

Raushan Z. Buzyakova

Observations on spaces with zerset or regular  $G_\delta$ -diagonals

*Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, Vol. 46 (2005), No. 3, 469--473

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/119541>

## Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 2005

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



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

## Observations on spaces with zerset or regular $G_\delta$ -diagonals

RAUSHAN Z. BUZYAKOVA

*Abstract.* We show that if  $X^2$  has countable extent and  $X$  has a zerset diagonal then  $X$  is submetrizable. We also make a couple of observations regarding spaces with a regular  $G_\delta$ -diagonal.

*Keywords:* zerset diagonal, regular  $G_\delta$ -diagonal, submetrizable, countable extent

*Classification:* 54E99, 54A25

### 1. Introduction

In [MAR], H. Martin proved that a separable space with a zerset diagonal is submetrizable. In general, having a zerset diagonal does not guarantee submetrizability as announced in [FRW]. In [MAR], H. Martin asks for what classes of spaces the presence of a zerset diagonal implies submetrizability. And in this paper we show that if  $X^2$  has countable extent and  $X$  has a zerset diagonal then  $X$  is submetrizable. Martin's theorem and our main result motivate the following questions.

**Question 1.1.** *Let  $X$  have countable extent and a zerset diagonal. Is  $X$  submetrizable? What if  $X$  is additionally locally compact or Čech-complete?*

**Question 1.2** (A.V. Arhangel'skii). *Let  $X$  have countable Souslin number and a zerset diagonal. Is  $X$  submetrizable?*

A property that lies between separability and countable Souslin number is  $\aleph_1$ -calibre. A space  $X$  has  $\aleph_1$ -calibre if every uncountable collection  $\mathcal{U}$  of open sets in  $X$  contains an uncountable subcollection  $\mathcal{U}'$  such that  $\bigcap \mathcal{U}' \neq \emptyset$ .

**Question 1.3.** *Let  $X$  have  $\aleph_1$ -calibre and a zerset diagonal. Is  $X$  submetrizable?*

In notation and terminology we will follow [ENG]. For a space  $X$ , by  $\Delta_X$  we denote the set  $\{(x, x) : x \in X\}$ . A space  $X$  has *countable extent* if every uncountable subset of  $X$  has a limit point in  $X$ . A space  $X$  has a *zerset diagonal* if  $\Delta_X$  is a zerset in  $X \times X$ , that is, there exists a continuous function  $f : X \times X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $\Delta_X = f^{-1}(0)$ . A space  $X$  has a *regular  $G_\delta$ -diagonal* if there exists

a collection  $\{W_n\}_n$  of open sets in  $X \times X$  such that  $\Delta_X = \bigcap_n W_n = \bigcap_n \overline{W}_n$ . A space  $X$  *condenses* into a space  $Y$  if there exists a continuous injection of  $X$  into  $Y$ .

**2. Results**

Given  $f : X \times X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and  $a \in X$ , by  $f_a$  we denote the mapping defined by  $f_a(x) = f(x, a)$  (as H. Martin does in [MAR]). We use the following idea of H. Martin [MAR]: *if  $x \in \overline{A}$  then for any  $y \in X \setminus \{x\}$  there exists  $a \in A$  such that  $f_a(x) \neq f_a(y)$ .*

Although in our main results, we do not assume any separation axioms, we will make use of a known folklore-type fact that any space with a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal is a  $T_1$ -space.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $X \times X$  have countable extent and let  $X$  have a zeroset diagonal. Then  $X$  is submetrizable.*

PROOF: Fix a continuous  $f : X^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f^{-1}(0) = \Delta_X$ . Assume that for each  $\beta < \alpha$ ,  $(x_\beta, y_\beta)$  and a family  $\mathcal{U}_\beta$  of open boxes in  $X^2$  are defined.

