

Francisco Gallego Lupiáñez

α -paracompact subsets and well-situated subsets

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 38 (1988), No. 2, 191–197

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/102212>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1988

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://dml.cz>

α -PARACOMPACT SUBSETS AND WELL-SITUATED SUBSETS

FRANCISCO GALLEGO LUPIAÑEZ, Madrid*)

(Received November 20, 1985)

INTRODUCTION

In Section 1 we study α -paracompact subsets, defined by C. E. Aull. We obtain some covering properties of α -paracompact subsets which are similar to the properties of paracompact spaces. In particular, we characterize α -paracompact subsets in regular spaces. Moreover, we study the behaviour of α -paracompact subsets under perfect mappings.

In Section 2 we consider R. Telgársky's well-situated subsets. The properties of α -paracompact subsets of Section 1 yield properties of well-situated subsets. Well-situated subsets are related to Tamano's problem (i.e.: to give an intrinsic description of T_2 spaces X such that $X \times Y$ is paracompact for each paracompact T_2 space Y) which remains open.

In Section 3 we solve a problem of Telgársky. We establish that in the realm of T_2 spaces, the class Π^* is perfect.

1. α -PARACOMPACT SUBSETS

C. E. Aull in [1] defined the notion of an α -paracompact subset. A subset E of a topological space X is said to be α -paracompact in X if every covering of E by open subsets of X has a refinement by open subsets of X , locally finite in X , which covers E . We continue in this paper the study of α -paracompact subsets. We omit the proofs in this section.

1.1. Proposition. *Let X be a topological space. Then:*

1) *If X is T_2 , E is an α -paracompact subset in X and F is a closed subset of E , then F is α -paracompact in X .*

2) *If $\{E_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a set of subsets of X , locally finite in X and such that E_j is α -paracompact in X for every $j \in J$ and there exists a locally finite family of open*

*) Part of this paper is contained in the author's Doctoral Thesis written under the supervision of Professor E. Outerelo. This paper has been published in a shorted version in *Quest. & Ans. Gen. Topology* 5 (1987), 293–302.

subsets $\{U_j\}_{j \in J}$ of X such that $E_j \subset U_j$ for every $j \in J$, then $\bigcup_{j \in J} E_j$ is α -paracompact in X . In particular, every finite union of α -paracompact subsets is α -paracompact.

1.2. Remark. In Proposition 1.1, point 2), the hypothesis “ $\{U_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a locally finite family” cannot be replaced by the hypothesis “ $\{U_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a locally finite set”. Indeed, in the Niemytski plane $X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 / y \geq 0\}$ (in which for $y_0 > 0$ the neighbourhoods of (x_0, y_0) are the usual neighbourhoods in the plane relativized with respect to X , while for $y_0 = 0$ the neighbourhoods of $(x_0, 0)$ consist of open circles with center (x_0, y) and radius y with the point $(x_0, 0)$ for each $y > 0$), $\{E_q\}_{q \in \mathbb{Q}}$ where $E_q = \{(q, 0)\}$ is a locally finite set of α -paracompact subsets of X such that $\bigcup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} E_q$ is not α -paracompact ([1] p. 50), and $\{U_q\}_{q \in \mathbb{Q}}$ where $U_q = X$ for each $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ is a locally finite set such that $E_q \subset U_q$ for each $q \in \mathbb{Q}$.

1.3. Theorem. Let X be a regular space and E a subset of X . The following conditions are equivalent:

- a) E is an α -paracompact subset in X .
- b) 1) Every covering \mathcal{U} of E by open subsets of X has a refinement \mathcal{V} by open subsets of X , σ -locally finite in X , which covers E , and 2) Every open subset U of X such that $E \subset U$ has an open subset V such that $E \subset V \subset \bar{V} \subset U$.
- c) Every covering \mathcal{U} of E by open subsets of X has a refinement $\mathcal{A} = \{A_s\}_{s \in S}$ by arbitrary sets of X , locally finite in X , such that $E \subset (\bigcup_{s \in S} A_s)^0$.
- d) Every covering \mathcal{U} of E by open subsets of X has a refinement $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}_{j \in J}$ by closed subsets of X , locally finite in X , such that $E \subset (\bigcup_{j \in J} F_j)^0$.

Remark. Theorem 1.3 implies Corollary 3 and Theorem 4 of [1].

1.4. Proposition. Let X be a regular space and E an α -paracompact subset in X . Then:

- 1) Every covering \mathcal{U} of E by open subsets of X has a refinement by open subsets of X , barycentric in X , which covers E .
- 2) Every covering \mathcal{U} of E by open subsets of X has a star refinement by open subsets of X , which covers E .

