

Q-SPACES, PERFECT SPACES AND RELATED CARDINAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CONTINUUM

TARAS BANAKH AND LIDIYA BAZYLEVYCH

ABSTRACT. A topological space X is called a Q -space if every subset of X is of type F_σ in X . For $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ let $\mathfrak{q}_i$ be the smallest cardinality of a second-countable T_i -space which is not a Q -space. It is clear that $\mathfrak{q}_1 \leq \mathfrak{q}_2 \leq \mathfrak{q}_3$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we prove that $\mathfrak{q}_i$ is equal to the smallest cardinality of a second-countable T_i -space which is not perfect. Also we prove that $\mathfrak{q}_3$ is equal to the smallest cardinality of a submetrizable space, which is not a Q -space. Martin's Axiom implies that $\mathfrak{q}_i = \mathfrak{c}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

A topological space X is called

- *perfect* if every open subset is of type F_σ in X ;
- a Q -space if every subset is of type F_σ in X ;
- a *non- Q -space* if X is not a Q -space.

A subset of topological space is *of type F_σ* if it can be written as the union of countably many closed sets.

It is clear that every Q -space is perfect. Under Martin's Axiom, every metrizable separable space of cardinality $< \mathfrak{c}$ is a Q -space, see [5, 4.2].

For a class $\mathcal{T}$ of topological spaces, denote by $\mathfrak{q}_\mathcal{T}$ the smallest cardinality of a non- Q -space $X \in \mathcal{T}$. The cardinal $\mathfrak{q}_\mathcal{T}$ is well-defined only for classes $\mathcal{T}$ containing non- Q -spaces. In this paper we study the cardinals $\mathfrak{q}_\mathcal{T}$ for classes $\mathcal{T}$ of topological spaces satisfying various separation properties.

A topological space X is called

- a T_1 -space if every finite subset is closed in X ;
- a T_2 -space if X is *Hausdorff*, which means that any distinct points in X have disjoint neighborhoods;
- a $T_{2\frac{1}{2}}$ -space if X is *Urysohn*, which means that any distinct points in X have disjoint closed neighborhoods;
- *functionally Hausdorff* if for any distinct points $x, y \in X$ there exists a continuous function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x) \neq f(y)$;
- a T_3 -space if X is Hausdorff and every neighborhood of any point $x \in X$ contains a closed neighborhood of x ;
- *Tychonoff* if X is Hausdorff and for any closed set $F \subseteq X$ and point $x \in X \setminus F$ there exists a continuous function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x) = 1$ and $f[F] \subseteq \{0\}$;
- *submetrizable* if there exists a continuous bijective map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ onto a metric space Y ;
- *second-countable* if X has a countable base of the topology.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E15, 03E17, 03E35, 03E50, 54A35, 54D10, 54H05.

Key words and phrases. Q -space, perfect space, cardinal characteristic of the continuum.

For every topological space we have implications

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \text{metrizable} & \implies & \text{submetrizable} & \implies & \text{functionally} \\
 & & & & \text{Hausdorff} \\
 \Downarrow & & & & \Downarrow \\
 \text{Tychonoff} & \implies & T_3\text{-space} & \implies & \text{Urysohn} & \implies & \text{Hausdorff} \implies T_1\text{-space}
 \end{array}$$

Observe that the one-point compactification of the discrete space of cardinality ω_1 is not perfect and hence $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathcal{T}} = \omega_1$ for the class $\mathcal{T}$ of (compact) Tychonoff spaces of weight $\leq \omega_1$. For classes $\mathcal{T}$ of second-countable spaces the cardinals $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathcal{T}}$ are more interesting.

For $i \in \{1, 2, 2\frac{1}{2}, 3\}$ denote by $\mathfrak{q}_i$ the smallest cardinality of a second-countable T_i -space which is not a Q -space. It is clear that $\mathfrak{q}_1 \leq \mathfrak{q}_2 \leq \mathfrak{q}_{2\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mathfrak{q}_3$. Since each second-countable T_3 -space (of cardinality $< \mathfrak{c}$) is metrizable (and zero-dimensional), the cardinal $\mathfrak{q}_3$ coincides with the well-known cardinal $\mathfrak{q}_0$, defined as the smallest cardinality of a subset of $\mathbb{R}$ which is not a Q -space. The cardinal $\mathfrak{q}_0$ is well-studied in Set-Theoretic Topology, see [5, §4], [3] or [1]. This cardinal has the following helpful property.

