M. M. Marjanović; Ante R. Vučemilović Two non-homeomorphic countable spaces having homeomorphic squares

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 26 (1985), No. 3, 579--588

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/106394

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1985

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* http://project.dml.cz

COMMENTATIONES MATHEMATICAE UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE 26,3 (1885)

TWO NON-HOMEOMORPHIC COUNTABLE SPACES HAVING HOMEOMORPHIC SQUARES M. M. MARJANOVIĆ and A. R. VUČEMILOVIĆ

<u>Abstract</u>: A pair of non-homeomorphic countable metrizable spaces having homeomorphic squares is exhibited. This answers a question of V. Trnková from [4].

Key words: Countable metrizable spaces, homeomorphism, squares of spaces.

Classification: 54B10

1. <u>Introduction</u>. A class \mathcal{K} of topological spaces is said to have the <u>unique square root property</u> if for any two objects A and B in \mathcal{K} . A \times A \approx B \times B implies A \approx B.

Several naturally organized classes of topological spaces do not have this property (see [4]). In [4], V. Trnková asked the following question: Is the unique square root property valid in the class of all countable metrizable spaces?

In this paper, we exhibit a pair of non-homeomorphic countable metrizable spaces having homeomorphic squares.

2. <u>A classification of points of a space</u>. Now we consider a classification of points of a countable metric space, following the case of classification of points of a compact metric O-dimensional space (see [2]).

When we say "a space", it will mean invariably "a countab-- 579 - le metric space".

For a space X, let X_0 be the set of all isolated points of X and X_1 the set of those points of X which have a neighborhood without isolated points. Let $X_{(0)} = X \setminus (X_0 \cup X_1)$. Since $X_{(0)} \subseteq \overline{X}_0$ (\overline{A} denotes the closure of the set A), the set $X_{(0)}$ is split again into two parts $X_2 = X_{(0)} \setminus \overline{X}_1$ and $X_{(0)(1)} = X_{(0)} \cap \overline{X}_1$. In words, the set $X_{(0)}$ is split into the set X_2 of those points which are not accumulation points of X_1 and the set $X_{(0)(1)}$ of those points which are accumulation points of X_1 .

Now we have the following inductive definition: Suppose that the sets X_0, X_1, \ldots, X_n and $X_{(0)}, X_{(0)}(1), \ldots, X_{(n-1)}$ have been already defined. Put

$$X_{n+1} = X(o)(1)...(n-1)^{\overline{X}_n}, X(o)(1)...(n) = X(o)(1)...(n-1)^{\overline{X}_n}.$$

In this way, we have defined a sequence of sets X_0, X_1, \dots ..., X_n, \dots which are disjoint and for each n, the set $X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n$ is open and $X_0 \cup (1), \dots (n-1)$ closed.

Let

$$\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{W}} = \bigcap \{ \mathbf{X}_{(\mathbf{0})}(1) \dots (\mathbf{n}) \colon \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N} \}.$$

The following statement is immediately derived from the given definition.

Statement 1.

(a) $\overline{X}_n = X_n \cup (\cup \{ X_k: k = n+2, \dots, w \})$

(b) If $X_n = \emptyset$, then $X_k = \emptyset$ for $k = n+2, \dots, w$.

Call a point $x \in X$ n-point if $x \in X_n$ for some n = 0, 1,, ω . The number n is called the <u>accumulation order</u> of x and we write ord (x) = n.

To the space X, for which $X_{n-2} \neq \emptyset$, $X_{n-1} = \emptyset$ and $X_n \neq \emptyset$ (and according to 1 (b), $X_k = \emptyset$ for k > n) the sequence $s(X) = (0, 1, ..., n-2, \emptyset, n),$

and to the space X for which $X_{n-1} \neq \emptyset$, $X_n \neq \emptyset$ and $X_k = \emptyset$ for k > n, the sequence

s(X) = (0,1,...,n-1,n)

is attached respectively. The sequence s(X) is called the <u>accumulation sequence</u> of the space X (we avoid here the case $X_{w} \neq \emptyset$).

3. Q-full spaces. Denote by Q the space of rational numbers. Every countable metric space without isolated points is homeomorphic to Q (Sierpinski's theorem, [1], p. 290).

Call a space X Q-full if for each n > 0, $X_n \neq \emptyset$ implies X_n has no isolated point (or $X_n \approx Q$).

Now we construct a sequence of Q-full spaces.