1.5. Proposition. Let X be a regular space and E an α -paracompact subset in X . Then for every family $\{F_s\}_{s \in S}$ of subsets of E , locally finite (discrete) in X , there is a family $\{U_s\}_{s \in S}$ of open subsets of X , locally finite (discrete) in X and such that $F_s \subset U_s$ for every $s \in S$.

We pass now to the study of the behaviour of the α -paracompact subsets under perfect mappings.

1.6. Proposition. Let X and X' be topological spaces and $f: X \rightarrow X'$ a perfect mapping. If E' is an α -paracompact subset in X' then $f^{-1}(E')$ is an α -paracompact subset in X .

1.7. Remark. Proposition 1.6 implies that if X and Y are topological spaces, E is an α -paracompact subset in X and Y is compact, then $E \times Y$ is an α -paracompact subset in $X \times Y$.

However, if X and Y are topological spaces, E is an α -paracompact subset in X and F is an α -paracompact subset in Y , $E \times F$ is not necessarily an α -paracompact subset in $X \times Y$. Indeed, \mathcal{Q} is an α -paracompact subset in the Michael line $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T})$ $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$ is an α -paracompact subset in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$, but $\mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ is not an α -paracompact subset in $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$. (Since the sets $\mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ and $C = \{(x, x) | x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}\}$ are disjoint closed sets which are not strongly separated, it follows from Theorem 5 in [1] that $\mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ is not an α -paracompact subset.)

1.8. Proposition. Let X and X' be topological spaces, where X is regular, let f be a perfect mapping from X onto X' and E' a subset of X' . If $f^{-1}(E')$ is an α -paracompact subset in X then E' is an α -paracompact subset in X' .

1.9. Remark. In Proposition 1.8 the hypothesis “ f is a mapping onto” cannot be omitted. Indeed, let $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T})$ be the Michael line. Then the mapping $i: \mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ is a perfect mapping but is not onto, $\mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ is an α -paracompact subset in $\mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ with the usual topology, and $\mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ is not an α -paracompact subset in $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ (see 1.7).

1.10. Proposition. Let X and X' be topological spaces and f a perfect and open mapping from X onto X' ; if E is an α -paracompact subset in X then $f(E)$ is an α -paracompact subset in X' .

1.11. Remark. Let X and X' be topological spaces and f a perfect mapping from X onto X' ; if E is an α -paracompact subset in X , $f(E)$ is not necessarily α -paracompact in X' . Indeed, let $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T})$ be the Michael line, $j_1: \mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}) + (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ and $j_2: (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}) + (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$. Then the mapping onto $f: \mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}) + (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ such that

$$f(j_1(x, y)) = (x, y) \quad \text{if } (x, y) \in \mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$$

$$f(j_2(x, y)) = (x, y) \quad \text{if } (x, y) \in (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$$

is a perfect mapping, $f(j_1(\mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}))) = \mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$, $j_1(\mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}))$ is an α -paracompact subset in $\mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q}) + (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ and $\mathcal{Q} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ is not an α -paracompact subset in $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ (1.7).

2. WELL-SITUATED SUBSETS

The concept of a well-situated subset was introduced by R. Telgársky in [4]. Using the notion of an α -paracompact subset, H. W. Martin phrased the definition of a well-situated subset of a space X as follows: a subset E of a space X is said

to be *well-situated* in X if for every paracompact T_2 space Y , $E \times Y$ is an α -paracompact subset in $X \times Y$ ([3]).

If E is a well-situated subset of a space X then E is an α -paracompact subset in X , but \mathcal{Q} is α -paracompact in (\mathbb{R}, T) , the Michael line, and \mathcal{Q} is not a well-situated subset in (\mathbb{R}, T) (cf. 1.7).

From Section 1 we easily obtain the following theorems.

2.1. Proposition. *Let X be a topological space. Then:*

1) *If X is T_2 , E is a well-situated subset in X and F is a closed subset of E , then F is a well-situated subset in X .*

2) *If $\{E_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a set of subsets of X , locally finite in X and such that E_j is a well-situated subset in X for every $j \in J$, and there exists a locally finite family of open subsets $\{U_j\}_{j \in J}$ of X such that $F_j \subset U_j$ for every $j \in J$, then $\bigcup_{j \in J} E_j$ is a well-situated subset in X . In particular, every finite union of well-situated subsets is well-situated.*

