

# TOPOLOGICAL GAMES AND ALSTER SPACES

LEANDRO F. AURICHI<sup>1</sup> AND RODRIGO R. DIAS<sup>2</sup>

*Dedicated to Ofelia T. Alas on occasion of her 70th birthday*

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study connections between topological games such as Rothberger, Menger and compact-open, and relate these games to properties involving covers by  $G_\delta$  subsets. The results include: (1) If Two has a winning strategy in the Menger game on a regular space  $X$ , then  $X$  is an Alster space. (2) If Two has a winning strategy in the Rothberger game on a topological space  $X$ , then the  $G_\delta$ -topology on  $X$  is Lindelöf. (3) The Menger game and the compact-open game are (consistently) not dual.

## 1. TOPOLOGICAL GAMES

We start by recalling some definitions. The following properties were introduced in studies of strong measure zero and  $\sigma$ -compact metric spaces, respectively.

**Definition 1.1** (Rothberger [27]). *A topological space  $X$  is said to be a Rothberger space if, for every sequence  $(\mathcal{U}_n)_{n \in \omega}$  of open covers of  $X$ , there is a sequence  $(U_n)_{n \in \omega}$  satisfying  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} U_n$  with  $U_n \in \mathcal{U}_n$  for all  $n \in \omega$ .*

**Definition 1.2** (Hurewicz [15]). *A topological space  $X$  is said to be a Menger space if, for every sequence  $(\mathcal{U}_n)_{n \in \omega}$  of open covers of  $X$ , there is a sequence  $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \omega}$  satisfying  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{F}_n$  with  $\mathcal{F}_n \in [\mathcal{U}_n]^{< \aleph_0}$  for all  $n \in \omega$ .*

The following topological games are naturally associated to the above properties.

**Definition 1.3** (Galvin [12]). *The Rothberger game in a topological space  $X$  is played according to the following rules. In each inning  $n \in \omega$ , One chooses an open cover  $\mathcal{U}_n$  of  $X$ , and then Two chooses  $U_n \in \mathcal{U}_n$ . The play is won by Two if  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} U_n$ ; otherwise, One is the winner.*

**Definition 1.4** (Telgársky [38]). *The Menger game in a topological space  $X$  is played as follows. In each inning  $n \in \omega$ , One chooses an open cover  $\mathcal{U}_n$  of  $X$ , and then Two chooses a finite subset  $\mathcal{F}_n$  of  $\mathcal{U}_n$ . Two wins the play if  $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{F}_n$  is a cover of  $X$ ; otherwise, One is the winner.*

It is easy to see that, if One does not have a winning strategy in the Rothberger (resp. Menger) game in a topological space  $X$ , then  $X$  is a Rothberger (resp. Menger) space. The following theorems show that these properties can in fact be expressed in terms of such games.

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 54D20; Secondary 54G99, 54A10.

*Key words and phrases.* topological games, selection principles, Alster spaces, Menger spaces, Rothberger spaces, Menger game, Rothberger game, compact-open game,  $G_\delta$ -topology.

<sup>1</sup> Partially supported by FAPESP (2010/16939-6).

<sup>2</sup> Supported by FAPESP (2012/09214-0).

**Theorem 1.5** (Pawlikowski [24]). *A topological space  $X$  is Rothberger if and only if One does not have a winning strategy in the Rothberger game on  $X$ .*

**Theorem 1.6** (Hurewicz [15]). *A topological space  $X$  is Menger if and only if One does not have a winning strategy in the Menger game on  $X$ .*

A more systematic study of combinatorial properties in topological spaces was initiated by M. Scheepers in [30]. Scheepers introduced a framework for investigating some classes of properties and their naturally associated games in greater generality, which has originated the subject of *selection principles*. One such general selection principle and its associated game are defined as follows.

**Definition 1.7** (Scheepers [30]). *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be nonempty families.  $S_1(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  denotes the following statement:*

*For every sequence  $(A_n)_{n \in \omega}$  of elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ , there is a sequence  $(B_n)_{n \in \omega}$  such that  $B_n \in A_n$  for each  $n \in \omega$  and  $\{B_n : n \in \omega\} \in \mathcal{B}$ .*

**Definition 1.8** (Scheepers [31]). *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be nonempty families with  $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{A}$ . The game  $G_1(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is played as follows. In each inning  $n \in \omega$ , One chooses  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ , and then Two chooses  $B_n \in A_n$ . Two wins the play if  $\{B_n : n \in \omega\} \in \mathcal{B}$ ; otherwise, One is the winner.*

Thus the Rothberger property is the particular case  $S_1(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$  of Definition 1.7, where  $\mathcal{O}$  denotes the family of all open covers of the space — more explicitly,  $S_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  means that  $X$  is a Rothberger space, where  $\mathcal{O}_X = \{\mathcal{U} \subseteq \tau_X : X = \bigcup \mathcal{U}\}$ . It is also clear that  $X$  is a Menger space if and only if  $S_1(\mathcal{O}_X^*, \mathcal{O}_X)$  holds, where  $\mathcal{O}_X^* = \{\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{O}_X : \mathcal{U} \text{ is closed by finite unions}\}$ . Similarly, the Rothberger and Menger games can be regarded as the games  $G_1(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$  and  $G_1(\mathcal{O}^*, \mathcal{O})$  respectively.<sup>1</sup>

The implication that was already observed in these particular cases holds in general: namely, the nonexistence of a winning strategy for One in the game  $G_1(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  implies  $S_1(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ . The converse, which holds in the particular cases previously considered (Theorems 1.5 and 1.6), is not always true; see [32, Example 3].

