

CCS-normal spaces

Sagarmoy Bag, Ram Chandra Manna, and Asit Baran Raha

ABSTRACT. A space X is called *CCS-normal* space if there exist a normal space Y and a bijection $f : X \mapsto Y$ such that $f|_C : C \mapsto f(C)$ is homeomorphism for any cellular-compact subset C of X . We discuss about the relations between C -normal, CC -normal, Ps -normal spaces with CCS -normal.

1. Introduction

A topological space X is called cellular-compact space if for any disjoint family \mathcal{U} of non-empty open subsets of X , there exists a compact subset K of X such that $K \cap U \neq \emptyset$, for any $U \in \mathcal{U}$. The notion of the cellular-compact space was first introduced in [7].

A space X is called *CCS-normal* (resp. C -normal, CC -normal, Ps -normal) space if there exist a normal space Y and a bijection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f|_C : C \rightarrow f(C)$ is a homeomorphism for any cellular-compact (resp. compact, countably compact, pseudocompact) subspace of X . The notion of C -normality is defined in [2]. The authors of [2] mentioned that C -normality was first introduced by Arhangel'skii while presenting a talk in a seminar held at Mathematics Department, King Abdulaziz University at Jeddah, Saudi Arabia in 2012. CC -normal spaces and Ps -spaces are initiated in [5] and [3] respectively. CCS -normal is a generalization of normal space. Every Ps -normal space is CCS -normal and every CCS -normal space is C -normal. We give an example of a C -normal space which is not CCS -normal [Example 2.8]. Also we give an example of a space which is CCS -normal but not Ps -normal [Example 2.9]. Finally we conclude this article by raising some open problems related to CCS -normal spaces.

2. *CCS-normal spaces*

DEFINITION 2.1. A space X is called *CCS-normal* if there exist a normal space Y and a bijection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f|_C : C \rightarrow f(C)$ is a homeomorphism for every cellular-compact subset C of X .

THEOREM 2.2. *Every CCS-normal space is a C-normal space.*

PROOF. Let X be a CCS -normal space. Then there exist a normal space Y and a bijection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f|_C : C \rightarrow f(C)$ is a homeomorphism for every cellular-compact subset C of X . Let C be a compact subset of X . Then C is cellular-compact. Hence $f|_C : C \rightarrow f(C)$ is a homeomorphism. Therefore X is a C -normal space. \square

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 54C40; Secondary 46E25.

The second author thanks to Government of West Bengal, India, for financial support.

In Proposition 3.1,[7], the authors proved that every Tychonoff Cellular-Compact space is pseudocompact. But we prove that the result holds anyway. We do not need Tychonoffness property.

THEOREM 2.3. *Any cellular-compact space is pseudocompact.*

PROOF. Let X be a Cellular-Compact space. Let \mathcal{U} be an infinite family of non-empty disjoint open sets. There exists a compact set $K \subset X$ such that $K \cap U \neq \emptyset$ for $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Choose $x_U \in K \cap U, U \in \mathcal{U}$. The infinite set $\{x_U : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$ is contained in K , a compact set. Hence $\{x_U : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$ has an accumulation point, say $x \in K$. Then the family \mathcal{U} has an accumulation point. Therefore X is feebly compact which implies pseudocompact. \square

THEOREM 2.4. *Any Ps -normal space is CCS -normal.*

PROOF. Let X be a Ps -normal space. Then there exist a normal space Y and a bijection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f|_P : P \rightarrow f(P)$ is a homeomorphism for every pseudocompact subset P of X . Let C be a cellular-compact subset of X . So, C is a pseudocompact subset of X by Theorem 2.3. Since X is Ps -normal, $f|_C : C \rightarrow f(C)$ is a homeomorphism. Hence X is a CCS -normal space. \square

In [2] the authors have shown that the Dieudonne Plank is C -normal. In what follows we can demonstrate that it is, indeed, Ps -normal. Let X be the Dieudonne plank i.e, $X = [0, \omega_1] \times [0, \omega_0] - (\omega_1, \omega_0)$ with the topology described below:

