

Some open problems on well-filtered spaces and sober spaces [☆]

Xiaoquan Xu^{a,*}, Dongsheng Zhao^b

^a*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Minnan Normal University, Zhangzhou 363000, China*

^b*Mathematics and Mathematics Education, National Institute of Education,
Nanyang Technological University, 1 Nanyang Walk, Singapore 637616*

Abstract

In the past few years, the research on sober spaces and well-filtered spaces has got some breakthrough progress. In this paper, we shall present a brief summarising survey on some of such development. Furthermore, we shall pose and illustrate some open problems on well-filtered spaces and sober spaces.

Keywords: Well-filtered space; Sober space; Strong d -space; Co-sober space; Reflection; Smyth power space.

2000 MSC: 54D99; 54B30; 54B20; 06B35

1. Introduction

Sobriety is probably the most important and useful property of non-Hausdorff topological spaces. It has been used in the characterizations of spectral spaces and T_0 spaces that are determined by their open set lattices. With the development of domain theory, another two properties also emerged as the very useful and important properties for non-Hausdorff topology theory: d -spaces and well-filtered spaces (see [1, 11-17, 19-37, 41-43, 45-60]). In the past few years, some remarkable progresses have been achieved in understanding such structures. In the current paper, we shall make a brief survey on some of these progresses, which concern the topics on sobriety of dcpos, existence of well-filterification, finer links between sobriety, coherency, locally compactness, Lawson compactness and well-filteredness.

After reviewing each part, we shall list some major open problems. These problems are not all new, some of them were already posed by other authors. The solutions of such problems, we believe, will further deepen our understanding of the relevant structures. Due to our information limitation, we are not able to include all recent research work on such topics in this paper.

2. Preliminary

We now recall some basic concepts and notations that will be used in the paper. For further details, we refer the reader to [10, 19, 22].

Let P be a poset. For any $A \subseteq P$, let $\downarrow A = \{x \in P : x \leq a \text{ for some } a \in A\}$ and $\uparrow A = \{x \in P : x \geq a \text{ for some } a \in A\}$. For each $x \in P$, we write $\downarrow x$ for $\downarrow \{x\}$ and $\uparrow x$ for $\uparrow \{x\}$. A subset A of P is called a *lower set* (resp., an *upper set*) if $A = \downarrow A$ (resp., $A = \uparrow A$). Define $P^{(<\omega)} = \{F \subseteq P : F \text{ is a nonempty finite set}\}$ and $\mathbf{Fin} P = \{\uparrow F : F \in P^{(<\omega)}\}$. For a nonempty subset A of P , define $\max(A) = \{a \in A : a \text{ is a maximal element of } A\}$ and $\min(A) = \{a \in A : a \text{ is a minimal element of } A\}$. The symbol \mathbb{N} will denote the poset of all natural numbers with the usual order.

[☆]This research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (11661057); the Natural Science Foundation of Jiangxi Province, China (20192ACBL20045); and NIE ACRF (RI 3/16 ZDS), Singapore

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: xiqxu2002@163.com (Xiaoquan Xu), dongsheng.zhao@nie.edu.sg (Dongsheng Zhao)

A nonempty subset D of a poset P is called *directed* if every two elements in D have an upper bound in D . The set of all directed sets of P is denoted by $\mathcal{D}(P)$. A poset P is called a *directed complete poset*, or *dcpo* for short, if $\bigvee D$ exists in P for every $D \in \mathcal{D}(P)$. A subset $I \subseteq P$ is called an *ideal* if I is a directed lower subset of P . Let $\text{Id}(P)$ denote the poset of all ideals of P with the set inclusion order. Dually, we define the *filters* and denote the poset of all filters of P by $\text{Filt}(P)$. The *upper topology* on P , generated by $\{P \setminus \downarrow x : x \in P\}$ as a subbase, is denoted by $v(P)$. A subset U of P is *Scott open* if (i) $U = \uparrow U$ and (ii) for any directed subset D for which $\bigvee D$ exists, $\bigvee D \in U$ implies $D \cap U \neq \emptyset$. All Scott open subsets of P form a topology, called the *Scott topology* on P and denoted by $\sigma(P)$. The space $\Sigma P = (P, \sigma(P))$ is called the *Scott space* of P . The upper sets of P form the (upper) *Alexandroff topology* $\alpha(P)$.

For a T_0 space X , the *specialization order* \leq_X on X is defined by $x \leq_X y$ iff $x \in \overline{\{y\}}$. In the following, when a T_0 space is considered as a poset, the order shall mean the specialization order provided a different one is specified. Let $\mathcal{O}(X)$ (resp., $\Gamma(X)$) be the set of all open subsets (resp., closed subsets) of space X . Define $\mathcal{S}_c(X) = \{\overline{\{x\}} : x \in X\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_c(X) = \{\overline{D} : D \in \mathcal{D}(X)\}$, where \overline{D} is the closure of set D . A space X is called a *d-space* (or *monotone convergence space*) if X (with the specialization order) is a dcpo and $\mathcal{O}(X) \subseteq \sigma(X)$ (cf. [19, 46]). For any dcpo P , ΣP is clearly a *d-space*. The category of all *d-spaces* and continuous mappings is denoted by \mathbf{Top}_d . For two spaces X and Y , we use the symbol $X \cong Y$ to denote that X and Y are homeomorphic.

Lemma 2.1. *Let X be a d-space. Then for any nonempty closed subset A of X , $A = \downarrow \max(A)$, and hence $\max(A) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. For $x \in A$, by Zorn's Lemma there is a maximal chain C_x in A with $x \in C_x$. Since X is a *d-space*, $c_x = \bigvee C_x$ exists and $c_x \in A$. By the maximality of C_x , we have $c_x \in \max(A)$ and $x \leq c_x$. Therefore, $A \subseteq \downarrow \max(A) \subseteq \downarrow A = A$, and hence $A = \downarrow \max(A)$. \square

Proposition 2.2. ([19]) *For any T_0 space X and *d-space* Y , the function space $\mathbf{Top}_0(X, Y)$ equipped with the pointwise convergence topology is a *d-space*.*

A nonempty subset A of a T_0 space X is called *irreducible* if for any $\{F_1, F_2\} \subseteq \Gamma(X)$, $A \subseteq F_1 \cup F_2$ implies $A \subseteq F_1$ or $A \subseteq F_2$. We denote by $\text{lrr}(X)$ (resp., $\text{lrr}_c(X)$) the set of all irreducible (resp., irreducible closed) subsets of X . Clearly, every subset of X that is directed under \leq_X is irreducible. A topological space Y is called *sober*, if for any $F \in \text{lrr}_c(Y)$, there is a unique point $a \in Y$ such that $F = \overline{\{a\}}$, the closure of $\{a\}$. The category of all sober spaces and continuous mappings is denoted by \mathbf{Sob} . Let $\text{OFilt}(\mathcal{O}(X)) = \sigma(\mathcal{O}(X)) \cap \text{Filt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$. The members of $\text{OFilt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$ are called open filters of X .

For any space X , let $\mathbf{K}(X)$ be the set of all nonempty compact subsets of X . The order on $\mathbf{K}(X)$ is usually taken as the reverse inclusion order.

For each $K \in \mathbf{K}(X)$, let $\Phi(K) = \{U \in \mathcal{O}(X) : K \subseteq U\}$. Then $\Phi(K) \in \text{OFilt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$ and $K = \bigcap \Phi(K)$. Obviously, $\Phi : \mathbf{K}(X) \rightarrow \text{OFilt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$, $K \mapsto \Phi(K)$, is an order embedding.

For a T_0 space X , $\mathcal{G} \subseteq 2^X$ and $W \subseteq X$, let $\diamond_{\mathcal{G}} W = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : G \cap W \neq \emptyset\}$ and $\square_{\mathcal{G}} W = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : G \subseteq W\}$. The symbols $\diamond_{\mathcal{G}} W$ and $\square_{\mathcal{G}} W$ will be simply written as $\diamond A$ and $\square A$ respectively if no ambiguity occur. The *lower Vietoris topology* on \mathcal{G} is the topology that has $\{\diamond U : U \in \mathcal{O}(X)\}$ as a subbase, and the resulting space is denoted by $P_H(\mathcal{G})$. If $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \text{lrr}(X)$, then $\{\diamond_{\mathcal{G}} U : U \in \mathcal{O}(X)\}$ is a topology on \mathcal{G} . The space $P_H(\Gamma(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\})$ is called the *Hoare power space* or *lower space* of X and is denoted by $P_H(X)$ for short (cf. [41]). Clearly, $P_H(X) = (\Gamma(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\}, v(\Gamma(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\}))$. So $P_H(X)$ is always sober (see [59, Corollary 4.10] or [51, Proposition 2.9]).

Remark 2.3. Let X be a T_0 space.

- (1) If $\mathcal{S}_c(X) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, then the specialization order on $P_H(\mathcal{G})$ is the set inclusion order, and the *canonical mapping* $\eta_X : X \rightarrow P_H(\mathcal{G})$, given by $\eta_X(x) = \overline{\{x\}}$, is an order and topological embedding (cf. [19, 22, 41]).
- (2) The space $X^s = P_H(\text{lrr}_c(X))$ with the canonical mapping $\eta_X : X \rightarrow X^s$ is the *sobrification* of X (cf. [19, 22]).

A subset A of a T_0 space X is called *saturated* if A equals the intersection of all open sets containing it (equivalently, A is an upper set with respect to the specialization order). We shall use $\mathbf{K}(X)$ to denote the set of all nonempty compact saturated subsets of X equipped with the *Smyth preorder*: for $K_1, K_2 \in \mathbf{K}(X)$, $K_1 \sqsubseteq K_2$ iff $K_2 \subseteq K_1$. For $U \in \mathcal{O}(X)$, let $\square U = \{K \in \mathbf{K}(X) : K \subseteq U\}$. The *upper Vietoris topology* on $\mathbf{K}(X)$ is the topology generated by $\{\square U : U \in \mathcal{O}(X)\}$ as a base, and the resulting space is called the *Smyth power space* or *upper space* of X and is denoted by $P_S(X)$ (cf. [23, 24, 41]).

For a nonempty subset C of a T_0 space X , it is easy to see that C is compact iff $\uparrow C \in \mathbf{K}(X)$. Furthermore, we have the following useful result (see, e.g., [11, pp. 2068]).

Lemma 2.4. *Let X be a T_0 space and $C \in \mathbf{K}(X)$. Then $C = \uparrow \min(C)$ and $\min(C)$ is compact.*

A space X is called *well-filtered* if it is T_0 , and for any open set U and any $\mathcal{K} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{K}(X))$, $\bigcap \mathcal{K} \subseteq U$ implies $K \subseteq U$ for some $K \in \mathcal{K}$. The category of all well-filtered spaces and continuous mappings is denoted by \mathbf{Top}_w .

Remark 2.5. Let X be a T_0 space. Then

- (1) the specialization order on $P_S(X)$ is the Smyth order, that is, $\leq_{P_S(X)} = \sqsubseteq$;
- (2) the *canonical mapping* $\xi_X : X \rightarrow P_S(X)$, $x \mapsto \uparrow x$, is an order and topological embedding (cf. [23, 24, 41]).

The Smyth power space construction defines a covariant functor. More precisely, we have the following.

Lemma 2.6. ([50]) *$P_S : \mathbf{Top}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}_0$ is a covariant functor, where for any $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathbf{Top}_0 , $P_S(f) : P_S(X) \rightarrow P_S(Y)$ is defined by $P_S(f)(K) = \uparrow f(K)$ for all $K \in \mathbf{K}(X)$.*

As in [13], a topological space X is *locally hypercompact* if for each $x \in X$ and each open neighborhood U of x , there is $\uparrow F \in \mathbf{Fin} X$ such that $x \in \text{int } \uparrow F \subseteq \uparrow F \subseteq U$. A space X is called a *C-space* if for each $x \in X$ and each open neighborhood U of x , there is $u \in X$ such that $x \in \text{int } \uparrow u \subseteq \uparrow u \subseteq U$. A set $K \subseteq X$ is called *supercompact* if for any family $\{U_i : i \in I\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$, $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} U_i$ implies $K \subseteq U$ for some $i \in I$. It is easy to see that the supercompact saturated sets of X are exactly the sets $\uparrow x$ with $x \in X$ (see [24, Fact 2.2]). It is well-known that X is a *C-space* iff $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is a *completely distributive* lattice (cf. [11]). A space X is called *core compact* if $(\mathcal{O}(X), \subseteq)$ is a *continuous lattice* (cf. [19]).

For a full subcategory \mathbf{K} of \mathbf{Top}_0 , the objects of \mathbf{K} will be called **K-spaces**. In [33], Keimel and Lawson proposed the following properties:

- (K₁) Homeomorphic copies of **K-spaces** are **K-spaces**.
- (K₂) All sober spaces are **K-spaces** or, equivalently, $\mathbf{Sob} \subseteq \mathbf{K}$.
- (K₃) In a sober space S , the intersection of any family of **K-subspaces** is a **K-space**.
- (K₄) Continuous maps $f : S \rightarrow T$ between sober spaces S and T are **K-continuous**, that is, for every **K-subspace** K of T , the inverse image $f^{-1}(K)$ is a **K-subspace** of S .

In what follows, **K** always refers to a full subcategory \mathbf{Top}_0 containing \mathbf{Sob} , that is, **K** has (K₂). **K** is said to be *closed with respect to homeomorphisms* if **K** has (K₁). We call **K** a *Keimel-Lawson category* if it satisfies (K₁)-(K₄).

3. Well-filtered spaces and sober spaces

It is well-known that every sober space is well-filtered (see [28]) and every well-filtered space is a *d-space* (cf. [47, 51]). The Scott space of every continuous dcpo is sober (see [19]). Furthermore, the Scott space of every quasicontinuous domain is sober (see [21]). Johnstone [31] constructed the first dcpo whose Scott space is non-sober. Soon after, Isbell [29] gave a complete lattice whose Scott space is non-sober. The general problem in this line is whether each object in a classic class of lattices has a sober Scott space.

In 1992, Heckmann [23] asked the following question:

Is every well-filtered dcpo sober in its Scott-topology?

The answer is negative. Kou [34] constructed the first dcpo whose Scott space is well-filtered but non-sober (see [30, 47, 60] for other different counterexamples).

In [47], Xi and Lawson proved a sufficient condition for a T_0 space to be well-filtered.

Theorem 3.1. ([47]) *Let X be a d -space with the property that $\downarrow(A \cap K)$ is closed for any $A \in \Gamma(X)$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}(X)$. Then X is well-filtered.*

Corollary 3.2. ([47]) *If a dcpo P is Lawson-compact (in particular, bounded-complete), then ΣP is well-filtered.*

It follows from Theorem 3.1 or Corollary 3.2 that Isbell's non-sober complete lattice is well-filtered. Note that Johnstone's dcpo is countable and Isbell's complete lattice is not countable. In 2019, in a talk [32] given in National Institute of Education, Singapore, Achim Jung posed the following problem which is still open.

Question 3.3. ([32]) *Is there a countable complete lattice that has a non-sober Scott topology?*

Isbell's non-sober complete lattice is not distributive. Thus in 1994, Jung also asked whether there is a distributive complete lattice whose Scott space is non-sober (see [1, Exercises 7.3.19-6] or [32]).

In [53], using Isbell's lattice, we give a positive answer to Jung's above problem.

Theorem 3.4. ([53]) *There is a spatial frame whose Scott space is non-sober.*

Note that the dual of a spatial frame need not be a frame. Thus a question naturally arising is the following.

Question 3.5. *Is there a complete lattice with enough co-primes (i.e., isomorphic to the lattice of all closed subsets of a topological space) that has a non-sober Scott topology?*

In [14], it is shown that for the complete Boolean algebra B of all regular open subsets of the reals line, the Scott space ΣB is not a topological join-semilattice (and hence the Scott topology $\sigma(B \times B)$ is properly larger than the product topology $\sigma(B) \times \sigma(B)$). It is natural to wonder whether ΣB is sober. Thus Ern  [15] asked the following.

