

## BITOPOLOGICAL SPACES AND ASSOCIATED $Q$ -PROXIMITY

MONORANJAN JAS AND A. P. BAINAB

*Department of Mathematics, Burdwan University,  
Burdwan 713104*

(Received 10 October 1981)

In this paper implications have been studied between various separation axioms in a bitopological space. Investigations have been made about nature of  $q$ -proximity compatible with a given bitopological space, and it has been proved among other results that there is a unique  $q$ -proximity compatible with a pairwise compact and pairwise regular bitopological space.

§1. Kelly (1963) has studied consequences of introducing a  $q$ -metric (quasi-metric) i.e., a metric minus axiom of symmetry in a non-empty set  $X$ . Given a  $q$ -metric  $p$  on  $X$  there is another such  $p_*$  on  $X$  called the conjugate of  $p$  given by  $p_*(x, y) = p(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ . There results a bitopological space  $(X, p, p_*)$ . Lane (1967) has developed in good length theory of  $q$ -uniform structure and proved that a bitopological space is  $q$ -uniformizable iff it is pairwise completely regular. The first author with Banerjee have proved in Jas and Banerjee (1981) that a bitopological space is  $q$ -proximizable iff it is pairwise completely regular. In this paper we have studied interaction of various separation axioms in a bitopological space, and also studied consequences of  $q$ -proximity in a bitopological space. It has been shown that a pairwise normal bitopological space with both topologies  $T_1$  is  $q$ -proximizable. While searching for a unique  $q$ -proximity compatible with a given bitopological space we have found that a pairwise compact and pairwise regular bitopological space admits of a unique compatible  $q$ -proximity, the formulation of which has also been laid down.

§2. It is necessary to recall the following definition as in Kelly (1963).

*Definition 1.1*—In a bitopological space  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$ ,  $\tau$  is said to be regular with respect to  $\mathbf{V}$  if for each  $x$  in  $X$  there is a  $\tau$ -neighbourhood base of  $\mathbf{V}$ -closed sets or equivalently if for  $x$  in  $X$  and each  $\tau$ -closed set  $F$  with  $x \notin F$  there are  $\tau$ -open set  $G$  and  $\mathbf{V}$ -open set  $H$  such that  $x \in G$  and  $F \subset H$  and that  $G \cap H = \emptyset$ .  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is said to be pairwise regular if  $\tau$  is regular w.r.t.  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  is regular w.r.t.  $\tau$ . Definitions of pairwise normal and pairwise Hausdorff bitopological spaces are now clear.

*Definition 1.2*—In a bitopological space  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$ ,  $\tau$  is said to be completely regular w.r.t.  $\mathbf{V}$  if for each point  $x$  and each  $\tau$ -open neighbourhood  $U$  of  $x$ , there is a  $\tau$ -lower semi-continuous (l.s.c.) and  $\mathbf{V}$ -upper semi-continuous (u.s.c.) function  $f: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(x) = 1$  and  $f(X \setminus U) = 0$ .  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is said to be pairwise completely regular if  $\tau$  is completely regular w.r.t.  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  is completely regular w.r.t.  $\tau$ .

*Definition 1.3* [Fletcher *et al.* (1969)]—A cover  $\mathcal{A}$  of a bitopological space  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is pairwise open if  $\mathcal{A} \subset \tau \cup \mathbf{V}$  with  $\mathcal{A} \cap \tau$  containing a non-empty set, and with  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathbf{V}$  containing a non-empty set.

*Definition 1.4* (see Fletcher *et al.* 1969)—A bitopological space  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is called pairwise compact if every pairwise open cover of  $X$  has a finite subcover.

Following definition 1.4 Fletcher *et al.* (1969) have proved the following theorems.

*Theorem 1.1* [Theorem 12 of Fletcher *et al.* (1969)]

If  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is pairwise Hausdorff and pairwise compact, then  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is pairwise regular.

*Theorem 1.2* [Theorem 13 of Fletcher *et al.* (1969)]—If  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is pairwise compact and either  $\tau$  is regular w.r.t.  $\mathbf{V}$  or  $\mathbf{V}$  is regular w.r.t.  $\tau$ , then  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is pairwise normal.