Let $Q_{-1} = \emptyset$ be the empty set, Q_0 a one point space and $Q_1 = Q$, where Q is the set of rationals realized geometrically as the set of all end points of removed intervals of the Cantor discontinuum C (when C is constructed in the usual way of removing the middle third intervals).

Suppose the sequence Q_0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_n has already been defined (and all the spaces Q_i , i = 0,..., n are the subspaces of [0,1]).

Define Q_{n+1} to be the space Q plus a copy of the disjoint topological sum $Q_{n-2} + Q_{n-1}$ being interpolated in each of the removed intervals. Now by induction, the sequence of spaces

$Q_0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_n, \ldots$

is defined and it is easy to see that all these spaces are $Q-\underline{full}$ as well as the sums $Q_{n-1} + Q_n$, (n $\in \mathbb{N}$).

As for the accumulation sequences, we have

 $s(Q_0) = (0), s(Q_1) = (\emptyset, 1), s(Q_0 + Q_1) = (0, 1)$ and for n > 1,

- 581 -

 $s(Q_n) = (o, \dots, n-2, \emptyset, n), s(Q_{n-1} + Q_n) = (o, \dots, n-1, n).$ In particular, $s(Q_2 + Q_3) = (o, 1, 2, 2), s(Q_5) =$

= (0,1,2,3,0,5), what shows that $Q_2 + Q_3 \not = Q_5$.

We quote [5] for the following two easily proved statements. Statement 2.

(a) <u>A compact space cannot be Q-full</u>.

(b) If every infinite sequence in X_0 has an accumulation point then $\overline{X_0}$ is compact.

Call two Q-full spaces X and Y <u>equivalent</u> if their accumulation sequences are finite and equal, and if card $(X_0) =$ = card (Y_0) .

According to the statement 2.6 in [5], which can be considered as a variation on the already mentioned Sierpinski's theorem, <u>two equivalent spaces are homeomorphic</u> (Sierpinski's theorem being the case $s(X) = s(Y) = (\emptyset, 1)$).

We give here a sketch of a (new) proof.

In order to simplify the proofs which follow, notice that according to the statement 1, <u>a space</u> X such that s(X) == (0,...,n-1,n) has both parts X_{n-1} and X_n closed in X. Then, it easily follows that X can be decomposed into two closed and open parts X' and X'' such that $s(X') = (0,..., \emptyset, n)$, s(X'') == (0,..., \emptyset , n-1) (see also 2.3 in [5]).

Notice also that a <u>closed</u> and open subset of a Q-full space is Q-full each.

A <u>pointed</u> Q-full space is a pair (X, x_0) where X is Q-full space and $x \in X$ a point of highest accumulation order.

Statement 3. Let (X, x_0) and (Y, y_0) be two pointed Q-full spaces such that X and Y are equivalent and s(X) = s(Y) == $(0, \dots, \emptyset, n)$. If X = X \cup X $\stackrel{\circ}{}$ is a decomposition into two closed and open subsets such that $x_0 \in X'$, then there exists a decomposition of Y into two closed and open subsets, $Y = Y' \cup Y''$ such that $y_0 \in Y'$ and X' is equivalent to Y' and X'' to Y''.

<u>Proof</u>. The statement is easily seen to be true in the cases s(X) = 0, $s(X) = (\emptyset, 1)$. Suppose $n \ge 2$. We have two cases

a) $s(X') = (0, ..., \emptyset, n), s(X') = (0, ..., \emptyset, m)$

b) $s(X') = (o, ..., \emptyset, n), s(X'') = (o, ..., m-1, m).$

a) If m = 0 and card $X'' < x_0$, we take $Y' \subset Y_0$ such that card Y'' = card X'' and $Y' = Y \setminus Y''$.

If m = 0 and card $X'' = Y_0$, then by 2, there exists a closed and open subset $Y' \subset Y_0$ such that card $Y'' = Y_0$ and $Y' = Y \setminus Y''$ has the required properties.

If $1 \le m < n$, then since $Y_0 \cup Y_1 \cup \ldots \cup Y_{m-2} \cup Y_m$ is open, take a small enough closed and open neighborhood Y'' of a point $y \in Y_m$ such that $Y'' \subset Y_1$ if m = 1 and $Y'' \subset Y_0 \cup Y_1 \cup \ldots \cup Y_{m-2} \cup Y_m$ if m > 1. Let $Y' = Y \setminus Y''$.

