Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education
Vol. 13, Issue No. 2, July-2017, ISSN 2230-7540

Developments in the Theory of Topological Tensor Products of Locally Convex Spaces

Santosh Kumar[1]* Dr. Raj Kumar[2] Dr. Sumit Kumar[3]

[1] Research Scholar, P.G Department of Mathematics, Patna University, Patna, Bihar

[2] St Xavier's College of Management and Technology, Digha Ashiyana Road, Patna, Bihar

[3] Assistant Professor, Zeal College of Engineering and Research

Abstract – An express portrayal of the n-folds symmetric tensor results of the limited direct whole of locally convex spaces is displayed. Additionally features the basic thoughts of locally convex space and limited sets, S topologies on the spaces, t-spaces, atomic space. Additionally focuses on the properties of tensor items. In this paper classes of control arrangement of locally convex spaces is contemplated.

Keywords: locally convex spaces, S topologies, t-spaces, nuclear space, classes of control system

---------------------------------x---------------------------------

INTRODUCTION

A topological vector space is locally convex in the event that it has a base of its topology comprising of convex open subsets. Proportionally, it is a vector space furnished with a check comprising of semi-norms. Likewise with other topological vector spaces, a locally convex space (LCS or LCTVS) is regularly thought to be Hausdorff. Locally convex (topological vector) spaces are the standard arrangement for quite a bit of contemporary utilitarian investigation.

A characteristic thought of smooth map between lctvs is given by Michal-Bastiani smooth maps.

The class lctvs is a symmetric monoidal classification with the inductive tensor item and even a symmetric shut monoidal class, where the inside norms are given by the space of consistent straight maps with the topology of pointwise combination.

A focal theme in the hypothesis of locally curved spaces (and furthermore in the hypothesis of topological vector spaces) is the investigation of the connection of the space with its double or adjoin space.

The establishment of this hypothesis of duality for locally raised spaces is the Hahn–Banach hypothesis, which suggests, specifically, that in the event that is a locally arched space, at that point its double space isolates the purposes of.

An essential part of the speculation of locally convex spaces is the theory of limited convex sets in a locally convex space. The convex hull $\mathrm{co}\ K$ what's more, the convex adjusted structure (cf. additionally Balanced arrangement) of a pre-minimal set K in a locally convex space are pre-minimal; in the event that is likewise semi complete, at that point the shut convex hull $\overline{\mathrm{co}}\ K$ of K what's more, its shut convex adjusted hull are conservative. If A and K are disjoint non-void convex subsets of a locally convex space E, where A is closed and K is compact, then there is a continuous real linear functional f on E such that for some real number α the inequalities $f(x) > \alpha$, $f(y) < \alpha$ hold for all $x \in A$, $y \in K$, respectively. In specific, a non-void shut convex set in a locally convex space is the crossing point of all shut half-spaces containing it.

A non-empty closed convex subset B of a closed convex set A is known as a face (or external subset) of A if any shut fragment in A with an inside point in B lies completely in B; a $x \in A$ is called an extreme point of A if the set $\{x\}$ is a face of A. In the event K that is a reduced convex set in a locally convex space E and $\partial_e K$ is the arrangement of its extraordinary focuses, at that point the accompanying conditions are proportionate for a set $X \subset K$: 1) $\overline{\mathrm{co}}\ X = K$; 2) $\bar{X} \supset \partial_e K$; and 3) $\sup f(X) = \sup f(K)$ for any continuous real linear functional f on E. In particular, $\overline{\mathrm{co}}\ \partial_e K = K$ (the Krein–Mil'man theorem).