Write $X = A \cup B \cup N$ where $A = \{\omega_1\} \times \mathbb{N}, B = [0, \omega_1] \times \{\omega_0\}, N = [0, \omega_1] \times \mathbb{N}$, where \mathbb{N} includes 0 also. All points of N are isolated. Basic open neighbourhoods of $(\omega_1, n) \in A$ are of the form $U_n(\alpha) = (\alpha, \omega_1] \times \{n\}, \alpha < \omega_1, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Basic open neighbourhoods of $(\alpha, \omega_0) \in B$ are of the form $V_\alpha(n) = \{\alpha\} \times (n, \omega_0], n \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha < \omega_0$. A and B are closed subsets of X . Any horizontal line $B_n = [0, \omega_1] \times \{n\}$ is clopen set, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. No B_n is pseudocompact: $B_n = [0, \omega_1] \times \{n\}$. Let $U_n(\alpha) = (\alpha, \omega_1] \times \{n\}$ be an open neighbourhood of $(\omega_1, n) \in B_n$. Since $\alpha < \omega_1$ is an infinite countable ordinal, $[0, \alpha)$ is a countably infinite set. We can write $[0, \alpha) = \{0 = \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \alpha_3 < \dots < \alpha_m < \dots\}$. Define $f : B_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f(\beta) = 0, \alpha \leq \beta \leq \omega_1, = m$ if $\beta = \alpha_m, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly f is continuous and unbounded. This shows that X is not pseudocompact; for if X is pseudocompact, each B_n , being clopen subset, would be pseudocompact-which is false. Suppose $C \subset X$ is pseudocompact. Then $C \cap B_n$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is clopen subset of C and hence, pseudocompact. Now $C \cap B_n$ consists of either isolated points of B_n or atmost one non isolated point, viz, (ω_1, n) . Hence $C \cap B_n$ cannot be pseudocompact if infinite. So $C \cap B_n$ is either empty or a non-empty finite set for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now take $Y = X$ as set with a topology described by the following nbhood system : All points of $N \cup A = [0, \omega_1] \times \mathbb{N}$ are isolated. The neighbourhoods of the points (α, ω_0) are unaltered. The topology of Y is T_4 , first-countable and is finer than the topology of X . Let C be a pseudocompact subset of X . Let (α, v) be a typical point of $X, \alpha \in [0, \omega_1], v \in [0, \omega_0]$. Let $(\alpha, v) \in C$ and $1_X : X \rightarrow Y$ be the identity map. If $(\alpha, v) \in N$, say $(\alpha, n), (\alpha, n)$ is isolated both in X and Y . Then 1_X is continuous at (α, n) . If $(\alpha, v) \in B$, say (α, ω_0) , the (α, ω_0) has the same nbhood in X and Y . 1_X is continuous at (α, ω_0) as well.

If $(\alpha, v) \in A$ i.e, $(\omega_1, n) \in A$. Then $(\omega_1, n) \in C \cap B_n$. Now $C \cap B_n$ is a finite set containing (ω_1, n) . Let $C \cap B_n - (\omega_1, n) = \{(\alpha_1, n), (\alpha_2, n), \dots, (\alpha_k, n)\}$, if non-empty. Choose $\beta < \omega_1$ such that $\alpha_i < \beta, 1 \leq i \leq k. (\beta, \omega_1] \times \{n\}$ is a neighbourhood of (ω_1, n) in B_n and $C \cap (\beta, \omega_1] \times \{n\} = \{(\omega_1, n)\}$ is an open nbhood of (ω_1, n) in C as a subspace of X . Since $\{(\omega_1, n)\}$ is an open nbhood of (ω_1, n) in Y , 1_X is continuous at (ω_1, n) . So we come to the conclusion that $1_X : C \rightarrow 1_X(C) \subset Y$ is a continuous map. So $1_X(C)$ is pseudocompact in Y . Now the topology of Y is finer than that of X , the identity map $1_Y : Y \rightarrow X$ is continuous. This implies

that $1_Y : 1_X(C) \rightarrow 1_Y(1_X(C)) = C$ is continuous. We can now conclude that $1_X : C \rightarrow 1_X(C)$ is a homeomorphism for each pseudocompact subset $C \subset X$. X is then Ps -normal and by Theorem 2.4 it is CCS -normal..

