

θ -refinability and some related properties*

Wu Lisheng

(Suzhou University)

Definition 1. A space is θ -refinable, if every directed open cover of the space has a pointwise star-refining sequence by open covers.

It is well-known, that both strict p and θ -refinability imply θ -refinability, but we don't know if strict p (or θ -refinability) implies θ -refinability^[1], and our paper is just discussing some facts related to this problem.

Theorem 1. Let X be a completely regular locally compact space, then the following conditions are mutually equivalent:

- (i) X is strict p ,
- (ii) The collection \mathcal{K} which consists by all compact subsets of X has a pointwise star-refining sequence by open covers of X ,
- (iii) X is θ -refinable,
- (iv) X is θ -refinable.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) are due to [2], (iii) \Rightarrow (iv) is evident, (iv) \Rightarrow (ii) Let X be a locally compact θ -refinable space. For each $x \in X$, there exists an open neighborhood O_x such that $\overline{O_x}$ is compact. Let $\mathcal{O} = \{O_x: x \in X\}$, then \mathcal{O}^F is a directed open cover of X , so it has a pointwise star-refining sequence $\{\mathcal{U}_n: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ by open covers of X . For each $x \in X$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $O \in \mathcal{O}^F$ such that $\text{st}(x, \mathcal{U}_n) \subset O \subset \overline{O} \in \mathcal{K}$, so $\{\mathcal{U}_n: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is also a pointwise star-refining sequence of \mathcal{K} .

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (i) Let $\{\mathcal{U}_n: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a pointwise star-refining sequence of \mathcal{K} , where each \mathcal{U}_n is an open cover of X . No loss of generality, we may assume \mathcal{U}_{n+1} refines \mathcal{U}_n .

Suppose $x_n \in \text{st}(x, \mathcal{U}_n)$, then there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $\{x_m\}_{m \geq n} \subset \text{st}(x, \mathcal{U}_n) \subset K$, so $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a cluster point, this shows X is a ω_Δ space. Now X is strict p in view of [3, theorem 1.7].

Lemma 1. Every θ -refinable space is θ -expandable.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F\}$ be a locally finite closed collection of X , Define $\mathcal{G} = \{X - (\mathcal{F} - \widetilde{\mathcal{F}})^*: \widetilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset \mathcal{F}, |\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}| < \infty\}$, then \mathcal{G} is a directed open cover of X , so it has a pointwise star-refining sequence $\{\mathcal{U}_n: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ by open covers of X .

For each $F \in \mathcal{F}$, Let $\mathcal{O}_n(F) = \text{st}(F, \mathcal{U}_n)$, then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{O}_n = \{\mathcal{O}_n(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is a open expansion of \mathcal{F} .

For each $x \in X$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset \mathcal{F}$, $|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}| < \infty$, such that $\text{st}(x, \mathcal{U}_n) \subset X \setminus (\mathcal{F} - \tilde{\mathcal{F}})^*$. If $F \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, then $\text{st}(x, \mathcal{U}_n) \cap F = \emptyset$, and thus $x \notin \text{st}(F, \mathcal{U}_n) = \mathcal{O}_n(F)$. so $|(\mathcal{O}_n)_x| \leq |\tilde{\mathcal{F}}| < \infty$. i.e. X is θ -expandable.

Corollary 1. Every θ -refinable space is countably metacompact.

Proof. Because countably metacompactness is equal to \mathcal{K}_o - θ -expandability.

Theorem 2. Every θ -refinable space is ultrapure.

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{U} is an open cover of θ -refinable space X . \mathcal{U}^F has a pointwise star-refining sequence $\{\mathcal{U}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ by open covers of X . Let $D_n = \{x \in X : \text{st}(x, \mathcal{V}_n) \subset W \text{ for some } W \in \mathcal{U}^F\}$. then $\bigcup \{D_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = X$.

Let $\mathcal{D}_n = \{D_n \cap V : V \in \mathcal{D}_n\}$, then (i) $\bigcup \{\mathcal{D}_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = \bigcup \{D_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = X$, (ii) each member of \mathcal{D}_n is an open subset of subspace \mathcal{D}_n^* , (iii) $\{\text{st}(x, \mathcal{D}_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \mathcal{D}_n^*\}$ refines \mathcal{U}^F , this shows X is ultrapure,

Corollary 2. Every θ -refinable space is isocompact.

Theorem 3. Every σ -orthocompact, θ -refinable space is θ -refinable.