One very noteworthy piece of the theory of locally convex spaces is the speculation of direct managers on a locally convex space; explicitly, the speculation of littler (moreover called absolutely steady), nuclear and Fredholm directors (cf. Nuclear chairman Negligible manager; Fredholm director ;). Shut chart and open-mapping hypotheses have extensive speculations in the hypothesis of locally convex spaces. A locally convex space is said to have the estimate property if the character mapping of into itself can be consistently approximated on pre-conservative arrangements of by limited position nonstop straight mappings of into itself. In the event that a locally convex space has the estimation property, at that point it has various other momentous properties. Specifically, in such a space any atomic administrator has an interestingly characterized follow. There are distinguishable Banach spaces that don't have the estimation property, however Banach spaces with a Schauder premise and subspaces of projective breaking points of Hilbert spaces do have the guess property. A few variants of this property are of enthusiasm for the hypothesis of totally consistent and Fredholm administrators.

A striking job in the hypothesis of locally convex spaces is played by strategies for homological polynomial math associated with the investigation of the class of locally convex spaces what's more, their relentless mappings, and besides some subcategories of this arrangement. Specifically, homological techniques have made it conceivable to tackle various issues associated with the augmentation of straight mappings and with the presence of a direct mapping into a given space that lifts a mapping into a remainder space of this space, and furthermore to contemplate properties of fruitions of remainder spaces in connection to the fulfillments of the spaces and .

Other significant inquiries in the hypothesis of locally convex spaces are: the hypothesis of coordination of vector-esteemed capacities with values in a locally convex space (when in doubt, a barrelled space); the hypothesis of separation of non-straight mappings between locally convex spaces; the hypothesis of topological tensor results of locally convex spaces and the hypothesis of Fredholm administrators and atomic administrators. There is a nitty gritty hypothesis of various unique classes of locally convex spaces, for example, a barrelled spaces (cf. Barrelled space), bornological spaces (on which any semi-standard that is limited on limited sets is persistent), reflexive and semi-reflexive spaces (the authoritative mapping of which into the solid second double is a topological or direct isomorphism, individually), atomic spaces (cf. Atomic space), and so on.

Continuous linear functionals

One motivation behind why locally convex topological vector spaces are significant is that loads of ceaseless direct functionals exist on them, at any rate on the off chance that one accept a fitting decision guideline, e.g., aphorism of decision or ultrafilter hypothesis (or simply subordinate decision for a detachable space).

In nonlinear control hypothesis, one thinks about frameworks of the structure

$$\xi'(t) = F(\xi(t), \mu(t)),$$

.........eq 1

where t ⟶ μ (t) is a bend taking qualities in a control set and t ⟶ is the comparing direction, taking qualities in a differentiable complex M. In this paper we are worried about two related inquiries: (1) what is the most characteristic structure to expect for the control what is the best possible approach to represent ordinary reliance of the framework set and (2) on state? Before we cautiously answer these inquiries, in this presentation we build up their control theoretic ackdrop, as they do emerge normally, yet are by and by not replied in any kind of general or efficient way.

Co-Probes and curves

The collections of continuous linear functional on a LCTVS is used in a way analogous to the collection of coordinate projections pri:ℝn→ℝmath{ℝ}to math{ℝ} out of a Cartesian space. For example, curves in a LCTVS over the reels can be composed with functional to arrive at a collection of functions ℝ→ℝmath {ℝ}to math{ℝ} which are analogous to the ‘components’ of the curve.

In one respect, a locally convex TVS is a nice topological space in that there are enough co-probes by maps to the base field.

Structures for control sets.

Give us initial a chance to consider the matter of what structure one ought to accept for the control set. The control set is regularly taken to be a subset of some Euclidean space Rm; this is particularly important for control-relative frameworks, where

$$F(x, u) = f_0(x) + \sum_{a=1}^{m} u^a f_a(x)$$

.....eq 2

for vector fields f0; f1; : ; fm. Be that as it may, there are unquestionably occurrences where one requires the control to take esteems in something more broad than proclivity dimensional Euclidean space Lipschitz, limitedly differentiable, and smooth control frameworks.

