

## A NOTE ON SPACES WITH A STRONG RANK 1-DIAGONAL

WEI-FENG XUAN  and WEI-XUE SHI

(Received 22 August 2013; accepted 23 September 2013; first published online 20 November 2013)

### Abstract

We mainly prove that, assuming  $b = c$ , every regular star-compact space with a strong rank 1-diagonal is metrisable.

2010 *Mathematics subject classification*: primary 54D20; secondary 54E35.

*Keywords and phrases*: star-compact, strong rank 1-diagonal.

### 1. Introduction

It is well known that the  $G_\delta$ -diagonal property plays an important role in metrisation theorems. In 1945, Sneider [7] proved that every compact space with a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal is metrisable. In 1976, Chaber [2] proved that every countably compact space with a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal is compact and thus metrisable, which improved Sneider's result. The strong rank 1-diagonal property is stronger than the  $G_\delta$ -diagonal property. The classical Mrowka space [6] demonstrates that a Tychonoff pseudocompact space with a strong rank 1-diagonal need not be metrisable. Notice that star-compactness is weaker than countable compactness and stronger than pseudocompactness. A natural question then arises.

**QUESTION 1.1.** Is every Tychonoff (regular) star-compact space metrisable if it has a strong rank 1-diagonal?

In this paper we mainly prove that, assuming  $b = c$ , every regular star-compact space with a strong rank 1-diagonal is metrisable. This gives a consistent positive answer to Question 1.1.

### 2. Notation and terminology

All spaces are assumed to be Hausdorff unless otherwise stated.

A subset  $A$  of a space  $X$  is said to be bounded in  $X$  if every infinite family  $\xi$  of open sets of  $X$  such that  $V \cap A \neq \emptyset$ , for every  $V \in \xi$ , has an accumulation point in  $X$ . If  $X$  is

---

The authors are supported by NSFC project 11271178.

© 2013 Australian Mathematical Publishing Association Inc. 0004-9727/2013 \$16.00

bounded in itself, then we say that  $X$  is pseudocompact. It should be pointed out that the definition of pseudocompactness given here is equivalent to DFCC in [5]. It is easy to see that for Tychonoff spaces it is also equivalent to the usual one: every continuous real-valued function on  $X$  is bounded.

A space  $X$  is star-compact if whenever  $\mathcal{U}$  is an open cover of  $X$ , there is a compact subset  $A \subseteq X$  such that  $\text{St}(A, \mathcal{U}) = X$ , where  $\text{St}(A, \mathcal{U}) = \bigcup\{U \in \mathcal{U} : U \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$ .

A space  $X$  has a strong rank 1-diagonal [1] if there exists a sequence  $\{\mathcal{U}_n : n \in \omega\}$  of open covers of  $X$  such that for each  $x \in X$ ,  $\{x\} = \bigcap\{\text{St}(x, \mathcal{U}_n) : n \in \omega\}$ .

The Lindelöf number  $l(X)$  of a topological space  $X$  is the smallest number  $\kappa$  such that every open cover of  $X$  has a subcover the cardinality of which is at most  $\kappa$ . The 'extent'  $e(X)$  of  $X$  is the supremum of the cardinalities of closed discrete subsets of  $X$ .

A space is called pseudonormal if every countable closed subset has arbitrarily small closed neighbourhoods.

All notation and terminology not explained here is given in [3].

### 3. Results

**LEMMA 3.1.** *Suppose that  $X$  is a regular pseudocompact space with a strong rank 1-diagonal. Then  $X$  is a Moore space.*

**PROOF.** Since a pseudocompact space is bounded in itself, the conclusion is an easy corollary of [1, Theorem 3.7].  $\square$