We now turn to (apparently) another game:

**Definition 1.9** (Galvin [12]). *The point-open game in a topological space  $X$  is defined by the following rules. In each inning  $n \in \omega$ , One picks a point  $x_n \in X$ , and then Two chooses an open set  $U_n \subseteq X$  with  $x_n \in U_n$ . The play is won by One if  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} U_n$ ; otherwise, Two is the winner.*

In [12], F. Galvin showed that the point-open game is essentially the same as the Rothberger game, in the following sense.

We say that two games  $G$  and  $G'$  are *dual* if

- One has a winning strategy in  $G$  if and only if Two has a winning strategy in  $G'$ ; and
- Two has a winning strategy in  $G$  if and only if One has a winning strategy in  $G'$ .

**Theorem 1.10** (Galvin [12]). *The Rothberger game and the point-open game are dual.*

---

<sup>1</sup>Although the rules of  $G_1(\mathcal{O}^*, \mathcal{O})$  and the Menger game are not quite the same, it is easy to see that these games are *equivalent*, i.e. One (resp. Two) has a winning strategy in  $G_1(\mathcal{O}^*, \mathcal{O})$  if and only if One (resp. Two) has a winning strategy in the Menger game.

We may then wonder how the point-open game could be modified to produce a similar game that is dual to the Menger game. The following is a natural candidate:

**Definition 1.11** (Telgársky [36]). *The compact-open game in a topological space  $X$  is defined as follows: in each inning  $n \in \omega$ , One chooses a compact subset  $K_n$  of  $X$ , and then Two chooses an open subset  $U_n$  of  $X$  such that  $K_n \subseteq U_n$ ; the play is won by One if  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} U_n$ , otherwise Two is the winner.*

In [38, Corollary 3], R. Telgársky proved that One has a winning strategy in the compact-open game if and only if Two has a winning strategy in the Menger game. Telgársky also observes (in Proposition 1 of the same paper) that One having a winning strategy in the Menger game implies Two having a winning strategy in the compact-open game, and then asks:

**Problem 1.12** (Telgársky [38]). *Does the converse hold? I.e., are the Menger game and the compact-open game dual?*

As we shall see later, in Examples 3.11 and 3.12, this may not always be the case.

The relationship between these two games may be more clearly understood by considering the following.

**Definition 1.13.** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. An open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  is said to be a  $k$ -cover of  $X$  if for every compact subset  $K$  of  $X$  there is  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $K \subseteq U$ . The family of all  $k$ -covers of  $X$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{K}_X$ .*

The next result is a particular case of Theorem 6.2 of [37].

**Proposition 1.14** (Galvin, Telgársky [37]). *The game  $G_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$  and the compact-open game are dual.*

Problem 1.12 may then be rewritten as:

**Problem 1.15** (Telgársky [38]). *Does the existence of a winning strategy for One in  $G_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$  imply the existence of a winning strategy for One in the game  $G_1(\mathcal{O}^*, \mathcal{O})$ ?*

Note that  $\mathcal{O}^* \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ ; thus, a counterexample to Problem 1.12 (i.e. Problem 1.15) must be a space in which these two classes of open covers are, in a certain sense, very far from each other. These problems shall be further discussed in Section 3.

As has already been observed, if One does not have a winning strategy in  $G_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$  (i.e. Two does not have a winning strategy in the compact-open game), then  $S_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$  holds. The question of whether the converse holds remains unsettled:

**Problem 1.16.** *Is  $S_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$  equivalent to One not having a winning strategy in the game  $G_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$  (i.e. Two not having a winning strategy in the compact-open game)?*

## 2. ALSTER SPACES

We now turn to properties of covers of topological spaces by  $G_\delta$  subsets. The main object of our interest is the *Alster property*, defined below (Definition 2.2).

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. A cover  $\mathcal{W}$  of  $X$  by  $G_\delta$  subsets is said to be an Alster cover if every compact subset of  $X$  is included in some element of  $\mathcal{W}$ . The set of all Alster covers of  $X$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{A}_X$ .*

**Definition 2.2** (Alster [1]). *A topological space  $X$  is an Alster space if, for every  $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{A}_X$ , there is a countable  $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  with  $X = \bigcup \mathcal{V}$ .*

Alster spaces were introduced in [1] in an attempt to characterize the class of *productively Lindelöf spaces*, i.e. the class of topological spaces  $X$  such that  $X \times Y$  is Lindelöf whenever  $Y$  is a Lindelöf space.

**Theorem 2.3** (Alster [1]). *Alster spaces are productively Lindelöf. Assuming the Continuum Hypothesis, productively Lindelöf spaces of weight not exceeding  $\aleph_1$  are Alster.*

An internal characterization of productive Lindelöfness — a problem attributed to H. Tamano in [25, Problem 5] — is still unknown. The following problem, implicitly raised in [1] (see also [6]), remains open:

**Problem 2.4** (Alster [1], Barr-Kennison-Raphael [6]). *Is it true that every productively Lindelöf space is an Alster space?*

After observing that both the properties “ $X$  is an Alster space” and “Two has a winning strategy in the Menger game on  $X$ ” are implied by “ $X$  is  $\sigma$ -compact”<sup>2</sup> and imply “ $X$  is Lindelöf and every continuous image of  $X$  in a separable metrizable space is  $\sigma$ -compact”, F. Tall asks in [35, Problem 5]:

**Problem 2.5** (Tall [35]). *Is there any implication between the Alster property and Two having a winning strategy in the Menger game?*

We shall provide a complete answer to Problem 2.5 by showing that:

- if a Two has a winning strategy in the Menger game on a regular space  $X$ , then  $X$  is Alster (Corollary 2.13);
- the regularity hypothesis in the above result is essential (Example 3.5);
- the converse implication does not hold (Example 3.4).