Proposition 1. *Every submetrizable space of cardinality $< \mathfrak{q}_0$ is a Q -space.*

Proof. Let X be a submetrizable space of cardinality $< \mathfrak{q}_0$. Find a continuous bijective map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ onto a metrizable space Y . The metrizable space Y has cardinality $|Y| = |X| < \mathfrak{q}_0 \leq \mathfrak{c}$ and weight $w(Y) \leq \omega \cdot |Y| \leq \mathfrak{c}$. By [4, 4.4.9], Y admits a topological embedding $h : Y \rightarrow J(\mathfrak{c})^\omega$ into the countable power of the hedgehog space $J(\mathfrak{c})$ with $\mathfrak{c}$ many spikes. Here $J(\mathfrak{c})$ is the set $\{x \in [0, 1]^\mathfrak{c} : |\{\alpha \in \mathfrak{c} : x(\alpha) > 0\}| \leq 1\}$ endowed with the metric

$$d(x, y) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{c}} |x(\alpha) - y(\alpha)|.$$

It is easy to see that the hedgehog space $J(\mathfrak{c})$ admits a continuous bijective map onto the triangle $\{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 : x + y \leq 1\}$ and hence $J(\mathfrak{c})^\omega$ admits a continuous bijective map $\beta : J(\mathfrak{c})^\omega \rightarrow [0, 1]^\omega$ onto the Hilbert cube $[0, 1]^\omega$. Then $g \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \beta \circ f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]^\omega$ is a continuous injective map. The metrizable separable space $g[X]$ has cardinality $< \mathfrak{q}_0$ and hence is a Q -space. Then for every set $A \subseteq X$ its image $g[A]$ is of type F_σ in $g[X]$. By the continuity of g , the preimage $g^{-1}[g[A]] = A$ of $g[A]$ is an F_σ -set in X , witnessing that X is a Q -space. $\square$

Now we prove some criteria of submetrizability among “sufficiently small” functionally Hausdorff spaces.

A family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of a topological space X is called

- *separating* if for any distinct points $x, y \in X$ there exists a set $F \in \mathcal{F}$ that contains x but not y ;
- a *network* if for every open set $U \subseteq X$ and point $x \in U$ there exists a set $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $x \in F \subseteq U$.

We say that a topological space X is

- *Lindelöf* if every open cover of X has a countable subcover;
- *hereditarily Lindelöf* if every subspace of X is Lindelöf;
- *nw-countable* if X has a countable network;
- *sw-countable* if X has a countable separating family of open sets.

It is clear that every second-countable T_1 -space is both nw-countable and sw-countable.

Lemma 2. *Every functionally Hausdorff space X with hereditarily Lindelöf square is submetrizable.*

Proof. Since X is functionally Hausdorff, for any distinct points $a, b \in X$, there exists a continuous function $f_{a,b} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f_{a,b}(a) = 0$ and $f_{a,b}(b) = 1$. By the continuity of $f_{a,b}$, the sets

$$f_{a,b}^{-1}(\downarrow \tfrac{1}{2}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X : f_{a,b}(x) < \tfrac{1}{2}\} \quad \text{and} \quad f_{a,b}^{-1}(\uparrow \tfrac{1}{2}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{y \in X : f_{a,b}(y) > \tfrac{1}{2}\}$$

are open neighborhoods of the points a, b , respectively. Since the space $X \times X$ is hereditarily Lindelöf, the open cover $\{f_{a,b}^{-1}(\downarrow \tfrac{1}{2}) \times f_{a,b}^{-1}(\uparrow \tfrac{1}{2}) : (a, b) \in \nabla_X\}$ of the subspace

$$\nabla_X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(x, y) \in X \times X : x \neq y\}$$

of $X \times X$ has a countable subcover. Consequently, there exists a countable set $C \subseteq \nabla_X$ such that $\nabla_X = \bigcup_{(a,b) \in C} f_{a,b}^{-1}(\downarrow \tfrac{1}{2}) \times f_{a,b}^{-1}(\uparrow \tfrac{1}{2})$.

Consider the metrizable space $\mathbb{R}^C$ and the continuous function

$$f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^C, \quad f : x \mapsto (f_{a,b}(x))_{(a,b) \in C}.$$

This function is injective because for any distinct $x, y \in X$ there exists a pair $(a, b) \in C$ such that $(x, y) \in f_{a,b}^{-1}(\downarrow \tfrac{1}{2}) \times f_{a,b}^{-1}(\uparrow \tfrac{1}{2})$ and hence $f_{a,b}(x) < \tfrac{1}{2} < f_{a,b}(y)$, witnessing that $f(x) \neq f(y)$. $\square$

Corollary 3. *Every nw-countable functionally Hausdorff space of cardinality $< \mathfrak{q}_0$ is a submetrizable Q -space.*

Proof. Let X be an nw-countable functionally Hausdorff space. By [4, 3.8.12], the square $X \times X$ has countable network and is hereditarily Lindelöf. By Lemma 2, X is submetrizable and by Proposition 1, X is a Q -space. $\square$

Propositions 1 and Corollary 3 will help us to prove the following characterization of the cardinal $\mathfrak{q}_0$.

Proposition 4. *The cardinal $\mathfrak{q}_0$ is equal to:*

- the smallest cardinality of a submetrizable space which is not a Q -space;
- the smallest cardinality of a non-perfect submetrizable space;
- the smallest cardinality of an nw-countable functionally Hausdorff non- Q -space;
- the smallest cardinality of a non-perfect nw-countable functionally Hausdorff space;
- the smallest cardinality of second-countable functionally Hausdorff non- Q -space.
- the smallest cardinality of non-perfect second-countable functionally Hausdorff space.

Proof. Let

- $\mathfrak{q}_{sm}$ be the smallest cardinality of a submetrizable non- Q -space;
- $\mathfrak{p}_{sm}$ be the smallest cardinality of a non-perfect submetrizable space;
- $\mathfrak{q}_{nw}$ be the smallest cardinality of an nw-countable functionally Hausdorff non- Q -space;
- $\mathfrak{p}_{nw}$ be the smallest cardinality of a non-perfect nw-countable functionally Hausdorff space;
- $\mathfrak{q}_w$ be the smallest cardinality of second-countable functionally Hausdorff non- Q -space.
- $\mathfrak{p}_w$ be the smallest cardinality of non-perfect second-countable functionally Hausdorff space.

We should prove that all these cardinals are equal to $\mathfrak{q}_0$. The inclusions between corresponding classes of topological spaces yield the following diagram in which an arrow $\kappa \rightarrow \lambda$ between cardinals κ, λ indicates that $\kappa \leq \lambda$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathfrak{p}_{sm} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{p}_{nw} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{p}_w \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \mathfrak{q}_{sm} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{q}_{nw} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{q}_w \end{array}$$

Proposition 1 implies that $\mathfrak{q}_0 \leq \mathfrak{q}_{sm}$. To prove that all these cardinals are equal to $\mathfrak{q}_0$, it remains to prove that $\mathfrak{p}_w \leq \mathfrak{q}_0$.

By the definition of the cardinal $\mathfrak{q}_0$, there exists a second-countable metrizable non- Q -space X and hence X contains a subset A which is not of type G_δ in X . Let τ' be the topology on X , generated by the subbase $\tau \cup \{X \setminus A\}$ where τ is the topology of the metrizable space X . It is clear that $X' = (X, \tau')$ is a second-countable space containing A as a closed subset. Since $\tau \subseteq \tau'$, the space X' is submetrizable and functionally Hausdorff. Assuming that X' is perfect, we conclude that the closed set A is equal to the intersection $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} W_n$ of some open sets $W_n \in \tau'$. By the choice of the topology τ' , for every $n \in \omega$ there exists open sets $U_n, V_n \in \tau$ such that $W_n = U_n \cup (V_n \setminus A)$. It follows from $A \subseteq W_n = U_n \cup (V_n \setminus A)$ that $A = A \cap W_n = A \cap U_n \subseteq U_n$. Then

$$A = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} W_n = A \cap \bigcap_{n \in \omega} W_n = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} (A \cap W_n) = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} (A \cap U_n) \subseteq \bigcap_{n \in \omega} U_n \subseteq \bigcap_{n \in \omega} W_n = A$$

and hence $A = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} U_n$ is a G_δ -set in X , which contradicts the choice of A . This contradiction shows that the functionally Hausdorff second-countable space X' is not perfect and hence $\mathfrak{p}_w \leq |X'| = \mathfrak{q}_0$. $\square$

Proposition 4 suggests the following

Question 5. *Is $\mathfrak{q}_2 = \mathfrak{q}_0$?*

Repeating the argument of the proof of Proposition 4, we can prove the following characterization of the cardinals $\mathfrak{q}_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 2\frac{1}{2}\}$.