THEOREM 2.5. *If X is CC -normal, first-countable, regular space. Then X is a CCS -normal space.*

PROOF. Since X is a CC -normal space, then there exist a normal space Y and a bijection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f|_C : C \rightarrow f(C)$ is a homeomorphism, for every countably-compact subset C of X . Take any cellular-compact subset D of X . Then D is a cellular-compact, first countable and regular space. So D is countably compact, [Corollary 4.2, [7]]. Hence $f|_D : D \rightarrow f(D)$ is a homeomorphism. So, X is a CCS -normal. \square

THEOREM 2.6. *CCS -normality is a topological property.*

PROOF. Let X be a CCS -normal space and X is homeomorphic to Z . Let Y be a normal space and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a bijective mapping such that $f|_C : C \rightarrow f(C)$ is a homeomorphism for any cellular-compact subspace C of X . Let $g : X \rightarrow Z$ be the homeomorphism. Then $f \circ g^{-1} : Z \rightarrow Y$ is the required map. \square

THEOREM 2.7. *If X is cellular-compact but not normal, then X is not CCS -normal.*

PROOF. Let X be cellular-compact but not normal. On the contrary assume that there exist a normal space Y and a bijective mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f|_C : C \rightarrow f(C)$ is a homeomorphism, for any cellular-compact subspace C of X . In particular $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a homeomorphism. This is a contradiction as Y is normal and X is not normal. Hence X is not CCS -normal. \square

The following example is an example of a CC -normal space which is not CCS -normal.

EXAMPLE 2.8. Consider (\mathbb{R}, τ_c) , where τ_c is the co-countable topology on \mathbb{R} . Then (\mathbb{R}, τ_c) is CC -normal, [Example 2.6, [5]]. Since there is no disjoint family of open sets in (\mathbb{R}, τ_c) , so (\mathbb{R}, τ_c) is cellular-compact (vacuously). It is known that (\mathbb{R}, τ_c) is not normal. Hence by Theorem 2.7, (\mathbb{R}, τ_c) is not CCS -normal. Also every CC -normal space is C -normal. Therefore (\mathbb{R}, τ_c) is C -normal but not CCS -normal.

Now we give an example of a CCS -normal space which is not Ps -normal.

EXAMPLE 2.9. Let $X = [0, \omega_1) \times [0, \omega_1]$ be equipped with the product of the respective order topologies. Then

- 1) X is countably compact , because $\Omega = [0, \omega_1)$ is countably compact and $\Omega_0 = [0, \omega_1]$ is compact.
- 2) X is locally compact, because Ω is locally compact and Ω_0 is compact.
- 3) X is not normal.

Following steps are needed to prove that X is not normal.

- a) Interlacing Lemma: Let $\{\alpha_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{\beta_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be two sequences in $\Omega = [0, \omega_1)$ such that $\alpha_n \leq \beta_n \leq \alpha_{n+1}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then both sequence converge and to the same point of Ω
- b) If $f : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ is a function such that $\alpha \leq f(\alpha)$ for each α , then for some $\alpha \in \Omega$, the point (α, α) is an accumulation point of the graph $G(f) = \{(\alpha, f(\alpha)) : \alpha \in \Omega\}$ of f .

