

Michael Hrušák; Paul J. Szeptycki; Artur Hideyuki Tomita  
Selections on  $\Psi$ -spaces

*Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, Vol. 42 (2001), No. 4, 763--769

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/119291>

## Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 2001

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>

## Selections on $\Psi$ -spaces

M. HRUŠÁK, P.J. SZEPTYCKI, A.H. TOMITA

*Abstract.* We show that if  $\mathcal{A}$  is an uncountable AD (almost disjoint) family of subsets of  $\omega$  then the space  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  does not admit a continuous selection; moreover, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is maximal then  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  does not even admit a continuous selection on pairs, answering thus questions of T. Nogura.

*Keywords:* MAD family, Vietoris topology, continuous selection

*Classification:* 54C65, 54B20, 03E05

The program of studying continuous selections on topological spaces was initiated by E. Michael in an influential series of papers in the 1950's (see [Mi]). Since then a number of both positive and negative results have been established and research in the area is blooming.

The concept of a  $\Psi$ -space, introduced independently by S. Mrówka and J. Isbell, provides an important class of examples in the theory of Fréchet spaces. Let us mention Mrówka's construction of a  $\Psi$ -space with a unique compactification ([Mr]) and P. Simon's example ([Si]) of two compact Fréchet spaces whose product is not Fréchet. The set-theoretic notation used here is standard and follows [Ku].

Recall that an infinite family  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$  is *almost disjoint (AD)* if every two distinct elements of  $\mathcal{A}$  have only finite intersection. A family  $\mathcal{A}$  is *MAD* if it is almost disjoint and maximal with this property. Given an almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$  denotes the ideal of those subsets of  $\omega$  which can be almost covered by finitely many elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{I}^*(\mathcal{A})$  denotes the dual filter and  $\mathcal{I}^+(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{P}(\omega) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$  the coideal of large sets.

**Definition 0.1.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an AD family. Define the space  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  as follows: The underlying set is  $\omega \cup \mathcal{A}$ , all elements of  $\omega$  are isolated and basic neighborhoods of  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  are of the form  $\{A\} \cup (A \setminus F)$  for some finite set  $F$ .

It follows immediately from the definition that  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  is a first countable, locally compact space. It is hardly surprising that there is a close relationship between topological properties of the space  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  and combinatorial properties of the almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A}$ . If  $\mathcal{A}$  is infinite then  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  is not countably compact and

---

The first author's research was partially supported by a grant GAČR 201/00/1466.

$\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  is pseudocompact (contains no infinite discrete family of open subsets) if and only if  $\mathcal{A}$  is a MAD family.

The hyperspace of a space  $X$  (denoted by  $\exp(X)$ ) consists of all closed non-empty subsets of  $X$ . There are many ways to define a topology on  $\exp(X)$  the standard (and most useful) being the *Vietoris topology* generated by sets of the form:

$$\langle U_0, \dots, U_{n-1} \rangle = \{F \in \exp(X) : F \subseteq \bigcup_{i < n} U_i \text{ and } F \cap U_i \neq \emptyset \text{ for every } i < n\}$$

where  $U_0, \dots, U_{n-1}$  are nonempty open subsets of  $X$ . Let  $[X]^2$  denote the set of (unordered) pairs of elements of  $X$ . If  $X$  is a  $T_1$ -space then we consider  $[X]^2$  as a subspace of  $\exp(X)$  equipped with the Vietoris topology.

**Definition 0.2.** A space  $X$  admits a selection if there exists a continuous  $\phi : \exp(X) \rightarrow X$  such that  $\phi(F) \in F$  for every  $F \in \exp(X)$ . Similarly,  $X$  has a weak selection if there exists a continuous  $\phi : [X]^2 \rightarrow X$  such that  $\phi(\{x, y\}) \in \{x, y\}$  for every pair  $\{x, y\}$  of elements of  $X$ .

Note that the existence of a weak selection is equivalent to the existence of a continuous function  $\varphi : X^2 \rightarrow X$  such that  $\varphi((x, y)) = \varphi((y, x)) \in \{x, y\}$ , where  $X^2$  is given the product topology.