**LEMMA 3.2.** *For a Moore space  $X$ ,  $l(X) = e(X) = nw(X) = w(X)$ .*

**PROOF.** Suppose that  $l(X) = \kappa$ . We prove that  $e(X) \leq l(X)$ . If not, let  $S$  be a closed discrete subspace of  $X$  with  $|S| > \kappa$ . For every  $x \in S$  there exists an open set  $U_x \subseteq X$  such that  $S \cap U_x = \{x\}$ . It is not difficult to see that the open cover  $\{U_x\}_{x \in S} \cup \{X \setminus S\}$  of the space  $X$  has no subcover of cardinality at most  $\kappa$ . This is a contradiction. Next, we prove that  $nw(X) \leq e(X)$ . Since  $X$  is a Moore space, it is a  $\sigma$ -space [4, Theorem 4.5], that is, it has a  $\sigma$ -discrete network. Let  $\mathcal{N} = \bigcup\{\mathcal{N}_n : n \in \omega\}$  be a  $\sigma$ -discrete network for  $X$ , where each  $\mathcal{N}_n$  is discrete. Fix  $n \in \omega$  and pick a point  $x_N$  from  $N$  for each  $N \in \mathcal{N}_n$ . Let  $S_n = \{x_N : N \in \mathcal{N}_n\}$ . Then  $S_n$  is closed discrete in  $X$ . Since  $|S_n| \leq e(X)$ ,  $|\mathcal{N}_n| \leq e(X)$ . It follows immediately that  $|\mathcal{N}| \leq e(X)$ . Now we prove that  $l(X) \leq nw(X)$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be an open cover of  $X$ . For each  $x \in X$  pick  $N_x \in \mathcal{N}$  such that  $x \in N_x \subseteq U$  for some  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ . Let  $\mathcal{N}_0 = \{N_x : x \in X\}$ ; clearly  $\mathcal{N}_0$  covers  $X$  and  $|\mathcal{N}_0| \leq nw(X)$ . For each  $N \in \mathcal{N}_0$  we can pick  $U_N \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $N \subseteq U_N$  since  $\mathcal{N}_0$  refines  $\mathcal{U}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}_0 = \{U_N : N \in \mathcal{N}_0\}$ . This is a subcover of  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $|\mathcal{U}_0| \leq nw(X)$ . This shows that  $l(X) \leq nw(X)$ . Therefore we can conclude that  $l(X) = e(X) = nw(X) = \kappa$ . Finally, since a Moore space is a  $p$ -space, we have  $nw(X) = w(X)$  [4, Theorem 4.2]. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**COROLLARY 3.3.** *If  $X$  is a Moore space with countable extent, then  $X$  is metrisable.*

**COROLLARY 3.4.** *If  $X$  is a regular pseudocompact space of countable extent and with a strong rank 1-diagonal, then  $X$  is metrisable.*

Recall that  $\mathfrak{b} = \min\{|B| : B \text{ is an unbounded subset of } \omega^\omega\}$ . It is known that  $\omega < \mathfrak{b} \leq \mathfrak{c}$ ; see [4].

**LEMMA 3.5** [8, Lemma 2.2.9]. *Suppose that  $X$  is a regular first countable space with  $l(X) < \mathfrak{b}$ . Then  $X$  is pseudonormal.*

**THEOREM 3.6.** *Suppose that  $X$  is a regular pseudocompact space with a strong rank 1-diagonal and  $e(X) < \mathfrak{b}$ . Then  $X$  is metrisable.*

**PROOF.** It is sufficient to prove that  $X$  is countably compact, since a countably compact space with a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal is metrisable [2]. Suppose that this is not so. Then there exists a countable infinite closed and discrete subset  $S$  of  $X$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $l(X) = e(X) < \mathfrak{b}$ ; by Lemma 3.5,  $X$  is pseudonormal. So there exists a discrete family of open sets  $\{U_x : x \in S\}$  of  $X$  such that  $U_x \cap S = \{x\}$  for all  $x \in S$  [4, Proposition 12.1]. Clearly,  $\{U_x : x \in S\}$  is not finite. This contradicts the fact that  $X$  is pseudocompact.  $\square$

Recall that a space is said to be 1-star-compact if for every open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$ , there is some finite subset  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  such that  $\text{St}(\bigcup \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U}) = X$ .