Proof. Let X be a σ -orthocompact, θ -refinable space, \mathcal{U} be a directed open cover of X . In view of corollary 1 and [4, proposition 3.1], X is orthocompact. \mathcal{U} has a pointwise star-refining sequence $\{\mathcal{V}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ by open covers of X . Each \mathcal{V}_n has an interior-preserving refinement \mathcal{W}_n . Now \mathcal{U} has a pointwise star-refining sequence $\{\mathcal{W}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ by interior-preserving open covers of X , so X is θ -refinable in view of [5].

Corollary 3. Every σ -orthocompact strict p space is θ -refinable.

Theorem 4. Every pointwise-star-orthocompact θ -refinable space is weak orthocompact.

Proof. Let X be a pointwise star-orthocompact θ -refinable space, \mathcal{U} be a directed open cover of X . Then \mathcal{U} has a pointwise star-refining sequence $\{\mathcal{V}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ by open covers of X . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an interior-preserving open cover $\mathcal{W}_n = \{W(n, x) : x \in X\}$ such that for each $x \in X$, $x \in W(n, x)$ and $W(n, x) \subset \text{st}(x, \mathcal{V}_n)$.

For each $x \in X$, there exists $n_x \in \mathbb{N}$ and $U(x) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\text{st}(x, \mathcal{V}_{n_x}) \subset U(x)$.

Let $X_n = \{x \in X : n_x = n\}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_n = \{W(n, x) : x \in X_n\}$. then $\bigcup \{\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a σ -interior-preserving open refinement of \mathcal{U} . Similar to the proof of [4, proposition 3.1], We can show \mathcal{U} has a interior-preserving open refinement, i.e., X is weak orthocompact.

Theorem 5. Every pointwise star-orthocompact strict p space is θ -refinable.

Proof. Let X be a pointwise star-orthocompact strict p space, \mathcal{U} be a open cover of X . There exists a sequence $\{g_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ by open covers of X such that,

- (i) For each $x \in X$, $P_x = \bigcap \{ \text{st}(x, \mathcal{Q}_n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \}$ is a compact set ,
- (ii) The family $\{ \text{st}(x, \mathcal{Q}_n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \}$ is a neighborhood base for the set P_x .
- (iii) g_{n+1} refines g_n

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an interior-preserving open cover $\mathcal{O}_n = \{ O_{n,x} : x \in X \}$ Such that $x \in O_{n,x} \subset \text{st}(x, g_n)$. Let $h(n, x) = \bigcap (\mathcal{O}_n)_x$, then $\{ h(n, x) : x \in X \}$ is also an interior-preserving collection.

Define $\mathcal{F}_n = \{ X - h(n, x) : x \in X \} \cup \{ X \}$, $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup \{ \mathcal{F}_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \}$, each \mathcal{F}_n is a closure-preserving closed cover of X .

For each $x \in X$, let $c(x) = \bigcap (\mathcal{F})_x = \bigcap \{ \bigcap (\mathcal{F}_n)_x : n \in \mathbb{N} \}$. We claim for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bigcap (\mathcal{F}_n)_x \subset \text{st}(x, g_n)$. In fact, for each $z \notin \text{st}(x, g_n)$, we have $x \notin h(n, z)$, otherwise $x \in h(n, z) \subset O_{n,z} \subset \text{st}(z, g_n)$ this would implies $z \in \text{st}(x, g_n)$, a contradiction.

So we have $z \in h(n, z) \subset \bigcup \{ h(n, y) : x \notin h(n, y) \}$, i.e.

$$z \notin X - \bigcup \{ h(n, y) : x \notin h(n, y) \} = \bigcap (\mathcal{F}_n)_x.$$

Thus $c(x) \subset P_x$ for each $x \in X$, and $c(x)$ is also a compact set.

For each $x \in X$, there exists $U_x \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $c(x) \subset P_x \subset U_x$, then there exists $n_x \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c(x) \subset P_x \subset \text{st}(x, g_{n_x}) \subset U_x$, so $c(x) \subset \bigcap (\mathcal{F}_{n_x})_x \subset \text{st}(x, g_{n_x}) \subset U_x$.