PROOF. Let α be any element of Ω . Let $\alpha_1 = \alpha, \alpha_2 = f(\alpha_1), \dots, \alpha_{n+1} = f(\alpha_n), n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now $\alpha_1 \leq f(\alpha_1) = \alpha_2 \leq f(\alpha_2) \leq \alpha_3, \dots$. Let $\beta_n = f(\alpha_n), n \in \mathbb{N}$. Applying Interlacing Lemma to sequences $\{\alpha_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}, \{\beta_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ we obtain a

point $\alpha_0 \in \Omega$. Consider the point $(\alpha_0, \alpha_0) \in X$ and any open nbhd of (α_0, α_0) of the form $(\gamma, \alpha_0] \times (\gamma, \alpha_0]$, where $0 \leq \gamma \leq \alpha_0$. Since $\alpha_0 = \lim \alpha_n = \lim \beta_n$, there exists $n_0 \geq 1$ such that $\gamma < \alpha_n \leq \alpha_0, \gamma < \beta_n \leq \alpha_0$ for $n \geq n_0$. Then $(\alpha_n, f(\alpha_n)) = (\alpha_n, \beta_n) \in (\gamma, \alpha_0] \times (\gamma, \alpha_0]$ for $n \geq n_0$. This shows that (α_0, α_0) is an accumulation point of $G(f) = \{(\alpha, f(\alpha)) : \alpha \in \Omega\}$. Now in order to show that X is not normal, let $A = \{(\alpha, \alpha) : \alpha \in \Omega\}$ and $B = [0, \omega_1] \times \{\omega_1\}$ be two disjoint closed subsets of X . Assume U is an open nbhd of A and V is an open nbhd of B and $U \cap V = \emptyset$.

Claim: For any $\alpha \in \Omega$ there exists $\alpha < \beta \in \Omega$ such that $(\alpha, \beta) \notin U$. If not there exists $\alpha_0 \in \Omega$ such that $(\alpha_0, \beta) \in U$ for all $\beta > \alpha_0$. Now $(\alpha_0, \omega_1) \in B$. There exists $\gamma, \delta \in \Omega$ such that $(\alpha_0, \omega_1) \in (\gamma, \alpha_0] \times (\delta, \omega_1] \subset V$, where $\gamma < \alpha_0, \delta < \omega_1$. Choose $\beta < \omega_1$ such that $\alpha_0 < \beta, \delta < \beta$. Now $(\alpha_0, \beta) \in (\gamma, \alpha_0] \times (\delta, \omega_1] \subset V$. Since $\alpha_0 < \beta, (\alpha_0, \beta) \in U$ also $(\alpha_0, \beta) \in V$. i.e, $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$, contradiction. This settles the claim. Define $f : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ by $f(\alpha) = \min\{\beta \in \Omega : \alpha < \beta, (\alpha, \beta) \notin U\}$. Then $\alpha < f(\alpha)$ for each $\alpha \in \Omega$. By (b) there exists $\alpha_0 \in \Omega$ such that (α_0, α_0) is an accumulation point of $G(f) = \{(\alpha, f(\alpha)) : \alpha \in \Omega\} \subset U^c$ i.e, $(\alpha_0, \alpha_0) \in \overline{G(f)} \subset U^c$ since U^c is closed. Contradiction because $(\alpha_0, \alpha_0) \in A \subset U$, we conclude that X is not normal. Because of (1) X is not CC -normal and because of (2) X is C -normal. As X is countably compact, X is Pseudocompact but not normal. So X is not PS-normal.

(4): X is CCS -normal: X is not cellular-compact. This is because X has a dense subset of isolated points. Let $A \subset X$ be a cellular-compact subspace. Let $p_1 : X \rightarrow \Omega, p_2 : X \rightarrow \Omega_0$ be two projections. Then $A \subset p_1(A) \times p_2(A)$. Now $p_1(A)$ is a cellular-compact in Ω . We claim that $p_1(A)$ is contained in a compact subset.

Case(i) : $p_1(A)$ is bounded set in Ω . Then for $\alpha < \omega_1, p_1(A) \subset [0, \alpha]$ and $[0, \alpha]$ is a compact subspace.

Case(ii) : $p_1(A)$ is unbounded. Then $p_1(A)$ contains a dense subspace of isolated points of $p_1(A)$ and must be compact. But unbounded subset of Ω cannot be compact. Assume $p_1(A) \subset K$ a compact subset of Ω . $A \subset p_1(A) \times p_2(A) \subset K \times \Omega_0$ and $K \times \Omega_0$ is compact in X . Since X is C -normal and every cellular-compact subset is contained in a compact subspace, X becomes CCS -normal.

