

A METRIC CHARACTERIZING ČECH DIMENSION ZERO

K. A. BROUGHAN

ABSTRACT. In this paper we prove the following: a metrizable space (X, τ) has (Čech) dimension zero if and only if there is a metric for X , generating the topology τ , taking values in some subset of the nonnegative real numbers with 0 as its only cluster point.

It is possible to categorize some classes of metrizable spaces using the existence of metrics with special properties. See for example J. de Groot [1], J. Nagata [2], and L. Janos [4]. One may also obtain classifications depending on the existence of metrics with values in subsets of the real numbers. For instance, a metrizable space has a metric with values in the nonnegative integers if and only if it is regular A space, [5]. In this note we extend the classification to those spaces having metrics with values in a subset of the positive real numbers with 0 as the only cluster point.

Let R be the set of real numbers and N the positive integers.

DEFINITION. We say (X, τ) is F -metrizable if there exists a metric ρ for X , generating the topology τ , such that for all $(x, y) \in X \times X$, $\rho(x, y) \in F \subset [0, \infty)$. We call such a ρ an F -metric. For example, every metrizable space is F -metrizable with $F = [0, 1]$.

Before coming to the main theorem we prove a special case of it:

THEOREM 1. *Let (X, τ) be metrizable and let $F = \{0\} \cup \{1/3^n \mid n \in N\}$. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) X is F -metrizable,
- (ii) X has Čech dimension zero, i.e. $\text{Ind } X = 0$.

PROOF. “(ii) \Rightarrow (i)”. Let $B(m)$ be the Baire space of weight m , that is, the cartesian product of a countable family of discrete spaces each of cardinality m .

We will show first that $B(m)$ is F -metrizable.

Received by the editors September 19, 1972.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 54E35, 54F45.

Key words and phrases. Metric spaces, Čech dimension zero.

If x and y are distinct points in $B(m)$ let $f(x, y) = \min\{k | x_k \neq y_k\}$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x, y) &= 3^{-f(x, y)} \quad \text{when } x \neq y, \\ &= 0 \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

Then ρ is an F -metric for $B(m)$ generating the topology. Thus $B(m)$ is F -metrizable. Now, if X has Čech dimension zero, we can imbed it in $B(m)$ for some m [6]. The result now follows upon making the observation that subspaces of F -metrizable spaces are F -metrizable.

“(i) \Rightarrow (ii)”. Let ρ be an F -metric for X generating the topology τ . We will show that ρ is a nonarchimedean metric. Let x, y and z be three distinct points in X and suppose that $\rho(x, y) = 1/3^l$, $\rho(x, z) = 1/3^m$ and $\rho(x, y) = 1/3^n$. Then $1/3^l \leq 1/3^m + 1/3^n$. If $m \leq l$ then $1/3^l \leq 1/3^m \leq \max\{1/3^m, 1/3^n\}$. On the other hand, if $m > l$ and $n > l$, suppose for instance that $m \geq n > l$. Then

$$1/3^n + 1/3^n \geq 1/3^m + 1/3^n \geq 1/3^l.$$

Therefore $2/3^n \geq 1/3^l$ and thus $2 \geq 3^{n-l} \geq 3$, a contradiction. Thus either $m \leq l$ or $n \leq l$. In either case $1/3^l \leq \max\{1/3^m, 1/3^n\}$. Therefore $\rho(x, y) \leq \max\{\rho(x, z), \rho(z, y)\}$. This inequality holds also when the three points are not distinct. Thus (X, τ) has a nonarchimedean metric and hence (by [1]), $\text{Ind } X = 0$.

The main result depends upon a special case of the following theorem of J. Nagata [3], “A space X has (Čech) dimension $\leq n$ if and only if we can introduce in X a topology preserving metric ρ such that all the open balls $B(x, \varepsilon)$ have boundaries of dimension $\leq n-1$ and such that $\{B(x, \varepsilon) | x \in X\}$ is closure preserving for every $\varepsilon > 0$.”

Let $B = \{a_n\} \cup \{0\}$ where $\{a_n\}$ is an arbitrary strictly monotonically decreasing sequence of real numbers with limit zero and $H = \{1/n | n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\}$.

THEOREM 2. *Let (X, τ) be metrizable. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\text{Ind } X = 0$,
- (ii) X is B -metrizable,
- (iii) X is H -metrizable.

PROOF. “(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)” is immediate.

“(iii) \Rightarrow (i)”. We will use Nagata’s Theorem in the case $n=0$. Let ρ be a compatible metric with values in $\{0\} \cup \{1/n | n \in \mathbb{N}\} = H$. Let $p \in X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. We will show firstly that $B(p, \varepsilon)$ has an empty boundary. This follows from the following:

LEMMA. $S(p, \varepsilon) = \{x | \rho(p, x) = \varepsilon\}$ is an open set.

PROOF OF THE LEMMA. We need check this only when $S(p, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$. In this case necessarily $\varepsilon = 1/m$ for some m in \mathbb{N} . Let $x \in S(p, \varepsilon)$, $\delta = 1/2m(m+1)$

and $y \in B(x, \delta)$. Suppose $y \notin S(p, \varepsilon)$. Then, either $\rho(p, y) < \varepsilon$ which implies $\rho(p, y) \leq 1/(m+1)$, or $\rho(p, y) > \varepsilon$ and we must have $\rho(p, y) \geq 1/(m-1)$ ($m \geq 2$ necessarily). In the first case

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(p, x) &\leq \rho(p, y) + \rho(y, x) \leq \frac{1}{m+1} + \delta \\ &= \frac{1}{m+1} + \frac{1}{2m(m+1)} < \frac{1}{m} = \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. If, on the other hand, $\rho(p, y) \geq 1/m-1$, then

$$\frac{1}{m-1} \leq \rho(p, y) \leq \rho(p, x) + \rho(x, y) < \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{2m(m+1)}.$$

But this is true if and only if $1/(m-1) - 1/m < \frac{1}{2}(1/m - 1/(m+1))$, again a contradiction. Thus if $y \in B(x, \delta)$ then $y \in S(p, \varepsilon)$. Therefore $S(p, \varepsilon)$ is open. This completes the proof of the lemma.

Suppose now that $x \in \text{Cl}(B(p, \varepsilon)) \setminus B(p, \varepsilon)$. Then $S(p, \varepsilon)$ is a neighbourhood of x not meeting $B(p, \varepsilon)$. Thus $B(p, \varepsilon)$ is closed and open and hence has an empty boundary.

We will now show that, for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the family $\{B(p, \varepsilon) | p \in X\}$ is closure preserving.

Let $A \subseteq X$ be an arbitrary subset. Then

$$\bigcup_{a \in A} \overline{B(a, \varepsilon)} \subset \overline{\bigcup_{a \in A} B(a, \varepsilon)}.$$

Suppose now that $x \in \text{Cl}(\bigcup_{a \in A} B(a, \varepsilon)) \setminus \bigcup_{a \in A} B(a, \varepsilon)$. Then for all $a \in A$, $\rho(a, x) \geq \varepsilon$. Thus $\rho(A, x) \geq \varepsilon$.

Also, there is a sequence $\{b_n\} \subset X$ and a sequence $\{a_n\} \subset A$ such that $\rho(x, b_n) < 1/n$ and $\rho(b_n, a_n) < \varepsilon$. Thus $\rho(x, a_n) < \varepsilon + 1/n$ and hence $\rho(A, x) = \varepsilon$.

We will now consider the possible values of ε .

Case 1. Suppose for some m in N , $1/m < \varepsilon < 1/(m-1) \leq 1$. Then $B(x, 1/m) \cap A = \emptyset$ and $B(x, 1/(m-1)) \cap A \neq \emptyset$. Thus for all $a \in A$, $\rho(x, a) > 1/(m-1)$ and $\rho(x, A) > \varepsilon$, a contradiction.

Case 2. Suppose now that $\varepsilon = 1/m$ for some m in N . Then $\rho(x, A) = 1/m$. Let $\delta = \frac{1}{2}(1/m + 1/(m+1))$.

If $y \in B(x, \delta) \cap B(a, \varepsilon)$ for some a in A then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m} &\leq \rho(x, a) \leq \rho(x, y) + \rho(y, a) \\ &< \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{m+1} \right) + \frac{1}{m+1} < \frac{1}{m}, \quad \text{a contradiction.} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $B(x, \delta) \cap \{\bigcup_{a \in A} B(a, \varepsilon)\} = \emptyset$ contradicting the assumption that $x \in \text{Cl}(\bigcup_{a \in A} B(a, \varepsilon))$. Thus

$$\bigcup_{a \in A} B(a, \varepsilon) = \overline{\bigcup_{a \in A} B(a, \varepsilon)}$$

and the family is closure preserving.

From these remarks and Nagata's Theorem it follows that $\text{Ind } X = 0$ proving (i).

"(i) \Rightarrow (ii)". Let $\{a_n\}$ be a strictly monotonically decreasing sequence of real numbers with limit zero. As in Theorem 1 the proof will follow from the proof for $B(m)$. Let x and y be in $B(m)$. Define $f(x, y)$ as in Theorem 1 and set

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x, y) &= a_{f(x, y)} \quad \text{when } x \neq y, \\ &= 0 \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

Let x, y and z be distinct points in $B(m)$. Then either $f(x, y) \geq f(x, z)$ or $f(x, y) < f(x, z)$ in which case $f(x, y) = f(y, z)$. Thus in either case $f(x, y) \geq \min\{f(x, z), f(y, z)\}$. Therefore $\rho(x, y) \leq \max\{\rho(x, z), \rho(y, z)\}$ and thus ρ satisfies the triangle law. The other metric axioms and the fact that ρ is compatible with the product topology on $B(m)$ are easily checked. This completes the proof of the theorem.

CONCLUDING REMARKS. If $F \subseteq [0, \infty)$ has 0 as its only cluster point F is a countable set and we may label the points of $F \cap [0, 1]$, $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \alpha_3 > \dots > 0$. The sequence $\{a_n\}$ is monotonically decreasing and has limit 0. Thus we have shown:

COROLLARY. *The space (X, τ) has (Čech) dimension zero if and only if there exists a metric for X , generating the topology τ , having values in R^+ with 0 as the only cluster point of those values.*

REFERENCES

1. J. de Groot, *On a metric that characterizes dimension*, *Canad. J. Math.* **9** (1957), 511–514. MR **19**, 874.
2. J. Nagata, *On a relation between dimension and metrization*, *Proc. Japan Acad.* **32** (1956), 237–240. MR **19**, 156.
3. ———, *Two theorems for the n -dimensionality of metric spaces*, *Compositio Math.* **15** (1963), 227–237. MR **29** #1617.
4. L. Janos, *A metric characterization of zero-dimensional spaces*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **31** (1972), 268–270.
5. K. Broughan and M. Schroder, *Variations on a metric theme*, Report #14, Univ. of Waikato Research, 1972.
6. K. Morita, *Normal families and dimension theory for metric spaces*, *Math. Ann.* **128** (1954), 350–362. MR **16**, 501.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO, HAMILTON, NEW ZEALAND