Murat Diker

The counterparts of some cardinal functions in bitopological spaces. II.

Mathematica Bohemica, Vol. 120 (1995), No. 3, 247–254

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/126007

THE COUNTERPARTS OF SOME CARDINAL FUNCTIONS IN BITOPOLOGICAL SPACES II

MURAT DİKER, Ankara

(Received December 8, 1993)

Summary. In this paper, bitopological counterparts of the cardinal functions Lindelöf number, weak Lindelöf number and spread are introduced and studied. Some basic relations between these functions and the functions in [3] are given.

Keywords: bi-Lindelöf number, weak bi-Lindelöf number, bispread, bi-quasi-uniform weight

AMS classification: 54A25, 54E55

In the preceding paper of this series, counterparts of the functions weight, density and cellularity were defined [3]. Here, *bi-Lindelöf number* is defined, and shown to be equal to the joint Lindelöf number. Following this we define the *weak bi-Lindelöf number*, and consider its relation with bicellularity. *Bidiscreteness* is introduced, the *bispread* of a bitopological space is defined, and the special properties of the various cardinal functions under consideration which hold on p-q metric space are obtained. Considering the *bi-quasi-uniform weight* of Kopperman and Meyer [7], some basic relations are obtained in this class of spaces for the biweight, bicellularity, bi-quasi-uniform weight and weak bi-Lindelöf number. For notation and terminology which is not explained here, we refer to [2], [5] and [6]. As in [3], bitopological counterparts of topological cardinal invariants are denoted by preceding the usual name with b (bw = biweight, etc.). The prefix j denotes the corresponding invariant applied to the joint topology.

1. Bi-Lindelöf number, weak bi-Lindelöf number and bispread

1.1. Definition. Let (X,u,v) be a bitopological space. X is called α *bi-Lindelöf* if every open dual cover has a subcover whose cardinal number is at most α. The cardinal number

$$\mathrm{bL}(X)=\min\{\alpha\colon X \text{ is } \alpha \text{ bi-Lindelöf}\}$$

is called the *bi-Lindelöf number* of (X,u,v).

1.2. Theorem. *For every bitopological space* (X,u,v), *we have*

$$\mathrm{bL}(X)=\mathrm{jL}(X).$$

Proof. $\mathrm{bL}(X)\leqslant \mathrm{jL}(X)$ is immediate from our observation that with every open dual cover d we may associate the jointly open dual cover $\{U\cap V\colon UdV\}$. Hence, it is enough to show that $\mathrm{jL}(X)\leqslant \mathrm{bL}(X)$. Let $\delta=\{I_\alpha\colon \alpha\in A\}$ be a jointly open cover of X. For each $\alpha\in A$, we can choose pairwise disjoint sets A_α such that $\bigcup\{U_\lambda\cap V_\lambda\colon \lambda\in A_\alpha\}=I_\alpha$ and $(U_\lambda,V_\lambda)\in u\times v$. Hence, $d=\{(U_\lambda,V_\lambda)\colon \lambda\in\bigcup A_\alpha\}$ is an open dual cover of X. Choose a subcover $e=\{(U_\lambda,V_\lambda)\colon \lambda\in B\}$ of d with $|B|\leqslant \mathrm{bL}(X)$, and $C=\{\alpha\colon \exists\lambda\in B(\lambda\in A_\alpha)\}$. It is easy to see that $\bigcup\{I_\alpha\colon \alpha\in C\}=X$ and $|C|\leqslant \mathrm{bL}(X)$. Hence, we obtain $\mathrm{jL}(X)\leqslant \mathrm{bL}(X)$. □

By an open pair we shall mean an ordered pair of sets (G,H) with $G\in u$ and $H\in v$. The following definition generalizes the concept of the weak Lindelöf number [6].

1.3. Definition. Let (X,u,v) be a bitopological space, d an open dual family, that is $d\subseteq u\times v$. Then d is called a *weak open dual cover* of X if given an open pair (G,H) with $G\cap H\neq\emptyset$, there exists $(U,V)\in d$ such that $G\cap V\neq\emptyset$ and $H\cap U\neq\emptyset$. If every open dual cover has a weak subcover whose cardinal number is at most α, then X is called *weak* α *bi-Lindelöf*. The cardinal number

$$\mathrm{wbL}(X)=\min\{\alpha\colon X \text{ is weak } \alpha \text{ bi-Lindelöf}\}$$

will be called the *weak bi-Lindelöf number* of X.

