \) and the sets \( K_{\beta}, \beta \in \Theta \).

**Theorem 1.** Let \( \varphi \) be a conical measure on \( \Omega \). Assume that \( \varphi \) has resultant \( \varphi(l_{\theta}) \) identically equal to unity. Then \( \varphi \) is induced by an experiment \( \delta = \{ P_{\theta}; \theta \in \Theta \} \) formed by probability measures on the \( \sigma \)-field \( \mathcal{E} \).

**Proof.** For each ordinal \( \beta \in \Theta \) decompose \( \varphi \) in a sum of disjoint terms \( \varphi = \varphi_{\beta} + \varphi_{\beta,1} + \varphi_{\beta,2} \) where \( \varphi_{\beta} \) is the component of \( \varphi \) out of \( C_{\beta} \) and \( \varphi_{\beta,2} \) is the component of \( \varphi \) in \( C'_{\beta} \). Then \( \varphi_{\beta,1} \) which has no component out of \( C_{\beta} \) or in \( C'_{\beta} \) is a candidate for application of Proposition 1. It can be represented through
a measure $m_{\beta}$ on $K_\beta = \{ \omega; \ell_\beta(\omega) = 1, \ell_\theta(\omega) = 0 \text{ for all } \theta < \beta \}$.

by an integral $\varphi_{\beta,1}(h) = \int h(\omega) m_{\beta}(d\omega)$.

Writing $\ell_\theta \cdot m_\beta$ for the measure which has density $\ell_\theta$ with respect to $m_\beta$, consider the sum

$$Q_{\theta,\beta} = \sum_{\alpha < \beta} \ell_\theta \cdot m_\alpha.$$

We claim that for every ordinal $\beta$, the component $\varphi_{\beta}$ is induced by the family $\{Q_{\theta,\beta}; \theta \in \theta\}$. To show this consider first the case where $\beta$ is finite, $\beta > 1$ and let $S$ be the sum $S = \sum_{\alpha < \beta} m_\alpha$.

On the $\sigma$-field $\mathcal{B}$ this is a sum of disjoint terms. On a set $K_\alpha$, $\alpha < \beta$ one may write

$$\frac{dQ_{\theta,\beta}}{dS} = \frac{dQ_{\theta,\beta}}{dm_\alpha} = \ell_\theta.$$

If $h \in H$ has the form $h = \sup_j \sum_{\theta} c_j \ell_{\theta}$ its restriction to $U(K_\alpha; \alpha < \beta)$ is equivalent, for $S$, to the expression

$$h = \sup_j \sum_{\theta} c_j \cdot \frac{dQ_{\theta,\beta}}{dS}.$$

It follows that $\int h dS = \sum_{\alpha < \beta} \int h dm_\alpha$ is precisely equal to $\varphi_{\beta}(h)$.

Proceeding inductively, let $\gamma$ be a limit ordinal and assume that, for all $\beta < \gamma$, the component $\varphi_{\beta}$ of $\varphi$ is induced by the sums $Q_{\theta,\beta}$.

Under this assumption, the resultant $\varphi_{\beta}(\ell_\theta)$ is equal to the norm $\|Q_{\theta,\beta}\|$ for all $\theta$ and all $\beta < \gamma$. It follows that

$$\|Q_{\theta,\gamma}\| = \sup_{\beta < \gamma} \|Q_{\theta,\beta}\| = \sup_{\beta < \gamma} \varphi_{\beta}(\ell_\theta).$$
According to Lemma 5, this last term is also equal to $\varphi_\gamma(l_\theta)$.

Let $\nu_\gamma$ be the conical measure generated by the system $(Q_{\theta,\gamma}; \theta \in \Theta)$. The construction implies that if $\beta < \gamma$ then $Q_{\theta,\beta}$ and $Q_{\theta,\gamma} - Q_{\theta,\beta}$ are disjoint. Thus, according to Lemma 1 Section 3, one has $\varphi_\beta \leq \nu_\gamma$ for all $\beta < \gamma$.

Applying Lemma 5 we obtain that

$$\varphi_\gamma = \sup_{\beta \leq \gamma} \varphi_\beta \leq \nu_\gamma.$$ 

However, since $\varphi_\gamma$ and $\nu_\gamma$ have the same resultant $\varphi_\gamma(l_\theta) = \nu_\gamma(l_\theta) = ||Q_{\theta,\gamma}||$, the inequality $\varphi_\nu \leq \nu_\gamma$ implies that $\varphi_\gamma = \nu_\gamma$.

Passage from an ordinal $\beta$ to the next ordinal $\gamma = \beta + 1$ consists in adding to $\varphi_\beta$ the term $\varphi_\beta,1$ which is represented by the measure $m_\beta$. Here again $Q_{\theta,\beta}$ and $l_\theta \cdot m_\beta$ are disjoint and the argument given for finite ordinals can be repeated without difficulty.