2.2. Theorem. *Let X be a regular space and E a subset of X . The following conditions are equivalent:*

a) *E is a well-situated subset in X .*

b) *For every paracompact T_2 space Y : 1) Every covering \mathcal{U} of $E \times Y$ by open subsets of $X \times Y$ has a refinement \mathcal{V} by open subsets of $X \times Y$, σ -locally finite in $X \times Y$, which covers $E \times Y$, and 2) Every open subset U of $X \times Y$ such that $E \times Y \subset U$ has an open subset V such that $E \times Y \subset V \subset \bar{V} \subset U$.*

c) *For every paracompact T_2 space Y , every covering \mathcal{U} of $E \times Y$ by open subsets of $X \times Y$ has a refinement $\mathcal{A} = \{A_s\}_{s \in S}$ by arbitrary sets of $X \times Y$, locally finite in $X \times Y$, such that $E \times Y \subset \left(\bigcup_{s \in S} A_s\right)^0$.*

d) *For every paracompact T_2 space Y , every covering of $E \times Y$ by open subsets of $X \times Y$ has a refinement $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}_{j \in J}$ by closed subsets of $X \times Y$, locally finite in $X \times Y$, such that $E \times Y \subset \left(\bigcup_{j \in J} F_j\right)^0$.*

2.3. Proposition. *Let X be a regular space and E a well-situated subset in X . Then:*

1) *For every paracompact T_2 space Y , every covering \mathcal{U} of $E \times Y$ by open subsets of $X \times Y$ has a refinement by open subsets of $X \times Y$, barycentric in $X \times Y$, which covers $E \times Y$.*

2) *For every paracompact T_2 space Y , every covering of $E \times Y$ by open subsets of $X \times Y$ has a star refinement by open subsets of $X \times Y$ which covers $E \times Y$.*

2.4. Proposition. *Let X be a regular space and E a well-situated subset in X . Then for every paracompact T_2 space Y , for every family $\{F_s\}_{s \in S}$ of subsets of $E \times Y$, locally finite (discrete) in $X \times Y$, there is a family $\{U_s\}_{s \in S}$ of open subsets of $X \times Y$, locally finite (discrete) in $X \times Y$ and such that $F_s \subset U_s$ for any $s \in S$.*

2.5. Proposition. *Let X and X' be topological spaces and $f: X \rightarrow X'$ a perfect*

mapping. If E' is a well-situated subset in X' then $f^{-1}(E')$ is a well-situated subset in X .

Proof. For every paracompact T_2 space Y , $f \times 1Y: X \times Y \rightarrow X' \times Y$ is a perfect mapping. Now 1.6 implies that $f^{-1}(E')$ is well-situated.

2.6. Proposition. Let X and X' be T_2 topological spaces where X' is paracompact, let E be a well-situated subset in X and F a closed subset of X' . Then $E \times F$ is an α -paracompact subset in $X \times X'$.

Proof follows from 1.1.

Remark. In [4] R. Telgársky denoted by Π the class of all T_2 spaces X such that $X \times Y$ is paracompact for each paracompact T_2 space Y . Let X and Y be T_2 topological spaces, E a well-situated subset in X and $Y \in \Pi$. Then $E \times Y$ is well-situated in $X \times Y$. (Indeed, for each paracompact T_2 space Z , $Y \times Z$ is paracompact and T_2 , hence $(E \times Y) \times Z$ is α -paracompact in $(X \times Y) \times Z$.)

2.7. Proposition. Let X and X' be topological spaces, where X is regular, let f be a perfect mapping from X onto X' and E' a subset of X' . If $f^{-1}(E')$ is a well-situated subset in X then E' is a well-situated subset in X' .

Proof. For every paracompact T_2 space Y , $f \times 1Y$ is a perfect mapping from $X \times Y$ onto $X' \times Y$. It follows from 1.8 that E' is well-situated.

2.8. Remark. In Proposition 2.7 the hypothesis “ f is a mapping onto” cannot be omitted. In deed, let (\mathbf{R}, T) be the Michael line. The mapping $i: \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}, T)$ is perfect but is not onto, $\mathcal{Q} \in \Pi$ ([4] p. 66) but \mathcal{Q} is not well-situated in (\mathbf{R}, T) (cf. 1.7).

2.9. Proposition. Let X and X' be topological spaces and f a perfect and open mapping from X onto X' : If E is a well-situated subset in X then $f(E)$ is a well-situated subset in X' .

Proof. For every paracompact T_2 space Y , $f \times 1Y$ is a perfect and open mapping from $X \times Y$ onto $X' \times Y$. Now 1.10 implies that $f(E)$ is well-situated.

2.10. Remark. Let X and X' be topological spaces and f a perfect mapping from X onto X' . If E is a well-situated subset in X , $f(E)$ is not necessarily a well-situated subset in X' . (See 1.11).

3. THE CLASS Π^*

In [4] R. Telgársky denoted by Π^* the class of all paracompact T_2 spaces which are well-situated in every paracompact T_2 space in which they are embedded as closed subsets.