Next let us go to the improvement of consistency of control frameworks. Before we start with speci_cs, let us bring up that the essential issue one must defy here is that one must create joint conditions on state and control; it isn't sufficient to just say that the consistency of a control framework is the normality of the reliance on state, for each fixed control esteem this would be independent consistency). The explanation behind this is, in presence and uniqueness hypotheses for common differential conditions, there are joint conditions required on state and time, e.g., the time reliance ought to be locally integrable, and limited by a locally integrable capacity locally consistently in state. Since time enters a control framework by method for the control, the manner by which one guarantees the right joint conditions on schedule and state is to determine suitable joint conditions on control and state.

We will see this issue of joint consistency conditions come up over and over in our resulting dialog. One approach to see the commitment of the paper is that it gives a bound together method for indicating these joint conditions over an expansive scope of normality conditions. In addition, in cases that are comprehended in the writing, our joint conditions concur with the ordinarily acknowledged ones. In any case, they likewise apply in cases that are not comprehended in the current writing. We likewise notice here that in (1) the issue of joint conditions for time and state are considered. In the present work, these are converted into joint conditions on control and state, however these interpretations are in no way, shape or form prompt or from the earlier clear.

The fundamental notions: I. Locally convex spaces.

We will be solely worried about vector spaces over the genuine field: the section to complex spaces offers no trouble. We will accept that the definition and properties of convex sets are known. A convex set An of every a vector space E is symmetric on the off chance that A=A, at that point 0 ϵ An if An isn't unfilled. A convex set An is engrossing if for each x ≠0 in E, there exists a number ∝ ≠0 to such an extent that λ x ϵ A for |λ|≦∝; this suggests A produces E.

A locally convex space is a topological vector space in which there is a major arrangement of neighborhoods of 0 which are convex [2,3]; these areas can generally should be symmetric and retaining. On the other hand, if any channel base is given on a vector space E, and comprises of convex, symmetric, and retaining sets, at that point it characterizes one and only one topology on E for which x+y and λx are ceaseless elements of both their contentions.

The fundamental notions: II. Bounded sets.

The idea of limited set is effectively characterized in a normed space: it is a set contained in some ball $||x|| \leqq R$. To extend this notion when nometric is at hand, we may reformulate it as follows: *B* is bounded if, given *any* ball $||x|| \leqq r$, there exists a λ>0 such that λB is containedin that ball. If we say that a set *A absorbs* a set *B* if there exists λ>0such that λB <*A*, we can therefore say that a bounded set is one which is absorbed by every ball. Hence the general definition of a bounded set in a locally convex space *E* : it is a set *B* which is *absorbed by every neighborhood of 0 in E (4,5)*. A proportional definition is that each semi-standard which characterizes the topology of *E* is limited on *B*. On the off chance that *B* is limited, so is fi*B* for any λx; the convex hull of *B* is limited, just as its conclusion. The association of a limited number of limited sets is limited; so is *A* +*B*, if both *A* and *B* are limited.

The idea of limited set isn't significant in normed spaces, since it is then proportionate to the thought of (subjective) subset of a ball; at the end of the day, there is a crucial arrangement of limited neighborhoods of 0. This ends up being remarkable among locally convex spaces: to be sure, a Hausdorff locally convex space has limited neighborhoods of 0 if furthermore, just if its topology can be described by techniques for a standard [6]. On a locally convex space (as on any abelian topological gathering) there is a uniform structure dictated by its topology, and such a space E is said to be finished if each Cauchy channel (for that uniform structure) meets in E for any Hausdorff locally convex space £, there is a very much decided locally convex space Ê which is finished and in which E is thick (the consummation of E). There are significant locally convex vector spaces which neglect to be finished; however most spaces which happen in useful investigation have in any event the more fragile property that limited shut sets are finished; they are called semi complete spaces. A still flimsier property, which gets the job done for some, applications, is that each Cauchy grouping is united, in which case the space is said to be semi-finished. The three ideas correspond obviously for metrizable spaces.

The $\mathfrak{S}$-topologies on the spaces(*E*, *F)* [4,6].