1.4. Theorem.
(i) $\mathrm{wbL}(X)\leqslant \mathrm{jwL}(X)\leqslant \mathrm{bL}(X)$
(ii) $\mathrm{wbL}(X)\leqslant \mathrm{bc}(X)$.

Proof. (i) Let $d=\{(U_\alpha,V_\alpha)\colon \alpha\in A\}$ be an open dual cover of X. Clearly, $\delta=\{U_\alpha\cap V_\alpha\colon \alpha\in A\}$ is a jointly open cover of X. We choose a weak subcover

$\delta' = \{U_\alpha \cap V_\alpha : \alpha \in A'\}$ of δ with $|A'| \leqslant \mathrm{jwL}(X)$. Since $\overline{\bigcup \delta'}^{u\vee v} = X$, for each open pair (G, H) with $G \cap H \neq \emptyset$ there exists $\alpha \in A'$ such that $G \cap H \cap U_\alpha \cap V_\alpha \neq \emptyset$. Hence, $G \cap V_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and $H \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset$. Thus the open dual family $\{(U_\alpha, V_\alpha) : \alpha \in A'\}$ is a weak subcover of d whose cardinality is at most $\mathrm{jwL}(X)$. We have shown that $\mathrm{wbL}(X) \leqslant \mathrm{jwL}(X)$. Since $\mathrm{jwL}(X) \leqslant \mathrm{jL}(X)$, by Theorem 1.2 we have $\mathrm{jwL}(X) \leqslant \mathrm{bL}(X)$ as well.

(ii) Let e be an open dual cover of X and $\mathscr{C} = \{(U_\alpha, V_\alpha) : \alpha \in A\}$ a maximal bicellular refinement of e (such a refinement exists by Zorn's Lemma). Let us show that $\mathscr{C}$ is a weak subcover of X. Suppose the contrary is true. Then there exists an open pair (G, H) with $G \cap H \neq \emptyset$ such that for each $\alpha \in A$, $U_\alpha \cap H = \emptyset$ or $V_\alpha \cap G = \emptyset$. Take $x \in G \cap H$ and choose $(R, S) \in e$ with $x \in R \cap S$. Let $U = G \cap R$ and $V = H \cap S$. Then $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$ and for each α, $U_\alpha \cap V = \emptyset$ or $V_\alpha \cap U = \emptyset$. Hence, $\mathscr{C}^\star = \mathscr{C} \cup \{(U, V)\}$ is a bicellular family in X, and clearly, $\mathscr{C}^\star \prec e$. Since $(U, V) \notin \mathscr{C}$, this contradicts the maximality of $\mathscr{C}$. Now for each $\alpha \in A$ we choose $(R_\alpha, S_\alpha) \in e$ with $U_\alpha \subseteq R_\alpha, V_\alpha \subseteq S_\alpha$. Then the family $\{(R_\alpha, S_\alpha) : \alpha \in A\}$ is a weak subcover of e whose cardinality is at most $\mathrm{bc}(X)$. Thus we have $\mathrm{wbL}(X) \leqslant \mathrm{bc}(X)$. □

1.5. Definition. A bitopological space (X, u, v) is called *bidiscrete* if for each $x \in X$ there exists an open pair (U_x, V_x) with $x \in U_x \cap V_x$ satisfying the condition

$$\forall y \in X, x \neq y \Rightarrow U_x \cap V_y = \emptyset \quad \text{or} \quad U_y \cap V_x = \emptyset \quad .$$

Trivially, every bidiscrete space is jointly discrete. For a discrete topological space, it is well known that $w(X) = |X| = \mathrm{d}(X)$. A similar result is, however, not true for bidiscrete bitopological spaces.

1.6. Example. Let $X = \mathbb{R}$. Consider the topologies $u = \{(-\infty, a] : a \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and $v = \{[b, \infty) : b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ on $\mathbb{R}$. The space $(\mathbb{R}, u, v)$ is bidiscrete and $\mathrm{qrd}(\mathbb{R}) = \mathrm{rd}(\mathbb{R}) = \mathrm{bd}(\mathbb{R}) < \mathrm{bw}(\mathbb{R}) = \omega_1$.

However, we do have:

1.7. Theorem. *If (X, u, v) is bidiscrete, then*

$$\mathrm{bd}(X) \leqslant |X| \leqslant \mathrm{bw}(X).$$

1.8. Definition. Let (X, u, v) be a bitopological space. The cardinal number

$$\mathrm{bs}(X) = \sup\{|D| : D \text{ is bidiscrete in } (X, u, v)\}$$

is called the *bispread* of X.

