

# ON SYMMETRIZABILITY AND PERFECTNESS OF SECOND-COUNTABLE SPACES

IRYNA BANAKH, TARAS BANAKH AND LIDIYA BAZYLEVYCH

ABSTRACT. A symmetrizability criterion of Arhangel'skii implies that a second-countable Hausdorff space is symmetrizable if and only if it is perfect. We present an example of a non-symmetrizable second-countable submetrizable space of cardinality  $\mathfrak{q}_0$  and study the smallest possible cardinality  $\mathfrak{q}_i$  of a non-symmetrizable second-countable  $T_i$ -space for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ .

Let us recall that a function  $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  on a set  $X$  is a *metric* if for every points  $x, y, z \in X$  the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1)  $d(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = y$ ;
- (2)  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ ;
- (3)  $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ .

A function  $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is called a *premetric* (resp. a *symmetric*) on  $X$  if it satisfies the condition (1) (resp. the conditions (1) and (2)).

We say that the topology of a topological space  $X$  is *generated by a premetric*  $d$  if a subset  $U \subseteq X$  is open if and only if for every  $x \in U$  there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B_d(x; \varepsilon) \subseteq U$  where  $B_d(x; \varepsilon) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{y \in X : d(x, y) < \varepsilon\}$  is the  $\varepsilon$ -ball centered at  $x$ .

A topological space is *symmetrizable* (resp. *metrizable*) if its topology is generated by some symmetric (resp. metric). Symmetrizable spaces satisfy the separation axiom  $T_1$ .

By the classical Urysohn Metrization Theorem [9, 4.2.9], each second-countable regular space is metrizable.

In this paper we address the following question (asked by the first author at [Mathoverflow](#) [2]).

**Problem 1.** *Is every second-countable Hausdorff space symmetrizable?*

To our surprise we have discovered that Problem 1 has negative answer, contrary to Theorem 2.9 [1] of Arhangel'skii claiming that a first-countable  $T_1$  space with a  $\sigma$ -discrete network is symmetrizable. In fact, the proof of this theorem works only under an additional restriction that the  $\sigma$ -discrete network consists of closed sets. Let us recall that a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of a topological space  $X$  is called a *network* for  $X$  if for every open set  $U \subseteq X$  and point  $x \in U$  there exists a set  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $x \in F \subseteq U$ . A network  $\mathcal{F}$  is *closed* if every set  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  is closed in  $X$ . So, the correct version of Arhangel'skii's Theorem 2.9 in [1] reads as follows.

**Theorem 2** (Arhangel'skii). *Every first-countable  $T_1$  space with a  $\sigma$ -discrete closed network is symmetrizable.*

This theorem implies

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54A35, 54E35, 54H05.

*Key words and phrases.* symmetrizable space, submetrizable space,  $\mathcal{Q}$ -space, cardinal characteristic of the continuum.

**Corollary 3.** *Every first-countable  $T_1$ -space with a countable closed network is symmetrizable.*

We shall apply this corollary to prove that for second-countable Hausdorff spaces the symmetrizability is equivalent to the perfectness.

A topological space  $X$  is called *perfect* if every closed subset  $F$  of  $X$  is of type  $G_\delta$ , i.e.,  $F$  is the intersection of countably many open sets. The following proposition is known, see the discussion before Theorem 9.8 in [10].

**Proposition 4.** *Every first-countable symmetrizable Hausdorff space  $X$  is perfect.*

*Proof.* We present a short proof for the convenience of the reader. Let  $d$  be a symmetric generating the topology of  $X$ . First we show that for every  $x \in X$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  the point  $x$  is contained in the interior  $B_d(x; \varepsilon)^\circ$  of the ball  $B_d(x; \varepsilon)$ . Indeed, in the opposite case we can use the first-countability of  $X$  and find a sequence  $S = \{x_n\}_{n \in \omega} \subseteq X \setminus B_d(x; \varepsilon)$  that converges to  $x$ . The Hausdorff property of  $X$  implies that the compact subset  $K = \{x\} \cup S$  is closed in  $X$  and hence for every  $y \in X \setminus K$  there exists  $\varepsilon_y$  such that  $B_d(y; \varepsilon_y) \cap S \subseteq B_d(y; \varepsilon_y) \cap K = \emptyset$ . Since also  $B_d(x; \varepsilon) \cap S = \emptyset$ , the set  $S$  is closed in  $X$ , which is not possible as the sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \omega}$  converges to  $x \notin S$ . This contradiction shows that  $x$  is an interior point of the ball  $B_d(x; \varepsilon)$ .