*Definition of  $(x_\alpha, y_\alpha)$  and  $O_\alpha$ :* Let  $O_\alpha = \bigcup\{U \times V : U \times V \in \mathcal{U}_\beta, \beta < \alpha\}$ . If  $(X^2 \setminus \Delta_X) \subset O_\alpha$  then stop construction. Otherwise, take any  $(x_\alpha, y_\alpha) \in X^2 \setminus (\Delta_X \cup O_\alpha)$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  consist of all elements in the following form:

$$f_{y_\alpha}^{-1}((1/n, 1]) \times f_{x_\alpha}^{-1}([0, 1/n)),$$

where  $n \in \omega \setminus \{0\}$ .

Let us show that for some  $\alpha < \omega_1$ , the co-diagonal part is in  $O_\alpha$ . Assume the contrary. Since  $f^{-1}(0) = \Delta_X$ , there exists  $n_0 \in \omega$  such that  $A = \{(x_\alpha, y_\alpha) : f(x_\alpha, y_\alpha) > 1/n_0, \alpha < \omega_1\}$  is uncountable. Since  $X^2$  has countable extent, there exists a limit point  $(a, b)$  for  $A$ . By continuity, there exists  $n_1$  such that  $f(a, b) > 1/n_1$ , whence  $a \neq b$ . Let  $\alpha \leq \omega_1$  be the smallest ordinal such that  $(a, b)$  is a limit point for  $\{(x_\beta, y_\beta) : \beta < \alpha\}$ . Clearly  $\alpha$  is limit (follows from  $T_1$ -axiom).

On one hand,  $(a, b) \notin O_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} O_\beta$ . Indeed, since each  $(x_\beta, y_\beta)$  is selected outside of  $O_\beta$ , no element of  $O_\beta$  can be limit for  $\{(x_\gamma, y_\gamma) : \beta \leq \gamma < \alpha\}$ . Therefore, if  $(a, b)$  were in  $O_\beta$  for some  $\beta < \alpha$ , then  $(a, b)$  would have been a limit point for  $\{(x_\gamma, y_\gamma) : \gamma < \beta\}$  contradicting the choice of  $\alpha$ .

On the other hand, there exist open  $U_a \ni a$  and  $V_b \ni b$  such that  $f(V_b \times V_b) \subset [0, 1/n_1)$  while  $f(U_a \times V_b) \subset (1/n_1, 1]$ . Since  $b$  is a limit point for  $\{y_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$  there exists  $y_\beta \in V_b$  for some  $\beta < \alpha$ . Then  $V = f_{y_\beta}^{-1}([0, 1/n_1))$  contains  $b$  while  $U = f_{y_\beta}^{-1}((1/n_1, 1])$  contains  $a$ . Then  $U \times V \in \mathcal{U}_\beta$  contains  $(a, b)$ . Hence  $(a, b) \in O_\alpha$ , a contradiction. (This “on the other hand” part is based on ideas of H. Martin mentioned above.)

Thus,  $X^2 \setminus \Delta_X = O_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha < \omega_1$ . Clearly,  $\Delta_{\beta < \alpha} f_{y_\beta}$  is a continuous injection of  $X$  to  $[0, 1]^\omega$ . □

Karpov proved in [KAR] that if  $X$  is Čech-complete and  $\omega_1$ -Lindelöf then  $X^2$  is  $\omega_1$ -Lindelöf as well. Recall that  $X$  is  $\omega_1$ -Lindelöf if every  $\omega_1$ -sized open cover of  $X$  contains a countable subcover. Since every  $\omega_1$ -Lindelöf space has countable extent we arrive at the following.

**Corollary 2.2.** *Let  $X$  be a Čech-complete  $\omega_1$ -Lindelöf space. If  $X$  has a zero set diagonal, then  $X$  is submetrizable.*

In [ARH], A.V. Arhangel'skii proved that a submetrizable Čech-complete Lindelöf space is metrizable. This motivates the following question.