*Corollary 1.1*—Every pairwise compact and pairwise regular bitopological space is pairwise normal.

Weakening pairwise compactness to pairwise Lindelöf (i.e., each pairwise open cover admits of a countable sub-cover) property we prove the following theorem :

*Theorem 1.3*—If  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is pairwise regular and pairwise Lindelöf, then  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is pairwise normal.

PROOF : Let  $A$  be a  $\tau$ -closed set and  $B$  be a  $\mathbf{V}$ -closed set with  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ . Let  $x \in A$ , by pairwise regularity there is a  $\mathbf{V}$ -open set  $N_x(A)$  satisfying  $x \in N_x(A) \subset \tau\text{-cl}(N_x(A)) \subset X \setminus B$ . Then  $\{N_x(A)\}_{x \in A} \cup (X \setminus A)$  is a pairwise open cover of  $X$ . Similarly for each  $y \in B$ , there is a  $\tau$ -open set  $N_y(B)$  satisfying  $y \in N_y(B) \subset \mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(N_y(B)) \subset X \setminus A$  and  $\{N_y(B)\}_{y \in B} \cup (X \setminus B)$  is a pairwise open cover of  $X$ . Rest of the proof follows the pattern of the proof of classical Lemma (Kelley 1955, p.113) and proceeding as therein we find the desired open sets to separate  $A$  and  $B$ .

*Theorem 1.4*—Product of pairwise completely regular bitopological spaces is pairwise completely regular.

PROOF : Let  $(X_\alpha, \tau_\alpha, \mathbf{V}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Delta}$  be a family of bitopological spaces. Let  $X = \prod \{X_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\}$ , and  $\tau = \prod \{\tau_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\}$  and  $\mathbf{V} = \prod \{\mathbf{V}_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\}$ . For  $x \in X$  and  $U \in \tau$  with  $x \in U$ , let us call a  $\tau$ -l.s.c.  $\mathbf{V}$ -u.s.c. function  $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  meant for  $(x, U)$  whenever  $f(x) = 1$  and  $f(X \setminus U) = 0$ . If  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n$  are functions meant for  $(x, U_1), (x, U_2), \dots, (x, U_n)$  and if  $g(x) = \sup \{f_i(x) : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , then  $g$  is a function meant for  $(x, \bigcap \{U_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\})$ . Consequently in  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$ ,  $\tau$  is completely regular w.r.t.  $\mathbf{V}$  if for each  $x \in X$  and each  $\tau$ -open neighbourhood  $U$  of  $x$  belonging to some sub-base for the topology  $\tau$ , there is a function  $f$  meant for  $(x, U)$ . Let  $x \in U$  and  $U_\alpha \in \tau_\alpha$  be a neighbourhood of  $x_\alpha$  in  $X_\alpha$ , and let  $f$  be the function meant for  $(x, U)$ ; then  $f \circ P_\alpha$  where  $P_\alpha$  is the projection mapping onto  $X_\alpha$  becomes a function meant for  $(x, P_\alpha^{-1}(U_\alpha))$ . Since  $\{P_\alpha^{-1}(U_\alpha)\}$  form a sub-base for  $\tau$ , we have shown that  $\tau$  is completely regular w.r.t.  $\mathbf{V}$ . Similarly we show that  $\mathbf{V}$  is completely regular w.r.t.  $\tau$ . The proof is now complete.

*Theorem 1.5*—Every pairwise compact and pairwise regular bitopological space is pairwise completely regular.

*PROOF* : Suppose a bitopological space  $(X, \tau, \mathcal{V})$  is pairwise compact and pairwise regular. Then by Theorem 1.2,  $(X, \tau, \mathcal{V})$  is pairwise normal. Let  $G \in \tau$  and  $x \in G$ . By pairwise regularly we have a  $\mathcal{V}$ -closed  $\tau$ -open neighbourhood  $F$  of  $x$  such that  $x \in F \subset G$ . So  $F \cap (X \setminus G) = \emptyset$ . Further  $X \setminus G$  is  $\tau$ -closed. By pairwise normality, we apply Theorem 2.7 of Kelly (1963) to find a  $\tau$ -u.s.c and  $\mathcal{V}$ -l.s.c. function  $f: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(X \setminus G) = 1$  and  $f(F) = 0$ . This gives  $f(x) = 0$  and  $f(X \setminus G) = 1$ ; and hence  $\tau$  is completely regular w.r.t.  $\mathcal{V}$ . Similarly we show that  $\mathcal{V}$  is completely regular w.r.t.  $\tau$ . The proof is now complete.

