

## $\theta$ -REFINABILITY AND LOCAL PROPERTIES

J. M. ATKINS AND R. F. GITTINGS

**ABSTRACT.** If  $Q$  is a property more general than metrizable, we prove several theorems of the general type: A locally  $Q$ ,  $\theta$ -refinable space is a  $Q$ -space.

**1. Introduction.** Let  $(Q)$  be a property for a space  $X$ . We call a space  $X$  a locally  $(Q)$ -space if each point of the space has an open neighborhood with property  $(Q)$ . Smirnov [20] proved that a paracompact, locally metrizable space is metrizable. Ceder [8] proved that a paracompact, locally  $M_i$ -space is an  $M_i$ -space for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Burke [5] recently showed that a subparacompact, locally developable space is developable.

Throughout this paper,  $n, m \in N$  and  $\alpha \in A$ . A space  $X$  is  $\theta$ -refinable [21] if for every open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  there is a sequence  $\{\mathcal{O}_n\}$  of open refinements of  $\mathcal{U}$  such that if  $x \in X$ , there is an  $n(x) \in N$  such that  $x$  is contained in at most finitely many members of  $\mathcal{O}_{n(x)}$  (i.e.  $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{O}_{n(x)}) < \infty$ ). If  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha\}$  is an open cover of  $X$  and  $\{\mathcal{O}_n\}$  is a  $\theta$ -refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$  we may assume, without loss of generality, that  $\mathcal{O}_n = \{V_n(\alpha)\}$  where  $V_n(\alpha) \subseteq U_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in A$ . Such a collection  $\{\mathcal{O}_n\}$  will be called an *indexed  $\theta$ -refinement* of  $\mathcal{U}$ . Clearly every metacompact space is  $\theta$ -refinable and Burke [5] proved that every subparacompact space is  $\theta$ -refinable. We show in Example 4.4 that paracompactness cannot be replaced by subparacompactness, metacompactness or  $\theta$ -refinability in the results of Smirnov and Ceder.

We assume all spaces are  $T_2$ . The positive integers are denoted by  $N$ .

**2. Locally semistratifiable spaces.** A space  $X$  is a *semistratifiable space* if for each open set  $U \subseteq X$ , there is a collection  $\{U_n\}$  of closed subsets of  $X$  such that  $U = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n$  and if  $U \subseteq V$ ,  $V$  open, then  $U_n \subseteq V_n$ . The concept of a semistratifiable space is due to E. Michael and was first studied by Creede [9]. Creede proved that every semistratifiable space is subparacompact and thus  $\theta$ -refinable.

---

Received by the editors March 15, 1973 and, in revised form, December 1, 1973.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 54D20; Secondary 54E30, 54D30, 54E20, 54E25.

Key words and phrases.  $\theta$ -refinable,  $\beta$ -space,  $\sigma^\#$ -space, semistratifiable space,  $\sigma$ -space,  $p$ -space, quasi-complete space.

Copyright © 1975, American Mathematical Society

A collection  $\mathcal{F}$  of closed subsets of a space  $X$  is a *ct-net* for  $X$  if for any two distinct points  $x, y$ , of  $X$ , there is an  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $x \in F$  and  $y \notin F$ . A space with a  $\sigma$ -closure preserving ct-net is called a  $\sigma^\#$ -space. These definitions were introduced by Siwiec and Nagata in [19].

A space  $X$  is a  $\beta$ -space if for each  $x \in X$ , there is a sequence  $\{g_n(x)\}$  of open neighborhoods of  $x$  such that if  $x \in g_n(x_n)$ , then  $\{x_n\}$  clusters. The first author and Hodel [12] independently defined  $\beta$ -spaces and proved Theorem 2.1.

**Theorem 2.1.** *A space  $X$  is a semistratifiable space if and only if  $X$  is a  $\beta$ -space and a  $\sigma^\#$ -space.*

The main result of this section is that a  $\theta$ -refinable, locally semi-stratifiable space is semistratifiable. To get this we first obtain the analogous result for  $\beta$ -spaces and  $\sigma^\#$ -spaces and then invoke Theorem 2.1.