Thus we obtain X as an example of a CCS -normal space which is not Ps -normal. \square

THEOREM 2.10. *If X is CCS -normal and Frechet, $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is witness of CCS -normality, Then f is a continuous mapping.*

PROOF. It is sufficient to show that for any $A \subset X, f(\overline{A}) \subset \overline{f(A)}$. Let $\emptyset \neq A \subset X$ and $y \in f(\overline{A})$. Let x be the unique point in \overline{A} such that $f(x) = y$. Since X is Frechet, then there exists a sequence $\{x_n, n \geq 1\}$ in A such that $x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$. Let $K = \{x_n : n \geq 1\} \cup \{x\}$. Then K is compact and therefore K is cellular-compact. Then $f|_K : K \rightarrow f(K)$ is a homeomorphism, as X is CCS -Normal. Let U be any open set in Y containing y . Then $U \cap f(K)$ is open set in $f(K)$ containing y . Now $\{x_n : n \geq 1\}$ is dense in K and is contained in $K \cap A \implies K \cap A$ is dense in $K \implies f(K \cap A)$ is dense in $f(K) \implies f(K \cap A) \cap f(K) \cap U \neq \emptyset \implies U \cap f(A) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore $y \in \overline{f(A)}$. Hence $f(\overline{A}) \subset \overline{f(A)}$. \square

THEOREM 2.11. *Let $X = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} X_\alpha$ and $C \subseteq X$. Then C is cellular-compact if and only if $\Lambda_o = \{\alpha \in \Lambda : C \cap X_\alpha \neq \emptyset\}$ is finite and $C \cap X_\alpha$ is cellular compact in X_α for each $\alpha \in \Lambda_o$.*

PROOF. Let C be cellular-compact. If possible let Λ_o be infinite set. Then $\{C \cap X_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda_o\}$ is a disjoint family of open sets in C . So there exists a compact set K in C such that $K \cap C \cap X_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ for all $\alpha \in \Lambda_o$. Thus $\{C \cap X_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda_o\}$ is

an open cover of K which has no finite subcover, which is a contradiction as K is compact. Therefore Λ_o is finite.

Let $\alpha \in \Lambda_o$. We show $C \cap X_\alpha$ is cellular-compact. Let $\{U_\gamma : \gamma \in I\}$ be a disjoint family of open sets in $C \cap X_\alpha$. Now each U_γ is open in C as $C \cap X_\alpha$ is open in C . Then there exists a compact subset K of C such that $K \cap U_\gamma \neq \emptyset$ as C is cellular-compact. K is compact in C then $K \cap X_\alpha$ is compact in $C \cap X_\alpha$ and also $(K \cap X_\alpha) \cap U_\gamma \neq \emptyset$ for all $\gamma \in I$. Therefore $C \cap X_\alpha$ is cellular compact for all $\alpha \in \Lambda_o$.

Conversely, let the given condition hold. Let $\{U_\gamma : \gamma \in I\}$ be a disjoint family of open sets in C . For $\alpha \in \Lambda_o$, $\{U_\gamma \cap X_\alpha : \gamma \in I\}$, if non-empty, is a disjoint family of open sets in $C \cap X_\alpha$. This implies there exists a compact set K_α in $C \cap X_\alpha$ such that $K_\alpha \cap (U_\gamma \cap X_\alpha) \neq \emptyset$ for all $\gamma \in I$. Let $K = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda_o} K_\alpha$. Then K is a compact set in C such that $K \cap U_\gamma \neq \emptyset$ for all $\gamma \in I$. Hence C is cellular compact. \square

THEOREM 2.12. *CCS-normality is an additive property.*

PROOF. Let $X = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} X_\alpha$ and each X_α is cellular-compact. Then for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$ there exists a normal space Y_α and a bijective mapping $f_\alpha : X_\alpha \rightarrow Y_\alpha$ such that $f_\alpha|_{C_\alpha} : C_\alpha \rightarrow f_\alpha(C_\alpha)$ is a homeomorphism for each cellular-compact subspace C_α of X_α . Then $Y = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} Y_\alpha$ is a normal space. Consider the function $f = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} f_\alpha : X \rightarrow Y$. Let C be a cellular -compact subspace of X . Then by Theorem 2.11 , $\Lambda_o = \{\alpha \in \Lambda : C \cap X_\alpha \neq \emptyset\}$ is finite and $C \cap X_\alpha$ is cellular -compact for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$ Then $f|_C : C \rightarrow f(C)$ is a homeomorphism. Hence X is CCS-normal. \square

3. Some special results

DEFINITION 3.1. A topological space X is called submetrizable if the topology admits of a weaker metrizable topology.

It is proved in [2] that submetrizable space is C -normal. In [5], the authors raised a question. Is a submetrizable space CC -normal? We can claim that the answer is affirmative.

THEOREM 3.2. *Every submetrizable space is CC-normal.*

In order to prove this we need the following Lemmas.

LEMMA 3.3. *Let X be a first countable Hausdorff space. If $A \subset X$ is countably compact, then A is closed in X .*

PROOF. Let $\emptyset \neq A \neq X$ be countably compact subspace. Let $\{U_n : n \geq 1\}$ be a countable local base at $x \notin A$. For each $y \in A$ there exist open sets $U_{n(y)}, V_{n(y)}$ such that $x \in U_{n(y)}, y \in V_{n(y)}$ and $U_{n(y)} \cap V_{n(y)} = \emptyset$. Now $\{V_{n(y)} : y \in A\}$ is , infact , a countable open cover of A and hence , admits of a finite subcover, say $\{V_{n(y_i)} : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. Look at $U_x = \bigcap_{i=1}^k U_{n(y_i)}$. Then $U_x \cap A = \emptyset$ and $x \in U_x$ an open neighbourhood of x . Thus $X - A$ is open $\implies A$ is closed. \square

LEMMA 3.4. *If X be a countably compact space, Y is first countable Hausdorff space and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a continuous bijection. Then f is a homeomorphism.*

PROOF. Since f is a continuous bijection, suffices to show that f is a closed map. Let $A \subset X$ be closed. Then A is countably compact and ipso facto, $f(A)$ is countably compact in Y . Since Y is first countable , Hausdorff, $f(A)$ is closed in Y , i.e, f is a closed map. Consequently f is a homeomorphism. \square

THEOREM 3.5. *Every submetrizable space is CC-normal.*

PROOF. Let (X, τ) be a submetrizable space. i.e, there exists a topology $\tau' \subset \tau$ such that (X, τ') is metrizable. Let $1_X : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \tau')$ be the identity map which is continuous and bijective. (X, τ') is normal being metrizable. Take any countably compact subspace $C \subset (X, \tau)$. $1_X(C)$ is countably compact in (X, τ') and $1_X : C \rightarrow 1_X(C)$ is a continuous, bijection. By Lemma 3.4, 1_X is a homeomorphism, so that (X, τ) is CC-normal. Further note that $1_X(C)$ being a countably compact subset of a metrizable space, is indeed compact which renders C into a compact subset of (X, τ) . This yields the further information that in a submetrizable space, compact and countably compact subsets coincide. \square

EXAMPLE 3.6. Example 3.8 produces an example of a submetrizable space which is not cellular-compact. It is proved in [7] that a cellular-compact, first-countable, T_3 space is countably-compact and ipsofacto, closed in view of Lemma 3.3. We can conclude that in a metrizable space all three concepts, viz, Compactness, countable-compactness and Cellular-compactness coincide.

DEFINITION 3.7. Let M be a non-empty proper subset of a topological space (X, τ) . Define a new topology $\tau_{(M)}$ on X as follows: $\tau_{(M)} = \{U \cup K : U \in \tau \text{ and } K \subset X \setminus M\}$, $(X, \tau_{(M)})$ is called a discrete extension of (X, τ) and we denote it by X_M .

Discrete extension of a cellular-compact space need not be cellular compact. This can be shown in the following example.

EXAMPLE 3.8. Let $X = [0, 1]$ with subspace topology of usual topology on \mathbb{R} and $M = X \setminus \{\frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\}$. Then X is compact $\implies X$ is cellular-compact. Claim: X_M is not cellular-compact. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{(\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{1}{n}) : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{\{\frac{1}{n}\} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\}$ is a disjoint family of open sets in X_M . There does not exist any compact set K in X_M such that $K \cap U \neq \emptyset$, for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Therefore X_M is not cellular-compact.

Let X be any topological space. Let $X' = X \times \{1\}$. Let $A(X) = X \cup X'$. For $x \in X$ we denote $\langle x, 1 \rangle$ as x' and for $B \subseteq X$ let $B' = \{x' : x \in B\} = B \times \{1\}$. Let $\{\beta(x) : x \in X\} \cup \{\beta(x') : x' \in X'\}$ be neighbourhood system for some topology τ on $A(X)$, where for $x \in X$, $\beta(x) = \{U \cup (U' \setminus \{x'\}) : U \text{ is an open set in } X \text{ containing } x\}$ and for $x' \in X'$, $\beta(x') = \{\{x'\}\}$. $(A(X), \tau)$ is called Alexandroff Duplicate of X .

OBSERVATION: Let X be a topological space and $A(X) = X \cup X'$ is the Alexandroff duplicate space. Let $C \subset A(X)$ be a compact subspace of $A(X)$. Let $C \cap X = D$, $C \cap X' = E$. If $D = \emptyset$, then $E = C \subset X' \implies C$ is finite. Suppose $D \neq \emptyset$. For $x \in D$ let $U_x \cup U'_x \setminus \{x'\}$ be an open neighbourhood of x . Consider the family $\{U_x \cup U'_x \setminus \{x'\} : x' \in D\} \cup \{\{x'\} : x' \in E\}$ of open subsets of $A(X)$, which is an open cover of C . Let $\{U_{x_i} \cup U'_{x_i} \setminus \{x'_i\} : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{\{y_j\} : y_j \in E, 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ be a finite subcover of $C = D \cup E$. Then $C \cap X = D \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_{x_i} = U \implies U'_{x_i} \setminus \{x'_i\} \subset U'_{x_i} \implies \bigcup_{i=1}^n U'_{x_i} \setminus \{x'_i\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n U'_{x_i} = U'$. Hence $C = D \cup E \subset U' \cup \{\{y_j\} : y_j \in E, 1 \leq j \leq m\} \cup U \implies E \subset U' \cup \{\{y_j\} : y_j \in E, 1 \leq j \leq m\} \implies E - U'$ is a finite subset of X' . So, we conclude that: A subset $C \subset A(X)$ is compact \implies for any open set $U \supset$ compact set $C \cap X$, $C \cap X' - U'$ is a finite subset of X' . Conversely let $C \subset A(X)$ be a subset such that $C \cap X$ is compact and for any open set $U \subset X$, $C \cap X \subset U$, $(C \cap X') \setminus U'$ is a finite subset of X' .

Claim: C is compact. It suffices to prove that any open cover of C by means of basic open sets of $A(X)$ has a finite subcover. Let $\{U_x \cup U'_x \setminus \{x'\} : x \in C \cap X\} \cup \{\{x'\} : x' \in C \cap X'\}$ be an open cover of C . Since $C \cap X$ is compact and $\{U_x : x \in C \cap X\}$ is an open cover $C \cap X$ in X . There exists a finite subcover, say,

$\{U_{x_i} : i \leq i \leq n\}$ ie, $C \cap X \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_{x_i} = U$ (say). By hypothesis $(C \cap X') \setminus U'$ is a finite subset of X' , say, $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m\}$. Hence $C \cap X' = U' \cup \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m\}$. Let $D = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m\} \cup \{x'_i \in C \cap X' : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Now $\{U_{x_i} \cup U'_{x_i} \setminus \{x_i\} : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{\{x'_i\} : x'_i \in C \cap X', 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{\{y_j\} : 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ is a finite open subcover for C from $\{U_x \cup U'_x \setminus \{x'\} : x \in C \cap X\} \cup \{\{x'_i\} : x'_i \in C \cap X'\}$. Hence C is compact.