One is in this way driven, specifically, to examine the $\mathcal{L}$(E, *F)*set of all nonstop direct mappings of a locally convex space *E* into a locally convex space F. This is itself a vector space, and one of the primary issues of the hypothesis is to characterize and to think about on $\mathcal{L}$(E, *F)* topologies related in a characteristic path to those of *E* and *F*. The known techniques for characterizing topologies on useful spaces by states of "uniform diminutiveness" on specific subsets [7] lead to the accompanying conditional definition: for each subset An of *E* and each area *E*,of 0 in F, let *T(A, V)* be the arrangement of all we uϵ (*E* , *F*) with the end goal that u(A)⊂V; one takes as an essential arrangement of neighborhoods *E*, of 0 in ((*E, F*) the sets *T(A, V),* where A goes through a family $\mathfrak{S}$of subsets of E and V through a principal arrangement of neighborhoods of 0 in F. Notably, this in actuality characterizes a locally convex topology (called Stopology) on $\mathcal{L}$(E, *F)*gave the sets A $\mathcal{L}$ are limited in E. On the off chance that *E* and *F* are Hausdorff, $\mathcal{L}$(E, *F)*is Hausdorff if the association of the arrangements of $\mathfrak{S}$is thick in E. The family $\mathfrak{S}$can generally should comprise of shut, convex, and symmetric sets, and to be with the end goal that the shut convex hull of the association of any limited number of sets of 𝔖has a place with 𝔖. Among all 𝔖-topologies for which the association of the arrangements of 𝔖is E, the best is the topology for which 𝔖is the arrangement of all limited, convex, shut symmetric arrangements of E (topology of limited combination on $\mathcal{L}$(E, *F)*when E and F are normed spaces, it is the typical standard or "uniform" topology on $\mathcal{L}$(E, *F)*; the coarsest is the topology for which 𝔖is the arrangement of all limited convex shut limited dimensional subsets of E (topology of pointwise intermingling on $\mathcal{L}$(E, *F)*.

***t*-spaces and the Banach-Steinhaus theorem[4; 6].**

Particularly important subsets of a space$\mathcal{L}$ (E, *F)* are the *equicontinuous* subsets : such a set *H* is characterized by the property that for every neighborhood V of 0 in *F,* there is a neighborhood *U* of 0 in *E* suchthat *u(U)*⊂*V* for *all u*∈*H.* Equicontinuous subsets are 𝔖–bounded for every family 𝔖 ,but the converse need not hold. A locally convex space *E* is called a *t-space* The definition of *t-space* can be given an equivalent formulation in which only "internal" properties of *E* intervene. In a locally convex space *E,* a *barrel* is a *closed, convex, symmetric,* and *absorbing* set; closed convex symmetric neighborhoods of 0 are of course barrels. Now £ is a /-space if and only if, conversely, *all barrels are neighborhoods of* 0 **[6]**

Duality in locally convex spaces [4].

Equicontinuous subsets of *E'* are those which are contained in*polars V° of neighborhoods of* 0 in *E;* these sets *V°* are *weakly* compact* by Tychonoff's theorem. Equicontinuous sets are stronglybounded, and strongly bounded sets are weakly* bounded; in general these three classes of sets are distinct. However:(1) every weakly* bounded set in *E'* is equicontinuous if and only

if £ is a *t* space ;(2) if *E* is semi-complete, every weakly* bounded set in *E'* is strongly bounded;

(3) in order that every strongly bounded set in E' be equicontinuous, it is necessary and sufficient that every barrel in E, which absorbs all bounded subsets of E, be a neighborhood of 0; E is then said to be a *quasi-t-space;* the completion of such a space is a /-space

Nuclear spaces[8]

A space is nuclear if and only if its completion is nuclear ; we shall therefore consider only complete nuclear spaces. In such a space, abounded set is always relatively compact, hence the space is always semi-reflexive (§6), but it need not be a /-space; if it is a /-space, it is of course a Montel space; moreover, if it is an (*F*)-space, its(strong) dual is also a nuclear space. A closed subspace *F* of a nuclear space *E* is nuclear and so is the quotient space *E/F.* Any projective limit of nuclear spaces (§8) is nuclear; so is the inductive limit of a sequence of nuclear spaces.