**Theorem 2.2.** *A  $\theta$ -refinable, locally  $\beta$ -space is a  $\beta$ -space.*

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha\}$  be an open cover of  $X$  by  $\beta$ -spaces. For each  $x \in X$  and for each  $\alpha \in A$  such that  $x \in U_\alpha$ , let  $\{g_{n,\alpha}(x)\}$  be a sequence of open neighborhoods of  $x$  illustrating that  $U_\alpha$  is a  $\beta$ -space. We may assume  $g_{n+1,\alpha}(x) \subseteq g_{n,\alpha}(x)$  for all  $n \in N$ . Let  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}$  be an indexed  $\theta$ -refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ . For every  $x \in X$  and  $n \in N$  there exists an  $\alpha_x \in A$  such that  $x \in V_n(\alpha_x)$ . Let  $h_{n,m}(x) = g_{m,\alpha_x}(x) \cap V_n(\alpha_x)$  and put  $h_m(x) = \bigcap_{n=1}^m h_{n,m}(x)$ . Suppose  $x_0 \in h_m(x_m)$ . There exists an integer  $n_0$  such that  $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{U}_{n_0})$  is finite. For  $m > n_0$ ,  $x_0 \in h_{n_0,m}(x_m) \subseteq V_{n_0}(\alpha_{x_m})$ . But  $\{\alpha_{x_m} : m = 1, 2, \dots\}$  is a finite set and hence there is an  $\alpha \in A$  and a subsequence  $N_1 \subseteq N - \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  such that  $\alpha_{x_j} = \alpha$  for all  $j \in N_1$ . Thus  $x_0 \in h_{n_0,j}(x_j) \subseteq g_{j,\alpha}(x_j)$  for all  $j \in N_1$ . Since  $U_\alpha$  is a  $\beta$ -space,  $\{x_j : j \in N_1\}$  clusters and thus the sequence  $\{x_m\}$  clusters. Hence  $X$  is a  $\beta$ -space.

In order to establish a theorem for  $\sigma^\#$ -spaces analogous to Theorem 2.2, we need the following characterization of  $\sigma^\#$ -spaces due essentially to R. W. Heath.

**Lemma 2.3.** *A space  $X$  is a  $\sigma^\#$ -space if and only if for each  $x \in X$ , there is a sequence  $\{g_n(x)\}$  of open neighborhoods of  $x$  such that  $\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty g_n(x) = \{x\}$  and if  $y \in g_n(x)$ , then  $g_n(y) \subseteq g_n(x)$ .*

**Theorem 2.4.** *A  $\theta$ -refinable, locally  $\sigma^\#$ -space  $X$  is a  $\sigma^\#$ -space.*

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha\}$  be an open cover of  $X$  by  $\sigma^\#$ -spaces. For each  $x \in X$  and for each  $\alpha \in A$  such that  $x \in U_\alpha$ , let  $\{g_{n,\alpha}(x)\}$  be a sequence

of open neighborhoods of  $x$  satisfying the conditions of Lemma 2.3 for  $U_\alpha$ . We first show that if there is a point-finite open refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ , then  $X$  is a  $\sigma^\#$ -space. Thus let  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_\alpha\}$  be an indexed point-finite open refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ . For each  $x \in X$ , let  $h_n(x) = \bigcap \{g_{n,\alpha}(x) \cap V_\alpha : x \in V_\alpha\}$ . Then it is easy to verify that  $\{h_n(x)\}$  satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.3 for  $X$ . Thus  $X$  is a  $\sigma^\#$ -space.

Now let  $\{\mathcal{H}_n\}$  be a  $\theta$ -refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ . Let  $X_{n,m} = \{x \in X : \text{ord}(x, \mathcal{H}_n) \leq m\}$ . Then  $X_{n,m}$  is a closed subset of  $X$  and every point of  $X_{n,m}$  is of finite order relative to  $\mathcal{H}_n$ . Since the property of being  $\sigma^\#$  is hereditary,  $\{U \cap X_{n,m} : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$  is an open cover of  $X_{n,m}$  by  $\sigma^\#$ -spaces. Since  $\{H \cap X_{n,m} : H \in \mathcal{H}_n\}$  is a point-finite open refinement of  $\{U \cap X_{n,m} : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$ ,  $X_{n,m}$  is a  $\sigma^\#$ -space. But  $X = \bigcup \{X_{n,m}\}$ . Since the countable union of closed  $\sigma^\#$ -spaces is clearly  $\sigma^\#$ ,  $X$  is a  $\sigma^\#$ -space.