T. Nogura has asked the natural question whether  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  admits a selection for some (any) MAD family  $\mathcal{A}$ . We answer this question in the negative by proving:

**Theorem 0.3.** *The space  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  does not have a weak selection for any maximal almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

It should be mentioned here that this theorem was proved independently by G. Artico, U. Marconi, J. Pelant, L. Rotter and M. Tkachenko in [A&al]. In fact, it follows directly from a much stronger theorem proved in [A&al].

Here we also show that

**Theorem 0.4.** *If  $X$  is regular, separable and contains an uncountable closed discrete set, then  $X$  does not admit a continuous selection.*

from which it directly follows that  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  does not admit a continuous selection for any uncountable almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A}$ .

We offer our thanks to Salvador Garcia-Ferreira for communicating the question to us and to Jan Pelant for detecting and filling a gap in a preliminary draft of this note.

## I. Proofs of the main theorems

Our proof of Theorem 0.3 is based on a Ramsey theoretic property of the coideal  $\mathcal{I}^+(\mathcal{A})$ . Recall that if  $f : [\omega]^2 \rightarrow 2$  is a coloring of pairs into two colors,

then a set  $A \subseteq \omega$  is *f-homogeneous* if  $|f([A]^2)| = 1$ , in other words, if all pairs of elements of  $A$  are colored by the same color. The famous Ramsey Theorem states that for any coloring  $f$  there is an infinite  $f$ -homogeneous set. The following crucial lemma is well known in set-theoretic circles (see also [BDS]):

**Lemma I.1** ([Ma]). *For every MAD family  $\mathcal{A}$  and every decreasing sequence  $\{X_i : i \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^+(\mathcal{A})$  there is an  $X \in \mathcal{I}^+(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $X \setminus i \subseteq \bigcap_{j < i} X_j$  for every  $i \in X$ .*

**Lemma I.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a MAD family and let  $f : [\omega]^2 \rightarrow 2$ . Then there exists an  $f$ -homogeneous set  $B$  such that  $B \in \mathcal{I}^+(\mathcal{A})$ .*

PROOF: Extend the filter  $\mathcal{I}^*(\mathcal{A}) = \langle \{\omega \setminus A : A \in \mathcal{A}\} \rangle$  to an ultrafilter  $\mathcal{U}$ . We will construct an  $f$ -homogeneous set using this ultrafilter. Let  $g : \omega \rightarrow 2$  be such that  $X_n = \{m \in \omega : f(\{n, m\}) = g(n)\} \in \mathcal{U}$ . Note that  $X_n \in \mathcal{I}^+(\mathcal{A})$ . By previous lemma, there is an  $X \in \mathcal{I}^+(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $X \setminus n \subseteq \bigcap_{i < n} X_i$ , for every  $n \in X$ . Let  $B(i) = \{n \in X : g(n) = i\}$  for  $i \in 2$ . As  $X = B(0) \cup B(1)$ , there exists  $i \in 2$  such that  $B(i) \in \mathcal{I}^+(\mathcal{A})$ . The set  $B = B(i)$  is the desired  $f$ -homogeneous subset.  $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 0.3: The proof proceeds by contradiction. Assume that  $\phi : [\Psi(\mathcal{A})]^2 \rightarrow \Psi(\mathcal{A})$  is a weak selection. Consider  $\phi \upharpoonright [\omega]^2$  and define  $f : [\omega]^2 \rightarrow 2$  by:

$$f(\{n, m\}) = 0 \text{ if and only if } \phi(\{n, m\}) = \min\{n, m\}.$$

By Lemma I.2 there is a  $B \in \mathcal{I}^+(\mathcal{A})$  which is  $f$ -homogeneous. Let  $A_0, A_1$  be distinct elements of  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $B \cap A_i$  is infinite for both  $i < 2$ . We will show that  $\phi$  is not continuous at  $\{A_0, A_1\}$ . Assume that  $\phi(\{A_0, A_1\}) = A_0$ . It suffices to show that the image of any open neighborhood of  $\{A_0, A_1\}$  is not contained in  $\{A_0\} \cup A_0$ , a neighborhood of  $A_0$ .

