

CHARACTERIZATIONS OF QUASI-METRIZABLE BITOPOLOGICAL SPACES

T. G. RAGHAVAN and I. L. REILLY

(Received 15 September 1986)

Communicated by J. H. Rubinstein

Abstract

In this paper we prove that a pairwise Hausdorff bitopological space $(X, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is quasi-metrizable if and only if for each point $x \in X$ and for $i, j = 1, 2, i \neq j$, one can assign \mathcal{T}_i nbd bases $\{S(n, i; x) \mid n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that (i) $y \notin S(n-1, i; x)$ implies $S(n, i; x) \cap S(n, j; y) = \emptyset$, (ii) $y \in S(n, i; x)$ implies $S(n, i; y) \subset S(n-1, i; x)$. We derive two further results from this.

1980 *Mathematics subject classification* (*Amer. Math. Soc.*): 54 E 55.

Keywords and phrases: quasi-metric, quasi-uniformity, bitopological space.

The concept of quasi-metric spaces was first introduced by Wilson [11]. The fact that a quasi-metric gives rise to a conjugate quasi-metric was noticed by Kelly [1], thus leading to the study of bitopological spaces. Since then one of the main problems in this area has been to find necessary and sufficient conditions for quasi-metrization. This problem was considered by Kelly [1] Patty [5], Lane [2], Reilly [6], Salbany [9] and later by Pareek [4] and Romaguera [7, 8].

The related notion of quasi-uniform spaces and their properties have been discussed in great detail in Murdheswar and Naimpally [3] and Stoltenberg [10]. In the proof of Theorem 1 we make use of the quasi-uniform analogue of the metrization theorem of Alexandroff and Urysohn, namely, a pairwise Hausdorff quasi-uniform space $(X, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}^{-1})$ is quasi-metrizable if and only if \mathcal{V} has a countable base. From Theorem 1 we derive Theorems 2 and 3 as corollaries. It must be noted that Theorem 2 has been proved by Pareek [4].

We write nbd for neighbourhood. If A is a subset of X and \mathcal{T}_i is a topology on X , then $\mathcal{T}_i \text{ cl } A$ ($\mathcal{T}_i \text{ int } A$) is the closure (interior) of A in the space (X, \mathcal{T}_i) .

The letters m, n, n_i, m_j, n_j represent positive integers. The letters i, j always take the values $i, j = 1, 2; i \neq j$. $S(n, i; x)$ represents a \mathcal{T}_i nbd of x where n is a positive integer.

1. THEOREM. *A pairwise Hausdorff bitopological space $(X, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is quasi-metrizable if and only if for each point $x \in X$ one can assign \mathcal{T}_i neighbourhood bases $\{S(n, i; x) | n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that*

- (i) $y \notin S(n - 1, i; x)$ implies $S(n, i; x) \cap S(n, j; y) = \emptyset$,
- (ii) $y \in S(n, i; x)$ implies $S(n, i; y) \subset S(n - 1, i; x)$ ($i, j = 1, 2; i \neq j$).

PROOF. To prove that the conditions are sufficient, we show first that $(X, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is pairwise regular. If $S(n, i; x) \cap S(n, j; y) = \emptyset$, then $S(n, i; x) \subset X - S(n, j; y)$ so that $\mathcal{T}_j \text{ cl } S(n, i; X) \subset X - \mathcal{T}_j \text{ int } S(n, j; y)$. Thus if $y \notin S(n - 1, i; x)$, then $y \notin \mathcal{T}_j \text{ cl } S(n, i; x)$ so that

$$x \in S(n, i; x) \subset \mathcal{T}_j \text{ cl } S(n, i; x) \subset S(n - 1, i; x).$$