Now we are ready to prove that  $X$  is perfect. Given any closed set  $F \subseteq X$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  consider the open neighborhood  $U_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{x \in F} B_d(x; \frac{1}{n})^\circ$  of  $F$  in  $X$  and observe that  $F = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} U_n$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.** *Each perfect second-countable  $T_1$ -space  $X$  is symmetrizable.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a countable base of the topology of  $X$ . By the perfectness of  $X$ , every open set  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is equal to the union  $\bigcup \mathcal{F}_B$  of a countable family  $\mathcal{F}_B$  of closed sets in  $X$ . Then  $\mathcal{F} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{F}_B$  is a countable closed network for  $X$ . By Corollary 3, the space  $X$  is symmetrizable.  $\square$

Propositions 4 and 5 imply the following criterion.

**Theorem 6.** *A second-countable Hausdorff space is symmetrizable if and only if it is perfect.*

Next, we prove that second-countable (submetrizable)  $T_1$ -spaces of sufficiently small cardinality are symmetrizable.

A topological space is *submetrizable* if it admits a continuous metric. Each submetrizable space is *functionally Hausdorff* in the sense that for any distinct elements  $x, y \in X$  there exists a continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(x) \neq f(y)$ . By [3], a second-countable space is submetrizable if and only if it is functionally Hausdorff.

A topological space  $X$  is called a *Q-space* if every subset of  $X$  is of type  $G_\delta$  in  $X$ . Every  $Q$ -space is perfect.

Let  $\mathfrak{q}_0$  be the smallest cardinality of a second-countable metrizable space which is not a  $Q$ -space. For properties of the cardinal  $\mathfrak{q}_0$ , see [11, §4], [7], [4].

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  $\omega_1 \leq \mathfrak{q}_1 \leq \mathfrak{q}_2 \leq \mathfrak{q}_3 = \mathfrak{q}_0 \leq \mathfrak{c}$ , where  $\mathfrak{c}$  stands for the cardinality of continuum. By [3],  $\mathfrak{p} \leq \mathfrak{q}_1$ , where  $\mathfrak{p}$  is the smallest cardinality of a subfamily  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$  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 [5] or [13]) that  $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{c}$  under Martin's Axiom. By [3], every submetrizable space of cardinality  $< \mathfrak{q}_0$  is a  $Q$ -space. This fact combined with Proposition 5 implies

**Proposition 7.** *Every second-countable submetrizable space of cardinality  $< \mathfrak{q}_0$  is symmetrizable.*

Since functionally Hausdorff second-countable spaces are submetrizable, Proposition 7 implies another criterion of symmetrizability.

**Proposition 8.** *Every second-countable functionally Hausdorff space of cardinality  $< \mathfrak{q}_0$  is symmetrizable.*

Proposition 5 combined with the definition of the cardinals  $\mathfrak{q}_i$  implies the following semimetrizability criterion.

**Proposition 9.** *Let  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Every second-countable  $T_i$ -space  $X$  of cardinality  $|X| < \mathfrak{q}_i$  is symmetrizable.*

Since  $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q}_1 = \mathfrak{c}$ , we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 10.** *Under Martin's Axiom, every second-countable  $T_1$ -space of cardinality  $< \mathfrak{c}$  is symmetrizable.*

Finally, we show that the cardinals  $\mathfrak{q}_0$  and  $\mathfrak{q}_2$  in Propositions 7, 8, 9 are the best possible.

**Example 11.** There exists a second-countable submetrizable space of cardinality  $\mathfrak{q}_0$  which is not symmetrizable.

*Proof.* By the definition of the cardinal  $\mathfrak{q}_0$ , there exists a second-countable metrizable space  $X$ , which is not a  $Q$ -space. Then  $X$  contains a subset  $A$  which is not of type  $G_\delta$  in  $X$ . Let  $\tau'$  be the topology on  $X$  generated by the subbase  $\tau \cup \{A\}$  where  $\tau$  is the topology of the space  $X$ . Since  $\tau \subseteq \tau'$ , the space  $X'$  is submetrizable. 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  $\tau'$ , 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  $A = A \cap W_n = A \cap U_n \subseteq U_n$ .