**Question 2.3.** *Let  $X$  be a submetrizable Čech-complete  $\omega_1$ -Lindelöf space. Is  $X$  metrizable?*

This is related to a question of A.V. Arhangel'skii whether  $\omega_1$ -Lindelöf Tychonoff (regular) spaces with  $G_\delta$ -diagonal are submetrizable.

In Theorem 2.1, we do not really know if “zero set diagonal” can be replaced by “regular  $G_\delta$ -diagonal”. The author does not even know if this can be done in Martin’s theorem. However, we believe that it is not possible. And therefore, it is interesting to know if any trace of submetrizability is left if we replace “zero set diagonal” with “regular  $G_\delta$ -diagonal” in Martin’s theorem and in Theorem 2.1. In the next two results a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of open sets in  $X$  is called *Hausdorff separating* if for any distinct  $x, y \in X$  there exist disjoint  $U_x, U_y \in \mathcal{U}$  containing  $x$  and  $y$ , respectively. Clearly, the presence of a countable Hausdorff separating family in  $X$  guarantees that  $X$  condenses onto a second-countable Hausdorff space. The following theorem is an analogue of Martin’s theorem.

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $X$  be separable with a regular  $G_\delta$ -diagonal. Then  $X$  condenses onto a second-countable Hausdorff space.*

PROOF: Let  $D$  be a countable dense subspace of  $X$ . Let  $\{W_n\}_n$  be a collection of open sets in  $X^2$  such that  $\bigcap_n W_n = \bigcap_n \overline{W}_n = \Delta_X$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the collection of all open sets in  $X$  that are of one of the following types:

1.  $\{x : (x, d) \in W_n\}$  for some  $d \in D$  and  $n \in \omega$ ;
2.  $\{x : (x, d) \in X \setminus \overline{W}_n\}$  for some  $d \in D$  and  $n \in \omega$ .

The family  $\mathcal{B}$  is clearly countable. We only need to show that  $\mathcal{B}$  is Hausdorff separating. First, observe that every element of  $\mathcal{B}$  is open in  $X$ .

Fix any distinct  $a, b \in X$ . There exists  $n \in \omega$  such that  $(a, b) \notin \overline{W}_n$ . Let  $U_a \ni a$  and  $V_b \ni b$  be open neighborhoods such that  $V_b \times V_b \subset W_n$  and  $U_a \times V_b \subset X^2 \setminus \overline{W}_n$ . Due to the density property, there exists  $d \in D$  such that  $d \in V_b$ . Then  $B_b = \{x : (x, d) \in W_n\}$  contains  $b$  while  $B_a = \{x : (x, d) \in X \setminus \overline{W}_n\}$  contains  $a$ . Clearly,  $B_a$  and  $B_b$  are disjoint elements of  $\mathcal{B}$ .  $\square$

The proof of the next theorem is almost identical to the proof of Theorem 2.1, however we have decided to handle it separately for better readability.

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $X \times X$  have countable extent and let  $X$  have a regular  $G_\delta$ -diagonal. Then  $X$  condenses onto a second-countable Hausdorff space.*

PROOF: Fix  $\{W_n\}_n$  a family of open sets in  $X^2$  such that  $\bigcap_n W_n = \bigcap_n \overline{W}_n = \Delta_X$ . Assume that for each  $\beta < \alpha$ ,  $(x_\beta, y_\beta)$  and a family  $\mathcal{U}_\beta$  of open boxes in  $X^2$  are defined.

*Definition of  $(x_\alpha, y_\alpha)$  and  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ :* Let  $O_\alpha = \bigcup\{U \times V : U \times V \in \mathcal{U}_\beta, \beta < \alpha\}$ . If  $(X^2 \setminus \Delta_X) \subset O_\alpha$  then stop construction. Otherwise, take any  $(x_\alpha, y_\alpha) \in X^2 \setminus (\Delta_X \cup O_\alpha)$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  consist of all elements in the following form:

$$\{x : (x, y_\alpha) \in X \setminus \overline{W}_n\} \times \{x : (x, y_\alpha) \in W_n\},$$

where  $n \in \omega$ .