The (*F* -spaces which are nuclear spaces can be characterized by the following property: they are the only (*F*-spaces in which every *unconditionally convergent* series is also *absolutely convergent:* for Banach spaces, this gives of course, in particular, an entirely new proof of the Dvoretzky-Rogers theorem [9].

The importance of nuclear spaces lies chiefly in the fact that most spaces which occur in the theory of distributions or in the theory of analytic functions, are nuclear spaces.

Properties of the tensor products

Important interpretations of tensor products stem from the initial remark of §10. Every element$\sum ix\otimes yi$of the (algebraic)tensor product *E'*⊗*F* can be identified with the linear mapping *x*—» $\sum$ *(x, xi)*$yi$of *E* into *F;* in other words, *E'* ⊗*F* can be considered as the space of all linear continuous mappings of *finite rank* of *E*into *F.* The tensor products *E'*⊗*F* and *E'* ⊗*2F* (where *E'* is given its strong topology) will, in the most important cases, be identified with spaces of linear mappings of *E* into J!7 which are "limits" in some sense of mappings of finite rank. For instance, if E is a reflexive Banach space with a basis, *E'* $\otimes_2$*E* will be identified with the space of *com*

$$u \rightarrow \int \langle u,\ x' \otimes y' \rangle d\mu(x',\ y')$$

where /* is a positive Radon measure defined on a product *PXQ* ofan equicontinuous (hence compact) subset *P* of *E'* and an equicontinuou subset *Q* of *F'.* This, applied to *E'* ⊗*2Fi* leads to important classes of linear mappings of *E* into *Fi* which have many useful properties.

Classes of control systems that integrate the properties of the locally convex topologies

Control systems with locally essentially bounded controls.

With the notions of parameterised sections from the preceding section, we readily define what we mean by a control system.

Definition:

(Control system) Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $m' \in \{0, \mathrm{lip}\}$, let $\nu \in \{m+m', \infty, \omega\}$ and let $r \in \{\infty, \omega\}$, as required. A C_-control system is a triple $\Sigma = (\mathsf{M}, F, \mathfrak{C})$, where

(i) M is a Cr-manifold whose elements are called states,

(ii) C is a topological space called the control set, and

(iii) $F \in \mathrm{JPI}^{\nu}(\mathcal{C}; \mathsf{TM})$.

The governing equations for a control system $\Sigma = (\mathsf{M}, F, \mathcal{C})$, are

$$\xi'(t) = F(\xi(t), \mu(t)),$$

for suitable functions $t \mapsto \mu(t) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $t \mapsto \xi(t) \in \mathsf{M}$. To ensure that these equations makesense, the difirential equation should be shown to have the properties needed for existenceand uniqueness of solutions, as well as appropriate dependence on initial conditions. We dothis by allowing the controls for the system to be as general as reasonable. Control systems with locally integrable controls. In this section we specialize the discussion from the preceding section in one direction, while generalizing it in another. To be precise, we now consider the case where our control set C is a subset of a locally convextopological vector space, and the system structure is such that the notion of integrabilityis preserved

Definition: (Sublinear control system) Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $m' \in \{0, \mathrm{lip}\}$, let $\nu \in \{m + m', \infty, \omega\}$ and let $r \in \{\infty, \omega\}$ as required. A C-sublinear control system is atriple $\Sigma = (\mathsf{M}, F, \mathcal{C})$, where

(i) M is a C-manifold whose elements are called states,

(ii) Is a subset of a locally convex topological vector space V, C being called the control set, and

(iii) *F* has the following property: for every continuous seminorm p for □_(TM), there exists a continuous seminorm q for V such that

$$p(F^{u_1} - F^{u_2}) \leq q(u_1 - u_2), \qquad u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{C}.$$

One may want to regard the generalisation from the case where the control set is a subset of $\mathbb{R}k$ to being a subset of a locally convex topological vector space to be mere fancygeneralisation, but this is, actually, far from being the case. Indeed, this observation isthe foundation for a general, control parameterisation-independent formulation for control theory (10)