If m = n, let Y be a small enough closed and open neighborhood of y_o such that $Y_n \setminus Y \neq \emptyset$. Take Y'' = Y \Y'.

b) If m = o, we do the same as under a) (and it is the same case). If s(X'') = (o,1), take a closed and open neighborhood U of a point in Y_1 such that $U \subseteq Y_1$ and let $V \subset Y_0$, closed in Y, be equivalent to $X'' \cap X_0$. Take $Y'' = U \cup V$, $Y' = Y \setminus Y''$.

Now we have left the case $1 \le m \le n = 2$. Take U and V to be closed and open neighborhoods of a point $y_1 \le Y_m$ and $y_2 \le Y_{m-1}$ respectively such that $U \le Y_0 \cup Y_1 \cup \ldots \cup Y_m$ and $V \le Y_0 \cup Y_1 \cup \ldots \cup Y_{m-1}$. Take $Y'' = U \cup V$ and $Y' = Y \setminus Y''$. This concludes the proof.

Statement 4. If X and Y are equivalent spaces, then they are homeomorphic.

<u>Proof.</u> We can suppose that X and Y are subspaces of the interval [0,1]. Since X and Y are countable, we have the enumera-

- 583 -

tions of each of them $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_1, \ldots, x_1, \ldots, y_1, \ldots, y$

Now let the term "to point a closed and open part A" of X or Y mean to form the pair (A,a), where a cA is the point of highest order in A which stands first in the given enumeration and has not been already used in the process of pointing.

If $s(X) = s(Y) = (0, \dots, n-1, n)$, then both of these spaces can be decomposed into two parts each, so that the accumulation sequences of the parts are $(0, \ldots, \emptyset, n)$ and $(0, \ldots, \emptyset, n-1)$, and the pointed parts having the sequence $(o, \ldots, \emptyset, n)$. Point the non-pointed parts, if any. Then, each of these parts of X. or X itself, if $s(X) = (0, \dots, \beta, n)$, can be decomposed into two closed and open parts which are of diameter less than 2/3 of the diameter of X. Applying 3, we also have equivalent parts of the parts of Y. Now the decompositions of X and Y have at most 4 elements and let us point non-pointed parts. The parts of Y, having the sequence (o,...,m-1,m) decompose into two parts having each the sequences $(o_1,\ldots, \emptyset, m)$ or $(o_1,\ldots, \emptyset, m-1)$, point them and correspond to each the equivalent parts of the corresponding parts of X. Point also parts of X. Now, we have at most 8 parts in each of the spaces. Finally decompose the parts of Y so that the diameters of the parts are less than 2/3 of dismeter of Y. Point non-pointed parts and do the same with the equivalent non-pointed parts of X.

In this way X and Y are decomposed into at most 16 pointed parts. If \mathbf{x}_{i_k} points a part of X, denote such a part by $X^1(\mathbf{x}_{i_k})$ and the corresponding part of Y with $Y^1(\mathbf{y}_{j_k})$. The parts $X^1(\mathbf{x}_{i_k})$ and $Y^1(\mathbf{y}_{j_k})$ are all of diameter less than 2/3 and they are equi-- 584 - valent pointed Q-full spaces.

Now starting with the pairs $X^{1}(x_{i_{k}}), Y^{1}(y_{j_{k}})$. We decompose them into at most 16 parts $X^{2}(x_{i_{k}}), Y^{2}(y_{j_{k}})$ having the diameters less than $(2/3)^{2}$.

Proceeding inductively, in the m-th step, we have the parts $X^{m}(x_{i_{k}}), Y^{m}(y_{j_{k}})$ of diameter less than $(2/3)^{m}$.

Define the mapping $f: X \longrightarrow Y$ by $f(x_{i_k}) = y_{j_k}$. If $x_{i_g} \in X_t$, then by 1, the set $X_0 \cup \ldots \cup X_t$ is open, and for a large enough m, there will exist a part X^m of X contained in $X_0 \cup \ldots \cup X_t$ and disjoint from the set of those points of order t which precede x_{i_g} . So x_{i_g} , if not already used in pointing, will be used in the m-th step. The same is valid for the points of Y, so that f is a mapping defined from the whole X onto Y. It is easily seen that f is 1-1 and on both sides continuous. Hence, X and Y are homeomorphic.

Thus the term "equivalent Q-full spaces" means to pologically equivalent and it was only a working term.

The statement 4 shows that the only Q-full spaces are the spaces

Q_n , $Q_{n-1} + Q_n$

adding to them at most countable discrete spaces and the topological sums of such a space and the space Q_1 .