Let $X_n = \{ x \in X : n_x = n \}$, $\mathcal{K}_n^x = \{ \bigcap (\mathcal{F}_n)_x : x \in X_n \}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{K}_n is a partial refinement of \mathcal{U} , and \mathcal{K}_n is a closed-preserving closed collection. In fact, if $y \in \bigcup \{ \bigcap (\mathcal{F}_n)_x : x \in \tilde{X} \subset X \}$, then $h(n, y)$ is an open neighborhood of y , and there exists $x \in \tilde{X}$ such that $h(n, y) \cap (\bigcap (\mathcal{F}_n)_x) \neq \emptyset$. i.e. $h(n, y) \cap (X - \bigcup \{ h(n, z) : x \notin h(n, z) \}) \neq \emptyset$, so $x \in h(n, y)$.

For each $z \in X$, if $x \notin h(n, z)$, then $y \notin h(n, z)$, otherwise from $y \in h(n, z)$ would implies $x \in h(n, y) \subset h(n, z)$, this is impossible. Thus $y \in \bigcap (\mathcal{F}_n)_x$, i.e. \mathcal{K}_n is a closure-preserving collection. Now \mathcal{U} has a σ -closure-preserving closed refinement $\mathcal{K} = \bigcup \{ \mathcal{K}_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \}$, i.e. X is θ -refinable.

Corollary 4. Every pointwise star-orthocompact strict p space is also an orthocompact $\Sigma^\#$ space.

Definition 2. A open cover $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup \{ \mathcal{A}_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N} \}$ is called a boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover, if

- (i) $\{ \mathcal{A}_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N} \}$ is point-finite.
- (ii) There exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $x \in X$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{A}_n^*) \leq k$.

Theorem 6. Let X be a space, then the following conditions are mutually equivalent .

- (i) X is discrete θ -expandable, (ii) Every boundly weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover of X has a θ -sequence by open refinement . (iii) Every c -cover has a θ -sequence by open refinement.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Suppose X is discrete θ -expandable, \mathcal{U} is a boundly

weak $\bar{\theta}$ -cover of X . Then \mathcal{U} has a refinement $\mathcal{P} = \bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_n; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{P - \bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_i^*; 1 \leq i \leq n\}; P \in \mathcal{P}_n\}$ is a discrete closed collection in $X - \bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_i^*; 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ (See [7]).

For each $P \in \mathcal{P}$, choose an $U_P \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $P \subset U_P$. Since \mathcal{P}_1 is a discrete closed collection in X , \mathcal{P}_1 has open expansion $\mathcal{V}_n = \{V_{n,P}; P \in \mathcal{P}_1\}$ for each $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $P \in \mathcal{P}_1$, $P \subset V_{n,P} \subset U_P$, and for each $x \in X$, there exists n_1 such that $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_{n_1}) < \infty$.

Suppose for each $1 \leq k < j$, each $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$, we have constructed open collection $\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_k} = \{V_{n_1, \dots, n_k, P}; P \in \mathcal{P}_k\}$ such that $P - \bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_k}^*; 1 \leq i \leq k\} \subset V_{n_1, \dots, n_k, P} \subset U_P - \bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_i^*; 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. For each $P \in \mathcal{P}_k$, and for each x , each $(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{k-1}$, there exists n_k such that $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_k}) < \infty$. We now construct the collection $\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_{k+1}}$.

Firstly, in view of the inductive conditions, for each $1 \leq k < j$, holds $\bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_i^*; 1 \leq i \leq k\} \subset \bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}^*; 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. In fact, it holds for $k=1$ is evident, suppose $\bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_i^*; 1 \leq i \leq s\} \subset \bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}^*; 1 \leq i \leq s\}$ for each $s < s+1 < j$, then $\bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}^*; 1 \leq i \leq s+1\} = \bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}^*; 1 \leq i \leq s\} \cup \mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_{s+1}}^* \supset \bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_i^*; 1 \leq i \leq s\} \cup (\mathcal{P}_{s+1}^* - \bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}^*; 1 \leq i \leq s\}) = \bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}^*; 1 \leq i \leq s\} \cup \mathcal{P}_{s+1}^* \supset \bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_i^*; 1 \leq i \leq s+1\}$. Thus we have $\bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_i^*; 1 \leq i \leq j\} \subset \bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}^*; 1 \leq i \leq j\}$.

$\mathcal{P}_j = \{P - \bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}^*; 1 \leq i \leq j-1\}; P \in \mathcal{P}_j\}$ is a discrete closed collection in X , so there exists open collections $\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_j} = \{V_{n_1, \dots, n_j, P}; P \in \mathcal{P}_j\}$ such that $P - \bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}^*; 1 \leq i \leq j-1\} \subset V_{n_1, \dots, n_j, P} \subset U_P - \bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_i^*; 1 \leq i \leq j\}$ for each $P \in \mathcal{P}_j$, and for each $x \in X$ each $(n_1, \dots, n_{j-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{j-1}$, there exists n_j such that $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_j}) < \infty$.