This generalizes the spread $\mathrm{s}(X)$ of a topological space X, see for example [6]. The following fact is evident:

1.9. Theorem.

$$\mathrm{bs}(X) \leqslant \mathrm{js}(X).$$

2. *p-q* METRIZABLE SPACES

It is well known that in a (pseudo) metric topological space several cardinal invariants coincide. Recall that a bitopological space (X, u, v) is called *p-q metrizable* if there exists a pseudo quasi-metric p such that u is the topology of p and v the topology of its conjugate q.

Also, the extent of a topological space X is defined by

$$\mathrm{e}(X) = \sup\left\{|D|\colon D \text{ is closed and discrete in } X\right\}.$$

2.1. Theorem. *If (X, u, v) is weakly pairwise* T_1 *and p-q metrizable, then*

$$\mathrm{bw}(X) = \mathrm{jw}(X) = \mathrm{bL}(X) = \mathrm{je}(X) = \mathrm{bs}(X) = \mathrm{bc}(X) = \mathrm{jd}(X).$$

Proof. Clearly, $\mathrm{bw}(X) \geqslant \mathrm{jw}(X) \geqslant \mathrm{bL}(X) \geqslant \mathrm{je}(X)$. If A is a bidiscrete subspace of X, it is also jointly discrete. Furthermore, X is jointly T_2 and perfectly normal. Hence, using a standart topological argument, we easily obtain $\mathrm{je}(X) \geqslant |A|$, that is $\mathrm{je}(X) \geqslant \mathrm{bs}(X)$. Now let $\mathscr{C} = \{(U_\alpha, V_\alpha)\colon \alpha \in B\}$ be a bicellular family in X. For each $\alpha \in B$, choose $x_\alpha \in U_\alpha \cap V_\alpha$. It is easy to see that $D = \{x_\alpha\colon \alpha \in B\}$ is bidiscrete, and $|D| = |\mathscr{C}| \leqslant \mathrm{bs}(X)$. Hence, $\mathrm{bs}(X) \geqslant \mathrm{bc}(X)$. Now we will show that $\mathrm{bc}(X) \geqslant \mathrm{jd}(X)$. Let p be a pseudo quasi metric compatible with (X, u, v) and let q be the conjugate of p. For $i = 1, 2, \dots$ consider the family

$$\mathscr{G}_i = \left\{B \subset X : x,\ y \in B,\ x \neq y \Rightarrow p(x,y) \geqslant \frac{1}{i} \ \text{ or } \ q(x,y) \geqslant \frac{1}{i}\right\}.$$

By using Teichmüller-Tukey Lemma, for each $i = 1, 2, \dots$ we can find a maximal set $G_i \in \mathscr{G}_i$ such that

$$x,\ y \in G_i,\ x \neq y \Rightarrow p(x,y) \geqslant \frac{1}{i} \ \text{ or } \ q(x,y) \geqslant \frac{1}{i}.$$

It be can easily checked that for each $i = 1, 2, \dots,$

$$\mathscr{C}_i = \left\{\left(B_p\left(x, \frac{1}{2i}\right), B_q\left(x, \frac{1}{2i}\right)\right) : x \in G_i\right\}$$

is a bicellular family in X, and $|G_i| = |\mathscr{C}_i| \leqslant \mathrm{bc}(X)$. Let $G = \bigcup\{G_i : i = 1, 2, \ldots\}$. Clearly, $|\mathscr{C}| \leqslant \mathrm{bc}(X)$. Now we show that G is jointly dense. Suppose the contrary. Let $x \in X \setminus \overline{G}^{u \vee v}$. Then there exists a natural number i_0 such that

$$(p \vee q)(a, G_{i_0}) \geqslant (p \vee q)(a, G) \geqslant \frac{1}{i_0}.$$

Consider the set $H = \{a\} \cup G_{i_0}$. For $x, y \in H$, we have $(p \vee q)(x, y) \geqslant \frac{1}{i_0}$ and so $p(x, y) \geqslant \frac{1}{i_0}$ or $q(x, y) \geqslant \frac{1}{i_0}$. But this contradicts the maximality of G_{i_0}. Thus, G is as desired. Hence, $\mathrm{bc}(X) \geqslant \mathrm{jd}(X)$. (If G_i is empty, then u and v are discrete topologies, and the result is immediate.)