In what follows, we will denote by  $\mathcal{O}_X^\delta$  the family of all covers of a topological space  $X$  by  $G_\delta$  subsets. We start by proving a characterization of the Alster property in terms of the selection principle  $\mathbf{S}_1$ .<sup>3</sup>

**Proposition 2.6.** *A topological space  $X$  is an Alster space if and only if  $\mathbf{S}_1(\mathcal{A}_X, \mathcal{O}_X^\delta)$  holds.*

*Proof.* The converse is clear. For the direct implication, suppose that  $X$  is an Alster space and let  $(\mathcal{U}_n)_{n \in \omega}$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{A}_X$ . Let  $S = \prod_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{U}_n$  and, for each  $f \in S$ , define  $V_f = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} f(n)$ . It follows that  $\{V_f : f \in S\}$  is an Alster cover of  $X$ ; therefore, there is  $\{f_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq S$  such that  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} V_{f_n}$ . Now, for every  $n \in \omega$ , define  $A_n = f_n(n)$ . Then

$$X = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} V_{f_n} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \bigcap_{k \in \omega} f_n(k) \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \omega} f_n(n) = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} A_n$$

and, since  $A_n \in \mathcal{U}_n$  for all  $n \in \omega$ , we are done.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.7.** *Every Alster space satisfies  $\mathbf{S}_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$ .*

*Proof.* This is immediate in view of Proposition 2.6, since  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

<sup>2</sup>A space is  $\sigma$ -compact if it is a countable union of compact subsets.

<sup>3</sup>Proposition 2.6 has also been obtained (independently) by L. Babinkostova, B. Pansera and M. Scheepers in [4].

Let us now consider a natural modification of the compact-open game.

**Definition 2.8** (Telgársky [37]). *The compact- $G_\delta$  game in a topological space  $X$  is defined in the same way as the compact-open game, with the difference that now Two is allowed to play  $G_\delta$  subsets of  $X$ .*

The proof of the following result is analogous to the proof of Proposition 1.14 — see [37, Theorem 6.2].

**Proposition 2.9.** *The game  $G_1(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{O}^\delta)$  and the compact- $G_\delta$  game are dual.*

Propositions 2.6 and 2.9 yield:

**Corollary 2.10.** *If Two does not have a winning strategy in the compact- $G_\delta$  game on a topological space  $X$ , then  $X$  is an Alster space.*

As usual, the characterization of the selective property in terms of its naturally associated game is of interest:

**Problem 2.11.** *Is the Alster property equivalent to Two not having a winning strategy in the compact- $G_\delta$  game?*

Finally, Theorem 5.1 of [37] and Corollary 3 of [38] can be combined to yield:

**Theorem 2.12** (Telgársky [37, 38]). *Consider the following statements about a topological space  $X$ :*

- (a) *One has a winning strategy in the compact- $G_\delta$  game on  $X$ ;*
- (b) *One has a winning strategy in the compact-open game on  $X$ ;*
- (c) *Two has a winning strategy in the Menger game on  $X$ .*

*Then (a)  $\leftrightarrow$  (b)  $\rightarrow$  (c). Furthermore, if  $X$  is regular, then the three statements are equivalent.*

This allows us to relate the Menger game to the Alster property:

**Corollary 2.13.** *If Two has a winning strategy in the Menger game on a regular space  $X$ , then  $X$  is an Alster space.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.12 and Corollary 2.10. □

In [38, Corollary 4], Telgársky showed:

**Theorem 2.14** (Telgársky [38]). *If  $X$  is a metrizable space, then Two has a winning strategy in the Menger game on  $X$  if and only if  $X$  is  $\sigma$ -compact.*

In [5], T. Banach and L. Zdomskyy noted that Telgársky’s argument would follow with “regular hereditarily Lindelöf” in place of “metrizable”. Since hereditarily Lindelöf regular spaces have the property that every compact subset is a  $G_\delta$  (a condition that clearly implies  $\sigma$ -compactness in the presence of the Alster property), Corollary 2.13 extends the Banach-Zdomskyy version of Theorem 2.14.

Telgársky’s proof of the equivalence between (b) and (c) in Theorem 2.12 is rather indirect. Inspired by [29], we can give a more straightforward proof of Corollary 2.13, which does not depend on the aforementioned equivalence:

*An alternative proof of Corollary 2.13.* Let  $\sigma : <^\omega \mathcal{O}_X \setminus \{\emptyset\} \rightarrow [\tau_X]^{< \aleph_0}$  be a winning strategy for Two in the Menger game on  $X$ . Now let  $\mathcal{W}$  be an Alster cover of  $X$ . Our task is to find a countable subset of  $\mathcal{W}$  that covers  $X$ .

The following claim is taken from [29].

*Claim 1.* For every  $s \in {}^{<\omega}\mathcal{O}_X$ , the set  $K_s = \bigcap \{\overline{\bigcup \sigma(s \frown \mathcal{U})} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{O}_X\}$  is compact.

Indeed, let  $\mathcal{V}$  be a cover of  $K_s$  by open subsets of  $X$ . For each  $x \in K_s$ , pick an open neighbourhood  $U_x$  of  $X$  such that  $\overline{U_x}$  is included in some element of  $\mathcal{V}$ ; now, for each  $x \in X \setminus K_s$ , pick an open neighbourhood  $U_x$  of  $X$  with  $\overline{U_x} \subseteq X \setminus K_s$ . Consider then  $\mathcal{U}_0 = \{U_x : x \in X\} \in \mathcal{O}_X$ , and let  $F \in [X]^{<\aleph_0}$  be such that  $\sigma(s \frown \mathcal{U}_0) = \{U_x : x \in F\}$ . Note that  $K_s \subseteq \overline{\bigcup \sigma(s \frown \mathcal{U}_0)} = \bigcup \{\overline{U_x} : x \in F\}$ ; thus, if for each  $x \in F \cap K_s$  we pick a  $V_x \in \mathcal{V}$  with  $\overline{U_x} \subseteq V_x$ , we will have  $K_s \subseteq \bigcup \{V_x : x \in F \cap K_s\}$ . This proves Claim 1.