R. Telgársky showed that Π^* is a very wide class contained in the class Π , and raised the following questions:

1. Is the class Π^* perfect? ([4], Problem 2.1.)
2. Does the class of all paracompact C -scattered spaces coincide with the class Π^* ? ([4], Problem 2.3.)

In the present paper, we shall give an affirmative answer to question 1.

3.1. Proposition. *Let E and E' be topological spaces where E is T_2 , and let f be a perfect mapping from E onto E' . If $E' \in \Pi^*$ then $E \in \Pi^*$.*

Proof. Let X be a paracompact T_2 space such that E is embedded in X as a closed subset. Let $j_1: X \rightarrow X + E'$, $j_2: E' \rightarrow X + E'$ be the embeddings of the subspaces X and E' in the sum $X + E'$, let $X \cup_f E'$ be the adjunction space determined by X , E' and f and let $q: X + E' \rightarrow X \cup_f E'$ be the natural quotient mapping. As the mapping f is closed, q is a continuous and closed mapping; since $X + E'$ is paracompact and T_2 , $X \cup_f E'$ is paracompact (this follows from the Michael Theorem) and T_2 . Further, $q \circ j_2: E' \rightarrow X \cup_f E'$ is a homeomorphic embedding and $(q \circ j_2)(E')$ is closed in $X \cup_f E'$. Since $E' \in \Pi^*$ and $X \cup_f E'$ is paracompact and T_2 , $(q \circ j_2)(E')$ is a well-situated subset in $X \cup_f E'$.

Let $\hat{f} = q \circ j_1: X \rightarrow X \cup_f E'$. Clearly \hat{f} is a perfect mapping.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\hat{f}} & X \cup_f E' \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow q \circ j_2 \\ E & \xrightarrow{f} & E' \end{array}$$

Since $(q \circ j_2)(E')$ is a well-situated subset in $X \cup_f E'$, Proposition 2.5 implies that $\hat{f}^{-1}((q \circ j_2)(E'))$ is a well-situated subset in X . However,

$$\hat{f}^{-1}((q \circ j_2)(E')) = j_1^{-1}(q^{-1}(q(j_2(E')))) = E.$$

Thus E is a well-situated subset in X . Hence $E \in \Pi^*$.

3.2. Proposition. *Let E and E' be topological spaces and f a perfect mapping from E onto E' . If $E \in \Pi^*$ then $E' \in \Pi^*$.*

Proof. Since f is continuous, $G_f = \{(x, f(x)) \in E \times E' \mid x \in E\}$ is homeomorphic to E , hence $G_f \in \Pi^*$.

Since E is T_{3a} and f is a perfect mapping from E onto E' , G_f is a closed subset of $\beta E \times E'$ (see [5], proof of Theorem 3.10).

Let X' be a paracompact T_2 space such that E' is embedded in X' as a closed subset. Then G_f is a closed subset of $\beta E \times X'$ which is paracompact and T_2 . Thus G_f is a well-situated subset in $\beta E \times X'$.

The projection $p_2: \beta E \times X' \rightarrow X'$ is perfect and open, and $p_2(G_f) = E'$. It follows from 2.9 that E' is a well-situated subset in X' .

3.3. Theorem. *In the realm of T_2 spaces, the class Π^* is perfect (i.e., if E and E' are topological spaces where E is T_2 , and f is a perfect mapping from E onto E' then $E \in \Pi^*$ if and only if $E' \in \Pi^*$).*

Proof follows from 3.1 and 3.2.

Added in proofs. The author learned, after writing this paper, that J. D. Wine [in: *Locally paracompact spaces*, *Glasnik Mat.*, 10 (30) (1975), 351–357] has obtained Proposition 1.1.2), and that I. Kovacević [in: *Subsets and paracompactness*, *Zbornik Radova PMF Univ. u Novom Sadu, ser. Mat.* 14 (1984), 79–87] has obtained also the implication a) \Rightarrow b) of the Theorem 1.3. The author thanks to Professors J. D. Wine and I. Kovacević for making available their papers to him.

References

- [1] C. E. Aull: *Paracompact subsets*. Proc. Second Prague. Topological Symposium (1966) 45–51.
- [2] R. Engelking: *General Topology*. Polish Scientific Publishers, Warszawa, 1977.
- [3] H. W. Martin: *Linearly ordered covers, normality and paracompactness*. *Top. and its Appl.* 12 (1981) 305–313.
- [4] R. Telgársky: *C-scattered and paracompact spaces*. *Fund. Math.* 73 (1971) 59–74.
- [5] R. Telgársky: *Concerning product of paracompact spaces*. *Fund. Math.* 74 (1972) 153–159.

Author's address: Departamento de Geometria y Topologia, Facultad de Matematicas, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain.