

LOCALLY CLOSED SETS AND SUBMAXIMAL SPACES

R. MOHAMADIAN

ABSTRACT. A topological space X is called submaximal if every dense subset of X is open. In this paper, we show that if βX , the Stone-Čech compactification of X , is a submaximal space, then X is a compact space and hence $\beta X = X$. We also prove that if νX , the Hewitt realcompactification of X , is submaximal and first countable and X is without isolated point, then X is realcompact and hence $\nu X = X$. We observe that every submaximal Hausdorff space is pseudo-finite. It turns out that if νX is a submaximal space, then X is a pseudo-finite μ -compact space. An example is given which shows that X may be submaximal but νX may not be submaximal. Given a topological space (X, \mathcal{T}) , the collection of all locally closed subsets of X forms a base for a topology on X which is denoted by \mathcal{T}_l . We study some topological properties between (X, \mathcal{T}) and (X, \mathcal{T}_l) , such as we show that a) (X, \mathcal{T}_l) is discrete if and only if (X, \mathcal{T}) is a T_D -space; b) (X, \mathcal{T}) is a locally indiscrete space if and only if $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_l$; c) (X, \mathcal{T}) is indiscrete space if and only if (X, \mathcal{T}_l) is connected. We see that, in locally indiscrete spaces, the concepts of T_0 , T_D , $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$, T_1 , submaximal and discrete coincide. Finally, we prove that every clopen subspace of an lc-compact space is lc-compact.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper we consider topological spaces on which no separation axioms are assumed unless explicitly stated. The topology of a space is denoted by \mathcal{T} and (X, \mathcal{T}) will be replaced by X if there is no chance for confusion. For a subset A of (X, \mathcal{T}) , the closure, the interior, the boundary and the set of accumulation points of A are denoted by $\text{cl}_{\mathcal{T}}(A)$ or $\text{cl}_X(A)$, $\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}}(A)$ or $\text{int}_X(A)$, $\text{Fr}_{\mathcal{T}}(A)$ or $\text{Fr}_X(A)$ and A' , respectively. In places where there is no chance for confusion \overline{A} and A° stands for $\text{cl}_{\mathcal{T}}(A)$ and $\text{int}_{\mathcal{T}}(A)$, respectively. If $A \subseteq X$ be open, closed or locally closed respect to the topology \mathcal{T} on X , then we write sometimes to avoid confusion, \mathcal{T} -open, \mathcal{T} -closed or \mathcal{T} -locally closed, respectively. A subset A of a topological space X is called locally closed if for every $x \in A$ there is an open set $U \subseteq X$ such that $x \in U$ and $A \cap U$ is closed in U . Since the intersection of two locally closed sets is locally closed, the family of \mathcal{T} -locally closed sets forms a base for a finer topology \mathcal{T}_l on X . For a Tychonoff (completely regular Hausdorff)

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54G99, 54G05, 54G10, 54C30.

Key words and phrases. locally closed set, locally indiscrete space, T_D -space, submaximal space, Stone-Čech compactification, Hewitt realcompactification.

space X , βX is the Stone-Ćech compactification and vX is the Hewitt realcompactification of X . It is well known that X is compact, pseudocompact or realcompact if and only if $\beta X = X$, $\beta X = vX$ or $vX = X$, respectively. For a Tychonoff space the symbol $C(X)$ (resp. $C^*(X)$) denotes the ring of all continuous real valued (resp. all bounded continuous real valued) functions defined on X . We say that a subspace S of X is C^* -embedded in X if every function in $C^*(S)$ can be extended to a function in $C^*(X)$. For $f \in C(X)$, the zero-set of f is the set $Z(f) = \{x \in X : f(x) = 0\}$. The set-theoretic complement of $Z(f)$ is denoted by $\text{coz}(f)$. The support of a function $f \in C(X)$ is the $\overline{\text{coz}(f)}$. For any $p \in \beta X$, the maximal ideal M^p (resp. the ideal O^p) is the set of all $f \in C(X)$ for which $p \in \text{cl}_{\beta X} Z(f)$ (resp. $p \in \text{int}_{\beta X} \text{cl}_{\beta X} Z(f)$). More generally, for $A \subseteq \beta X$, M^A (resp. O^A) is the intersection of all M^p (resp. O^p) with $p \in A$. It is clear that $O^A \subseteq M^A$.

A space X is said to be a, a) door space if every set is either open or closed; b) $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -space if every singleton is either open or closed; c) submaximal space if every dense subset is open; d) principal space, if every intersection of open sets is open, e) c -principal space, if every countable intersection of open sets (i.e., G_δ -set) is open, f) resolvable space if it has two disjoint dense subsets.

Tychonoff c -principal spaces are the same P -spaces, see Exercise 4J of [12]. A door space is submaximal and a submaximal space is $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$. The one-point compactification of any discrete space is submaximal. A nonempty resolvable space never submaximal. For example, \mathbb{R} and $\beta\mathbb{Q}$ are resolvable spaces. For more information about the locally closed sets, see [2, 8, 11], about the submaximal spaces, see [2, 8, 7, 1], about the door spaces, see [7, 9] and about the $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -spaces, see [3]. For details about βX and vX , see [12, 18] and about other concepts of general topology, see [10, 19].