Furthermore the space is pairwise normal. Indeed, if A and B are \mathcal{T}_1 closed and \mathcal{T}_2 closed subsets (of X) respectively such that $A \cap B = \emptyset$ and $y \in B$, then there exists a positive integer $n(y)$ such that $A \cap \mathcal{T}_2 \text{ cl } S(n(y), 1; y) = \emptyset$. Since $x \notin S(n(y), 1; y)$ for each $x \in A$, $S(n(y) + 1, 1; y) \cap S(n(y) + 1, 2; x) = \emptyset$ for all $x \in A$. If $Q_{n(y)} = \cup \{ \mathcal{T}_2 \text{ int } S(n(y) + 1, 2; x) | x \in A \}$, then $Q_{n(y)} \supset A$ and $Q_{n(y)} \cap \mathcal{T}_2 \text{ cl } S(n(y) + 1, 1; y) = \emptyset$. If we write $\cup \{ \mathcal{T}_1 \text{ int } S(n(y) + 1, 1; y) | n(y) = k \} = W(k, 1)$, then $Q_k \cap \mathcal{T}_2 \text{ cl } W(k, 1) = \emptyset$ so that we get a \mathcal{T}_1 open covering $\{W(k, 1) | k = 1, 2, \dots\}$ of B such that $A \cap \mathcal{T}_2 \text{ cl } W(k, 1) = \emptyset$ for each k . Similarly we can form a \mathcal{T}_2 open covering $\{W(k, 2) | k = 1, 2, \dots\}$ of A such that $B \cap \mathcal{T}_1 \text{ cl } W(k, 2) = \emptyset$ for each k . Then a standard argument produces disjoint sets $W_1 \in \mathcal{T}_1$ and $W_2 \in \mathcal{T}_2$ such that $W_1 \supset B$ and $W_2 \supset A$.

Let $\mathcal{X}(m, i) = \{ \mathcal{T}_i \text{ int } S(m, i; y) | y \in X \}$. Let $S(x, \mathcal{X}(m, i)) = \cup \{ \mathcal{T}_i \text{ int } S(m, i; y) | x \in \mathcal{T}_j \text{ int } S(m, j; y) \}$. Let $\mathcal{B}(i; x) = \{ S(x, \mathcal{X}(m, i)) | m = 1, 2, \dots \}$. We claim $\mathcal{B}(i; x)$ is a \mathcal{T}_i local base at x . If x is fixed initially and $U(i; x)$ are arbitrary \mathcal{T}_i nbds of x then there exists n_i such that $x \in S(n_i - 1, i; x) \subset U(i; x)$. Consider $m = \max(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1)$. Then clearly $S(m, i; x) \subset S(n_i, i; x)$. In order to avoid confusion, let us now prove specifically $\mathcal{B}(2; x)$ is a \mathcal{T}_2 local base at x . Let y be such that $x \in \mathcal{T}_1 \text{ int } S(m, 1; y)$. Then $S(m, 1; y) \cap S(m, 2; x) \neq \emptyset$ so that $y \in S(m - 1, 2; x) \subset S(n_2, 2; x)$. Hence $S(n_2, 2; y) \subset S(n_2 - 1, 2; x)$. Since $m = \max(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1)$, $\mathcal{T}_2 \text{ int } S(m, 2; y) \subset S(n_2, 2; y) \subset S(n_2 - 1, 2; x) \subset U(2; x)$. Thus $\mathcal{B}(2; x)$ is a \mathcal{T}_2 local base at x .

If $x \in \mathcal{T}_1 \text{ int } S(n + 2, 1; y)$, then $S(n + 2, 1; y) \cap S(n + 2, 2; x) \neq \emptyset$ so that by (i) $y \in S(n + 1, 2; x)$. Hence by (ii) $S(n + 1, 2; y) \subset S(n, 2; x)$ so that $\cup \{ \mathcal{T}_2 \text{ int } S(n + 2, 2; y) | x \in \mathcal{T}_1 \text{ int } S(n + 1, 1; y) \} \subset \mathcal{T}_2 \text{ int } S(n, 2; x)$. If we define $\mathcal{L}(m, i) = \{ S(x, \mathcal{X}(m, i)) | x \in X \}$, then $\mathcal{L}(n + 2, i) \subset \mathcal{X}(n, i)$ for all

$n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. If we write $V(m, i) = \cup\{\mathcal{T}_j \text{ int } S(m, j; y) \times \mathcal{T}_i \text{ int } S(m, i; y) \mid y \in X\}$, then $(x, y) \in V(m + 2, i) \circ V(m + 2, i)$ implies, for some $z \in X$ that $(x, z) \in V(m + 2, i)$ and $(z, y) \in V(m + 2, i)$.

Indeed $x \in V(m + 2, j)[z] \subset \mathcal{T}_j \text{ int } S(m, j; z)$ and $y \in V(m + 2, i)[z] \subset \mathcal{T}_i \text{ int } S(m, i; z)$ so that $(x, y) \in V(m, i)$. Also notice that $(V(m, i))^{-1} = V(m, j)$. Thus the conditions are sufficient.