$\mathrm{jd}(X) \geqslant \mathrm{bw}(X)$: Let A be a jointly dense subset of X with $|A| = \mathrm{jd}(X)$. It is easy to see that the family

$$d = \Big\{ \big(B_p(y, r),\ B_q(y, r)\big) : y \in A,\ r \in \mathbb{Q} \Big\}$$

is a bibase for X and $|A| \geqslant |d|$, that is $\mathrm{jd}(X) \geqslant \mathrm{bw}(X)$. □

The following example shows that in general $\mathrm{bd}(X)$ cannot be included in the above equalities:

2.2. Example. Consider the set $X = \{(x, y) : x \geqslant 0, y \geqslant 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Let u consist of $\emptyset$ and all subsets G of X satisfying

(i) $(x, y) \in G,\ 0 < x' \leqslant x \Rightarrow (x', y) \in G$
(ii) $(x, y) \in G,\ 0 < y \leqslant y' \Rightarrow (x, y') \in G$
(iii) $\exists y > 0$ with $(0, y) \in G$.

Clearly, u is a topology on X, and so is $v = \{G^{-1} : G \in u\}$. The space (X, u, v) is weakly pairwise T_1 and p-q metrizable [2]. The set $A = \{(x, y) : x \geqslant 0,\ y \geqslant 0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}\}$ is bidense in X, with $\mathrm{bd}(X) = |A| = \omega$. However, $\mathrm{bw}(X) = \mathrm{jd}(X) = \omega_1$. Hence, $\mathrm{bd}(X) < \mathrm{bw}(X)$.

If we remove the condition that (X, u, v) is weakly pairwise T_1, we obtain the following more limited result:

2.3. Theorem. *If (X,u,v) is p-q metrizable, then*

$$\mathrm{bc}(X) = \mathrm{jd}(X) = \mathrm{bw}(X).$$

3. Pairwise completely regular spaces

Let $\{(X_\alpha, u_\alpha, v_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in A}$ be a family of bitopological spaces. Consider the product bitopological space (X, u, v), where $X = \prod_{\alpha\in A} X_\alpha$, $u = \prod_{\alpha\in A} u_\alpha$, $v = \prod_{\alpha\in A} v_\alpha$.

The following theorem generalizes the well known properties of the weight in topological spaces:

3.1. Theorem.

$$\mathrm{bw}(X) = |A| \sup\left\{\, \mathrm{bw}(X_\alpha) \colon \alpha \in A \right\}.$$

3.2. Definition. Let (X, u, v) be a pairwise completely regular space. The cardinal number

$$\mathrm{bq}(X) = \min\left\{|\delta| \colon \delta \text{ is a base for a quasi-uniformity compatible with } X\right\}$$

is called the *biquasi-uniform weight* of X.

3.3. Theorem. *If (X, u, v) is pairwise completely regular, then*

$$\mathrm{bw}(X) \leqslant \mathrm{bq}(X) \cdot \mathrm{bc}(X).$$

Proof. If (X, u, v) is p-q metrizable, then by Theorem 2.3 the assertion is immediate. Assume X is not p-q metrizable. Consider the family $\mathscr{P}$ of p-q metrics, with $|\mathscr{P}| = \mathrm{bq}(X)$ (the gage of X). If $|\mathscr{P}| \geqslant \mathrm{bw}(X)$, then the proof is complete. Suppose $|\mathscr{P}| < \mathrm{bw}(X)$. Consider the bitopological space X_p determined by $p \in \mathscr{P}$. By Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\mathrm{bw}\left(\prod\{X_p \colon p \in \mathscr{P}\}\right) = |\mathscr{P}| \sup\left\{\, \mathrm{bw}(X_p) \colon p \in \mathscr{P}\right\}.$$

It can be checked that $\mathrm{bw}(X) \leqslant \mathrm{bw}(\prod\{X_p \colon p \in \mathscr{P}\})$ (cf.[4]). Hence, $\mathrm{bw}(X) \leqslant \sup\{\mathrm{bw}(X_p) \colon p \in \mathscr{P}\}$. By Theorem 2.3, $\mathrm{bw}(X_p) = \mathrm{bc}(X_p)$ and so $\mathrm{bw}(X) \leqslant \sup\{\mathrm{bc}(X_p) \colon p \in \mathscr{P}\}$. Clearly, $\sup\{\mathrm{bc}(X_p) \colon p \in \mathscr{P}\} \leqslant \mathrm{bc}(X)$. Finally, we obtain $\mathrm{bw}(X) \leqslant \mathrm{bc}(X)$. This completes the proof. □

Now we give a stronger result than Theorem 3.3.