Section 2, of this paper is devoted to investigate some separation properties between (X, \mathcal{T}) and (X, \mathcal{T}_l) . Such as we show that (X, \mathcal{T}_l) is discrete if and only if (X, \mathcal{T}) is a T_D -space. We show that, in this section, if βX is submaximal, then X is compact and therefor, in this case, we conclude that $X = \beta X$. We also prove that if vX is submaximal and first countable and X is without isolated point, then X is realcompact. We observe that every submaximal Hausdorff space is pseudo-finite. It turns out that if vX is a submaximal space, then X is a pseudo-finite μ -compact space. In Section 3, we study and investigate the behavior locally indiscrete spaces. We observe that (X, \mathcal{T}) is a locally indiscrete space if and only if $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_l$ if and only if every dense open subset of X is regular open. In Section 4, we introduce some lc-properties such as lc-regular and lc-completely regular and compare them with the concepts regular and completely regular. We prove that every clopen subset of a lc-compact space is lc-compact.

2. LOCALLY CLOSED SETS AND \mathcal{T}_l -TOPOLOGY

A space X is called a T_D -space if every singleton is locally closed. It is well known that the space X is submaximal if and only if every subset

of X is locally closed, see Theorem 4.2 of [8] and also every subspace of a submaximal space is submaximal, see Theorem 1.1 of [8].

The proof of the following proposition is straightforward.

Proposition 2.1. The following statements are equivalent, for a subset A of the space X .

- a) A is a locally closed set.
- b) $A = G \cap B$, which G is open and B is closed.
- c) $A = H \cap \overline{A}$, which H is open.
- d) $A = E - F$, which E and F are closed.
- e) $\overline{A} - A$ is a closed set.
- f) $A \subseteq (A \cup (X - \overline{A}))^\circ$.
- g) $A \cup (X - \overline{A})$ is an open set.

Remark 2.2. a) Every closed (resp. open) set is locally closed.

- b) Every dense locally closed set is open.
- c) The intersection of finite number locally closed sets is locally closed.
- d) Every intersection of locally closed sets may not be locally closed.
- e) The complement of a locally closed set need not be locally closed. For example, $A = \{\frac{1}{n} : n = 1, \dots\}$ is a locally closed set in \mathbb{R} while $\mathbb{R} - A$ is not locally closed.
- f) The union of two locally closed sets need not be locally closed. For example, suppose that $A = (-\infty, 0]$ and $B = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{1}{n})$ in \mathbb{R} . Then $A \cup B$ is not locally closed.
- g) The union of two completely separated locally closed sets is locally closed.
- h) If A is preopen, (that is, $A \subseteq \text{intcl}(A)$) then it is open if and only if it is locally closed.
- i) If \overline{A} is open, where A is locally closed, then A is open.
- j) If A is locally closed and B is clopen, then $\overline{A \cap B}$ is locally closed.
- k) If A and B are locally closed, then the equal $\overline{A \cap B} = \overline{A} \cap \overline{B}$ may not be true. For example, let $X = \{a, b\}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, X\}$. Now suppose that $A = \{a\}$ and $B = \{b\}$.
- l) Let X be a topological space and Y a subspace of X . The set $A \subseteq Y$ is locally closed in Y if and only if $A = Y \cap B$, where B is locally closed in X .
- m) In a locally compact Hausdorff space, any subset is locally closed if and only if it is a locally compact set, see Theorem 18.4 of [19] or Corollary 3.3.10 of [10].
- n) Let X, Y are topological spaces, the continuous mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is one-to-one and let the one element family $\{f\}$ separates points and closed sets. If X is a T_1 -space and $f(X)$ is open subset of Y , then $f(X)$ is a T_D -space, see Lemma 2.3.19 of [10].
- o) A locally closed set A of X is dense in X if and only if there is an open set G of X such that $A \cap G$ is dense in X .
- p) Every discrete subset of a T_1 -space is locally closed.
- q) $A \subseteq X$ is locally closed in X if and only if it is locally closed in \overline{A} .

Given a topological space (X, \mathcal{T}) , the collection of all locally closed subsets of X forms a base for a topology on X which is denoted by \mathcal{T}_l . It is clear that $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_l$ and in locally indiscrete spaces we have $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_l$, see Proposition 3.4. In the sequel, we study some topological properties between (X, \mathcal{T}) and (X, \mathcal{T}_l) .

Proposition 2.3. (X, \mathcal{T}) is indiscrete if and only if (X, \mathcal{T}_l) is a connected space.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let $G \in \mathcal{T}$ and let $\emptyset \neq G \neq X$. Clearly $G \in \mathcal{T}_l$ and $X - G \in \mathcal{T}_l$ and therefore (X, \mathcal{T}_l) is disconnected.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that $X = G \cup H$, which G and H are two nonempty disjoint \mathcal{T}_l -open sets and let $x \in G$. Hence there is a \mathcal{T} -locally closed set A such that $x \in A \subseteq G$. Therefore $A = U \cap \text{cl}_{\mathcal{T}}A$, where $U \in \mathcal{T}$. If $U \neq X$, then we are done. Assume that $U = X$. This implies that $A = \text{cl}_{\mathcal{T}}A$, that is, $X - A$ is a \mathcal{T} -open. Since $\emptyset \neq H \subseteq X - A$, we infer that $X - A \neq \emptyset$. Now if $X - A = X$, then $A = \emptyset$ which is not true. Consequently, $\emptyset \neq X - A \neq X$ is a \mathcal{T} -open set. This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 2.4. (X, \mathcal{T}) is a T_0 -space if and only if (X, \mathcal{T}_l) is a T_0 -space.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) It is trivial.