For each  $s \in {}^{<\omega}\mathcal{O}_X$ , we can then fix a  $W_s \in \mathcal{W}$  with  $K_s \subseteq W_s$ .

*Claim 2.* For every  $s \in {}^{<\omega}\mathcal{O}_X$ , there is a countable  $\mathcal{C}_s \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$  such that  $K_s \subseteq \bigcap \{\overline{\bigcup \sigma(s \frown \mathcal{U})} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_s\} \subseteq W_s$ .

Since  $K_s \subseteq W_s$ , the set  $\{X \setminus \overline{\bigcup \sigma(s \frown \mathcal{U})} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{O}_X\}$  is an open cover of  $X \setminus W_s$ . But  $X \setminus W_s$  is an  $F_\sigma$ -subset of  $X$ ; since our hypothesis implies that  $X$  is a Lindelöf space, it follows that  $X \setminus W_s$  is Lindelöf as well, whence there is a countable  $\mathcal{C}_s \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$  such that  $X \setminus W_s \subseteq \bigcup \{X \setminus \overline{\bigcup \sigma(s \frown \mathcal{U})} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_s\}$ . This proves Claim 2.

Now define recursively  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{C}_\emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{n+1} = \mathcal{A}_n \cup \bigcup \{\mathcal{C}_s : s \in {}^{n+1}\mathcal{A}_n\}$  for all  $n \in \omega$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup \{\mathcal{A}_n : n \in \omega\}$ . We will show that the countable subset  $W_0 = \{W_s : s \in {}^{<\omega}\mathcal{A}\}$  of  $\mathcal{W}$  is a cover of  $X$ .

Suppose, to the contrary, that there is  $p \in X \setminus \bigcup W_0$ . Since  $p \notin W_\emptyset$ , there is some  $\mathcal{U}_0 \in \mathcal{C}_\emptyset$  such that  $p \notin \overline{\bigcup \sigma(\mathcal{U}_0)}$ . We also have  $p \notin W_{(\mathcal{U}_0)}$ , so there is  $\mathcal{U}_1 \in \mathcal{C}_{(\mathcal{U}_0)}$  such that  $p \notin \overline{\bigcup \sigma((\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1))}$ . By proceeding in this fashion ( $p \notin W_{(\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1)}$ , and so on), we obtain a play

$$(\mathcal{U}_0, \sigma((\mathcal{U}_0)), \mathcal{U}_1, \sigma((\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1)), \mathcal{U}_2, \sigma((\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2)), \mathcal{U}_3, \dots)$$

of the Menger game on  $X$  such that  $p \notin \overline{\bigcup \sigma((\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_k))}$  for all  $k \in \omega$ . But this is a contradiction, since Two follows the winning strategy  $\sigma$  in this play.  $\square$

A similar argument shows that, if ‘‘Menger’’ is replaced by ‘‘Rothberger’’ in Proposition 2.13, the conclusion can be replaced by ‘‘ $X_\delta$  is Lindelöf’’ — here,  $X_\delta$  is the set  $X$  endowed with the topology generated by the  $G_\delta$  subsets from its original topology. But in this case we can avoid the requirement of any separation axioms by making use of Theorem 1.10 (cf. Theorem 6.1 of [36] and Theorem 2 of [12]):

**Proposition 2.15.** *If Two has a winning strategy in the Rothberger game on a topological space  $X$ , then  $X_\delta$  is a Lindelöf space.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 1.10, this hypothesis is equivalent to the existence of a winning strategy for One in the point-open game. Let then  $\sigma : {}^{<\omega}\tau \rightarrow X$  be such a strategy, where  $\tau$  is the topology of  $X$ .

Now let  $\mathcal{W}$  be a cover of  $X$  by  $G_\delta$  subsets. For each  $W \in \mathcal{W}$ , fix a sequence  $(U(W, n))_{n \in \omega}$  of open sets with  $W = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} U(W, n)$ . Proceeding by induction on  $n \in \omega$ , we shall assign to each  $s \in {}^n\omega$  an element  $W_s$  of  $\mathcal{W}$  as follows.

First, pick  $W_\emptyset \in \mathcal{W}$  such that  $\sigma(\emptyset) \in W_\emptyset$ . Now let  $n \in \omega$  be such that  $W_s \in \mathcal{W}$  has already been defined for all  $s \in {}^n\omega$ . For each  $s \in {}^n\omega$  and each  $k \in \omega$ , choose  $W_{s \frown k} \in \mathcal{W}$  satisfying  $\sigma(t_{s,k}) \in W_{s \frown k}$ , where  $t_{s,k} \in {}^{n+1}\tau$  is the sequence defined by  $t_{s,k}(i) = U(W_{s \upharpoonright i}, s(i))$  for all  $i < n$  and  $t_{s,k}(n) = U(W_s, k)$ .

We claim that  $\{W_s : s \in {}^{<\omega}\omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{W}$  is a cover of  $X$ . Suppose not, and fix  $p \in X \setminus \bigcup_{s \in {}^{<\omega}\omega} W_s$ . For  $n \in \omega$ , we can recursively pick  $k_n \in \omega$  with  $p \notin U(W_{(k_i)_{i < n}}, k_n)$ .

But then we get a contradiction from the fact that

$$(\sigma(\emptyset), U(W_\emptyset, k_0), \sigma(U(W_\emptyset, k_0)), U(W_{(k_0)}, k_1), \sigma(U(W_{(k_0)}, k_1)), U(W_{(k_0, k_1)}, k_2), \dots)$$

is a play of the point-open game in which One plays according to  $\sigma$  and loses.  $\square$

We shall see later, in Example 3.5, that the regularity hypothesis in Corollary 2.13 is essential.