Question 3.6. ([15]) *Let B be the complete Boolean algebra of all regular open subsets of the reals line. Is the Scott space ΣB sober?*

If the answer would be in the affirmative, we would have an example of a sober complete Scott space that fails to be a topological join-semilattice; if it would be in the negative, we would have a second, more natural example of a non-sober Scott space of a complete lattice (which is really a complete Boolean algebra).

Another such type of problem is the following.

Question 3.7. *Is there a complete Boolean algebra that has a non-sober Scott topology?*

One of the most important result on sober spaces is the Hofmann-Mislove Theorem (see [28, Theorem 2.16] or [19, Theorem II-1.20 and Theorem II-1.21]).

Theorem 3.8. (Hofmann-Mislove Theorem) *For a T_0 space X , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *X is a sober space.*
- (2) *For any $\mathcal{F} \in \text{OFilt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$, there is a $K \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ such that $\mathcal{F} = \Phi(K)$.*
- (3) *For any $\mathcal{F} \in \text{OFilt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$, $\mathcal{F} = \Phi(\bigcap \mathcal{F})$.*

By Hofmann-Mislove Theorem, $\Phi : \mathcal{K}(X) \longrightarrow \text{OFilt}(\mathcal{O}(X))$ is an order isomorphism if and only if X is sober.

For locally compact well-filtered spaces, we have the following well-known result (see, e.g., [19, 22, 34]).

Theorem 3.9. *For a T_0 space X , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) X is locally compact and sober.
- (2) X is locally compact and well-filtered.
- (3) X is core compact and sober.

In [30], Jia Xiaodong asks the following question.

Is every core compact and well-filtered space sober?

This problem was first solved by Lawson and Xi [35], and later answered by Xu, Shen, Xi and Zhao [51, 52] using a different method.

Theorem 3.10. ([35, 51, 52]) *Every core compact well-filtered space is sober.*

In addition, we have proved the following.

Theorem 3.11. ([52]) *Every first countable well-filtered T_0 space is sober.*

By Theorem 3.10, Theorem 3.9 can be strengthened to the following one.

Theorem 3.12. *For a T_0 space X , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) X is locally compact and sober.
- (2) X is locally compact and well-filtered.
- (3) X is core compact and sober.
- (4) X is core compact and well-filtered.

Jia [30] also asked the following question.

Question 3.13. ([30]) If L is a meet-continuous dcpo and ΣP is core compact, is ΣP sober?

The following related question arises naturally.

Question 3.14. If the Scott topology on a dcpo P is locally compact, is ΣL sober?

4. Scott sober dcpo and Scott well-filtered dcpo

In [9], the sober posets are defined and studied. A poset P is said to be *sober* if there exists a sober topology τ on P which is compatible with the original order of P (i.e., $\text{cl}_\tau\{x\} = \downarrow x$ for each $x \in P$).

In a similar manner, we introduce the well-filtered posets.

Definition 4.1. A poset P is said to be *well-filtered* if there exists a well-filtered topology τ on P which is compatible with the original order of P .

Clearly, sober posets are well-filtered and well-filtered posets are dcpo.

Example 4.2. (Johnstone's dcpo) Let $\mathbb{J} = \mathbb{N} \times (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})$ with ordering defined by $(j, k) \leq (m, n)$ iff $j = m$ and $k \leq n$, or $n = \infty$ and $k \leq m$ (see Figure 1).

\mathbb{J} is a well-known dcpo constructed by Johnstone in [31]. Now we show that \mathbb{J} is not well-filtered. Suppose, on the contrary, that there exists a well-filtered topology τ on \mathbb{J} which is compatible with the original order of \mathbb{J} . Clearly, $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\uparrow(1, n) \cap \uparrow(2, 1)) = \emptyset$, and $\uparrow(1, n) \cap \uparrow(2, 1) = \{(m, \infty) : n \leq m\}$ is a compact saturated subset in $\Sigma \mathbb{J}$, and hence a compact saturated subset in (\mathbb{J}, τ) since $\tau \subseteq \sigma(\mathbb{J})$. By the well-filteredness of (\mathbb{J}, τ) , $\uparrow(1, n_0) \cap \uparrow(2, 1) = \emptyset$ for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, a contradiction. Thus \mathbb{J} is not well-filtered. In particular, $\Sigma \mathbb{J}$ is not well-filtered (see [22, Exercise 8.3.9]).

It is still not known whether there is a well-filtered dcpo that is not sober. For Isblle's lattice L constructed in [29], ΣL is non-sober, and by Corollary 3.2, ΣL is well-filtered, and hence L is well-filtered. But we do not know whether L is sober.




Figure 1: Johnstone's dcpo \mathbb{J}

Question 4.3. Characterize the well-filtered dcpos.

In order to emphasize the Scott topology, we introduce the following notions.

Definition 4.4. Let P be a dcpo.

- (1) P is said to be *Scott sober* if ΣP is sober.
- (2) P is said to be *Scott well-filtered* if ΣP is well-filtered.

Regarding these, we have the following five problems.

Question 4.5. Find an order characterization for Scott well-filtered dcpos (cf. the first problem below [19, Exercise VII-1.14]).

Question 4.6. Let P, Q be Scott sober dcpos. Must the product $P \times Q$ be Scott sober?

Question 4.7. Let P, Q be well-filtered dcpos. Must the product $P \times Q$ be Scott well-filtered?

If P is a domain, then one can prove that for any sober dcpo Q , the product $P \times Q$ is sober. Thus it is natural to wonder which other dcpos also own this property.

Question 4.8. Characterize those Scott sober dcpos P for which the products $P \times Q$ is Scott sober for every Scott sober dcpo Q .

Question 4.9. Characterize those Scott well-filtered dcpos P for which the products $P \times Q$ is Scott well-filtered for every Scott well-filtered dcpo Q .

Another problem concerning the sober dcpos is the following one.

Question 4.10. Is there a topological property p which is weaker than the sobriety for general T_0 topological spaces but equivalent to the sobriety for Scott spaces of dcpos?

5. Rudin sets and well-filtered determined sets

Rudin's Lemma is a very useful tool in non-Hausdorff topology and plays a crucial role in domain theory (see [1, 12, 13, 19-24, 30, 41, 42, 49-53, 55]). Marry Ellen Rudin [40] proved her lemma by transfinite methods, using the Axiom of Choice. Heckman and Keimel [24] obtained the following topological variant of Rudin's Lemma.

Lemma 5.1. (Topological Rudin's Lemma) *Let X be a topological space and \mathcal{A} an irreducible subset of the Smyth power space $P_S(X)$. Then every closed set $C \subseteq X$ that meets all members of \mathcal{A} contains an minimal irreducible closed subset A that still meets all members of \mathcal{A} .*

Applying Lemma 5.1 to the Alexandroff topology on a poset P , one obtains the original Rudin's Lemma.

Corollary 5.2. (Rudin's Lemma) *Let P be a poset, C a nonempty lower subset of P and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbf{Fin} P$ a filtered family with $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \diamond C$. Then there exists a directed subset D of C such that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \diamond \downarrow D$.*

Definition 5.3. ([51]) A T_0 space X is called a *directed closure space*, *DC space* for short, if $\text{Irr}_c(X) = \mathcal{D}_c(X)$, that is, for each $A \in \text{Irr}_c(X)$, there exists a directed subset of X such that $A = \overline{D}$.

It is easy to verify that closed subspaces, retracts and products of DC spaces are again DC spaces (see [51]).

For a T_0 space X and $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbf{K}(X)$, let $M(\mathcal{K}) = \{A \in \Gamma(X) : K \cap A \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } K \in \mathcal{K}\}$ (that is, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \diamond A$) and $m(\mathcal{K}) = \{A \in \Gamma(X) : A \text{ is a minimal member of } M(\mathcal{K})\}$.

Based on the topological Rudin's Lemma, we introduce a new type of spaces — Rudin spaces (see [42, 51]).

Definition 5.4. Let X be a T_0 space and A a nonempty subset of X .

- (1) A is said to have the *Rudin property*, if there exists a filtered family $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbf{K}(X)$ such that $\overline{A} \in m(\mathcal{K})$ (that is, \overline{A} is a minimal closed set that intersects all members of \mathcal{K}). Let $\text{RD}(X) = \{A \in \Gamma(X) : A \text{ has Rudin property}\}$. The sets in $\text{RD}(X)$ will also be called *Rudin sets*.
- (2) X is called a *Rudin space*, *RD space* for short, if $\text{Irr}_c(X) = \text{RD}(X)$, that is, every irreducible closed set of X is a Rudin set.

The Rudin property is called the *compactly filtered property* in [42]. Here, in order to emphasize its root from (topological) Rudin's Lemma, we call such a property the Rudin property.

Now we define another type of spaces — **K**-determined spaces.

Definition 5.5. ([49]) Let **K** be a full category of \mathbf{Top}_0 containing **Sob** and X a T_0 space. A subset A of X is called a ***K**-determined set*, provided for any continuous mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to a **K**-space Y , there exists a unique $y_A \in Y$ such that $f(A) = \{y_A\}$. Denote by $\mathbf{K}(X)$ the set of all closed **K**-determined sets of X . The space X is said to be a ***K**-determined space*, if $\text{Irr}_c(X) = \mathbf{K}(X)$ or, equivalently, all irreducible closed sets of X are **K**-sets.

Clearly, a subset A of a space X is **K**-determined iff \overline{A} is a **K**-determined set. For simplicity, let $d(X) = \mathbf{Top}_d(X)$ and $\text{WD}(X) = \mathbf{Top}_w(X)$. The sets in $\text{WD}(X)$ are called *WD sets*. The space X is called a *well-filtered determined space*, shortly a *WD space*, if all irreducible closed subsets of X are WD sets, that is, $\text{Irr}_c(X) = \text{WD}(X)$ (see [49, 51]).

Lemma 5.6. ([49]) *Let **K** be a full category of \mathbf{Top}_0 containing **Sob** and X a T_0 space. Then $\mathcal{S}_c(X) \subseteq \mathbf{KD}(X) \subseteq \mathbf{Sob}(X) = \text{Irr}_c(X)$.*

Proposition 5.7. ([51]) *For any T_0 space X , $\mathcal{S}_c(X) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_c(X) \subseteq \text{RD}(X) \subseteq \text{WD}(X) \subseteq \text{Irr}_c(X)$.*

Corollary 5.8. ([51]) *$\text{Sober} \Rightarrow \text{DC} \Rightarrow \text{RD} \Rightarrow \text{WD}$.*

By Lemma 5.6, sober spaces are **K**-determined. By Proposition 5.7 we know that the class of Rudin spaces lie between the class of WD spaces and that of DC spaces. Also the class of DC spaces lie between the class of Rudin spaces and that of sober spaces.

In [36, Example 4.15], Liu, Li and Wu constructed a T_0 space X in which some well-filtered determined sets are not Rudin sets, and hence gave a negative answer to a question posed by Xu and Zhao in [55]: Does $\text{RD}(X) = \text{WD}(X)$ hold for every T_0 space X ? It is not difficult to check that the space X is a WD space but not a Rudin space. Therefore, Example 4.15 in [36] also gave a negative answer to another related question raised by Xu, Shen, Xi and Zhao in [51]: Is every well-filtered determined space a Rudin space?

Using Rudin sets and WD sets, we can give some new characterizations of well-filtered spaces and sober spaces.

Theorem 5.9. ([51]) *For a T_0 space X , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) X is well-filtered.
- (2) $\text{RD}(X) = \mathcal{S}_c(X)$.
- (3) $\text{WD}(X) = \mathcal{S}_c(X)$, that is, for each $A \in \text{WD}(X)$, there exists a unique $x \in X$ such that $A = \overline{\{x\}}$.

Theorem 5.10. ([51]) For a T_0 space X , the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) X is sober.
- (2) X is a DC d -space.
- (3) X is a well-filtered DC space.
- (4) X is a well-filtered Rudin space.
- (5) X is a well-filtered WD space.

Lemma 5.11. ([13]) Let X be a locally hypercompact T_0 space and $A \in \text{Irr}(X)$. Then there exists a directed subset $D \subseteq \downarrow A$ such that $\overline{A} = \overline{D}$.

Corollary 5.8 and Lemma 5.11 together imply the following.

Corollary 5.12. ([51]) If X is a locally hypercompact T_0 space, then it is a DC space. Therefore, it is a Rudin space and a WD space.

Theorem 5.13. ([51]) Every locally compact T_0 space is a Rudin space.

Similarly, we have the following result, which positively answers [55, Problem 4.2].

Theorem 5.14. ([51]) Every core compact T_0 space is well-filtered determined.

Figure 2 shows some relationships among some types of spaces.




Figure 2: Certain relations among some kinds of spaces

Question 5.15. Is every core compact T_0 space a Rudin space?

In [42], it is shown that the closed subspaces and retracts of Rudin spaces are again Rudin spaces.

Lemma 5.16. ([42]) Let $X = \prod_{i \in I} X_i$ be the product of a family $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ of T_0 spaces and $A \in \text{Irr}(X)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) A is a Rudin set.
- (2) $p_i(A)$ is a Rudin set for each $i \in I$.

Theorem 5.17. ([51]) Let $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ be a family of T_0 spaces. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:

- (1) The product space $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$ is a Rudin space.
- (2) For each $i \in I$, X_i is a Rudin space.

It is proved in [51] that closed subspaces and retracts of well-filtered determined spaces are again well-filtered determined spaces. But we do not know whether a saturated (especially, an open) subspace of a well-filtered determined space is still well-filtered determined.

Lemma 5.18. ([51]) Let $\{X_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ be a finite family of T_0 spaces and $X = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i$ the product space.

For $A \in \text{lrr}(X)$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) A is a WD set.
- (2) $p_i(A)$ is a WD set for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Corollary 5.19. ([51]) Let $X = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i$ be the product of a finite family $\{X_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ of T_0 spaces. If

$A \in \text{WD}(X)$, then $A = \prod_{i=1}^n p_i(X_i)$, and $p_i(A) \in \text{WD}(X_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Corollary 5.20. ([51]) Let $\{X_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ be a finite family of T_0 spaces. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:

- (1) The product space $\prod_{i=1}^n X_i$ is a well-filtered determined space.
- (2) For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, X_i is a well-filtered determined space.

Question 5.21. ([49]) Let \mathbf{K} be a full subcategory of \mathbf{Top}_0 containing **Sob** (in particular, a Keimel-Lawson category) and $X = \prod_{i \in I} X_i$ be the product space of a family $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ of T_0 spaces. If each $A_i \subseteq X_i$ ($i \in I$) is \mathbf{K} -determined, must the product set $\prod_{i \in I} A_i$ be \mathbf{K} -determined?

Question 5.22. ([49]) Let \mathbf{K} be a full category of \mathbf{Top}_0 containing **Sob** (in particular, a Keimel-Lawson category). Is the product space of an arbitrary family of \mathbf{K} -determined spaces \mathbf{K} -determined?

Question 5.23. ([51]) Let $X = \prod_{i \in I} X_i$ be the product space of a family $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ of T_0 spaces. If each $A_i \subseteq X_i$ ($i \in I$) is well-filtered determined, must the product set $\prod_{i \in I} A_i$ be well-filtered determined?

Question 5.24. ([51]) Is the product space of an arbitrary family of well-filtered determined spaces well-filtered determined?

6. Smyth power spaces

The Smyth power spaces are very important structures in domain theory, which play a fundamental role in modeling the semantics of non-deterministic programming languages (see [1, 19, 41]). There naturally arises a question of which topological properties are preserved by the Smyth power spaces.

It was proved by Schalk [41] that the Smyth power space $P_S(X)$ of a sober space X is sober (see also [24, Theorem 3.13]), and the upper Vietoris topology (that is, the topology of Smyth power space) agrees with the Scott topology on $K(X)$ if X is a locally compact sober space. Xi and Zhao [48] proved that a T_0 space X is well-filtered iff $P_S(X)$ is a d -space. Brecht and Kawai [5] pointed out that $P_S(X)$ is second-countable for a second-countable T_0 space X . Recently, we further proved that a T_0 space X is well-filtered iff $P_S(X)$ is well-filtered [53].

Theorem 6.1. (Heckmann-Keimel-Schalk Theorem) ([24, 41]) For a T_0 space X , the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) X is sober.
- (2) For any $\mathcal{A} \in \text{lrr}(P_S(X))$ and $U \in \mathcal{O}(X)$, $\bigcap \mathcal{K} \subseteq U$ implies $K \subseteq U$ for some $K \in \mathcal{A}$.

(3) $P_S(X)$ is sober.

For the well-filteredness of Smyth power space, we have the following similar result.

Theorem 6.2. ([51, 53]) *For a T_0 space, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) X is well-filtered.
- (2) $P_S(X)$ is a d -space.
- (3) $P_S(X)$ is well-filtered.

For the core compactness of Smyth power spaces, one has the following.

Theorem 6.3. ([38]) *For a T_0 space, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) X is locally compact.
- (2) $P_S(X)$ is a C -space.
- (3) $P_S(X)$ is locally compact.
- (4) $P_S(X)$ is core compact.

Hofmann and Lawson [27] (or [19, Exercise V-5.25]) constructed a second-countable core compact T_0 space X in which every compact subset has empty interior (and hence X is not locally compact), and hence by Theorem 6.3, the core compactness is not preserved by the Smyth power space functor.

Theorem 6.4. ([51]) *Let X be a T_0 space. If $P_S(X)$ is well-filtered determined, then X is well-filtered determined.*

Question 6.5. ([51]) *Is the Smyth power space $P_S(X)$ of a well-filtered determined T_0 space X well-filtered determined?*

Now we consider the following question: for a first-countable (resp., second-countable) space X , does its Smyth power space $P_S(X)$ be first-countable (resp., second-countable)?

First, we have the following result, which was indicated in the proof of [5, Proposition 6].

Theorem 6.6. ([5]) *For a T_0 space, the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) X is second-countable.
- (2) $P_S(X)$ is second-countable.

Theorem 6.7. ([5]) *If X is a second-countable sober space, then the upper Vietoris topology and the Scott topology on $K(X)$ coincide.*

Theorem 6.8. ([54]) *Let X be a first-countable T_0 space. If $\min(K)$ is countable for any $K \in K(X)$, then $P_S(X)$ is first-countable.*

For the Alexandroff double circle Y (see [10, Example 3.1.26]), which is Hausdorff and first-countable, it is shown in [54] that its Smyth power space $P_S(Y)$ is not first-countable.

For a general T_0 space X , Schalk [41] proved the following.

Proposition 6.9. ([41]) *If X is a locally compact sober space, then the upper Vietoris topology and the Scott topology on $K(X)$ coincide.*

By Theorem 3.10 and Proposition 6.9, we have the following conclusion.

Corollary 6.10. *If X is a core compact well-filtered space, then the upper Vietoris topology and the Scott topology on $K(X)$ coincide.*

Theorem 6.11. ([54]) *If X is a well-filtered space and $P_S(X)$ is first-countable, then the upper Vietoris topology agrees with and the Scott topology on $K(X)$.*

By Theorem 6.8 and Theorem 6.11, we get the following.

Corollary 6.12. ([54]) *If X is a well-filtered space and $\min(K)$ is countable for any $K \in \mathbf{K}(X)$, then the upper Vietoris topology agrees with and the Scott topology on $\mathbf{K}(X)$.*

So naturally one asks the following question.

Question 6.13. ([54]) *For a first-countable well-filtered space X , does the upper Vietoris topology and the Scott topology on $\mathbf{K}(X)$ coincide?*

A topological space X is said to be *consonant* if for every $\mathcal{F} \in \sigma(\mathcal{O}(X))$, there is a family $\{K_i : i \in I\} \subseteq \mathbf{K}(X)$ with $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{A}} \Phi(K)$ (see, e.g., [3, 7, 8, 22, 39]). The consonance is an important topological property (see [2, 3, 4, 8, 39]). In [8] it is proved that every C  ch-complete space — hence, in particular, every completely metrizable space — is consonant. Bouziad [4] (see also [7]) showed that the space of rationals with the subspace topology inherited from the reals is not consonant. It was shown in [6] that quasi-Polish spaces are consonant, and it is known that a separable co-analytic metrizable space is consonant if and only if it is Polish (see [3]). Recently, in [38] it is shown that a T_0 space X is locally compact iff X is core compact and consonant.

For a sober space X , by the Hoffmann-Mislove Theorem (Theorem 3.8), we know that X is consonant iff the Scott topology on $\mathcal{O}(X)$ has a basis consisting of Scott-open filters.

Theorem 6.14. ([22]) *For a T_0 space X , the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) X is consonant.
- (2) The compact open topology coincides with Isbell topology on $\mathbf{Top}_o(X, S)$, where $S = \Sigma 2$ is the Sierpinski space.
- (3) The compact open topology coincides with Isbell topology on $\mathbf{Top}_o(X, Y)$ for every T_0 space Y .

Recently, Brecht [5] proved that for a T_0 space X , the consonance of X is equivalent to the commutativity of the upper and lower power spaces in the sense that $P_H(P_S(X)) \cong P_S(P_H(X))$ under a naturally defined homeomorphism.

In [5] Brecht and Kawai posed the following two questions.

Question 6.15. ([5]) *For a consonant T_0 space X , is $P_S(X)$ also consonant?*

Question 6.16. ([5]) *For a consonant T_0 space X , is $P_H(X)$ also consonant?*

In [38], Lyu and Jia gave a partial answer to Question 6.15.

Proposition 6.17. ([38]) *If a T_0 space X is consonant and $\Sigma\mathcal{O}(X)$ is first-countable, then $P_S(X)$ is consonant.*

7. d -reflections and well-filtered reflections of T_0 spaces

Definition 7.1. ([33, 49]) Let \mathbf{K} be a full subcategory of \mathbf{Top}_0 containing **Sob** and X a T_0 space. A \mathbf{K} -reflection of X is a pair $\langle \tilde{X}, \mu \rangle$ consisting of a \mathbf{K} -space \tilde{X} and a continuous mapping $\mu : X \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ satisfying that for any continuous mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to a \mathbf{K} -space, there exists a unique continuous mapping $f^* : \tilde{X} \rightarrow Y$ such that $f^* \circ \mu = f$, that is, the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\mu} & \tilde{X} \\ & \searrow f & \downarrow f^* \\ & & Y \end{array}$$

By a standard argument, \mathbf{K} -reflections, if they exist, are unique up to homeomorphism. We shall use X^k to denote the space of the \mathbf{K} -reflection of X if it exists. The space of **Sob**-reflection of X is the sobrification X^s of X . The space of \mathbf{Top}_d -reflection (resp., \mathbf{Top}_w -reflection) of X is denoted by X^d (resp., X^w).

It is well-known that **Sob** is reflective in \mathbf{Top}_0 (see [19, 22]). Using d -closures, Wyler [46] proved that \mathbf{Top}_d is reflective in \mathbf{Top}_0 . Later, Ershov [16] showed that the d -completion (i.e., the d -reflection) of X can be obtained by adding the closure of directed sets onto X (and then repeating this process by transfinite induction). A more direct way to d -completions of T_0 spaces was given in [56]. In [33], using Wyler's method, Keimel and Lawson proved that for a full subcategory \mathbf{K} of \mathbf{Top}_0 containing **Sob**, if \mathbf{K} has certain properties, then \mathbf{K} is reflective in \mathbf{Top}_0 . They showed that \mathbf{Top}_d and some other categories have such properties.

For quite a long time, it is not known whether \mathbf{Top}_w is reflective in \mathbf{Top}_0 . Recently, following Keimel and Lawson's method, this problem is answered positively in [45]. Following Ershov's method, a more constructive well-filtered reflectors of T_0 spaces are presented in [42]. In [36], following closely to Ershov's method in [17], another way to construct a well-filterification of a T_0 space is given. In [49], for a full subcategory \mathbf{K} of \mathbf{Top}_0 containing **Sob**, the first author has provided a direct approach to \mathbf{K} -reflections of T_0 spaces.

Theorem 7.2. ([49]) *Let \mathbf{K} be a full subcategory of \mathbf{Top}_0 containing **Sob** and Let X a T_0 space. If $P_H(\mathbf{K}(X))$ is a \mathbf{K} -space, then the pair $\langle X^k = P_H(\mathbf{K}(X)), \eta_X^k \rangle$, where $\eta_X^k : X \rightarrow X^k$, $x \mapsto \{x\}$, is the \mathbf{K} -reflection of X .*

Definition 7.3. ([49]) Let \mathbf{K} be a full subcategory of \mathbf{Top}_0 containing **Sob**. \mathbf{K} is called *adequate* if for any T_0 space X , $P_H(\mathbf{K}(X))$ is a \mathbf{K} -space.

Corollary 7.4. ([49]) *If \mathbf{K} is adequate, then \mathbf{K} is reflective in \mathbf{Top}_0 .*

Theorem 7.5. ([49]) *Every Keimel-Lawson category is adequate, and hence reflective in \mathbf{Top}_0 .*

Theorem 7.6. ([49]) *For $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{Sob}, \mathbf{Top}_d, \mathbf{Top}_w\}$, \mathbf{K} is adequate, and hence reflective in \mathbf{Top}_0 .*

Theorem 7.7. ([49]) *Suppose that \mathbf{K} is adequate and closed with respect to homeomorphisms. Then for any family $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ of T_0 spaces, the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The product space $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$ is a \mathbf{K} -space.*
- (2) *For each $i \in I$, X_i is a \mathbf{K} -space.*

Corollary 7.8. ([42, 51, 53]) *For any family $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ of T_0 spaces, the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The product space $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$ is well-filtered.*
- (2) *For each $i \in I$, X_i is well-filtered.*

Theorem 7.9. ([25, 26]) *For any family $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ of T_0 spaces, $(\prod_{i \in I} X_i)^s = \prod_{i \in I} X_i^s$ (up to homeomorphism).*

Theorem 7.10. ([49]) *For an adequate \mathbf{K} and a finite family $\{X_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ of T_0 spaces, $(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i)^k = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^k$ (up to homeomorphism).*

Corollary 7.11. ([49]) *For a Keimel-Lawson category \mathbf{K} and a finite family $\{X_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ of T_0 spaces, $(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i)^k = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^k$ (up to homeomorphism).*

Corollary 7.12. ([33, 49]) *For a finite family $\{X_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ of T_0 spaces, $(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i)^d = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^d$ (up to homeomorphism).*

Corollary 7.13. ([42, 49, 51]) For a finite family $\{X_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ of T_0 spaces, $(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i)^w = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^w$ (up to homeomorphism).

Question 7.14. ([49]) Suppose that \mathbf{K} is adequate and closed with respect to homeomorphisms. Does the \mathbf{K} -reflection functor preserves arbitrary products of T_0 spaces? Or equivalently, $(\prod_{i \in I} X_i)^k = \prod_{i \in I} X_i^k$ (up to homeomorphism) hold for any family $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ of T_0 spaces?

Question 7.15. ([49]) Let \mathbf{K} be a Keimel-Lawson category. Does the \mathbf{K} -reflection functor preserves arbitrary products of T_0 spaces? Or equivalently, $(\prod_{i \in I} X_i)^k = \prod_{i \in I} X_i^k$ (up to homeomorphism) hold for any family $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ of T_0 spaces?

Question 7.16. ([49]) Does the d -reflection functor preserves arbitrary products of T_0 spaces? Or equivalently, does $(\prod_{i \in I} X_i)^d = \prod_{i \in I} X_i^d$ (up to homeomorphism) hold for any family $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ of T_0 spaces?

Question 7.17. ([51]) Does the well-filtered reflection functor preserves arbitrary products of T_0 spaces? Or equivalently, does $(\prod_{i \in I} X_i)^w = \prod_{i \in I} X_i^w$ (up to homeomorphism) hold for any family $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ of T_0 spaces?

Definition 7.18. ([49]) \mathbf{K} is said to be a *Smyth category*, if for any \mathbf{K} -space X , the Smyth power space $P_S(X)$ is a \mathbf{K} -space.

By Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 6.2, \mathbf{Sob} and \mathbf{Top}_w are Smyth categories. Let X be any d -space but not well-filtered (see Example 4.2). Then by Theorem 6.2, $P_S(X)$ is not a d -space. So \mathbf{Top}_d is not a Smyth category.

Theorem 7.19. ([49]) Let \mathbf{K} be an adequate Smyth category and X a T_0 space. If $P_S(X)$ is \mathbf{K} -determined, then X is \mathbf{K} -determined.

Question 7.20. ([49]) Let \mathbf{K} be an adequate Smyth category. Is the Smyth power space $P_S(X)$ of a \mathbf{K} -determined T_0 space X again \mathbf{K} -determined?

In [58], Zhao and Fan introduced *bounded sobriety*, a weak notion of sobriety, and showed that every T_0 space has a bounded sobrification. Equivalently, \mathbf{BSob} , the category of all bounded sober spaces with continuous mappings, is reflective in \mathbf{Top}_0 . By the way, using the method of [49], one can directly verify that \mathbf{BSob} is adequate and hence reflective in \mathbf{Top}_0 . In [59], Zhao and Ho introduced another weaker notion of sobriety — the *k-bounded sobriety*. A space X is called *k-bounded sober* if for any nonempty irreducible closed set F whose supremum exists, there is a unique point $x \in X$ such that $F = \text{cl}\{x\}$. Zhao and Ho [59] raised a question whether $\text{KB}(X)$, the set of all irreducible closed sets of a T_0 space X whose suprema exist, is the canonical *k-bounded sobrification* of X in the sense of Keimel and Lawson, with respect to the mapping $x \mapsto \text{cl}\{x\}$.

Recently, Zhao Bin, Lu Jing and Wang Kaiyun [57] gave a negative answer to Zhao and Ho's problem. Furthermore, it is proved in [37] that, unlike \mathbf{Sob} and \mathbf{BSob} , the category \mathbf{KBSob} of all *k-bounded sober* spaces with continuous mappings is not reflective in \mathbf{Top}_0 . Using the counterexample in [37], one can directly verify that \mathbf{KBSob} is not adequate (cf. [49, Conclusion section]). Also it is noted that the *k-sobriety* is not preserved by the Smyth power space functor (see [37, Theorem 4.1]).

Let \mathbf{Top}_k be the category of all T_0 spaces with continuous mappings preserving all existing irreducible suprema. Note that every continuous mapping between *k-bounded sober* spaces preserves all existing irreducible suprema (see [59, Theorem 4.5 and Lemma 5.3]). In [37] the following question is stated.

Question 7.21. ([37]) Is \mathbf{KBSob} reflective in \mathbf{Top}_k ?

8. Strong d -spaces

In order to uncover more finer links between d -spaces and well-filtered spaces, the notion of strong d -spaces has been introduced in [55].

Definition 8.1. A T_0 space X is called a strong d -space if for any $D \in \mathcal{D}(X)$, $x \in X$ and $U \in \mathcal{O}(X)$, $\bigcap_{d \in D} \uparrow d \cap \uparrow x \subseteq U$ implies $\uparrow d \cap \uparrow x \subseteq U$ for some $d \in D$. The category of all strong d -spaces with continuous mappings is denoted by **S-Top** $_d$.

Figure 3 shows some relationships among classes of spaces lying between d -spaces and T_2 spaces (see [55]).




Figure 3: Relations of some spaces lying between d -spaces and T_2 spaces

The following two examples were given in [55] (see also [42, 51]).

Example 8.2. Let X be a countably infinite set and X_{cof} the space of X equipped with the *co-finite topology* (the empty set and the complements of finite subsets of X are open). Then X_{cof} is T_1 and hence a strong d -space, but it is not well-filtered.