(\Leftarrow) Let $x, y \in X$ and $x \neq y$. Hence there is $G \in \mathcal{T}_l$ such that $x \in G$ and $y \notin G$. Let A be \mathcal{T} -locally closed set such that $x \in A \subseteq G$. Therefore $A = U \cap \text{cl}_{\mathcal{T}}A$, where $U \in \mathcal{T}$. If $y \notin U$, then we are done. If $y \in U$, then $y \notin \text{cl}_{\mathcal{T}}A$. Otherwise $y \in A$ and so $y \in G$ which is not true. Thus there is $V \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $y \in V$ and $V \cap A = \emptyset$. This consequence that $x \notin V$ and this completes the proof. \square

If (X, \mathcal{T}) is a T_1 -space then (X, \mathcal{T}_l) is discrete. The converse is not true. For example, let $X = \{a, b\}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, X\}$. For the converse see the next proposition.

Proposition 2.5. (X, \mathcal{T}) is a T_D -space if and only if (X, \mathcal{T}_l) is discrete.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) It is trivial.

(\Leftarrow) Let $x \in X$. Hence $\{x\} \in \mathcal{T}_l$, and therefore there is a \mathcal{T} -locally closed set A such that $x \in A \subseteq \{x\}$. It implies that $A = \{x\}$, i.e., (X, \mathcal{T}) is a T_D -space. \square

Remark 2.6. Every T_D -space is T_0 . The converse is false. For example, we consider the topology $\mathcal{T} = \{(a, \infty) : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{\emptyset, \mathbb{R}\}$ on \mathbb{R} .

If \mathcal{T} be the principal topology on X , then every element $x \in X$ has a minimal open neighborhood $M_x = \bigcap \{G \in \mathcal{T} : x \in G\}$. For details about principal topology, see [17].

Lemma 2.7. Every principal T_0 -space is T_D .

Proof. Suppose that $x \in X$. If $\overline{\{x\}} = \{x\}$, then we are done. Hence, assume that $x \neq x_0 \in \overline{\{x\}}$. Since there is no an open set G such that $x_0 \in G$ and

$x \notin G$ we infer that there is an open set H such that $x \in H$ and $x_0 \notin H$. Now let $U = \overline{M_x}$ be the minimal open neighborhood of x . We claim that $\{x\} = U \cap \overline{\{x\}}$. Assume that $t \in U \cap \overline{\{x\}}$. We show that $t = x$. If not, then two cases occur. In the first case, there is an open set V such that $t \in V$ and $x \notin V$, which is not true, for $t \in \overline{\{x\}}$. In the second case, there is an open set W such that $t \notin W$ and $x \in W$. Now since $t \in U$, we conclude that $t \in W$ which is not true. Consequently, $t = x$ and this implies that $\{x\}$ is locally closed set. \square

Remark 2.8. a) If (X, \mathcal{T}) is a principal space, then every intersection of locally closed sets is locally closed.

b) If (X, \mathcal{T}) is a principal space, then (X, \mathcal{T}_l) is principal. The converse is false. For example, $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}_l)$ is principal but $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}_u)$, where \mathcal{T}_u denotes usual topology on \mathbb{R} , is not principal.

Example 2.9. A continuous image of a T_D -space need not be T_D -space. Let $X = (0, 1)$ with usual topology and $Y = (1, \infty)$ with $\mathcal{T}_Y = \{Y \cap G : G \in \mathcal{T}\}$, where $\mathcal{T} = \{(a, \infty) : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{\emptyset, \mathbb{R}\}$ on \mathbb{R} . We define $f : X \rightarrow Y$ by $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. Then f is a one-to-one and onto which is continuous. To prove continuity, suppose that $H \subseteq Y$ be open and $f(x_0) \in H$, where $x_0 \in X$. There is $0 < r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r < \frac{1}{x_0}$ and $H = (r, \infty)$. We put $G = (s, \frac{1}{r})$, where $s < x_0$. It is clear that $f(G) \subseteq H$. Note that X is a T_D -space while Y is not a T_D -space.

If $\prod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} X_\alpha$ is a T_D -space, then X_α is a T_D -space for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$. The converse is true if I is finite. In the next example we see that an arbitrary product of T_D -spaces need not be T_D .

Example 2.10. Let $X_n = \{a, b\}$ and $\mathcal{T}_n = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, X\}$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $X = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$. Suppose that $x = (x_n) \in X$, where $x_n = a$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is clear that x belongs to every nonempty open set in X . We claim that $\{x\}$ is not a locally closed set. Otherwise, there is an open set G and a closed set F such that $\{x\} = G \cap F$. If $F \neq X$, then $x \in F \cap (X - F)$ which is not true. If $F = X$, then $\{x\} = G$. But $G = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_n$, where $G_n = X_n$, for every $n \notin I$, which $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is finite and this is impossible. It is consequence that $\{x\}$ is not locally closed.

Lemma 2.11. $X = \prod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} X_\alpha$ is a c -principal space if and only if all but finitely many of the X_α are trivial spaces.

Proof. It is straightforward. \square

In the sequel, by $|A|$ we mean the cardinality of A for every set A .

Remark 2.12. Let $X = \prod_{\alpha \in \Lambda} X_\alpha$ be a c -principal space and $|I| \leq \aleph_0$. Then X is a T_D -space if and only if each factor space is a T_D -space, see part (b) of Exercise 2.3.B of [10].

Every $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -space is T_D . The converse is not true. For example, let $X = \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \{E_n : n = 1, \dots\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$, where $E_n = \{n, n + 1, \dots\}$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since $\{n\} = E_n \cap (\mathbb{N} - E_{n+1})$, we infer that \mathbb{N} is a T_D -space. It is clear that the set $\{2\}$ neither open nor closed, so \mathbb{N} is not a $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -space.