Suppose  $U$  is a neighborhood of  $\{A_0, A_1\}$ . Then  $U$  contains  $V = \langle \{A_0\} \cup (A_0 \setminus k), \{A_1\} \cup (A_1 \setminus k) \rangle$  for some  $k \in \omega$ .

Suppose that  $f([B]^2) = 0$ . Let  $n > k$  be such that  $n \in (A_1 \cap B) \setminus A_0$  and  $m > n$  such that  $m \in (A_0 \cap B) \setminus A_1$ . Then  $\{n, m\} \in V$  and  $\phi(\{n, m\}) = n \notin A_0$ . On the other hand, if  $f([B]^2) = 1$ , let  $n > k$  be such that  $n \in (A_0 \cap B) \setminus A_1$  and  $m > n$  such that  $m \in (A_1 \cap B) \setminus A_0$ . Then  $\{n, m\} \in V$  and  $\phi(\{n, m\}) = m \notin A_0$ .

Therefore,  $\phi''U \not\subseteq \{A_0\} \cup A_0$ .  $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 0.4: Let  $X$  be a separable regular space and let  $A$  be an uncountable closed discrete subset of  $X$ , without loss of generality without isolated points. By way of contradiction assume that  $\phi : \exp(X) \rightarrow X$  is a continuous selection. Define an enumeration

$$A = \{a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$$

by letting  $a_0 = \phi(A)$  and  $a_\alpha = \phi(A_\alpha)$  where

$$A_\alpha = A \setminus \{a_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}.$$

Fix open neighborhoods  $O_\alpha$  of each  $a_\alpha$  such that

$$\overline{O_\alpha} \cap A = \{a_\alpha\}.$$

By continuity, for each  $\alpha$ ,  $\phi^{-1}(O_\alpha)$  is an open set in  $\text{exp}(X)$  containing  $A_\alpha$ . So, by definition of the Vietoris topology on  $\text{exp}(X)$ , there are  $m_\alpha \in \omega$  and open sets  $U_\alpha^n$ ,  $n < m_\alpha$ , such that

$$A_\alpha \in \langle U_\alpha^n : n < m_\alpha \rangle \subseteq \phi^{-1}(O_\alpha).$$

Therefore,  $A_\alpha \subseteq \bigcup_{n < m_\alpha} U_\alpha^n$  and  $A_\alpha \cap U_\alpha^n \neq \emptyset$  for each  $n < m_\alpha$ .

By shrinking the  $U_\alpha^n$ 's we may assume that

- (a)  $U_\alpha^0 \subseteq O_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha < \lambda$ .
- (b)  $\overline{O_\alpha} \cap \bigcup_{0 < n < m_\alpha} U_\alpha^n = \emptyset$ .

Therefore, as  $\langle U_\alpha^n : n < m_\alpha \rangle \subseteq \phi^{-1}(O_\alpha)$ , we have

- (c) For each  $F \in [X]^{<\aleph_0}$  if  $F \in \langle U_\alpha^n : n < m_\alpha \rangle$  then  $\phi(F) \in F \cap U_\alpha^0$ .

Using that  $X$  is separable, fix  $D$  to be a countable dense subset of  $X$ .

**Claim.** *There is  $F \in [D]^{<\aleph_0}$ , and  $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$  such that*

- (d)  $F \cap U_\alpha^n \neq \emptyset$  for each  $n < m_\alpha$ ;
- (e)  $F \cap U_\beta^n \neq \emptyset$  for each  $n < m_\beta$ ;
- (f)  $F \subseteq (\bigcup_{n < m_\alpha} U_\alpha^n) \cap (\bigcup_{n < m_\beta} U_\beta^n)$ ;
- (g)  $(F \cap U_\alpha^0) \cap (F \cap U_\beta^0) = \emptyset$ .

First note that the Claim leads to a contradiction. Namely, by (b),  $\phi(F) \in U_\alpha^0 \cap U_\beta^0$  but by (g) this is impossible. Thus, proving the Claim will complete the proof of the theorem.