The necessity is proved as follows. Let p_1 be the quasi-metric that induces \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 be induced by its conjugate p_2 . Let us write $S(n, i; x) = \{y \mid p_i(x, y) < (\frac{1}{2})^n\}$. If $x \notin S(n - 1, i; x)$ and $S(n, i; x) \cap S(n, j; z) \neq \emptyset$, then there exists $y \in X$ such that $p_i(x, y) < (\frac{1}{2})^n$ and $p_j(z, y) < (\frac{1}{2})^n$. Hence $p_i(x, z) \leq p_i(x, y) + p_i(y, z) < (\frac{1}{2})^{n-1}$, a contradiction. Also, if $y \in S(n, i; x)$ and $z \in S(n, i; y)$, then $p_i(x, y) < (\frac{1}{2})^n$ and $p_i(y, z) < (\frac{1}{2})^n$ so that $p_i(x, z) < (\frac{1}{2})^{n-1}$ and hence $z \in S(n - 1, i; x)$.

2. THEOREM. *A pairwise Hausdorff space $(X, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is quasi-metrizable if and only if for each $x \in X$ one can assign \mathcal{T}_i nbd bases $\{S(n, i; x) \mid n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that*

- (i) $y \notin S(n - 1, i; x)$ implies $S(n, i; x) \cap S(n, j; y) = \emptyset$,
- (ii) $y \in S(n, i; x)$ implies $x \in S(n, j; y)$ ($i, j = 1, 2; i \neq j$).

PROOF. We have to verify only condition (ii) of Theorem 1. Now

$$y \notin S(n - 1, i; x)$$

implies $S(n, i; x) \cap S(n, j; y) = \emptyset$ so that if $z \in S(n, i; x)$, then $z \notin S(n, j; y)$. Thus $y \notin S(n, i; z)$. The necessity is obvious.

3. THEOREM. *A pairwise Hausdorff space $(X, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ is quasi-metrizable if and only if for each $x \in X$ one can assign \mathcal{T}_i nbd bases $\{S(n, i; x) \mid n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that*

- (i) $y \in S(n, i; x)$ implies $S(n, i; y) \subset S(n - 1, i; x)$,
- (ii) $y \in S(n, i; x)$ implies $x \in S(n, j; y)$ ($i, j = 1, 2; i \neq j$).

PROOF. We only have to verify condition (i) of Theorem 1. If

$$S(n, i; x) \cap S(n, j; y) \neq \emptyset,$$

then there is a point $z \in S(n, i; x)$ and $z \in S(n, j; y)$ so that $S(n, i; z) \subset S(n - 1, i; x)$ and $y \in S(n, i; z)$. Thus $y \in S(n - 1, i; x)$.

The necessity is obvious.

References

[1] J. C. Kelly, 'Bitopological spaces', *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **13** (1963), 71–89.
 [2] E. P. Lane, 'Bitopological spaces and quasi-uniform spaces', *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **17** (1967), 241–256.

- [3] M. C. Murdeshwar and S. A. Naimpally, *Quasi-uniform topological spaces* (Noordhoff, Groningen, 1966).
- [4] C. M. Pareek, 'Bitopological and quasi-metric spaces', *J. Univ. Kuwait Sci.* **6** (1980), 1–7.
- [5] C. W. Patty, 'Bitopological spaces', *Duke Math. J.* **34** (1967), 387–392.
- [6] I. L. Reilly, 'Quasi-gauge spaces', *J. London Math. Soc.* **6** (1973), 481–487.
- [7] S. Romoguera, 'Two characterizations of quasi-pseudo-metrizable bitopological spaces', *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **35** (1983), 327–333.
- [8] S. Romoguera, 'On bitopological quasi-pseudometrization', *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **36** (1984), 126–129.
- [9] S. Salbany, 'Quasi-metrization of bitopological spaces', *Arch. Math.* **23** (1972), 299–316.
- [10] R. Stoltenberg, 'Some properties of quasi-uniform spaces', *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **17** (1967), 342–354.
- [11] W. A. Wilson, 'On quasi-metric spaces', *Amer. J. Math.* **53** (1931), 675–684.

Department of Mathematics
University of Auckland
Private Bag, Auckland
New Zealand