3.4. Theorem. *If (X,u,v) is pairwise completely regular, then*

$$\mathrm{bw}(X) \leqslant \mathrm{bq}(X) \cdot \mathrm{wbL}(X).$$

P r o o f. Let δ be a covering base [1] of a quasi-uniformity compatible with (X,u,v), and $|\delta| = \mathrm{bq}(X)$. We take an open pair (G,H) with $G\cap H \neq \emptyset$. Let $x \in G\cap H$. Then there exists an open normal dual cover $d \in \delta$ such that $\mathrm{St}(d,x) = \bigcup\{U\colon \exists V(U,V) \in d, x \in V\} \subseteq G$ and $\mathrm{St}(x,d) = \bigcup\{V\colon \exists U(U,V) \in d, x \in U\} \subseteq H$. Let $e \in \delta,\ e \prec \star d$. Choose $(R,S) \in e$ and $x \in R\cap S$. Consider a weak subcover I_e of e with $|I_e| \leqslant \mathrm{wbL}(X)$. There exists $(L,T) \in I_e$ such that $S\cap L \neq \emptyset$ and $R\cap T \neq \emptyset$. Since $e \prec \star d$, there exists an open pair $(U,V) \in d$ such that $\mathrm{St}(e,L) = \bigcup\{R\colon (R,S) \in e, S\cap L \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq U, \mathrm{St}(T,e) = \bigcup\{S\colon (R,S) \in e, R\cap T \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq V$. Clearly, $x \in U\cap V$. Since $x \in \mathrm{St}(e,L) \subseteq U \subseteq \mathrm{St}(d,x) \subseteq G$ and $x \in \mathrm{St}(T,e) \subseteq V \subseteq \mathrm{St}(x,d) \subseteq H$, the family

$$d' = \Big\{\big(\mathrm{St}(e,L), \mathrm{St}(T,e)\big)\colon e \in \delta, (L,T) \in I_e\Big\}$$

is a bibase for X. Hence, we obtain

$$\mathrm{bw}(X) \leqslant |d'| \leqslant \mathrm{bq}(X)\cdot \mathrm{wbL}(X).$$

□

R e m a r k. Note that Theorem 3.3 can be also obtained as a consequence of Theorems 1.4(ii) and 3.4.

3.5. Theorem. [7] *If (X,u,v) is pairwise completely regular, then*

$$\mathrm{bq}(X) \leqslant \mathrm{bw}(X).$$

As a consequence of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 we have the following

3.6. Corollary. *If (X,u,v) is pairwise completely regular and* F *is an element of* $\{\mathrm{bc},\mathrm{jc},\mathrm{bs},\mathrm{js},\mathrm{bL},\mathrm{wbL},\mathrm{jwL}\}$, *then*

$$\mathrm{bw}(X) = \mathrm{bq}(X)\cdot \mathrm{F}(X).$$

References

[1] *L. M. Brown*: On extensions of bitopological spaces. Colloquia Mathematica Societatis Janos Bolyai, 23, Topology, Budapest, 1978.

[2] *L. M. Brown*: Dual covering theory, confluence structures and the lattice of bicontinuous functions. PhD Thesis Univ. of Glasgow, 1980.

[3] *M. Diker*: The counterparts of some cardinal functions in bitopological spaces I. Mathematica Bohemica *120* (1995), 237–245.

[4] *T. E. Gantner, R. C. Steinlage*: Characterization of quasi uniformities. J. London Math. Soc. Ser. 5 *11* (1972), 48–52.

[5] *I. Juhász*: Cardinal functions in topology. Math. Center Tracts No. 34, Math. Centrum, Amsterdam, 1971.
[6] *I. Juhász*: Cardinal functions in topology ten years later. Math. Center Tracts No. 123, Math. Centrum, Amsterdam, 1980.
[7] *R. D. Kopperman, P. R. Meyer*: Cardinal invariants of bitopological spaces. Časopis pro pěstování matematiky *114* (1989), no. 4, 374–380.

Author's address: *Murat Diker*, Department of Science Education, Hacettepe University, Beytepe, 06532 Ankara, Türkiye.