The following result is an immediate consequence of Theorems 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4.

**Theorem 2.5.** *A locally semistratifiable space  $X$  is semistratifiable if and only if  $X$  is  $\theta$ -refinable.*

Creede [9] has shown that a space  $X$  is semimetrizable if and only if  $X$  is semistratifiable and first countable. Thus we have the following:

**Theorem 2.6.** *A locally semimetrizable space  $X$  is semimetrizable if and only if  $X$  is  $\theta$ -refinable.*

A collection  $\mathcal{B}$  of subsets of a space  $X$  is called a *network* for  $X$  if for any open set  $U \subseteq X$  and  $x \in U$  there is a set  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $x \in B \subseteq U$ . A space with a  $\sigma$ -locally finite closed network is called a  $\sigma$ -space [18] (see also [19]). It is easy to verify that every  $\sigma$ -space is semistratifiable.

**Theorem 2.7.** *A locally  $\sigma$ -space is a  $\sigma$ -space if and only if  $X$  is  $\theta$ -refinable.*

**Proof.** The necessity is obvious. Conversely, let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha\}$  be an open cover of  $X$  by  $\sigma$ -spaces. Since each  $U_\alpha$  is semistratifiable, it follows from Theorem 2.5 that  $X$  is semistratifiable and hence subparacompact. Let  $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{F}_n$  be a  $\sigma$ -discrete closed refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ . Since the property of  $\sigma$  is hereditary,  $X$  has a  $\sigma$ -discrete closed cover by  $\sigma$ -spaces. Hence  $X$  is a  $\sigma$ -space.

A class of spaces which simultaneously generalizes  $\sigma$ -spaces and  $M^*$ -spaces [13] is the class of  $\Sigma$ -spaces introduced by Nagami [16]. A space  $X$  is a  $\Sigma$ -space if there is a sequence of locally finite closed covers  $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$  of  $X$  such that if  $x_n \in \bigcap \{F \in \mathcal{F}_n : x \in F\}$  for some fixed point  $x \in X$ , then

$\{x_n\}$  clusters. Michael [14] has pointed out that replacing “ $\sigma$ -locally finite” by “ $\sigma$ -closure preserving” in the definition of  $\Sigma$ -space leads to a strictly larger class of spaces, which are called  $\Sigma^\#$ -spaces.

It is unknown if a  $\theta$ -refinable, locally  $\Sigma$ -space is a  $\Sigma$ -space. In fact, it is not even known if the union of two open  $\Sigma$ -spaces is a  $\Sigma$ -space. However, by Corollary 1.10 and Theorem 3.2 of [16], we have the following partial result.

**Theorem 2.8.** *A subparacompact, locally  $\Sigma$ -space is a  $\Sigma$ -space.*

On the other hand, using a characterization of  $\Sigma^\#$ -spaces given by Nagata [17] (see also [2]) we can obtain the following theorem. The proof is essentially the same as the proof of Theorems 2.2 and 2.4 and is omitted.

**Theorem 2.9.** *A  $\theta$ -refinable, locally  $\Sigma^\#$ -space is a  $\Sigma^\#$ -space.*

**3. Locally  $p$ -spaces and locally  $w\Delta$ -spaces.** By Arhangel'skiĭ [1], a completely regular space  $X$  is called a  $p$ -space if there is a sequence  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}$  of open (in  $\beta X$ ) covers of  $X$  such that if  $x \in X$ ,  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{St}(x, \mathcal{U}_n) \subseteq X$ . If, in addition, for each  $x \in X$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists an  $n(x) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\text{St}(x, \mathcal{U}_{n(x)}) \subseteq \text{St}(x, \mathcal{U}_n)$ , then  $X$  is called a *strict  $p$ -space*.

A space  $X$  is a  $w\Delta$ -space [4] if there is a sequence  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}$  of open covers of  $X$  such that if  $x_n \in \text{St}(x, \mathcal{U}_n)$ , then  $\{x_n\}$  clusters.

Creede [9] introduced the class of quasi-complete spaces which simultaneously generalizes  $p$ -spaces and  $w\Delta$ -spaces. A space  $X$  is a *quasi-complete space* if there is a sequence  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}$  of open covers of  $X$  such that if  $\{x_k : k > n\} \cup \{x\} \subseteq U \in \mathcal{U}_n$  for some fixed point  $x \in X$ , then  $\{x_n\}$  clusters.