Example 8.3. Let X be an uncountably infinite set and X_{coc} the space equipped with *the co-countable topology* (the empty set and the complements of countable subsets of X are open). Then X_{coc} is a well-filtered T_1 space and hence a strong d -space, but it not sober.

The following example shows that even for a continuous dcpo P with ΣP coherent, ΣP may not be a strong d -space.

Example 8.4. ([55]) Let $C = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n, \dots\} \cup \{\omega_0\}$ and $P = C \cup \{b\} \cup \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n, \dots\}$ with the order (see Figure 4) generated by

- (a) $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_n < a_{n+1} < \dots$;
- (b) $a_n < \omega_0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (c) $b < \omega_n$ and $a_m < \omega_n$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \leq n$.

Then $x \ll x$ for all $x \in P \setminus \{\omega_0\}$. Therefore, P is a continuous dcpo, and hence ΣP is sober. Clearly, $\uparrow a_1, \uparrow b \in \mathbf{K}(\Sigma)$, but $\uparrow a_1 \cap \uparrow b = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n, \dots\}$ is not Scott compact (note $\{\omega_n\} \in \sigma(P)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$). Thus ΣP is not coherent. Clearly, $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \uparrow a_n \cap \uparrow b = \emptyset$, but $\uparrow a_n \cap \uparrow b = \{\omega_n, \omega_{n+1}, \dots\} \neq \emptyset$, and consequently, neither $(P, v(P))$ nor ΣP is a strong d -space.

Proposition 8.5. ([55]) *If X is a d -space and $\downarrow(\uparrow x \cap A) \in \Gamma(X)$ for all $x \in X$ and $A \in \Gamma(X)$, then X is a strong d -space.*

Lemma 8.6. ([55]) *For a poset P and $A \in \Gamma(\Sigma P)$, the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\downarrow(\uparrow x \cap A) \in \Gamma(\Sigma P)$ for all $x \in P$.
- (2) $\downarrow(K \cap A) = \bigcup_{k \in K} \downarrow(\uparrow k \cap A) \in \Gamma(\Sigma P)$ for all $K \in \mathbf{K}(\Sigma P)$.




Figure 4: The Poset P

Lemma 8.7. ([55]) *For a poset P , the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) ΣP is a strong d -space.
- (2) P is a dcpo, and for any $A \in \Gamma(\Sigma P)$ and $x \in P$, $\downarrow(\uparrow x \cap A) \in \Gamma(\Sigma P)$.

Theorem 3.1, Lemma 8.6 and Lemma 8.7 together imply the following.

Corollary 8.8. *For a poset P , if ΣP is a strong d -space, then it is well-filtered.*

It is easy to verify that if A is a saturated subspace or a closed subspace of a strong d -space X , then A is again a strong d -space.

Proposition 8.9. *A retract of a strong d -space is a strong d -space.*

Proof. It is well-known that a retract of a T_0 space is T_0 (cf. [10]). Assume that X is a strong d -space and Y a retract of X . Then there are continuous mappings $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \rightarrow X$ with $f \circ g = \text{id}_Y$. For any $D \in \mathcal{D}(Y)$, $y \in Y$ and $V \in \mathcal{O}(Y)$, if $\bigcap_{d \in D} \uparrow d \cap \uparrow y \subseteq V$, then $\bigcap_{d \in D} \uparrow g(d) \cap \uparrow g(y) \subseteq f^{-1}(V)$ and $\{g(d) : d \in D\} \in \mathcal{D}(X)$. Since X is a strong d -space, there is $d \in D$ such that $\uparrow g(d) \cap \uparrow g(y) \subseteq f^{-1}(V)$, and hence $\uparrow d \cap \uparrow y = \uparrow f(\uparrow g(d) \cap \uparrow g(y)) \subseteq \uparrow f(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq V$. Thus Y is a strong d -space. \square

Let $\{X_i : i \in I\}$ be a family of T_0 spaces. Then for each $j \in I$, X_j is a retract of the product space $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$. So if $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$ is a strong d -space, then by Proposition 8.9, any factor space X_j ($j \in I$) is a strong d -space.

Concerning the other properties of strong d -spaces, we have the following three questions.

Question 8.10. Is the product space of an arbitrary family of strong d -spaces again a strong d -space?

Question 8.11. Let X be a T_0 space and Y a strong d -space. Is the function space $\mathbf{Top}_0(X, Y)$ equipped with the pointwise convergence topology a strong d -space? (cf. Proposition 2.2)

Question 8.12. Is $\mathbf{S-Top}_d$ reflective in \mathbf{Top}_0 ?

9. Co-sober spaces

In [18], the concepts of k -irreducible sets and *co-spaces* were introduced, and for a co-sober space, the alternative conditions for the dual Hofmann-Mislove Theorem were given (see [18, Theorem 8.10]).

Definition 9.1. ([18]) Let X be a T_0 space and $G \in \mathbf{K}(X)$.

- (1) G is called *k-irreducible* if it cannot be written as the union of two proper compact saturated subsets, or equivalently if $G = K_1 \cup K_2$ for $K_1, K_2 \in \mathbf{K}(X)$ implies $G = K_1$ or $G = K_2$. The set of all *k-irreducible* compact saturated sets of X is denoted by $\mathbf{K}\text{-lrr}(X)$.
- (2) X is called *co-sober* if for any $K \in \mathbf{K}\text{-lrr}(X)$, there is a (unique) point $k \in X$ such that $K = \uparrow k$. The category of all co-sober spaces with continuous mappings is denoted by **Co-Sob**.

For co-sober spaces, Escardó, Lawson and Simpson [18, Problem 9.7] asked whether every sober space is co-sober. In [43], Wen and the first author answered this problem in the negative by constructing a counterexample, and proved that saturated subspaces and closed subspaces of a co-sober space are co-sober.

Theorem 9.2. ([43]) *Let (X, τ) be a co-sober space and $c : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \tau)$ a continuous mapping. If $c : X \rightarrow X$ is a closure operator with respect to the specialization order of X , that is, $x \in \text{cl}\{c(x)\}$ and $c(c(x)) = c(x)$ for any $x \in X$. Then the subspace $(c(X), \tau|_{c(X)})$ is a co-sober space.*

Theorem 9.3. ([43]) *Let X be a T_0 space. If the Smyth power space $P_S(X)$ is co-sober, then X is co-sober.*

Question 9.4. ([43]) Is the Smyth power space $P_S(X)$ of a co-sober space X again co-sober?

The following are more questions on co-sober spaces.

Question 9.5. Let (X, τ) be a co-sober space and $k : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \tau)$ a continuous mapping for which $k : X \rightarrow X$ is a kernel operator with respect to the specialization order of X , that is, $k(x) \in \text{cl}\{x\}$ and $k(k(x)) = k(x)$ for any $x \in X$. Is the subspace $(k(X), \tau|_{k(X)})$ co-sober?

Question 9.6. Is a retract of a co-sober space co-sober?

Question 9.7. Is the product space of a family of co-sober spaces co-sober?

Question 9.8. Is **Co-Sob** reflective in **Top**₀?