Proposition: (Property of sublinear control system when the control is specified)

$Let\ m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $m' \in \{0, \mathrm{lip}\},\ let\ \nu \in \{m + m', \infty, \omega\},\ and\ let\ r \in \{\infty, \omega\}$, as required. Let $Let\ \Sigma = (\mathsf{M}, F, \mathcal{C})$ be a C''-sublinear control system for which $\mathcal{C}$ is a subset of a locally convex topological vector space V. If $\mu \in \mathrm{L}^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{T}; \mathcal{C})$, then $F^{\mu} \in \mathrm{LI}\Gamma^{\nu}(\mathbb{T}; \mathsf{TM})$ where $F^{\mu} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathsf{M} \to \mathsf{TM}$ is defined by

$$F^{\mu}(t, x) = F(x, \mu(t))$$

To prove that $F^{\mu} \in \mathrm{LI}\Gamma^{\nu}(\mathbb{T}; \mathsf{TM})$, let K ⊆M be compact, let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let $\boldsymbol{a} \in c_0(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}_{>0})$, and denote(11)

$$p_K = \begin{cases} p^{\infty}_{K,k}, & \nu = \infty, \\ p^{m}_{K}, & \nu = m, \\ p^{m+\mathrm{lip}}_{K}, & \nu = m + \mathrm{lip}, \\ p^{\omega}_{K,a}, & \nu = \omega. \end{cases}$$

CONCLUSION

The all focuses are on that the theories of the analytic are nuclear spaces that defines the Also in this article the define control system of locally convex spaces. Control systems with locally integral controls. With the point of view theories is described that the development increased in the topological tensor product of locally convex space.

REFERENCES

1. Jafarpour, S. and Lewis, A. D. (2014) Time-Varying Vector Fields and Their Flows, Springer Briefs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag: New York/Heidelberg/Berlin, isbn: 978-3-319-10138-5.

2. L. Schwartz, Théorie des distributions, vol. I, Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, no. 1091=Publ. Inst. Math. Univ. Strasbourg 9, Paris, Hermann, 1950, 148 pp.; vol. II, Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles no. 1122=Publ. Inst. Math. Univ. Strasbourg 10, Paris, Hermann, 1951. 169 pp.

3. J. V. Wehausen (1983). Transformations in linear topological spaces, Duke Math. J. vol. 4, pp. 157-169.

4. J. von Neumann (1935). On complete topological spaces, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. vol. 37 pp. 1-20.

5. A. Kolmogoroff, Zur Normierbarkeit eines allgemeinen topologischen linearen Raumes, Studia Math. vol. 5 (1935) pp. 29-33.

6. Espaces vectoriels topologiques, Chapters III-V. (To be published shortly.) 7. , Sur certains espaces vectoriels topologiques, Ann. Inst. Fourier Grenoble vol. 2 (1950) pp. 5-16 (1951).

7. Éléments de mathématique. X. Part 1. Les structures fondamentales de V analyse. Book III. Topologie générale. Chapter X. Espaces fonctionnels ; dictionnaire, Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, no. 1084, Paris, Hermann, 1949. ii+101 pp.

8. Produits tensoriels topologiques ET espaces nucléaires, (To be published in the Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society.)

9. A. Dvoretzky and C. A. Rogers (1950). Absolute and unconditional convergence in normed linear spaces, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. vol. 36, pp. 192-197.

10. Lewis, A. D. (2014) Tautological Control Systems, Springer Briefs in Electrical and Computer Engineering|Control, Automation and Robotics, Springer-Verlag: New York/-Heidelberg/Berlin, ISBN: 978-3-319-08637-8, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-08638-5.

11. Hirsch, M. W. (1976) Di_erential Topology, number 33 in Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag: New York/Heidelberg/Berlin, ISBN: 978-0-387-90148-0.

Corresponding Author

Santosh Kumar*

Research Scholar, P.G Department of Mathematics, Patna University, Patna, Bihar

santoshrathore.kumar20@gmail.com