The following diagram summarizes the connections between the properties considered in this paper. We will now quote some results from which some of the implications in the diagram follow.

For the first result (proven in Theorem 5.2 of [19]), recall that a topological space  $X$  is *scattered* if every nonempty subspace  $Y \subseteq X$  has an isolated point (relative to  $Y$ ).

**Theorem 2.16** (Levy-Rice [19]). *If a regular space  $X$  is Lindelöf and scattered, then  $X_\delta$  is Lindelöf.*

The next result is attributed to F. Galvin in [13] — see Theorem 47 of [33]. Recall that a *P-space* is a topological space in which every  $G_\delta$  subset is open.

**Proposition 2.17** (Galvin). *A P-space is Lindelöf if and only if it is Rothberger.*

Recall that a *Michael space* is a Lindelöf space  $X$  such that  $X \times \omega^\omega$  is not Lindelöf. Michael spaces have been constructed with the aid of several set-theoretical hypotheses; see e.g. [21], [18] and [22]. In Proposition 3.1 of [26], it was shown:<sup>4</sup>

**Theorem 2.18** (Repovš-Zdomskyy [26]). *If there is a Michael space, then every productively Lindelöf space is Menger.*


Finally, a closer look at the proof of the folklore fact that compact scattered spaces are Rothberger (see e.g. [3, Proposition 5.5]) shows that, in fact, we have:

**Proposition 2.19** (folklore). *Two has a winning strategy in the Rothberger game on every compact scattered space.*

Each arrow of the diagram has the number of the result from which the implication follows, as well as the number of the counterexample (in Section 3) showing that the implication cannot be reversed — or that the regularity assumption is necessary, if this is the case.

---

<sup>4</sup>We thank Lyubomyr Zdomskyy for bringing this result to our attention.





## 3. COUNTEREXAMPLES

We shall now see that, unless the question of whether the converse implication holds is indicated, the implications from the previous diagram cannot be reversed (at least consistently); moreover, the regularity assumptions that appear in the diagram cannot be dropped (again, at least consistently). This will follow from the examples listed below.

**Example 3.1.** *A compact Hausdorff space that is not Rothberger.*

The Cantor set  $2^\omega$  satisfies these conditions: it is folklore that the sequence  $(\mathcal{U}_n)_{n \in \omega}$  of open covers of  $2^\omega$  defined by  $\mathcal{U}_n = \{\pi_n^{-1}[\{0\}], \pi_n^{-1}[\{1\}]\}$ , where  $\pi_n : 2^\omega \rightarrow 2$  is the projection onto the  $n$ -th coordinate, witnesses the failure of the Rothberger property.

**Example 3.2.** *A Lindelöf scattered regular space that is not  $\sigma$ -compact and such that Two has a winning strategy in the Rothberger game.*

This is the one-point Lindelöfication of an uncountable discrete space, i.e. the space  $X = A \cup \{p\}$ , where  $A$  is uncountable and  $p \notin A$ , in which every point of  $A$  is isolated and cocountable subsets of  $X$  are open. Two has a winning strategy in the Rothberger game since, if she covers the point  $p$  in the first inning, only countably many points remain uncovered.

**Example 3.3.** *A Rothberger regular space that is not productively Lindelöf.*

J. Moore's L space [23] is Rothberger (see [33, section 4]) but has a non-Lindelöf finite power<sup>5</sup> (see [39, Theorem 3.4(2)] and [2, Theorem 2]).

**Example 3.4.** *There is a Lindelöf regular non-scattered space  $Y$  such that  $Y_\delta$  is Lindelöf (hence, in particular,  $Y$  is Alster) and Two does not have a winning strategy in the Menger game on  $Y$ .*

Let  $Y$  be the space considered by Telgársky in Section 7 of [37]: for each  $\lambda \in \lim(\omega_1) = \{\gamma \in \omega_1 : \gamma \text{ is a limit ordinal}\}$ , fix a cofinal subset  $C_\lambda \subseteq \lambda$  such that  $|C_\lambda \cap \alpha| < \aleph_0$  whenever  $\alpha < \lambda$ ; the set  $Y = \{\chi_{C_\lambda} : \lambda \in \lim(\omega_1)\} \cup \{\chi_F : F \in [\omega_1]^{< \aleph_0}\}$  is then regarded as a subspace of  $2^{\omega_1}$  with the countable box product topology  $\tau$ .<sup>6</sup>

Note that  $Y = Y_\delta$  and that  $\{\chi_F : F \in [\omega_1]^{< \aleph_0}\}$  is a closed subset of  $Y$  without isolated points. In [37], it was proven that the compact-open game on  $Y$  is undetermined; thus, in view of Theorem 2.12, there is no winning strategy for Two in the Menger game on  $Y$ .

As in Corollary 2.13, we can give a proof for this last fact that does not rely on the equivalence between (b) and (c) of Theorem 2.12.

*A direct proof for Example 3.4.* For each  $p \in Y$  and each  $\alpha \in \omega_1$ , we shall write  $V(p, \alpha) = \{y \in Y : y \upharpoonright \alpha = p \upharpoonright \alpha\} \in \tau$ .