Recall that union of two locally closed sets may not be locally closed. In the next example, we see that even if we add a cluster point to a locally closed set, the resulting set may not be locally closed. In other words, if A is locally closed and $x \in \overline{A} - A$, then $A \cup \{x\}$ need not be locally closed.

Example 2.13. Suppose that $X = \mathbb{R}$, and for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A_k = \{\frac{n+1}{kn+1} : n = 1, \dots\}$. We consider $A = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k$ and we put $B = A - \{1, \frac{1}{2}, \dots\}$. Then $\overline{B} - B = \{0, 1, \frac{1}{2}, \dots\}$ is closed and hence B is locally closed in \mathbb{R} . Now assume that $C = B \cup \{0\}$. Clearly, $\overline{B} = \overline{C}$. Note that $\overline{C} - C = \{1, \frac{1}{2}, \dots\}$ is not closed set in \mathbb{R} and hence C is not locally closed.

Example 2.14. An arbitrary product of Tychonoff, compact and submaximal spaces need not be submaximal. For example, assume that $X_n^* = X_n \cup \{\sigma_n\}$ be a one-point compactification of a discrete space X_n , for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $X = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n^*$ and suppose that $A = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$, then A is dense in X which is not open.

Proposition 2.15. Let X be a submaximal space and $A, B \subseteq X$ with $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Then $\overline{A} \cap \overline{B}$ is discrete.

Proof. Suppose that $x \in \overline{A} \cap \overline{B}$. Hence $A \cup \{x\}$ is locally closed in \overline{A} . Therefore there is an open set G in \overline{A} such that $A \cup \{x\} = G \cap \text{cl}_{\overline{A}}(A \cup \{x\})$. Let U be open in X such that $G = U \cap \overline{A}$. Note that $\text{cl}_{\overline{A}}(A \cup \{x\}) = \text{cl}_X(A \cup \{x\}) \cap \overline{A} = \overline{A} \cap \overline{A} = \overline{A}$. This implies that $A \cup \{x\} = U \cap \overline{A}$. Similarly, there is an open set V in X such that $B \cup \{x\} = V \cap \overline{B}$. Now $\{x\} = (A \cup \{x\}) \cap (B \cup \{x\}) = (U \cap \overline{A}) \cap (V \cap \overline{B}) = (U \cap V) \cap (\overline{A} \cap \overline{B})$. This consequence that x is an isolated point of $\overline{A} \cap \overline{B}$. \square

If X is a submaximal space and $A \subseteq X$, then $\text{Fr}(A)$ is a discrete subset of X . Also if X is a submaximal space and A is a discrete subset of X , then $\overline{A'}$ is discrete and if in addition X is a T_1 -space, then A' is discrete.

Theorem 2.16. If βX is a submaximal space, then X is compact. In this case $\beta X = X$.

Proof. Since βX is countably compact, by Theorem 4.20 of [1], βX is a finite disjoint union of one-point compactification of some discrete spaces. Suppose that $\beta X = \bigcup_{i=1}^n X_i^*$, where X_i^* is the one-point compactification of discrete space X_i , for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. Assume that $X_i^* = X_i \cup \{\sigma_i\}$, $Y = \bigcup_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $A = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$. Clearly, Y is discrete and hence $Y \subseteq X$. It is sufficient to show that $A \subseteq X$. On the contrary suppose that $A \cap (\beta X - X) = I$ is a nonempty set. Then $D = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ is discrete and $X = D \cup (\bigcup_{i \notin I} X_i^*)$. One can easily see that D is C^* -embedded in X and consequently is C^* -embedded in βX . Hence, $\text{cl}_{\beta X} D = \beta D$ and therefore $\beta D \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i^*$. This implies that $|\beta D| \leq |\bigcup_{i \in I} X_i^*| = \sum_{i \in I} |X_i| = |D|$ which is contradiction, for by Theorem 9.2 of [12] we have $|\beta D| = 2^{2^{|D|}}$. \square

The converse of the above theorem is not true, in general. For example, $X = \beta\mathbb{Q}$ is compact, while $\beta X = \beta\mathbb{Q}$ is not a submaximal space. Also, if X is a submaximal space, then βX may not be submaximal. For example, \mathbb{N} is submaximal but $\beta\mathbb{N}$ is not submaximal.

Corollary 2.17. Let vX be a submaximal space. The following statements are equivalent.

- a) X is compact.
- b) X is σ -compact.
- c) X is countably compact.
- d) X is pseudocompact.

Proof. ($a \Rightarrow b$) and ($c \Rightarrow d$) are trivial.

($b \Rightarrow c$) Since X is union a finite number of compact spaces, then it is countably compact.

($c \Rightarrow a$) If X is a pseudocompact space, then $vX = \beta X$ and by hypothesis βX is submaximal. Now by Theorem 2.16 we conclude that X is compact. \square

Lemma 2.18. If X is a dense countably compact set in T and T is a Hausdorff submaximal space, then $X = T$.

Proof. Since X is a submaximal space, then by Theorem 4.21 of [1], X is compact and since T is Hausdorff, we infer that X is closed in T . Therefore, by density of X we have $X = T$. \square

By the above lemma the proof of the next corollary is obvious.

Corollary 2.19. If vX is submaximal and X is countably compact, then X is realcompact.

Remark 2.20. We denote the set of all isolated points of space X with $I(X)$. If X is open in T , then $I(X) \subseteq I(T)$ and if X is dense in T , then $I(T) \subseteq I(X)$. Hence, if X is an open dense set in T , then $I(X) = I(T)$.

Theorem 2.21. Suppose that T is a first countable, Hausdorff and submaximal space and X is a dense set in T and $I(X) = \emptyset$. Then $X = T$.

Proof. Let $p \in T - X$. Hence, there is an infinite sequence (x_n) contained in X which converges to p . Put $A = \{x_n : n = 1, \dots\} \cup \{p\}$. Let N be a copy of \mathbb{N} contained in A . Since A is compact, then N has an accumulation point in A , namely x_0 . We claim that $\overline{T - N} = T$. To see this, let $a \in T$ and $a \in G \subseteq T$, which G is an open set in T . We must show that $G \cap (T - N) \neq \emptyset$. If not, then $a \in G \subseteq N$ and hence there is an open set H in T such that $H \cap N = \{a\}$. It is clear that $H \cap G = \{a\}$, that is $a \in I(T)$ which is contradiction. Now one can easily see that $x_0 \in T - N$ while $x_0 \notin (T - N)^\circ$, that is $T - N$ is not open, so it contradicts the submaximality of T . \square

Corollary 2.22. Let X be a compact submaximal space. Then $|I(X)|$ is finite if and only if X is finite.

Proof. Suppose that $|I(X)|$ is finite. If $X - I(X)$ is infinite, then similar to the proof of the Theorem 2.21, we can show that X is not submaximal, which is a contradiction. Hence $X - I(X)$ is finite and so X is finite. \square

Corollary 2.23. If vX is submaximal and first countable and $I(X) = \emptyset$, then $X = vX$ i.e., X is realcompact.

Proof. By Theorem 2.21 is clear. \square

A space X is called a pseudo-finite (resp. pseudo-discrete) space if every compact subspace of X is finite (resp. has finite interior). We say that X is real pseudo-finite, if vX is pseudo-finite. Every pseudo-finite space is pseudo-discrete, but not conversely. For example, we consider the space \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers.

Example 2.24. The space Σ is pseudo-finite. To see this, let $F \subseteq \Sigma$ be a compact subspace. If $\sigma \notin F$, then F is discrete and hence it is finite. If $\sigma \in F$ and F is infinite, then assume that $A = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ be an infinite subset of F and put $G = (\mathbb{N} - \{x_1\}) \cup \{\sigma\}$. Now $\mathcal{C} = \{\{x_n\} : n = 1, \dots\} \cup \{G\}$ be an open cover for F which has not a finite subcover. This is a contradiction.

Proposition 2.25. Every submaximal Hausdorff space is pseudo-finite.

Proof. Let X be a submaximal Hausdorff space and let Y be a compact subspace of X . If Y be infinite, then contains a copy of \mathbb{N} , namely N . Suppose that $x_0 \in N'$, where $x_0 \in Y$. Now similar to the proof of the Theorem 2.21, it is observe that $X - N$ is dense in X but it is not an open set in X , so it contradicts the submaximality of X . \square

A pseudo-finite Tychonoff space may be not submaximal. For example, \mathbb{Q} is pseudo-finite but not submaximal. See also the following example.

Example 2.26. We consider the space X in Example 2 of [16]. This example shows that the Tychonoff space X is an infinite countably compact subset of $\beta\mathbb{N}$ which is also pseudo-finite. We claim that X is not submaximal. Otherwise, by Theorem 4.20 of [1], X must be a compact space. In this case, since X is pseudo-finite, it must be finite, which is not true.

$C_K(X)$ (resp. $C_\psi(X)$) is the family of all $f \in C(X)$ with compact (resp. pseudocompact) support. Also $C_\infty(X)$ is a subcollection of $C^*(X)$ consisting of all functions vanishing at infinity, that is all $f \in C(X)$ for which $\{x \in X : |f(x)| \geq \frac{1}{n}\}$ is compact for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For the convenience of readers, some special ideals are listed below.

a) $C_F(X) = O^{\beta X \setminus I(X)}$ is the intersection of all essential ideals in $C(X)$. Recall that $C_F(X)$ is the socle of $C(X)$ and it is well known that $C_F(X) = \{f \in C(X) : \text{coz}(f) \text{ is finite}\}$, see Proposition 3.3 of [14].

b) $C_K(X) = O^{\beta X \setminus X}$ is the intersection of all free ideals in $C(X)$, see 7E of [12].

c) $C_\infty(X) = M^{*\beta X \setminus X}$ is the intersection of all free maximal ideals in $C^*(X)$.

d) $C_\psi(X) = M^{\beta X \setminus vX}$ is the intersection of all hyper-real maximal ideals in $C(X)$.

e) $I_\psi(X) = M^{\beta X \setminus X}$ is the intersection of all free maximal ideals in $C(X)$.

One can easily see that $C_F(X) \subseteq C_K(X) \subseteq I_\psi(X)$. In Theorem 8.19 of [12], it is shown that if X is realcompact, then $C_K(X) = I_\psi(X)$. In part (a) of Theorem 4.5 of [4], it is proved that X is a pseudo-discrete if and only if $C_F(X) = C_K(X)$.

In [13] a space X is called:

- a) a μ -compact if $C_K(X) = I_\psi(X)$.
- b) an η -compact if $C_\psi(X) = I_\psi(X)$.
- c) a ψ -compact if $C_K(X) = C_\psi(X)$.
- d) an ∞ -compact if $C_K(X) = C_\infty(X)$.

In [15] a space X is called an i -compact if $C_\infty(X) = I_\psi(X)$.

Proposition 2.27. If vX is a submaximal space, then X is a pseudo-finite μ -compact space.

Proof. By Corollary 2.25, X is pseudo-finite. Since X is real pseudo-finite, by Theorem 3.8 of [14], we infer that $C_K(X) = I_\psi(X)$, that is, X is a μ -compact space. \square

The converse of the above proposition is not true, in general. For example, \mathbb{Q} is a pseudo-finite μ -compact space but $v\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}$ is not submaximal. By part (b) of Theorem 4.5 of [4], the proof of the result is obvious.

Corollary 2.28. Let X be a submaximal Hausdorff space and $|I(X)| < \aleph_0$. Then $C_K(X) = C_\infty(X)$.

Proposition 2.29. Let vX be a submaximal space and $|I(X)| < \aleph_0$. Then the following statement are hold.

- a) X is a i -compact.
- b) X is a ∞ -compact.
- c) X is compact if and only if it is a realcompact space.

Proof. The proof of parts (a) and (b) and implication (\Rightarrow) of (c) is clear. For the other side of (c), since X is i -compact, then $C_\infty(X) = I_\psi(X)$. Since X is realcompact, we infer that $C_\psi(X) = I_\psi(X) = C_K(X)$, that is, X is η -compact and ψ -compact. Hence $C_\infty(X) = C_\psi(X)$ and by Corollary 2.5 of [5] we conclude that X is compact. \square

Similar to Theorem 2.16, the question arises that if vX is a submaximal space, is X realcompact?. So far, we have not been able to answer this question, in general. Therefor we express it as a question.

Question: If vX is a submaximal space, is X realcompact?

The space \mathbb{R} is a realcompact space which is not submaximal. See the following example for an example of a space that is submaximal but not

realcompact. This example, also shows that X may be submaximal but vX may not be submaximal.

Example 2.30. We consider the space Ψ in 5I of [12]. By 5I. 5, the space Ψ is pseudocompact which it is not a realcompact space. We now show that it is submaximal. Suppose that $\overline{B} = \Psi$. Since $\mathbb{N} \subseteq B$, we infer that $B = \mathbb{N} \cup A$, where $A = \{\omega_E : E \in \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{E}\}$. Assume that $\omega_E \in B$, which $E \in \mathcal{F}$. Put $G = D \cup \{\omega_E\}$, where D containing all but a finite number of points of E . Then G is an open set contains ω_E and $G \subseteq B$. This implies that $\omega_E \in B^\circ$, that is B open and consequence that Ψ is submaximal. Furthermore, since Ψ is not compact, by Theorem 2.16, $\beta\Psi$ is not submaximal. Now $v\Psi = \beta\Psi$ shows that $v\Psi$ is not a submaximal space.

It is possible that X is a locally compact and pseudocompact space but vX is not submaximal. See the next example.

Example 2.31. We consider the space $\mathbf{W} = W(\omega_1) = \{\sigma : \sigma < \omega_1\}$ of all countable ordinals and $\mathbf{W}^* = W(\omega_1 + 1) = \{\sigma : \sigma \leq \omega_1\}$, where ω_1 denoting the first uncountable ordinal. It is well known that \mathbf{W} is a pseudocompact locally compact space which neither compact nor realcompact. Clearly, $v\mathbf{W} = \beta\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}^*$. Since \mathbf{W} is not compact, then by Theorem 2.16, $v\mathbf{W}$ is not submaximal. For a direct proof let $A = \{\omega_0, 2\omega_0, 3\omega_0, \dots\}$, where ω_0 is the first infinite ordinal and let $B = \mathbf{W}^* - A$. One can easily check that B is dense in $v\mathbf{W}$. But B is not open in $v\mathbf{W}$, for $\omega_0^2 \in B$ while $\omega_0^2 \notin B^\circ$.

3. LOCALLY INDISCRETE SPACES

A space X is called locally indiscrete if every open set is closed or equivalently if every closed set is open. Every discrete space is locally indiscrete. For another nontrivial example, let R be a principal ideal ring. Then the space $\text{Min}(R)$ with Zariski topology is a locally indiscrete space.

Proposition 3.1. For a topological space X the following conditions are equivalent.

- a) X is locally indiscrete.
- b) Every subset of X is preopen.
- c) Every singleton in X is preopen.
- d) Every closed subset of X is preopen.
- e) Every locally closed subset of X is open.
- f) Every locally closed subset of X is closed.
- g) The closure of every locally closed set is open.
- h) Every dense open subset of X is regular open.

Proof. All implications are straightforward. We only show $(h \Rightarrow a)$. Suppose that A is an open set in X and consider $B = A \cup (X - A)^\circ$. Then B is open in X . Furthermore, $\overline{B} = \overline{A \cup (X - A)^\circ} = \overline{A} \cup \overline{(X - A)^\circ} = \overline{A} \cup (X - \overline{A}) = \overline{A} \cup (X - \overline{A}^\circ) = X$. Hence, by hypothesis B is regular open and therefore we have $X = \overline{B}^\circ \subseteq B$. It implies that $X = A \cup (X - \overline{A})$ and thus $\overline{A} \cap (X - A) = \emptyset$. This consequence that $\overline{A} \subseteq A$, that is, A is closed and we are done. \square

Proposition 3.2. For a topological T_1 -space X the following conditions are equivalent.

- a) X is discrete.
- b) X is locally indiscrete.
- c) Every open set is regular open.

Proof. It is straightforward. □

To see the definition of the concepts given in the next remark, see [12, 10]. For details about P_F -spaces, see [6].