In order to obtain the results of this section we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.1 (Burke [6]).** *For a completely regular  $\theta$ -refinable space  $X$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (a)  $X$  is a  $p$ -space.
- (b)  $X$  is a strict  $p$ -space.
- (c)  $X$  is a  $w\Delta$ -space.
- (d)  $X$  is a quasi-complete space.

Moreover, conditions (c) and (d) are equivalent for any  $\theta$ -refinable space  $X$ .

It should be noted that the equivalence of (a), (b) and (c) is the content of Theorem 1.7 of [6]. The “moreover” is Corollary 3.1.8 of [10].

**Theorem 3.2.** *A  $\theta$ -refinable, locally quasi-complete space  $X$  is quasi-complete.*

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha\}$  be an open cover of  $X$  by quasi-complete spaces. For each  $\alpha \in A$ , let  $\{\mathcal{G}_{n,\alpha}\}$  be a sequence of open covers of  $U_\alpha$  illustrating that  $U_\alpha$  is quasi-complete. We may assume  $\mathcal{G}_{n+1,\alpha} < \mathcal{G}_{n,\alpha}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\{\mathcal{V}_n\}$  be an indexed  $\theta$ -refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ . Let us put  $\mathcal{W}_{n,m} = \{G \cap V_n(\alpha) : G \in \mathcal{G}_{m,\alpha}\}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_k = \bigwedge_{n+m=2}^{k+1} \mathcal{W}_{n,m}$ . Then for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_k$  is an open cover of  $X$ .

Suppose  $\{x_i : i > n\} \cup \{x\} \subset H_n \in \mathcal{H}_n$  for some fixed point  $x \in X$ . There exists an integer  $n_0$  such that  $\text{ord}(x, \mathcal{V}_{n_0})$  is finite. For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , put  $S_k = \{x_i : i \geq n_0 + k\}$ . Since  $S_k \subseteq H_{n_0+k} \in \mathcal{H}_{n_0}$  it follows that  $S_k \subseteq W$  for some  $W \in \mathcal{W}_{n_0,k}$ . Thus there exists an  $\alpha_k \in A$  and a  $G_k \in \mathcal{G}_{k,\alpha_k}$  such that  $S_k \subseteq G_k \cap V_{n_0}(\alpha_k)$ . But  $\{\alpha_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is a finite set and hence there is an  $\alpha \in A$  and a subsequence  $N_1 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\alpha_j = \alpha$  for all  $j \in N_1$ . Since  $S_j = \{x_i : i \geq n_0 + j\} \cup \{x\} \subseteq G_j \in \mathcal{G}_{j,\alpha}$ , the sequence  $\{x_n\}$  clusters.

The next two results are an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.2.

**Theorem 3.3.** *A  $\theta$ -refinable, locally  $w\Delta$ -space is a  $w\Delta$ -space.*

**Theorem 3.4.** *A completely regular  $\theta$ -refinable locally  $p$ -space (locally strict  $p$ -space) is a  $p$ -space (strict  $p$ -space).*

#### 4. Applications and examples.

**Theorem 4.1.** *A locally Moore space  $X$  is a Moore space if and only if  $X$  is  $\theta$ -refinable.*

**Proof.** A locally Moore space is both locally semistratifiable and locally quasi-complete. Thus, by Theorems 3.2 and 2.5,  $X$  is both semistratifiable and quasi-complete. It follows from [9, Theorem 4.6] that  $X$  is a Moore space.

We note that Theorem 4.1 generalizes, at least for regular spaces, the result of Burke mentioned in the Introduction.

**Theorem 4.2 (Smirnov [20]).** *A locally metrizable space  $X$  is metrizable if and only if  $X$  is paracompact.*

**Proof.** A locally metrizable space is a locally Moore space and hence a Moore space by Theorem 4.1. But a paracompact Moore space is metrizable [3].

The next result follows immediately from Corollary 3.5. For the appropriate definitions the reader is referred to [15].