Proposition 6. *Let $i \in \{1, 2, 2\frac{1}{2}\}$. The cardinal $\mathfrak{q}_i$ is equal to the smallest cardinality of a non-perfect second-countable T_i -space.*

Proposition 7. *Every sw-countable space of cardinality $< \mathfrak{q}_1$ is a Q -space.*

Proof. Let X be an sw-countable space of cardinality $< \mathfrak{q}_1$. By the sw-countability of X , there exists a countable separating family $\mathcal{U}$ of open sets in X . Consider the topology τ on X generated by the subbase $\mathcal{U}$ and observe that $X_\tau \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (X, \tau)$ is a second-countable T_1 -space of cardinality $< \mathfrak{q}_1$. The definition of $\mathfrak{q}_1$ ensures that X_τ is a Q -space. Then every set $A \subseteq X$ is an F_σ set in X_τ . Since the identity map $X \rightarrow X_\tau$ is continuous, the set A remains of type F_σ in X , witnessing that X is a Q -space. $\square$

Proposition 8. *The cardinal $\mathfrak{q}_1$ is equal to*

- (1) *the smallest cardinality of an sw-countable non- Q -space;*
- (2) *the smallest cardinality of a non-perfect sw-countable space.*

Proof. Let

- $\mathfrak{q}_{sw}$ be the smallest cardinality of an sw-countable non- Q -space;

- $\mathfrak{p}_{sw}$ be the smallest cardinality of a non-perfect **sw**-countable space;
- $\mathfrak{p}_1$ be the smallest cardinality of a non-perfect second-countable T_1 -space;

Propositions 7, 6 and the definitions of the cardinals $\mathfrak{q}_{sw}, \mathfrak{p}_{sw}, \mathfrak{p}_1$ imply that

$$\mathfrak{q}_1 \leq \mathfrak{q}_{sw} \leq \mathfrak{p}_{sw} \leq \mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{q}_1$$

and hence $\mathfrak{q}_1 = \mathfrak{q}_{sw} = \mathfrak{p}_{sw}$. $\square$

Finally we establish a non-trivial lower bound on the cardinal $\mathfrak{q}_1$ using the cardinal characteristic $\mathfrak{adp}$, which is intermediate between the cardinals $\mathfrak{ap}$ and $\mathfrak{dp}$ introduced and studied by Brendle [3]. To introduce these cardinals, we need to recall three notions.

A family of sets $\mathcal{A}$ is called *almost disjoint* if $A \cap B$ is finite for any distinct sets $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$.

Two families of sets $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ are called *orthogonal* if $A \cap B$ is finite for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

We shall say that a family $\mathcal{A}$ of sets is *weakly separated* from a family of sets $\mathcal{B}$ if there exists a set D such that for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ the intersection $A \cap D$ is infinite and for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ the intersection $B \cap D$ is finite.

Observe that the notion of orthogonality is symmetric whereas the weak separatedness is not.

For any set X we denote by $[X]^\omega$ and $[X]^{<\omega}$ the families of infinite and finite subsets of X , respectively.

Let

- $\mathfrak{ap}$ be the smallest cardinality of an almost disjoint family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ that contains a subfamily $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ which cannot be weakly separated from $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$;
- $\mathfrak{dp}$ be the smallest cardinality of the union $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$ of two orthogonal families $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ cannot be weakly separated from $\mathcal{B}$;
- $\mathfrak{adp}$ be the smallest cardinality of the union $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$ of two orthogonal families $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ is almost disjoint and cannot be weakly separated from $\mathcal{B}$.

It is clear that

$$\mathfrak{dp} \leq \mathfrak{adp} \leq \mathfrak{ap}.$$

According to [3] we also have the inequalities

$$\mathfrak{p} \leq \mathfrak{dp} \leq \mathfrak{ap} \leq \min\{\mathfrak{q}_0, \text{add}(\mathcal{M})\},$$

where $\text{add}(\mathcal{M})$ is the smallest cardinality of a family $\mathcal{A}$ of meager subsets of the real line whose union $\bigcup \mathcal{A}$ is not meager in $\mathbb{R}$, and $\mathfrak{p}$ is the smallest cardinality of a family $\mathcal{B} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ such that for every finite subfamily $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ the intersection $\bigcap \mathcal{F}$ is infinite but for every infinite set $I \subseteq \omega$ there exists a set $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $I \cap F$ is finite. It is well-known (see [2] or [6]) that $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{c}$ under Martin's Axiom, where $\mathfrak{c}$ stands for the cardinality of continuum.

Proposition 9. *Every second-countable T_1 -space X of cardinality $|X| < \mathfrak{adp}$ is a Q -space and hence*

$$\mathfrak{p} \leq \mathfrak{dp} \leq \mathfrak{adp} \leq \mathfrak{q}_1 \leq \mathfrak{q}_2 \leq \mathfrak{q}_{2\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mathfrak{q}_3 = \mathfrak{q}_0.$$

Proof. Given any subset $A \subseteq X$, we should prove that A is of type G_δ in X . Let $\mathcal{B} = \{U_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ be a countable base of the topology of the space X .