We come to the conclusion that $C \subset A(X)$ is compact if and only if every open set $U \subset X, C \cap X \subset U$ we must have $C \cap X' \setminus U'$ is a finite subset of X' .

Using this result we can cite an example for which $A(X)$ is not cellular-compact but X is cellular-compact.

EXAMPLE 3.9. Suppose $A(X)$ is Cellular-Compact and X is infinite. Now isolated points of $A(X) = X \cup X'$, namely the points of X' form an infinite family of disjoint open sets. Hence $A(X)$ must contain a compact set C such that $C \cap \{x'\} \neq \emptyset$ for each $x' \in X'$. ie, $C \supset X'$. Since $C = X'$ is impossible, $C \cap X \neq \emptyset$ and $C \cap X$ is a compact set. As C is compact in $A(X)$, by the preceding observation, if $U \subset X$ is an open set containing $C \cap X$, then $X' \setminus U' = C \cap X' \setminus U'$ is a finite subset of X' vide Theorem 2.2.[2]. i.e, $X \setminus U$ is a finite subset X . i.e, every open set of X containing $C \cap X$ is cofinite in X .

Now take $X = \mathbb{R}$ with cocountable topology . Then X is a T_1 space which is cellular-compact. Also any compact subset of X is finite. Now look at $A(X) = X \cup X'$. If $A(X)$ has to be cellular-compact, from the preceding para it is clear that X must have a compact set K such that any open set containing K must be cofinite. Since K is anyhow finite, this is not true! Thus $A(X)$ cannot be cellular-compact.

THEOREM 3.10. *Let X be a Hausdorff space and $A(X) = X \cup X'$ be the Alexandroff duplicate space. If $A(X)$ is cellular-compact , then there should exist a compact set $K \supset$ the dense set of isolated points of X' . Since K is closed , as $A(X)$ is $T_2, K = A(X)$. Hence $A(X)$ is compact. Consequently if X is a non-compact T_2 space , then $A(X)$ cannot be cellular-compact. In presence of Hausdorffness $A(X)$ is cellular-compact if and only if X is compact if and only if $A(X)$ is compact.*

The following problems are open.

- 1) Is the discrete extension of a CCS-normal space CCS-normal?
- 2) Is $A(X)$ CCS-normal, when X is CCS-normal?

References

- [1] S. AlZahrani, C -Tychonoff and L -Tychonoff topological spaces, European Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, **11** (2018), 882–892.
- [2] S. AlZahrani, L. Kalantan, C -normal topological property, Filomat, **31** (2017), 407–411.
- [3] S. Bag, R. C. Manna, S. K. Patra, Ps -normal and Ps -Tychonoff spaces, doi.org/10.1007/s13370-019-00744-6.
- [4] E. Hewitt, Rings of real valued continuous functions. I, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 64(1948), 45–99.
- [5] L. Kalantan, M. Alhomieyed, CC -normal topological spaces, Turkish Journal of Mathematics, **41** (2017), 749–755.
- [6] J. Kelley, General Topology, D. Van Nostrand Company Princeton, New Jersey,1955.
- [7] V. V. Tkachuk, R. G. Wilson, Cellular-compact spaces and their applications, Acta. Math. Hunger., **159** (2019), 674–688.

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA, 35, BALLYGUNGE CIRCULAR ROAD, KOLKATA 700019, WEST BENGAL, INDIA
E-mail address: `sagarmoy.bag01@gmail.com`

RAMAKRISHNA MISSION VIDYAMANDIR, BELUR MATH, HOWRAH-711202, WEST BENGAL, INDIA
E-mail address: `mannaramchandra8@gmail.com`

INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, 203 BARRACKPORE TRUNK ROAD, KOLKATA-700 108, WEST BENGAL, INDIA
E-mail address: `rahaab@gmail.com`