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

and hence  $A = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} U_n$  is a  $G_\delta$ -set in  $X$ , which contradicts the choice of  $A$ . This contradiction shows that the submetrizable second-countable space  $X'$  is not perfect. By Proposition 4,  $X'$  is not symmetrizable.  $\square$

By analogy, we can prove that the cardinal  $\mathfrak{q}_2$  in Proposition 9 is the best possible.

**Example 12.** There exists a second-countable Hausdorff space of cardinality  $\mathfrak{q}_2$  which is not symmetrizable.

However this argument does not work for the cardinal  $\mathfrak{q}_1$  (because Proposition 5 is applicable only for Hausdorff spaces).

**Problem 13.** *Is  $\mathfrak{q}_1$  equal to the smallest cardinality of a second-countable  $T_1$ -space which is not symmetrizable?*

**Problem 14.** *Is  $\mathfrak{q}_1 = \mathfrak{q}_2 = \mathfrak{q}_0$ ?*

By Proposition 4, every symmetrizable first-countable Hausdorff space is perfect. On the other hand, by [6], [8], [12], there exists a non-perfect symmetrizable Hausdorff (even regular) spaces. However those examples are not first-countable.

**Question 15.** *Is every second-countable symmetrizable space perfect?*

**Example 16.** Consider the set  $X = \{-\frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\} \cup \{\frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  endowed with the symmetric

$$d(x, y) = \begin{cases} \max\{x, y\} & \text{if } \max\{x, y\} > 0 \text{ and } \min\{x, y\} < 0; \\ |x - y| & \text{if } \max\{x, y\} \leq 0; \\ 0 & \text{if } x = y; \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This symmetric generates a first-countable non-Hausdorff topology in which the unit ball  $B_d(0, 1) = \{-\frac{1}{n} : n \geq 2\} \cup \{0\}$  is nowhere dense. So, the proof of the perfectness of symmetrizable first-countable Hausdorff spaces from Proposition 4 does not work in this case. Nonetheless, the symmetrizable space  $X$  is countable and hence perfect, so this example does not answer Question 15.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] A.V. Arhangel'skii, *Mappings and spaces*, Russ. Math. Surv. **21**:4 (1966), 115–162.
- [2] T. Banakh, *Is every second-countable Hausdorff space symmetrizable?*, [mathoverflow.net/q/423630/61536](https://mathoverflow.net/q/423630/61536).
- [3] T. Banakh, L. Bazylevych, *Q-spaces, perfect spaces and related cardinal characteristics of the continuum*, preprint.
- [4] T. Banakh, M. Machura, and L. Zdomskyy, *On critical cardinalities related to Q-sets*, Math. Bull. Shevchenko Sci. Soc. **11** (2014), 21–32.
- [5] A. Blass, *Combinatorial cardinal characteristics of the continuum*, Handbook of set theory. Vols. 1, 2, 3, 395–489, Springer, Dordrecht, 2010.
- [6] D. Bonnett, *A symmetrizable space that is not perfect*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **34** (1972), 560–564.
- [7] J. Brendle, *Dow's principle and Q-sets*, Canad. Math. Bull. **42**:1 (1999), 13–24.
- [8] S.W. Davis, G. Gruenhage, P. Nyikos,  *$G_\delta$  sets in symmetrizable and related spaces*, General Topology Appl. **9**:3 (1978), 253–261.
- [9] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [10] G. Gruenhage, *Generalized metric spaces*, in: Handbook of set-theoretic topology, 423–501, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [11] A. Miller, *Special subsets of the real line*, in: Handbook of set-theoretic topology, 201–233, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [12] R.M. Stephenson, Jr. *Symmetrizable,  $\mathcal{F}$ -, and weakly first countable spaces*, Canadian J. Math. **29**:3 (1977), 480–488.
- [13] J. Vaughan, *Small uncountable cardinals and topology*, With an appendix by S. Shelah. Open problems in topology, 195–218, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990.

YA. PIDSTRYHACH INSTITUTE FOR APPLIED PROBLEMS OF MECHANICS AND MATHEMATICS, NAUKOVA 3B, LVIV, UKRAINE

*Email address:* [ibanakh@yahoo.com](mailto:ibanakh@yahoo.com)

FACULTY OF MECHANICS AND MATHEMATICS, IVAN FRANKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LVIV, UKRAINE

*Email address:* [t.o.banakh@gmail.com](mailto:t.o.banakh@gmail.com)

*Email address:* [izar@litech.lviv.ua](mailto:izar@litech.lviv.ua)