To this end let, for each  $\alpha$ ,

$$V_\alpha = \bigcup_{0 < n < m_\alpha} U_\alpha^n.$$

Then  $U_\alpha^0 \cap V_\alpha = \emptyset$  by (a) and (b). As  $D$  is countable, there is an uncountable set  $J \subset \omega_1$  and a finite set  $G \subset D$  such that

$$\forall \alpha \in J \forall n, 0 < n < m_\alpha : G \cap U_\alpha^n \neq \emptyset \ \& \ G \subset V_\alpha.$$

Let  $\{\delta_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$  be an increasing enumeration of  $J$ .

For each  $\alpha \in J$  let

$$D_{\alpha+1} = D \cap U_{\delta_{\alpha+1}}^0 \cap V_{\delta_\alpha}.$$

Note that each  $D_{\alpha+1}$  is a nonempty subset of  $D$  ( $a_{\delta_{\alpha+1}} \in U_{\delta_{\alpha+1}}^0 \cap V_{\delta_\alpha}$  and  $a_{\delta_{\alpha+1}}$  is not isolated). Therefore  $\{D_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \omega_1\}$  is not pairwise disjoint. So we may fix successor ordinals  $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$  such that

$$U_{\delta_\alpha}^0 \cap V_{\delta_\beta} \neq \emptyset.$$

Let  $k_0 \in D \cap U_{\delta_\alpha}^0 \cap V_{\delta_\beta}$ . As  $D \cap U_{\delta_\beta}^0 \cap V_{\delta_\alpha} \neq \emptyset$  (recall that  $a_{\delta_\beta} \in V_{\delta_\alpha}$  as  $V_{\delta_\alpha}$  is an open set containing  $A_{\delta_{\alpha+1}}$  and  $a_{\delta_\beta} \in A_{\delta_{\alpha+1}}$ ), we may choose  $k_1 \in D \cap U_{\delta_\beta}^0 \cap V_{\delta_\alpha}$ . Now define  $F = G \cup \{k_0, k_1\}$ .

Notice that  $F \cap U_{\delta_\alpha}^0 = \{k_0\}$  and  $F \cap U_{\delta_\beta}^0 = \{k_1\}$ , thus  $F$  satisfies (g). It is clear that  $F$  satisfies the other conclusions of the Claim.  $\square$

## II. Concluding remarks

The proof of Theorem 0.3 is similar to the proof of the following proposition due to E. van Douwen ([vD1]).

**Proposition II.1** (van Douwen). *If  $X$  is a countably compact, not sequentially compact space, then  $X$  does not have a weak selection. In particular, it does not admit a continuous selection.*

A natural question arises as to for which almost disjoint families  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  admits a weak selection. Obviously, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is a countable almost disjoint family, then  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  is homeomorphic to an ordinal hence admits a continuous selection. For the proof of Theorem 0.3 we, in fact, only needed that  $\mathcal{A}$  is *somewhere MAD*, i.e. there is an  $X \in \mathcal{I}^+(\mathcal{A})$  such that for every infinite  $Y \subseteq X$  there is an  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  intersecting  $Y$  in an infinite set. If an AD family  $\mathcal{A}$  is not somewhere MAD we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is *nowhere MAD*. Note that the one-point compactification of the locally compact space  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  is Fréchet if and only if  $\mathcal{A}$  is nowhere MAD (see e.g. [vD2]).

We will show that for some, but not all, uncountable nowhere MAD families  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  does admit a weak selection.

**Example II.2.** *There is an uncountable almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  admits a weak selection.*

PROOF: Identify  $\omega$  with  $2^{<\omega}$  — the set of all finite sequences of 0's and 1's. For every  $f \in 2^\omega$  let  $A_f = \{f \upharpoonright n : n \in \omega\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_f : f \in 2^\omega\}$ . For  $s, t \in 2^{<\omega} \cup 2^\omega$  let  $\Delta_{s,t} = \min\{n \in \omega : s(n) \neq t(n)\}$ . Of course,  $\Delta_{s,t}$  is not well-defined if  $s \subseteq t$

or  $t \subseteq s$ . Define an ordering on  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  by:

$$x \leq y \text{ if } \begin{cases} x, y \in 2^{<\omega} \text{ and } (x \subseteq y \text{ or } x(\Delta_{x,y}) < y(\Delta_{x,y})), \\ x \in 2^{<\omega}, y = A_f \text{ and } (x \subseteq f \text{ or } x(\Delta_{x,f}) < f(\Delta_{x,f})), \\ x = A_f, y \in 2^{<\omega} \text{ and } f(\Delta_{y,f}) < y(\Delta_{y,f}), \\ x = A_f, y = A_g \text{ and } (f = g \text{ or } f(\Delta_{f,g}) < g(\Delta_{f,g})). \end{cases}$$