**Theorem 4.3.** *A paracompact, locally  $M (M^*, M^\#, \text{ or } wM)$ -space  $X$  is an  $M (M^*, M^\#, \text{ or } wM)$ -space.*

**Example 4.4.** Let  $S$  be the space of Example 1 in [11]. The space  $S$  is a metacompact Moore space which is locally metrizable, but not metrizable. Thus paracompactness in Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 cannot be replaced by metacompactness, subparacompactness or  $\theta$ -refinability.

**Example 4.5.** Let  $X$  be the space constructed by Burke in [7]. This is an example of a locally compact, locally metrizable space which is not  $\theta$ -refinable. This example shows that  $\theta$ -refinability is necessary in Theorems 2.2, 2.5–2.7, 2.9, 3.3, and subparacompactness is necessary in Theorem 2.8.

## REFERENCES

1. A. V. Arhangel'skiĭ, *On a class of spaces containing all metric and all locally bi-compact spaces*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 151 (1963), 751–754 = Soviet Math. Dokl. 4 (1963), 1051–1055. MR 27 #2959.
2. J. Atkins, *A characterization of  $\Sigma$  and  $M^*$ -spaces*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. 18 (1971), 1111. Abstract #71T-G206.
3. R. H. Bing, *Metrization of topological spaces*, Canad. J. Math. 3 (1951), 175–186. MR 13, 264.
4. Carlos J. R. Borges, *On metrizability of topological spaces*, Canad. J. Math. 20 (1968), 795–804. MR 37 #6910.
5. D. K. Burke, *On subparacompact spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 23 (1969), 655–663. MR 40 #3508.
6. ———, *On  $p$ -spaces and  $w\Delta$ -spaces*, Pacific J. Math. 35 (1970), 285–296. MR 43 #3986.
7. ———, *A nondevelopable locally compact Hausdorff space with a  $G$ -diagonal*, General Topology and Appl. 2 (1972), 287–291. MR 47 #7702.
8. J. G. Ceder, *Some generalizations of metric spaces*, Pacific J. Math. 11 (1961), 105–125. MR 24 #A1707.
9. G. D. Creede, *Concerning semi-stratifiable spaces*, Pacific J. Math. 32 (1970), 47–54. MR 40 #8006.
10. R. Gittings, Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Greensburg, Pa., 1973.
11. R. W. Heath, *Screenability, pointwise paracompactness, and metrization of Moore spaces*, Canad. J. Math. 16 (1964), 763–770. MR 29 #4033.
12. R. Hodel, *Moore spaces and  $w\Delta$ -spaces*, Pacific J. Math. 38 (1971), 641–652. MR 46 #6290.
13. T. Ishii, *On closed mappings and  $M$ -spaces*. I, Proc. Japan Acad. 43 (1967), 752–756. MR 36 #5904.
14. E. Michael, *On Nagami's  $\Sigma$ -spaces and some related matters*, Proc. Washington State Univ. Conf. on General Topology (Pullman, Wash., 1970), Pi Mu Epsilon, Dept. of Math., Washington State Univ., Pullman, Wash., 1970, pp. 13–19. MR 42 #1067.
15. K. Morita, *A survey of the theory of  $M$ -spaces*, General Topology and Appl. 1 (1971), 49–55. MR 44 #3276.
16. K. Nagami,  *$\Sigma$ -spaces*, Fund. Math. 65 (1969), 169–192. MR 41 #2612.
17. J. Nagata, *Characterization of some generalized metric spaces*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. 18 (1971), 838. Abstract #71T-G151.
18. A. Okuyama,  *$\alpha$ -spaces and closed mappings*. I, II, Proc. Japan Acad. 44 (1968), 472–477; *ibid.* 44 (1968), 478–481. MR 37 #4791.
19. F. Siwiec and J. Nagata, *A note on nets and metrization*, Proc. Japan Acad. 44 (1968), 623–627. MR 39 #3450.

20. Ju. M. Smirnov, *On the metrization of topological spaces*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk 6 (1951), no. 6 (46), 100–111. (Russian) MR 14, 70.

21. J. M. Worrell, Jr. and H. H. Wicke, *Characterizations of developable topological spaces*, Canad. J. Math. 17 (1965), 820–830. MR 32 #427.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BETHANY COLLEGE, BETHANY, WEST VIRGINIA 26032 (Current address of J. M. Atkins)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15260

*Current address* (R. F. Gittings): Department of Mathematics, (CUNY) Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York 11210