References

References

- [1] S. Abramsky and A. Jung, Domain theory, in: S. Abramsky, D. Gabbay, and T. Maibaum (eds.), *Semantic Structures*, volume 3 of *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science*, Clarendon Press, 1994, pp. 1-168.
- [2] B. Alleche and J. Calbrix, On the coincidence of the upper Kuratowski topology with the cocompact topology, *Topol. Appl.* 93 (1999) 207-218.
- [3] A. Bouziad, Consonance and topological completeness in analytic spaces, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 127 (1999) 3733-3737.
- [4] A. Bouziad, Borel measures in consonant spaces, *Topol. Appl.* 70 (1996) 125-138.
- [5] M. Brecht and T. Kawai, On the commutativity of the powerspace constructions, *Logic Methods in Comput. Sci.* 15(3) (2019) 13:1-13:25.
- [6] M. Brecht, M. Schröder and V. Selivanov, Base-complexity classification of *qcb*₀-spaces, *Computability* 5 (1) (2016) 75-102.
- [7] C. Constantini and S. Watson, On the dissonance of some metrizable spaces, *Topol. Appl.* 84 (1998) 259-268.
- [8] S. Dolecki, G. Greco and A. Lechicki, When do the upper Kuratowski topology (homeomorphically, Scott topology) and the co-compact topology coincide? *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 347 (1995) 2869-2884.
- [9] O. Echi and S. Lazaar, Sober spaces and sober Sets, *Missouri J. Math. Sci.* 20 (1) (2008) 60-72.
- [10] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, Polish Scientific Publishers, Warszawa, 1989.
- [11] M. Ern , Infinite distributive laws versus local connectedness and compactness properties, *Topol. Appl.* 156 (2009) 2054-2069.
- [12] M. Ern , The strength of prime separation, sobriety, and compactness theorems, *Topol. Appl.* 241 (2018) 263-290.
- [13] M. Ern , Categories of locally hypercompact spaces and quasicontinuous posets, *Applied Categorical Structures*. 26 (2018) 823-854.
- [14] M. Ern  and H. Gatzke, Convergence and continuity in partially ordered sets and semilattices, in: R. Hoffmann and K. Hofmann (eds.), *Continuous Lattices and Their Applications*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. 101, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1985, pp. 9-40.
- [15] M. Ern , S. Luo and X. Xu, Coreflective constructs of topological spaces determined by net systems or subset systems (preprint).
- [16] Y. Ershov, On *d*-spaces, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 224 (1999) 59-72.
- [17] Y. Ershov, The *d*-rank of a topological space, *Algebra and Logic* 56 (2017) 98-107.

- [18] M. Escardó, J. Lawson and A. Simpson, Comparing Cartesian closed categories of (core) compactly generated spaces, *Topol. Appl.* 143(2004) 105-145.
- [19] G. Gierz, K. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J. Lawson, M. Mislove and D. Scott, Continuous Lattices and Domains, *Encycl. Math. Appl.*, vol. 93, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [20] G. Gierz and J. Lawson, Generalized continuous and hypercontinuous lattices, *Rocky Mt. J. Math.* 11 (1981) 271-296.
- [21] G. Gierz, J. Lawson and A. Stralka, Quasicontinuous posets, *Houst. J. Math.* 9 (1983) 191-208.
- [22] J. Goubault-Larrecq, *Non-Hausdorff Topology and Domain Theory*, New Mathematical Monographs, vol. 22, Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [23] R. Heckmann, An upper power domain construction in terms of strongly compact sets, in: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 598, Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1992, pp. 272-293.
- [24] R. Heckmann and K. Keimel, Quasicontinuous domains and the Smyth powerdomain, *Electronic Notes in Theor. Comp. Sci.* 298 (2013) 215-232.
- [25] R. Hoffmann, On the sobrification remainder ${}^S X - X$, *Pacific Journal of Math.* 83 (1979) 145-156.
- [26] R. Hoffmann, Sobrification of partially ordered sets, *Semigroup Forum* 17 (1979) 123-138.
- [27] K. Hofmann and J. Lawson, The spectral theory of distributive continuous lattices, *Trans. of the Amer. Math. Soc.* 246 (1978) 285-310.
- [28] K. Hofmann and M. Mislove, Local compactness and continuous lattices, in: *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 871, 1981, pp. 125-158.
- [29] J. Isbell, Completion of a construction of Johnstone, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soci.* 85 (1982) 333-334.
- [30] X. Jia, *Meet-Continuity and Locally Compact Sober Dcpo*, PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2018.
- [31] P. Johnstone, Scott is not always sober, in: *Continuous Lattices*, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, vol. 871, Springer-Verlag, 1981, pp. 282-283.
- [32] A. Jung, Four dcpo, a theorem, and an open problem (preprint).
- [33] K. Keimel and J. Lawson, D -completions and the d -topology, *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.* 159 (3) (2009) 292-306.
- [34] H. Kou, U_k -admitting dcpo need not be sober, in: *Domains and Processes, Semantic Structure on Domain Theory*, vol. 1, Kluwer, 2001, pp. 41-50.
- [35] J. Lawson, G. Wu and X. Xi, Well-filtered spaces, compactness, and the lower topology. *Houston J. Math.*, to appear.
- [36] B. Liu, Q. Li, G. Wu, Well-filterifications of topological spaces, *Topol. Appl.* (2020), to appear.
- [37] J. Lu, K. Wang, G. Wu and B. Zhao, Nonexistence of k -bounded sobrification (preprint).
- [38] Z. Lyua and X. Jia, Core-compactness of Smyth powerspaces, *Topol. Appl.* (2020), to appear, arXiv:1907.04715.
- [39] T. Nogura and D. Shakhmatov, When does the Fell topology on a hyperspace of closed sets coincide with the meet of the upper Kuratowski and the lower Vietoris topologies? *Topol. Appl.* 70 (1996) 213-243.
- [40] M. Rudin, Directed sets which converge, in: *General Topology and Modern Analysis*, University of California, Riverside, 1980, Academic Press, 1981, pp. 305-307.
- [41] A. Schalk, *Algebras for Generalized Power Constructions*, PhD Thesis, Technische Hochschule Darmstadt, 1993.
- [42] C. Shen, X. Xi, X. Xu and D. Zhao, On well-filtered reflections of T_0 spaces, *Topol. Appl.* 267 (2019) 106869.
- [43] X. Wen and X. Xu, Sober is not always co-sober, *Topol. Appl.* 250 (2018) 48-52.
- [44] J. Wright, E. Wagner and J. Thatcher, A uniform approach to inductive posets and inductive closure, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 7(1) (1978) 57-77.
- [45] G. Wu, X. Xi, X. Xu and D. Zhao, Existence of well-filterification, *Topol. Appl.* 267 (2019) 107044.
- [46] U. Wyler, Dedekind complete posets and Scott topologies, in: *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 871, 1981, pp. 384-389.
- [47] X. Xi and J. Lawson, On well-filtered spaces and ordered sets, *Topol. Appl.* 228 (2017) 139-144.
- [48] X. Xi and D. Zhao, Well-filtered spaces and their dcpo models, *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.* 27 (2017) 507-515.
- [49] X. Xu, A direct approach to K-reflections of T_0 spaces, *Topol. Appl.* 272 (2020) 107076.
- [50] X. Xu, On H-sober spaces and H-sobrifications of T_0 spaces, *Topol. Appl.* (2020), submitted for publication, arXiv:2003.07737.
- [51] X. Xu, C. Shen, X. Xi and D. Zhao, On T_0 spaces determined by well-filtered spaces, *Topol. Appl.* (2020), submitted for publication, arXiv:1903.09303.
- [52] X. Xu, C. Shen, X. Xi and D. Zhao, First countability, ω -well-filtered spaces and reflections, *Topol. Appl.*, to appear.
- [53] X. Xu, X. Xi and D. Zhao, A complete Heyting algebra whose Scott topology is not sober, *Fund. Math.*, to appear.
- [54] X. Xu and Z. Yang, Coincidence of the upper Vietoris topology and the Scott topology, *Topol. Appl.* (2020), submitted for publication, arXiv:2003.06542.
- [55] X. Xu and D. Zhao, On topological Rudins lemma, well-filtered spaces and sober spaces, *Topol. Appl.* 272 (2020) 107080.
- [56] Z. Zhang and Q. Li, A direct characterization of the monotone convergence space completion. *Topol. Appl.* 230 (2017) 99-104.
- [57] B. Zhao, J. Lu and K. Wang, The answer to a problem posed by Zhao and Ho, *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)* 35 (3) (2019) 438-444.
- [58] D. Zhao and T. Fan, Dcpo-completion of posets, *Theor. Comp. Sci.* 411 (2010) 2167-2173.
- [59] D. Zhao and W. Ho, On topologies defined by irreducible sets, *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.* 84(1) (2015) 185-195.
- [60] D. Zhao, X. Xi and Y. Chen, A new dcpo whose Scott topology is well-filtered but not sober. *Topol. Appl.* 252(2019), 97-02.