Let  $\sigma$  be a strategy for Two in the Menger game on  $Y$ . By expanding the answers of Two if necessary, we may regard  $\sigma$  as a function  $\sigma : (<^\omega \lim(\omega_1)) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \rightarrow [\omega_1]^{< \aleph_0}$ , meaning that, if One gives an open cover  $\{V(y, \alpha) : y \in Y\}$  of  $Y$  with  $\alpha \in \lim(\omega_1)$  — note that, as  $Y$  is Lindelöf and  $\omega_1$  is regular, any open cover of  $Y$  has an open refinement of this form —, Two responds by choosing, for some  $F \in [\alpha]^{< \aleph_0}$ , the open sets  $V(y, \alpha)$  with  $y \in \{\chi_G : G \subseteq F\} \cup \{\chi_{C_\gamma} : \gamma \in F \cap \lim(\omega_1)\} \cup \{\chi_{C_\alpha}\}$ .

<sup>5</sup>We thank Marion Scheepers and Boaz Tsaban for pointing this out to us.

<sup>6</sup>Here,  $\chi_A$  denotes the function in  ${}^{\omega_1}2$  satisfying  $\{\alpha \in \omega_1 : \chi_A(\alpha) = 1\} = A$ .

For each  $t \in {}^{<\omega}\lim(\omega_1)$ , we have  $\max(\sigma(t \frown \alpha)) < \alpha$  for all  $\alpha \in \lim(\omega_1)$ ; thus, it follows from Fodor's Lemma ([10, Theorem 2]; see e.g. [17, Theorem 21.12]) that there exist  $\beta_t \in \omega_1$  and a stationary set  $S_t \subseteq \lim(\omega_1)$  such that, for all  $\alpha \in S_t$ , we have  $\max(\sigma(t \frown \alpha)) = \beta_t$ . Let  $M$  be a countable elementary submodel of  $H_\theta$  for a convenient choice of  $\theta$  (see e.g. [9] or [17, Chapter 24]) such that  $Y, \tau, \sigma \in M$ , and consider  $\lambda = M \cap \omega_1 \in \lim(\omega_1)$ . By elementarity, it follows that, for each  $t \in {}^{<\omega}\lim(\lambda)$ , there exist  $\beta_t \in \lambda$  and an unbounded subset  $S_t$  of  $\lambda$  with  $S_t \subseteq \lim(\lambda)$  such that  $\max(\sigma(t \frown \alpha)) = \beta_t$  for all  $\alpha \in S_t$ .

We shall now prove that  $\sigma$  is not a winning strategy by showing that One can prevent the point  $\chi_{C_\lambda} \in Y$  from being covered if Two plays according to  $\sigma$ .

In order to accomplish this, One starts by picking  $\xi_0 \in C_\lambda$  with  $\beta_\emptyset < \xi_0$ , and then plays  $\alpha_0 \in S_\emptyset$  such that  $\xi_0 < \alpha_0$  — which, we recall, is short for saying that she plays the open cover  $\{V(y, \alpha) : y \in Y\}$ . Since Two follows the strategy  $\sigma$ , he responds with  $\sigma((\alpha_0)) \in [\lambda]^{<\aleph_0}$ ; now One picks  $\xi_1 \in C_\lambda$  satisfying  $\beta_{(\alpha_0)} < \xi_1$ , and then plays  $\alpha_1 \in S_{(\alpha_0)}$  with  $\xi_1 < \alpha_1$ . In general, in the  $n$ -th inning, if  $t_n = (\alpha_k)_{k < n}$  is the sequence of One's moves so far, she picks  $\xi_n \in C_\lambda$  such that  $\beta_{t_n} < \xi_n$ , and then plays  $\alpha_n \in S_{t_n}$  with  $\xi_n < \alpha_n$ . It is clear that the point  $\chi_{C_\lambda} \in Y$  is not covered in any of the innings, since for all  $n \in \omega$  we have  $\max \sigma((\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n)) < \xi_n < \alpha_n$  and  $\chi_{C_\lambda}(\xi_n) = 1$ .  $\square$

**Example 3.5.** *There is a Hausdorff non-regular space  $X$  such that  $S_1(\mathcal{K}_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  fails and yet Two has a winning strategy in the Menger game on  $X$  — in particular,  $X$  is a Menger space.*

This is the space  $X$  obtained by taking the real line  $\mathbb{R}$  (with the usual topology) and then declaring every countable subset closed. Since every compact subset of  $X$  is finite, it follows from Theorem 17 of [30] that  $S_1(\mathcal{K}_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  is equivalent to  $S_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ , which does not hold since  $\mathbb{R}$  is not a Rothberger space.

Now write  $\{2k + 1 : k \in \omega\} = \bigcup_{j \in \omega} A_j$  with  $|A_j| = \aleph_0$  for each  $j \in \omega$ , and let  $\varrho$  be a winning strategy for Two in the Menger game played on the real line with the usual topology — such a strategy exists since  $\mathbb{R}$  is  $\sigma$ -compact. We may assume that, in the Menger game on  $X$ , One only plays covers constituted by basic open sets of the form  $U \setminus C$ , where  $U$  is open in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is countable; for each such basic open set  $W$ , fix  $U(W)$  open in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $C(W) \in [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq \aleph_0}$  with  $W = U(W) \setminus C(W)$ ; then, for each basic open cover  $\mathcal{W}$  of  $X$ , define  $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{W}) = \{U(W) : W \in \mathcal{W}\} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}$ .

We shall now describe a winning strategy for Two in the Menger game on  $X$ . In each even inning  $2k \in \omega$ , if  $(\mathcal{W}_i)_{i \leq 2k}$  is the sequence of open covers played by One so far, Two responds with  $\mathcal{F}_{2k} \in [\mathcal{W}_{2k}]^{<\aleph_0}$  such that  $\varrho((\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{W}_{2i}))_{i \leq k}) = \{U(W) : W \in \mathcal{F}_{2k}\}$  — i.e.,  $\{U(W) : W \in \mathcal{F}_{2k}\}$  is Two's answer to the sequence  $(\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{W}_{2i}))_{i \leq k}$  in the Menger game on  $\mathbb{R}$  according to the strategy  $\varrho$ . Now Two makes use of the innings in  $A_k$  to cover the countably many points in  $\bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{F}_{2k}} C(W)$ . The fact that  $\varrho$  is a winning strategy for Two in the Menger game on  $\mathbb{R}$  guarantees that  $X$  will be covered by Two through this procedure.