Thus if $\varphi_\beta$ is induced by $(Q_{\theta,\beta})$ for $\beta < \gamma$, then $\varphi_\gamma$ is induced by $(Q_{\theta,\gamma})$.

In particular $\varphi$ itself is induced by the family of probability measures $(P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta)$ with

$$P_\theta = \sum_{\alpha \in \Theta} l_\theta \cdot m_\alpha.$$ 

This concludes the proof of the theorem.

**Corollary.** The set of experiment types $E(\Theta)$ is compact for its weak topology.
Proof. Topologize the space of conical measures on $\Omega$ by the topology of pointwise convergence on $H$. For this topology, the space of conical measures of resultant identically unity is obviously compact. The result follows since the topology in question is very exactly identical to the weak topology of $E(\theta)$.

(One could also argue that coherent families $\{\delta(A); A \subset \theta,$ A finite$\}$ form a compact space and use the identification between these and the space $E(\theta)$. This is essentially the same argument.)

Remark 1. It is clear from the proof of the theorem that the terms $l_\theta \cdot m_\beta$ vanish for all $\beta > \theta$. The term $l_\theta \cdot m_\beta$ itself represents the part of $P_\beta$ which is disjoint from all the $P_\alpha$, $\alpha < \beta$. Each $P_\theta$ is, of course, the sum of an at most countable set of terms of the type $l_\theta \cdot m_\alpha$.

Remark 2. The above theorem and its corollary refer to the compactness of $E(\theta)$ for the weak topology. If $\theta$ is finite this is the same thing as compactness for the experiment distance $\Delta$. However, for infinite $\theta$ the set $E(\theta)$ is not compact for $\Delta$. We do not have, at present, very usable criteria for the strong compactness of subsets of $E(\theta)$.

Note that a subset $S$ of $E(\theta)$ is relatively compact for $\Delta$ if and only if its restriction to countable subsets of $\theta$ has the same property. Thus the study of strong compactness could as well be carried out assuming that $\theta$ is countable.

The difference between the weak and strong (that is, $\Delta$) topology can be described on the Choquet measures as follows.
Consider a particular finite sum \( h_0 = \sum_{\theta} c_{0, \theta} e^\theta \) with \( c_{0, \theta} \geq 0 \) and \( \sum c_{0, \theta} = 1 \). Let \( H(h_0) \) be the subset of \( H_0 \) (see Section 2) formed by functions \( h \in H_0 \) such that \( h \leq h_0 \). The weak convergence is the topology of uniform convergence on each \( H(h_0) \) so constructed. The strong topology is the topology of uniform convergence on the union \( H_1 \) of the \( H(h_0) \).

**Remark 3.** The measures \( P_\theta \) obtained in Theorem 1 are only \( \sigma \)-additive measures. One can easily pass to Radon measures as follows. Let \( \Omega \) be the compact space \( \Omega = [0, \infty]^\theta \) and let \( K_\beta \) be the set \( K_\beta = \{ \omega; \omega \in \Omega, \omega(\beta) = 1, \omega(\theta) = 0 \text{ for } \theta < \beta \} \). Each \( m_\beta \) constructed above has a unique extension \( \overline{m}_\beta \) which is a Radon measure on \( K_\beta \). The introduction of possibly infinite values is largely inessential since for each \( \theta \) the set \( \{ \omega; \omega(\theta) = \infty \} \) has measure zero. Thus one could define the sums \( \overline{P}_\theta = \sum_{\alpha} \ell_{\alpha} \cdot \overline{m}_\alpha \) as Radon measures on \( \Omega \).

**Remark 4.** The construction carried out in Remark 3 can also be modified to yield a version of the experiment \( \mathcal{E} = \{ P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta \} \) which is \( \Sigma \)-finite. Explicitly if \( \mathcal{E} \) is represented by measures \( P_\theta \) and a set \( T \) with \( \sigma \)-field \( \mathcal{A} \), the system is called \( \Sigma \)-finite if there is a partition \( \{ A_j; j \in J \}, A_j \in \mathcal{A} \) of arbitrary cardinality such that (i) when restricted to an \( A_j \) the family \( P_\theta \) is dominated, (ii) any bounded function \( f \) whose restriction to each \( A_j \) is measurable is already \( \sigma \)-measurable and \( \int f dP_\theta = \sum_j \int_{A_j} f dP_\theta \).
Here this $\Sigma$-finiteness can be obtained by taking the compacts $\bar{K}_\beta$ of Remark 3 and letting $T$ be the topological direct sum of the $\bar{K}_\beta$. The space $T$ so obtained is locally compact and the $P_\theta$ are still Radon measures. One can take for $\sigma$-field $\mathcal{A}$ the $\sigma$-field of the universally measurable sets.

This $\Sigma$-finiteness is involved in the proof of various representation theorems. One can always obtain it by passing to the Kakutani representation space. However, the space $T$ constructed above may be more directly accessible.
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