Thus we can construct for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, each $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$ an open collection $\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_k}$ such that

- (i) $\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_k}$ is a partial refinement of \mathcal{U} ,
- (ii) $\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_k} \cap (\bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_i^*; 1 \leq i \leq k-1\}) = \emptyset$,
- (iii) $\bigcup \{\mathcal{P}_i^*; 1 \leq i \leq k\} \supset \bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}^*; 1 \leq i \leq k\}$.

Define $\mathcal{V}_{(n_1, \dots, n_m)} = \bigcup \{\mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}; i \in \mathbb{N}, n_i = n_m \text{ when } i \geq m\}$
 $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{V}_{(n_1, \dots, n_m)}; m \in \mathbb{N}, (n_1, \dots, n_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m\}$.

then \mathcal{V} is a θ -sequence. In fact, for each $x \in X$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x \in \mathcal{P}_m^*$. there exists n_1 such that $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_{n_1}) < \infty$, then there exists n_2, \dots, n_m one after one such that for each $1 \leq i \leq m$ $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}) < \infty$, so $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_{(n_1, \dots, n_m)}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_{n_1, \dots, n_i}) < \infty$.

i.e. \mathcal{U} has a θ -sequence by open refinement.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii). Suppose $\mathcal{U} = \{U_a; a \in A\}$ is a C -cover, i.e., for each $a \in A$, $U_a = \bigcap_{\beta \neq a} \bigcup_{\gamma \neq \beta} U_\gamma$. Define $F_a = X - \bigcup_{\beta \neq a} U_\beta$, then for each $a \in A$, $F_a \subset U_a$ and $X -$

$\bigcup\{F_a: a \in A\} \subset \bigcap\{U_a: a \in A\}$. Let $\mathcal{V}'_1 = \{X - \bigcup\{F_a: a \in A\}\}$, $\mathcal{V}'_2 = \mathcal{U}$, then $\mathcal{V}' = \mathcal{V}'_1 \cup \mathcal{V}'_2$ is a boundly weak- $\bar{\theta}$ -cover which refines \mathcal{U} . so \mathcal{U} has a θ -sequence by open refinement.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) is due to [8, Lemma 2, 7].

Corollary 5. Let X be a space which has property $B(D, \omega)$, then

- (1) X is collectionwise normal iff X is paracompact,
- (2) X is collectionwise subnormal iff X is subparacompact,
- (3) X is almost discrete expandable iff X is metacompact

Similar to Theorem 6, we have

Theorem 7 Let X be a θ -expandable space, \mathcal{U} be a open cover of X and has a refinement $\mathcal{P} = \bigcup\{\mathcal{P}_n: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{P - \bigcup\{\mathcal{P}_i^*: 1 \leq i < n\}; P \in \mathcal{P}_n\}$ is a locally finite closed collection in $X - \bigcup\{\mathcal{P}_i^*: 1 \leq i < n\}$, then \mathcal{U} has a θ -sequence by open refinement.

Remark Theorem 7 shows that if $\bar{\theta}$ -refinability implies property $B(LF, \omega)$, then $\bar{\theta}$ -refinability is equal to θ -refinability.

References

- [1] H. Junnila, Three Covering Properties, Surveys in General Topology, Academic Press 1980.
- [2] J. Chaber, H. Junnila, On θ -refinability of strict p -spaces, Gen. Top. Appl. 10 (1979) 233-238.
- [3] D. K. Burke, On p -spaces and ω_Δ -spaces, Pacific J. Math. 35 (1970) 285-296.
- [4] P. Fletcher, W. F. Lindgren, Orthocompactness and Strong Čech Completeness in Moore Spaces, Duke J. Math. 39 (1972) 753-766.
- [5] H. Junnila, On Submetacompactness, Top. Proc. 3 (1978) 375-405.
- [6] G. Gruenhage, On closed images of orthocompact spaces, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 77 (1979) 389-394.
- [7] Long Bing, Some separating or covering properties, (to appear)
- [8] Zong Ning, expandability of discrete collections (to appear)
- [9] J. C. Smith, Irreducible Spaces and Property b_1 , Top. Proc. 5 (1980) 187-200.