**Example 3.6.** *If there is a Luzin subset of the real line,<sup>7</sup> then there is a Hausdorff non-regular space  $X$  that is Lindelöf scattered and such that  $X_\delta$  is not Lindelöf.*

<sup>7</sup>That is, an uncountable set  $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  such that  $L \cap A$  is countable for every nowhere dense subset  $A$  of  $\mathbb{R}$ . The Continuum Hypothesis implies the existence of a Luzin set [20, Theorem 1].

Let  $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be a Luzin set, which we may assume to consist only of irrational numbers. On the set  $X = L \cup \mathbb{Q}$ , consider the topology in which every point of  $L$  is isolated and basic neighbourhoods of  $q \in \mathbb{Q}$  are of the form  $\{q\} \cup \{x \in L : |x - q| < \frac{1}{n+1}\}$  for  $n \in \omega$ . It is clear that  $X$  is scattered and that  $X_\delta$ , being discrete and uncountable, is not Lindelöf. Yet  $X$  is Lindelöf: from any open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$ , we can extract a countable subset  $\mathcal{U}_0$  that covers  $\mathbb{Q}$ ; as  $L$  is a Luzin set,  $\mathcal{U}_0$  leaves only countably many points of  $L$  uncovered.

**Definition 3.7.** *An open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of a topological space  $X$  is an  $R$ -cover if every Rothberger subspace of  $X$  is included in some element of  $\mathcal{U}$ . The set of all  $R$ -covers of  $X$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{R}_X$ .*

The following result is a straightforward generalization of the implication (3)  $\rightarrow$  (1) of Theorem 17 of [30]; its proof is essentially the same.

**Proposition 3.8.** *A topological space  $X$  satisfies  $S_1(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{O})$  if and only if  $X$  is a Rothberger space.*

**Corollary 3.9.** *Let  $X$  be a topological space such that every compact subspace of  $X$  is Rothberger. Then  $X$  satisfies  $S_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$  if and only if  $X$  is a Rothberger space.<sup>8</sup>*

*Proof.* Since in this case we have  $\mathcal{R}_X \subseteq \mathcal{K}_X$ , it follows that  $S_1(\mathcal{K}_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  implies  $S_1(\mathcal{R}_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  — which, by Proposition 3.8, is equivalent to  $X$  being Rothberger.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.10.** *Let  $X$  be a topological space every compact subspace of which has an isolated point. Then  $X$  satisfies  $S_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$  if and only if  $X$  is a Rothberger space.*

*Proof.* This follows directly from Corollary 3.9, since every compact scattered space is Rothberger.  $\square$

**Example 3.11.** *If  $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}) < \mathfrak{d}$ , then there is a Menger regular space that does not satisfy  $S_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$ .*

It follows from Theorem 5 of [11] that  $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M})$  is the least cardinality of a non-Rothberger subspace of the real line; let then  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be such a subspace. As  $|X| < \mathfrak{d}$ , it follows from Theorem 5 of [16] (see also [11, Theorem 3]) that  $X$  is a Menger space. By the Čech-Pospíšil Theorem ([8]; see e.g. [14, Theorem 7.19]), any compact subspace of  $X$  without isolated points would have size at least  $\mathfrak{c} \geq \mathfrak{d} > |X|$ , which is impossible; thus, by Corollary 3.10,  $X$  does not satisfy  $S_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$ .

**Example 3.12.** *If there is a Sierpiński subset of the real line,<sup>9</sup> then there is a Menger regular space that does not satisfy  $S_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$ .*

Pick a Sierpiński set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and endow it with the Sorgenfrey line topology. By Corollary 3.6 of [28],  $S$  is Menger. Since  $S$  does not have measure zero, it cannot be Rothberger [27]; thus, as every compact subset of the Sorgenfrey line is countable, it follows from Corollary 3.9 that  $S$  does not satisfy  $S_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$ .

In view of Examples 3.11 and 3.12, it is natural to ask:

**Problem 3.13.** *Is it consistent with ZFC that every Menger regular space satisfies  $S_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$ ?*

<sup>8</sup>This has also been observed independently in [4].

<sup>9</sup>That is, an uncountable set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  such that  $S \cap A$  is countable for every (Lebesgue) measure zero subset  $A$  of  $\mathbb{R}$ . The Continuum Hypothesis implies the existence of a Sierpiński set [34, 4.6].

We conjecture that the answer is negative. Note that this could be proven by means of a dichotomic argument, e.g. by showing that a counterexample exists under  $\text{cov}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{d}$ . Should this be the case, one might still ask:

**Problem 3.14.** *Is there a ZFC example of a Menger regular space that does not satisfy  $S_1(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{O})$ ?*