Remark 3.3. a) A locally indiscrete space need not be discrete.

b) If X is a $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -space, then it is locally indiscrete if and only if it is discrete.

c) Every locally indiscrete space is a strongly zero-dimensional space. The converse is not true. For example, $A = \{0, 1, \frac{1}{2}, \dots\}$ is a strongly zero-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R} while it is not locally indiscrete.

d) Every locally indiscrete space is a P_F -space. The converse is not true. For example, the space Σ of 4M in [12] is a P_F -space which is not locally indiscrete.

e) A locally indiscrete space need not be submaximal. For instance, let $X = \{a, b, c\}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b, c\}, X\}$.

f) A submaximal space need not be a locally indiscrete space. For example we consider the space Σ of 4M in [12].

g) Every locally indiscrete space is a P -space. The converse is false. For example, the space S in 4.N of [12] is a P -space which is not locally indiscrete.

h) Every locally indiscrete space is a extremally disconnected and hence is basically disconnected. The converse is false. For example, the space S in 4.N of [12] is a basically disconnected which is not locally indiscrete and the space Σ is extremally disconnected which is not locally indiscrete.

Proposition 3.4. The space (X, \mathcal{T}) is a locally indiscrete space if and only if $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_l$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let $G \in \mathcal{T}_l$. Then $G = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} A_\alpha$, where A_α is \mathcal{T} -locally closed, for any $\alpha \in \Lambda$. By hypothesis, A_α is \mathcal{T} -open, hence $G \in \mathcal{T}$ and we are done.

(\Leftarrow) Let A is a \mathcal{T} -locally closed subset of X . Hence $A \in \mathcal{T}_l$ and therefore $A \in \mathcal{T}$. This shows that X is a locally indiscrete space. □

Proposition 3.5. Let X be a locally indiscrete space. The following conditions are equivalent.

- a) X is a T_1 -space.
- b) X is a $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -space.
- c) X is a T_D -space.
- d) X is a T_0 -space.
- e) X is a submaximal space.
- f) X is a discrete space.

Proof. All implications are obvious. We only show $(d \Rightarrow a)$. Let $x \in X$ and on the contrary suppose that $y \in \overline{\{x\}}$ and $y \neq x$. If there is an open set G

such that $y \in G$ and $x \notin G$, then $G \cap \{x\} \neq \emptyset$ which is not true. If there is an open set H such that $x \in H$ and $y \notin H$, then $y \in X - H$ and since $X - H$ is open we infer that $(X - H) \cap \{x\} \neq \emptyset$ and this is not true. Therefore X is a T_1 -space and we are through. \square

4. LC-PROPERTIES

In this section, by using the locally closed sets, we introduce some separation axioms. For more details about lc-continuous functions, see [11]. We begin with the following definition.

Definition 4.1. A space X is called:

- a) lc-regular if for each locally closed set A and for each point $x \notin A$, there are disjoint open sets U and V with $x \in U$ and $A \subseteq V$.
- b) lc-completely regular if for each locally closed set A and for each point $x \notin A$, there exists a continuous function $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $f(x) = 0$ and $f(A) = 1$.
- c) lc-normal if for every two disjoint locally closed sets A and B , there are disjoint open sets U and V with $A \subseteq U$ and $B \subseteq V$.

Every lc-regular (resp. lc-completely regular, lc-normal) space is a regular (resp. completely regular, normal) space. The converse is hold in locally indiscrete spaces, but is not true, in general. See the following example.

Example 4.2. We consider $X = \mathbb{R}$ with usual topology.

- a) \mathbb{R} is not a lc-regular space. To see this let $A = [0, 1)$. Then A is locally closed and $1 \notin A$. But A cannot be separated from 1 by disjoint open sets.
- b) \mathbb{R} is not a lc-completely regular space. To see this let $A = \{1, \frac{1}{2}, \dots\}$. Then A is locally closed and $0 \notin A$. But A cannot be separated from 0 by a continuous function.
- c) \mathbb{R} is not a lc-normal space. To see this let $A = \{1, \frac{1}{2}, \dots\}$ and $B = \{0\}$. Then A and B are locally closed sets. But A and B cannot be separated by disjoint open sets.

Remark 4.3. a) Every lc-completely regular T_D -space is completely regular.
b) Every lc-normal T_D -space is Hausdorff.

Definition 4.4. A space X is called lc-compact if each locally closed cover of X has a finite subcover.

Every lc-compact space is compact. Every infinite compact T_1 -space is not lc-compact. One can easily see that (X, \mathcal{T}) is lc-compact if and only if (X, \mathcal{T}_l) is compact.

Proposition 4.5. Every clopen subset of a lc-compact space is lc-compact.

Proof. Suppose that $Y \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} A_\alpha \in \Lambda$, where A_α is locally closed set in Y , for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$. Hence, $A_\alpha = B_\alpha \cap Y$, which B_α is locally closed set in X , for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$. Therefore there is an open set G_α and a closed set F_α in X which $B_\alpha = G_\alpha \cap F_\alpha$. Now it is clear that $X = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda} (G_\alpha \cup$

$(X - Y) \cap (F_\alpha \cup (X - Y))$). Since X is a lc-compact space we infer that $X = \bigcup_{k=1}^n ((G_{\alpha_k} \cup (X - Y)) \cap (F_{\alpha_k} \cup (X - Y)))$, for a natural number n and $\alpha_i \in \Lambda$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. It implies that $Y \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^n A_{\alpha_k}$, that is, Y is a lc-compact space. \square

Definition 4.6. A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called lc-continuous if the converse image of any open set in Y is locally closed in X .