Let us show that for some  $\alpha < \omega_1$ , the co-diagonal part is in  $O_\alpha$ . Assume the contrary. Since  $\bigcap_n \overline{W}_n = \Delta_X$ , there exists  $n_0 \in \omega$  such that  $W_{n_0}$  misses uncountably many  $(x_\alpha, y_\alpha)$ 's. That is,  $A = [X^2 \setminus W_{n_0}] \cap \{(x_\alpha, y_\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_1\}$  is uncountable. Since  $X^2$  has countable extent, there exists  $(a, b)$  a limit point for  $A$ . Since  $A$  is outside of  $W_{n_0}$ , while  $\Delta_X \subset W_{n_0}$ , we have  $a \neq b$ . Hence there exists  $n_1 \in \omega$  such that  $(a, b) \in X^2 \setminus \overline{W}_{n_1}$ . Let  $\alpha \leq \omega_1$  be the smallest ordinal such that  $(a, b)$  is a limit point for  $\{(x_\beta, y_\beta) : \beta < \alpha\}$ . On one hand,  $(a, b) \notin O_\alpha$  (see the proof of Theorem 2.1). On the other hand, there exist open  $U_a \ni a$  and  $V_b \ni b$  such that  $V_b \times V_b \subset W_{n_1}$  while  $U_a \times V_b \subset X^2 \setminus \overline{W}_{n_1}$ . Since  $b$  is a limit point for  $\{y_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$  there exists  $y_\beta \in V_b$  for some  $\beta < \alpha$ . Then  $V = \{(x, y_\beta) : x \in W_{n_1}\}$  contains  $b$  while  $U = \{(x, y_\beta) : x \in X \setminus \overline{W}_{n_1}\}$  contains  $a$ . Then  $U \times V \in \mathcal{U}_\beta$  contains  $(a, b)$ . Therefore  $(a, b) \in O_\alpha$ , a contradiction.

Thus,  $X^2 \setminus \Delta_X = O_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha < \omega_1$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{B} = \{U, V : U \times V \in \mathcal{U}_\beta, \beta \leq \alpha\}$  is a countable Hausdorff separating family. □

The last two theorems suggest the following question.

**Question 2.6.** *Let a Tychonoff (regular)  $X$  have a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal. Suppose that  $X$  is separable or  $X^2$  has countable extent. Is it true that  $X$  condenses onto a second-countable  $T_1$ -space?*

The assumption of regularity in the above question is important. Indeed, let  $k\mathbb{N}$  be the Katětov extension of the natural numbers. The space  $k\mathbb{N}$  is Hausdorff and is a countable union of closed discrete subspaces. Hence,  $k\mathbb{N}$  has a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal. However,  $k\mathbb{N}$  does not condense onto any second countable  $T_1$ -space since  $|k\mathbb{N}| = 2^{2^\omega}$ , while any second-countable  $T_1$ -space has cardinality at most  $2^\omega$ .

REFERENCES

[ARH] Arhangel'skii A.V., *On a class of spaces containing all metric spaces and all locally compact spaces*, Mat. Sb **67** (1965); English Translation: Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. **92** (1970), 1–39.

- [ENG] Engelking R., *General Topology*, Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics, 6, Heldermann, Berlin, revised ed., 1989.
- [FRW] Fleissner W.G., Reed G.M., Wage M.L., *Normality versus countable paracompactness in perfect spaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **82** (1976), no. 4, 635–639.
- [KAR] Karpov A.N., *Countable products of Čech-complete linearly Lindelöf and initially-compact spaces*, Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh. (2000), no. 5, 7–9, 67.
- [MAR] Martin H.W., *Contractibility of topological spaces onto metric spaces*, Pacific J. Math. **61** (1975), no. 1, 209–217.

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, BROOKLYN COLLEGE, BROOKLYN, NY 11210, USA

*E-mail:* RaushanB@brooklyn.cuny.edu

(Received November 12, 2004, revised January 10, 2005)