We point out that a set of reals satisfying these conditions would have to be, in particular, a ZFC example of a non- $\sigma$ -compact Menger subspace of  $\mathbb{R}$  — a kind of set that only recently has been constructed (see Theorem 16 in [7]). Note also that, if the regularity requirement is dropped, then Example 3.5 answers Problem 3.14 in the affirmative.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] K. Alster, *On the class of all spaces of weight not greater than  $\omega_1$  whose cartesian product with every Lindelöf space is Lindelöf*, Fund. Math. **129** (1988), 133–140.
- [2] A. V. Arkhangel'skii, *On some topological spaces that occur in functional analysis*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **31**:5 (1976), 17–32 (Russian Math. Surveys **31**:5 (1976), 14–30).
- [3] L. F. Aurichi, *D-spaces, topological games, and selection principles*, Topology Proc. **36** (2010), 107–122.
- [4] L. Babinkostova, B. A. Pansera and M. Scheepers, *Weak covering properties and selection principles*, preprint.
- [5] T. Banach and L. Zdomskyy, *Selection principles and infinite games on multicovered spaces*, Selection principles and covering properties in topology (L. D. R. Kočinac, ed.), Quad. Mat. 18, Dept. Math., Seconda Univ. Napoli, Caserta, 2006, 1–51.
- [6] M. Barr, J. F. Kennison and R. Raphael, *On productively Lindelöf spaces*, Sci. Math. Jpn. **65** (2007), 319–332.
- [7] T. Bartoszyński and B. Tsaban, *Hereditary topological diagonalizations and the Menger-Hurewicz conjectures*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **134** (2006), 605–615.
- [8] E. Čech and B. Pospíšil, *Sur les espaces compacts*, Publ. Fac. Sci. Univ. Masaryk **258** (1938), 1–7.
- [9] A. Dow, *An introduction to applications of elementary submodels to topology*, Topology Proc. **13** (1988), 17–72.
- [10] G. Fodor, *Eine Bemerkung zur Theorie der regressiven Funktionen*, Acta Sci. Math. Szeged **17** (1956), 139–142.
- [11] D. H. Fremlin and A. W. Miller, *On some properties of Hurewicz, Menger, and Rothberger*, Fund. Math. **129** (1988), 17–33.
- [12] F. Galvin, *Indeterminacy of point-open games*, Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci., Sér. Sci. Math. Astron. Phys. **26** (1978), 445–449.
- [13] J. Gerlits and Z. Nagy, *Some properties of  $C(X)$ , I*, Topology Appl. **14** (1982), 151–161.
- [14] R. Hodel, *Cardinal functions I*, Handbook of set-theoretic topology (K. Kunen and J. E. Vaughan, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, 1–61.
- [15] W. Hurewicz, *Über eine Verallgemeinerung des Borelschen Theorems*, Math. Z. **24** (1926), 401–421.
- [16] W. Hurewicz, *Über Folgen stetiger Funktionen*, Fund. Math. **9** (1927), 193–204.
- [17] W. Just and M. Weese, *Discovering modern set theory. II*, Graduate studies in mathematics, Volume 18, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1997.
- [18] L. B. Lawrence, *The influence of a small cardinal on the product of a Lindelöf space and the irrationals*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **110** (1990), 535–542.
- [19] R. Levy and M. D. Rice, *Normal P-spaces and the  $G_\delta$ -topology*, Colloq. Math. **44** (1981), 227–240.
- [20] N. Lusin, *Sur un problème de M. Baire*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **158** (1914), 1258–1261.
- [21] E. A. Michael, *Paracompactness and the Lindelöf property in finite and countable cartesian products*, Compos. Math. **23** (1971), 199–214.
- [22] J. T. Moore, *Some of the combinatorics related to Michael's problem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **127** (1999), 2459–2467.

- [23] J. T. Moore, *A solution to the  $L$  space problem*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **19** (2006), 717–736.
- [24] J. Pawlikowski, *Undetermined sets of point-open games*, Fund. Math. **144** (1994), 279–285.
- [25] T. C. Przymusiński, *Products of normal spaces*, Handbook of set-theoretic topology (K. Kunen and J. E. Vaughan, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, 781–826.
- [26] D. Repovš and L. Zdomskyy, *On the Menger covering property and  $D$  spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **140** (2012), 1069–1074.
- [27] F. Rothberger, *Eine Verschärfung der Eigenschaft  $C$* , Fund. Math. **30** (1938), 50–55.
- [28] M. Sakai, *Menger subsets of the Sorgenfrey line*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **137** (2009), 3129–3138.
- [29] M. Scheepers, *A direct proof of a theorem of Telgársky*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **123** (1995), 3483–3485.
- [30] M. Scheepers, *Combinatorics of open covers I: Ramsey theory*, Topology Appl. **69** (1996), 31–62.
- [31] M. Scheepers, *Combinatorics of open covers (III): games,  $C_p(X)$* , Fund. Math. **152** (1997), 231–254.
- [32] M. Scheepers, *Combinatorics of open covers VI: Selectors for sequences of dense sets*, Quaest. Math. **28** (2005), 409–424.
- [33] M. Scheepers and F. D. Tall, *Lindelöf indestructibility, topological games and selection principles*, Fund. Math. **210** (2010), 1–46.
- [34] W. Sierpiński, *Sur l'hypothèse du continu ( $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$ )*, Fund. Math. **5** (1924), 177–187.
- [35] F. D. Tall, *Productively Lindelöf spaces may all be  $D$* , Canad. Math. Bull. **56** (2013), 203–212.
- [36] R. Telgársky, *Spaces defined by topological games*, Fund. Math. **88** (1975), 193–223.
- [37] R. Telgársky, *Spaces defined by topological games, II*, Fund. Math. **116** (1983), 189–207.
- [38] R. Telgársky, *On games of Topsøe*, Math. Scand. **54** (1984), 170–176.
- [39] B. Tsaban and L. Zdomskyy, *Arhangel'skiĭ sheaf amalgamations in topological groups*, preprint, arXiv:1103.4957v1

INSTITUTO DE CIÊNCIAS MATEMÁTICAS E DE COMPUTAÇÃO, UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO,  
CAIXA POSTAL 668, SÃO CARLOS, SP, 13560-970, BRAZIL  
*E-mail address:* aurichi@icmc.usp.br

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA E ESTATÍSTICA, UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO, CAIXA POSTAL  
66281, SÃO PAULO, SP, 05315-970, BRAZIL  
*E-mail address:* roque@ime.usp.br