4. The space $Q_2 + Q_3$ and Q_5 have homeomorphic squares. Consider two spaces X and Y having no point of the accumulation order 4. (Such two spaces are $Q_2 + Q_3$ and Q_5 .) If ord (x) = = m,(x \in X) and ord (y) = n, (y \in Y), we will denote the order of (x,y) \in X \times Y by mx n. The number m×n does not depend of the choi-

- 585 -

ce of spaces X and Y as it will become evident from the proofs which follow. The evident homeomorphism of the spaces $X \times Y$ and $Y \times X$ sends the point (x,y) onto (y,x) and so $m \times n = n \times m$.

Now we show that $n \times m$ dependently of n and m is given by the following table

×	0	1	2	3	5
0	0	1	2	3	5
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	1	2	5	5
3	3	1	5	3	5
5	5	1	5	5	5

(a) $0 \times n = n$: Suppose ord (x) = 0, ord (y) = n. The set $\{x\} \times Y$ is mapped onto Y by a homeomorphism sending (x,y) onto y. Thus, ord (x,y) =ord (y).

(b) $1 \times n = 1$: The point x has a neighborhood without isolated points and so the point (x,y) has also such a neighborhood.

(c) $2 \times 3 \ge 5$: In an arbitrary neighborhood of the point (x,y), there exist two points (x',y'), (x'',y'') such that ord (x') = 0, ord (y') = 3, ord (x'') = 2, ord (y'') = 0. Thus, ord (x',y') = 3, ord (x'',y'') = 2 and the point (x,y) is an accumulation point of $(X \times Y)_2$ and $(X \times Y)_3$. By the statement 1 (a), it follows that ord $(x,y) \ge 5$.

(d) $2 \times 5 \ge 5$: The proof is the same as under (c).

(e) $3\times 3 = 3$: By 1 (a), $\widehat{X}_2 = X_2 \cup X_4 \cup X_5$ and the set $X_0 \cup \cup X_1 \cup X_3$ is open. Take closed and open neighborhoods U and V of x and y respectively so that $U \subseteq X_0 \cup X_1 \cup X_3$, $V \subseteq Y_0 \cup Y_1 \cup Y_3$. Let (x',y') be in U×V. If one of the numbers ord (x'), ord (y') is less than 3, then ord (x',y') = 0,1 or 3. If ord (x') = 0 or (y') = 3, then ord $(x',y') \ge 3$, since $(x',y') \in (\overline{X} \times Y)_0$ and $(x',y') \in \overline{(X \times Y)}_1$. Thus, no point in U×V has the order 2. Thus, ord (x',y') = 3.

- 586 -

- (f) $3 \times 5 \ge 5$: The proof is the same as under (c).
- (g) $5 \times 5 \ge 5$: The proof as under (c).
- (h) $2 \times 2 = 2$: The proof easier than (e).

Hence, the space $X \times Y$ has no point of order 4. By 1 (b), $X \times Y$ has no point of order greater than 5 and we have $2 \times 3 = 5$, $2 \times 5 = 5$, $3 \times 5 = 5$, $5 \times 5 = 5$.

It is immediately seen that the product of two Q-full spaces X and Y is a Q-full space.

Take $X = Q_2 + Q_3$, $Y = Q_5$. Then, s(X) = (o,1,2,3) and $s(Y) = (o,1,2,3,\emptyset,5)$ and X and Y are not homeomorphic. The spaces $X \times X$ and $Y \times Y$ are Q-full and $s(X \times X) = s(Y \times Y) = (o,1,2,3,\emptyset,5)$. By the statement 4, the spaces $X \times X$ and $Y \times Y$ are homeomorphic.

In a full analogy with the case of compact spaces (see [3]), it can be shown that there exists an infinite sequence of pairs; of non-homeomorphic separable metric spaces having homeomorphic squares.

References

C11	KURATOWSKI K.: Topology (Russian), vol. 1, Moscow (1966).
[2]	MARJANOVIĆ M.M.: Exponentially complete spaces III, Publ. Inst.Math.,Beograd, t. 14(28)(1972), 97-109.
[3]	 Numerical invariants of 0-dimensional spaces and their Cartesian multiplication, Publ. Inst.Math., Beograd, t. 17(31)(1974), 113-120.
[4]	TRNKOVÁ V.: Representations of commutative semigroups by pro- ducts of topological spaces, Proc. Fifth Prague To- pol. Şymp. 1981, Berlin (1982), 631-641.
7 - 7	

 [5] VUČEMILOVIĆ A.: On countable spaces, Mathematica Balcanica, 4.127(1974), 669-674. Math. Institute PMF, Studentski trg 16, 11000 Beograd, Yugoslavia

(Oblatum 23.1. 1985)

.

.

۰.