The ordering  $\leq$  is a linear order on  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  and the usual topology on  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  is finer than the interval topology induced by  $\leq$ . It is easy to verify that putting

$$\phi(\{x, y\}) = x \text{ if and only if } x \leq y$$

defines a continuous weak selection for  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$ . □

On the other hand:

**Proposition II.3.** *There are nowhere MAD families whose  $\Psi$ -spaces do not have a weak selection.*

PROOF: Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A}$  from Example II.2. Note that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a nowhere MAD family of size  $\mathfrak{c}$ .

Enumerate all  $f : [\omega]^2 \rightarrow 2$  as  $\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$  and enumerate  $\mathcal{A}$  as  $\{A_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathfrak{c}\}$ .

For every  $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$ , find an infinite  $f_\alpha$ -homogeneous subset  $C_\alpha$  of  $A_\alpha$  and split it into two infinite pieces  $C_\alpha^0$  and  $C_\alpha^1$ . Let  $A_\alpha^0 = C_\alpha^0$  and  $A_\alpha^1 = A_\alpha \setminus C_\alpha^0$ . Let  $\mathcal{B} = \{A_\alpha^0, A_\alpha^1 : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ . Now, the proof of Theorem 0.3 goes through, so  $\Psi(\mathcal{B})$  does not have a weak selection, and  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ , so  $\mathcal{B}$  is nowhere MAD. □

**Corollary II.4.** *There is a separable scattered compact Fréchet space without a weak selection.*

PROOF: Let  $X$  be a one-point compactification of  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  without a weak selection, where  $\mathcal{A}$  is nowhere MAD. Then  $X$  is compact, Fréchet and scattered, and does not have a weak selection since  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  does not admit one. □

As pointed out by the referee this follows directly from a result of J. van Mill and E. Wattel (see [vMW]) where they proved that *a compact space admits a weak selection if and only if it is orderable*.

#### REFERENCES

- [A&al] G. Artico, U. Marconi, J. Pelant, L. Rotter and M. Tkachenko, *Selections and suborderability*, preprint.
- [BDS] Balcar B., Dočkálková J., Simon P., *Almost disjoint families of countable sets*, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, Finite and Infinite Sets **37** (1984), 59–88.
- [vD1] van Douwen E.K., *Mappings from hyperspaces and convergent sequences*, Topology Appl. **34** (1990), 35–45.

- [vD2] van Douwen E., *The integers and topology*, in K. Kunen, J. Vaughn, editors, Handbook of Set Theoretic Topology (1984), North-Holland, 111–167.
- [Ku] Kunen K., *Set Theory: An Introduction to Independence Proofs*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980.
- [Ma] Mathias A.R.D., *Happy families*, Ann. Math. Logic **12** (1977), 59–111.
- [vMW] van Mill J., Wattel E., *Selections and orderability*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **83** (1981), 601–605.
- [Mi] Michael E., *Topologies on spaces of subsets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **71** (1951), 152–182.
- [Mr] Mrówka S., *Some set-theoretic constructions in topology*, Fund. Math. **94** (1977), 83–92.
- [Si] Simon P., *A compact Fréchet space whose square is not Fréchet*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **21** (1980), 749–753.

DEPARTMENT OF MATH. AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT, DE BOELELAAN 1081A, 1081 HV AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS

*E-mail:* michael@cs.vu.nl

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ATKINSON, YORK UNIVERSITY, 4700 KEELE STREET, M3J 1P3 TORONTO, CANADA

*E-mail:* szeptyck@yorku.ca

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA E ESTATÍSTICA, UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO, CAIXA POSTAL 66281, CEP 05389-970, SÃO PAULO, BRASIL

*E-mail:* tomita@ime.usp.br

(Received October 23, 2000, revised August 28, 2001)