*Theorem 1.6*—Let  $(X, \tau, \mathcal{V})$  has a subset  $Y$  which is (i) both  $\tau$ - and  $\mathcal{V}$ -closed and (ii) both  $\tau$ - and  $\mathcal{V}$ -discrete. If  $Y$  has a subset  $D$  dense w.r.t. upper bound topology of  $\tau$  and  $\mathcal{V}$ , and  $|Y| \geq 2^{|D|}$ , then  $(X, \tau, \mathcal{V})$  is not pairwise normal.

( $| \cdot |$  denoting the cardinality). Proof goes the same way as in Dugundji (1975) and is left out.

Example of a pairwise completely regular bitopological space which is not pairwise normal.

*Example 1.1*—Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be the space of reals with topologies  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$ , where  $\mathcal{U}$  has  $(a, b]$  as basic open sets, and  $-\mathcal{V}$  has  $[a, b)$ ,  $a < b$  as basic open sets. It is easy to see that  $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is pairwise regular and pairwise Lindelöf. By Theorem 1.3  $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is pairwise normal. Since both topologies  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  are  $T_1$ , it follows that  $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is pairwise completely regular. Let  $X = \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{R}$ ,  $\tau = \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}$ , and  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ . Then by Theorem 1.4  $(X, \tau, \mathcal{V})$  is pairwise completely regular. Let  $Y = \{(x, -x) : x \in \mathcal{R}\}$ . Then  $Y \subset X$  has a subset  $D = \{(x, -x) : x \text{ is rational}\}$  such that  $Y$  and  $D$  satisfy all the conditions of Theorem 1.6 an application of which shows that  $(X, \tau, \mathcal{V})$  is not pairwise normal.

§3. In this section we study consequences of  $q$ -proximity in a bitopological space in context of various separation axioms. A  $q$ -proximity is a proximity minus the requirement of symmetry, the definition of which is given below.

There is a kind of proximity introduced by Pervin in Naimpally and Warrack (1970) and we now remark that definition of Pervin proximity and  $q$ -proximity as given by us in Definition 2.1 are equivalent. We recall from Jas and Banerjee (1981) that a bitopological space  $(X, \tau, \mathcal{V})$  is pairwise completely regular if and only if there is a compatible  $q$ -proximity  $\prec$  i.e.,  $\prec$  satisfying  $\tau = \tau_{\prec}$  and  $\mathcal{V} = \tau_{\prec} * \prec$  where  $\tau_{\prec}$  and  $\tau_{\prec} *$  are topologies induced by  $\prec$  and its conjugate  $q$ -proximity  $\prec *$  given by  $A \prec * B$  iff  $(X \setminus B) \prec (X \setminus A)$ . The proof of this result owes to the fact that if  $A \prec B$  then there is a  $\tau_{\prec}$ -u.s.c. and  $\tau_{\prec} *$ -l.s.c. function  $f: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(A) = 0$  and  $f(X \setminus B) = 1$ . This result also appears in Jas and Banerjee (1981).

*Definition 2.1*—A relation on the power set of  $X$  denoted by  $\prec$  is said to define a  $q$ -proximity on  $X$  ( $\neq \emptyset$ ) iff it satisfies the following axioms :

- Q 1.  $X \prec X$  and  $\emptyset \prec \emptyset$
- Q 2.  $A \prec B$  implies  $A \subset B$
- Q 3.  $A \subset B \prec C \subset D$  implies  $A \prec D$

Q 4.  $A \prec B_K; K = 1, 2, \dots, n$  implies  $A \prec \bigcap_{K=1}^n B_K$

$A_k \prec B, K = 1, 2, \dots, n$  implies  $\bigcup_{k=1}^n A_k \prec B$

and

Q 5.  $A \prec B$  implies the existence of a subset  $C$  of  $X$  such that  $A \prec C \prec B$ .

We now quote the following theorem which is converse of Theorem 2.7 of Kelly (1963).