Every continuous function is lc-continuous. The converse is not true. For example, let $X = \{a, b\}$ and $\mathcal{T}_1 = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, X\}$ and $\mathcal{T}_2 = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\}, X\}$ are two topology on X . We define $f : (X, \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{T}_2)$ by $f(x) = x$. Then f is lc-continuous but it is not a continuous function.

Remark 4.7. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a onto and X be a lc-compact space. Then
 a) if f is continuous then Y is lc-compact.
 b) if f is lc-continuous then Y is compact.

Remark 4.8. If $f : (X, \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow Y$ is lc-continuous, then $f : (X, \mathcal{T}_l) \rightarrow Y$ is continuous. The converse is false. To see this we consider $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}_u)$ and define $f : (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}_l) \rightarrow Y = \{0, 1\}$ by $f(\mathbb{Q}) = 0$ and $f(\mathbb{R} - \mathbb{Q}) = 1$, which Y is equipped with discrete topology. Since $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}_l)$ is discrete, then f is continuous. But $\mathbb{Q} = f^{-1}(\{0\})$ is not locally closed set in $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}_u)$ while $\{0\}$ is an open set in Y . This shows that $f : (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}_u) \rightarrow Y$ is not a lc-continuous function.

Remark 4.9. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be continuous. Then
 a) if $B \subseteq Y$ is locally closed then $f^{-1}(B) \subseteq X$ is locally closed.
 b) if $A \subseteq X$ is locally closed then $f(A)$ need not be locally closed. Let $X = \{a, b\}$, \mathcal{T}_1 be discrete topology and \mathcal{T}_2 be trivial topology on X . We define $f : (X, \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{T}_2)$ by $f(x) = x$. Then $A = \{a\}$ is locally closed set in (X, \mathcal{T}_1) but $f(A) = \{a\}$ is not locally closed set in (X, \mathcal{T}_2) .

Definition 4.10. A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called locally closed if the image of each locally closed set of X , is locally closed in Y .

If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is one-to-one, open and closed function, then it is locally closed. A locally closed function need not be open or closed. See the next example.

Example 4.11. a) Let $X = \{a, b\}$, \mathcal{T}_1 be discrete topology and $\mathcal{T}_2 = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, X\}$ be another topology on X . We define $f : (X, \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{T}_2)$ by $f(x) = x$. Then f is locally closed but it is not an open function.
 b) Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$, \mathcal{T}_1 be discrete topology and $\mathcal{T}_2 = \{\emptyset, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}, \{c\}, X\}$ be another topology on X . We define $f : (X, \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{T}_2)$ by $f(x) = x$. Then f is locally closed but it is not a closed function.

REFERENCES

[1] A. R. Aliabad, V. Bagheri and M. Karavan Jahromi, On Quasi P -Spaces and Their Application in Submaximal and Nodec Spaces, Bull. Iranian Math. Soc. Vol. 43, No. 3, (2017), 835-852.

- [2] A. V. Arhangel'skii and P. J. Collins, On submaximal spaces, *Top. Appl.* 64 (1995), No. 3, 219-241.
- [3] C. E. Aull and W. J. Thron, Separation axioms between T_0 and T_1 , *Indagationes Math.* 24 (1962), 26-37.
- [4] F. Azarpanah, Intersection of essential ideals in $C(X)$, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 125 (1997), 2149-2154.
- [5] F. Azarpanah and T. Soundararajan, When the family of functions vanishing at infinity is an ideal of $C(X)$, *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, Vol. 31, No. 4 (2001), 1133-1140.
- [6] F. Azarpanah, R. Mohamadian, P. Monjezi, On P_F -spaces, *Top. Appl.* 302 (2021), 1-8.
- [7] K. Belaid, L. Dridi, O. Echi, Submaximal and door compactifications, *Top. Appl.*, 158 (2011), 1969-1975.
- [8] J. Dontchev, On submaximal spaces, *Tamkang J. Math.*, Vol. 26, No 3, (1995).
- [9] L. Dridi, S. Lazaar and T. Turki, F -door spaces and F -submaximal spaces, *Applied General Topology*, Volume 14, No. 1, (2013), 97-113
- [10] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, PWN Polish Scientific Publishers, (1977).
- [11] M. Ganster and I. L. Reilly, locally closed sets and LC-continuous functions, *Internat. J. Math. Sci.* vol 12, No 3, (1989), 417-424.
- [12] L. Gillman, M. Jerison, *Rings of Continuous Functions*, Springer-Verlag, 1976.
- [13] D. Johnson and M. Mandelker, Functions with pseudocompact support, *Gen. Topology Appl.* 3 (1973), 331-338.
- [14] O. A. S. Karamzadeh and M. Rostami, On the Intrinsic Topology and Some Related Ideals of $C(X)$, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, Vol. 93, No. 1, (1985), 179-184.
- [15] F. Manshoor, Characterization of some kind of compactness via some properties of the space of functions with m -topology, *Int. J. Contemp. Math. Sciences*, 7, No. 21 (2012), 1037-1042.
- [16] M. Rajagopalan and R. F. Wheeler, Sequential compactness of X implies a compactness property for $C(X)$, *Canad J. Math.* 28 (1976), 207-210.
- [17] B. Richmond, Principal topologies and transformation semigroups, *Top. Appl.* 155 (2008) 1644-1649.
- [18] R. C. Walker, *The Stone-Ćech Compactification*, Springer, New York, 1974.
- [19] S. Willard, *General Topology*, Addison- Wesley, 1970.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHAHID CHAMRAN UNIVERSITY OF AHVAZ, AHVAZ, IRAN

Email address: mohamadian_r@scu.ac.ir