**LEMMA 3.7** [8, Corollary 2.2.7]. *If  $X$  is a 1-star-compact Moore space, then  $w(X)$  has countable cofinality.*

**THEOREM 3.8.** *Assume  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c}$ . Let  $X$  be a regular 1-star-compact space with a strong rank 1-diagonal. Then  $X$  is metrisable.*

**PROOF.** Since a 1-star-compact space is pseudocompact [8, Theorem 2.1.8],  $X$  is a Moore space by Lemma 3.1. Apply [8, Lemma 2.2.1] to conclude that  $X$  is separable. Therefore it is not difficult to see that  $w(X) \leq \mathfrak{c}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{c}$  does not have countable cofinality, by Lemma 3.7, we can conclude that  $w(X) < \mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{b}$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $e(X) = w(X) < \mathfrak{b}$ . It remains to apply Theorem 3.6.  $\square$

It is easy to see that a star-compact space is 1-star-compact. So the following result is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.8.

**THEOREM 3.9.** *Assume that  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c}$ . Let  $X$  be a regular star-compact space with a strong rank 1-diagonal. Then  $X$  is metrisable.*

In Theorem 3.9, regularity cannot be weakened to the Hausdorff property.

**EXAMPLE 3.10.** There exists a Hausdorff star-compact non-metrisable space with a strong rank 1-diagonal.

**PROOF.** The space was constructed in [8, Example 2.2.4] as follows.

Let  $Y = \bigcup\{[0, 1] \times \{n\} : n \in \omega\}$  and  $X = Y \cup \{a\}$  where  $a \notin Y$ . Define a basis for a topology on  $X$  as follows. Basic open sets containing  $a$  take the form  $\{a\} \cup \bigcup\{[0, 1] \times m : m \geq n\}$  where  $n \in \omega$ . Basic open sets about the other points of  $X$  are the usual induced metric open sets.

It is easy to construct a sequence  $\{\mathcal{V}_n : n \in \omega\}$  of open covers of  $Y$  which demonstrates that  $Y$  has a strong rank 1-diagonal. Let

$$\mathcal{U}_n = \mathcal{V}_n \cup \left( \{a\} \cup \bigcup \{[0, 1) \times m : m \geq n\} \right).$$

Then  $\{\mathcal{U}_n : n \in \omega\}$  shows that  $X$  has a strong rank 1-diagonal. However, it is proved in [9] that  $X$  is a Hausdorff star-compact and non-metrisable space.  $\square$

However, the following question remains open.

**QUESTION 3.11.** Is a regular star-compact space metrisable if it has a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal?

### References

- [1] A. V. Arhangel'skii and R. Z. Buzyakova, 'The rank of the diagonal and submetrizability', *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.* **47**(4) (2006), 585–597.
- [2] J. Chaber, 'Conditions which imply compactness in countably compact spaces', *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Ser. Sci. Math.* **24**(11) (1976), 993–998.
- [3] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics 6 (Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989).
- [4] K. Kunen and J. Vaughan, *Handbook of Set-theoretic Topology* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1984).
- [5] M. V. Matveev, 'A survey on star-covering properties', *Topology Atlas*, Preprint no. 330 (1998).
- [6] S. Mrowka, 'On completely regular spaces', *Fund. Math.* **41**(1) (1955), 105–106.
- [7] V. Sneider, 'Continuous images of Souslin and Borel sets; Metrization theorems', *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **50** (1959), 77–79.
- [8] E. K. van Douwen, G. M. Reed and A. W. Roscoe, 'Star covering properties', *Topology Appl.* **39**(1) (1991), 71–103.
- [9] E. Yang and W. Shi, 'An answer to van Mill's question', *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.* **78** (2008), 353–355.

WEI-FENG XUAN, Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University,  
Nanjing, 210093, PR China  
e-mail: [xuanwf8@gmail.com](mailto:xuanwf8@gmail.com)

WEI-XUE SHI, Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University,  
Nanjing, 210093, PR China  
e-mail: [wxshi@nju.edu.cn](mailto:wxshi@nju.edu.cn)