For every $y \in X \setminus A$, let $I_y = \{n \in \omega : y \in U_n\}$. Since $\{U_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ is a base of the topology of X , for every $x \in A$ there exists an infinite set $I_x \subseteq \omega$ satisfying two conditions:

- for any numbers $n < m$ in I_x we have $x \in U_m \subseteq U_n$;
- for every neighborhood O_x of x in X there exists $n \in I_x$ such that $x \in U_n \subseteq O_x$.

We claim that for any $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ the intersection $I_x \cap I_y$ is finite. Indeed, by the choice of the set I_x , there exists $n \in \omega$ such that $U_n \subseteq X \setminus \{y\}$. Then for every $m \geq n$ we have $U_m \subseteq U_n$ and hence $y \notin U_m$ and $m \notin I_y$. Therefore, the families $\{I_x : x \in A\}$ and $\{I_y : y \in X \setminus A\}$ are orthogonal. The same argument shows that the family $\{I_x : x \in A\}$ is almost disjoint.

Since $|A \cup B| = |X| < \mathfrak{adp}$, the family $\{I_x : x \in A\}$ can be weakly separated from the family $\{I_y : y \in X \setminus A\}$ and hence there exists a set $D \subseteq \omega$ such that for any $x \in A$ the intersection $I_x \cap D$ is infinite and for any $x \in B$ the intersection $I_y \cap D$ is finite. For every finite set $F \subseteq D$ consider the open subset

$$W_F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{n \in D \setminus F} U_n$$

of X . For every $x \in A$ the infinite set $I_x \cap D$ contains a number $n \notin F$ and then $x \in U_n \subseteq W_F$. Therefore $G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap_{F \in [D]^{<\omega}} W_F$ is a G_δ -set containing A . On the other hand, for every $x \in X \setminus A$, the intersection $F = I_y \cap D = \{n \in D : y \in U_n\}$ is finite and hence $y \notin \bigcup_{n \in D \setminus F} U_n = W_F$. Therefore, $A = \bigcap_{F \in [D]^{<\omega}} W_F$ is a G_δ set in X witnessing that X is a Q -space. $\square$

Since $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{c}$ under Martin's Axiom, Proposition 9 implies the following corollary.

Corollary 10. *Under Martin's Axiom, $\mathfrak{q}_i = \mathfrak{c}$ for every $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 2\frac{1}{2}, 3\}$.*

It would be interesting to have any additional information on (im)possible inequalities between the cardinals $\mathfrak{q}_i$ and other cardinal characteristics of the continuum. In particular, the following questions are natural and seem to be open.

- Problem 11.** (1) *Is $\mathfrak{ap} \leq \mathfrak{q}_2$?*
 (2) *Is $\mathfrak{q}_1 \leq \text{add}(\mathcal{M})$?*
 (3) *Is $\mathfrak{q}_1 = \mathfrak{q}_2$?*
 (4) *Is the strict inequality $\mathfrak{q}_1 < \mathfrak{q}_0$ consistent?*

Also the position of the new cardinal $\mathfrak{adp}$ in the interval $[\mathfrak{dp}, \mathfrak{ap}]$ is not clear.

- Problem 12.** (1) *Is $\mathfrak{adp} = \mathfrak{dp}$ in ZFC?*
 (2) *Is $\mathfrak{adp} = \mathfrak{ap}$ in ZFC?*

By [3], the strict inequality $\mathfrak{dp} < \mathfrak{ap}$ is consistent, so one of the questions in Problem 12 has negative answer. But which one? Or both?

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Banach, M. Machura, and L. Zdomskyy, *On critical cardinalities related to Q -sets*, Math. Bull. Shevchenko Sci. Soc. **11** (2014), 21–32.
- [2] A. Blass, *Combinatorial cardinal characteristics of the continuum*, Handbook of set theory. Vols. 1, 2, 3, 395–489, Springer, Dordrecht, 2010.
- [3] J. Brendle, *Dow's principle and Q -sets*, Canad. Math. Bull. **42**:1 (1999), 13–24.
- [4] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [5] A. Miller, *Special subsets of the real line*, in: Handbook of set-theoretic topology, 201–233, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [6] J. Vaughan, *Small uncountable cardinals and topology*, With an appendix by S. Shelah. Open problems in topology, 195–218, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990.

IVAN FRANKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LVIV, UKRAINE
 Email address: t.o.banakh@gmail.com
 Email address: izar@litech.lviv.ua