*Theorem 2.1*—Let  $A$  be  $\tau$ -closed and  $B$  be  $\mathbf{V}$ -closed sets in  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  such that  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ . If there is a  $\tau$ -u.s.c. and  $\mathbf{V}$ -l.s.c. function  $f: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(A) = 1$  and  $f(B) = 0$  then  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is pairwise normal.

The proof is a routine work and is left out.

Suppose  $\prec$  is a  $q$ -proximity to make a bitopological space  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$   $q$ -proximizable, and suppose  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \cap \tau\text{-cl}(X \setminus B) = \emptyset$  for two subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $X$ . It does not necessarily follow that  $A \prec B$ . Because otherwise by Theorem 2.1 and by what has been stated above we would have  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  as pairwise normal.

Example 1.1 above confirms of a contrary situation.

*Theorem 2.2*—If  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is pairwise normal with both topologies  $T_1$ , then a compatible  $q$ -proximity  $\prec$  on  $X$  is given by  $A \prec B$  iff  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \cap \tau\text{-cl}(X/B) = \emptyset$ .

PROOF: It is a routine exercise to show that  $\prec$  defined by the prescribed rule is indeed a  $q$ -proximity on  $X$ . We next show that  $\tau = \tau_{\prec}$  and  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_{\prec}^*$ .

Let  $G$  be a  $\tau_{\prec}$ -open set and  $x \in G$ . Since  $\mathbf{V}$  is  $T_1$ ,  $\{x\}$  is  $\mathbf{V}$ -closed; Also  $\{x\} \prec G$ . So we have  $\{x\} \cap \tau\text{-cl}(X/G) = \emptyset$ . This gives  $x \in \tau\text{-int}(G)$ , i.e.  $G \subset \tau\text{-int}(G)$ . So  $G$  is  $\tau$ -open. Conversely let  $A$  be  $\tau$ -open, and  $x \in A$ : since  $\{x\} \cap (X/A) = \emptyset$ ; i.e.  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}\{x\} \cap \tau\text{-cl}(X \setminus A) = \emptyset$ . We have  $\{x\} \prec A$ . Hence  $x \in \tau_{\prec}\text{-int}(A)$ ; i.e.  $A \subset \tau_{\prec}\text{-int}(A)$ . Thus  $A$  is  $\tau_{\prec}$ -open. Using  $A \prec^* B$  iff  $(X \setminus B) \prec (X \setminus A)$ , iff  $\tau\text{-cl}(A) \cap \mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(X \setminus B) = \emptyset$ , we proceed similar to above to show that  $\tau_{\prec}^* = \mathbf{V}$ .

*Theorem 2.3*—If a pairwise completely regular bitopological space  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  has a compatible  $q$ -proximity  $\prec$  given by  $A \prec B$  iff  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \cap \tau\text{-cl}(X \setminus B) = \emptyset$ , then  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is pairwise normal.

PROOF: Let  $C$  be a  $\tau$ -closed set and  $D$  be a  $\mathbf{V}$ -closed set which  $C \cap D = \emptyset$ . Hence  $D \prec (X/C)$ . So we can find [see Lemma 2.2 of Jas and Banerjee (1981)],  $\tau$ -u.s.c and  $\mathbf{V}$ -l.s.c. function  $g: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $g(D) = 0$  and  $g(C) = 1$ . Hence application of Theorem 2.1 completes the proof.

While searching for a unique  $q$ -proximity compatible with a given bitopological space we take special type of pairwise normal bitopological space. We prove the following theorem in this connection.

*Theorem 2.4*—Every pairwise compact and pairwise regular space  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  has a unique compatible  $q$ -proximity  $\prec$  given by  $A \prec B$  iff  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \cap \tau\text{-cl}(X \setminus B) = \emptyset$ .

PROOF: Using Theorem 1.3 and 1.5 it follows that  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  is pairwise normal and pairwise completely regular. So by Theorem 2.1 of Jas and Banerjee (1981), there is a compatible  $q$ -proximity  $\prec_1$  on  $X$  defined by  $A \prec_1 B$  iff there is a  $\tau$ -l.s.c.

and  $\mathbf{V}$ -u.s.c. function  $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(A) = 1$  and  $f(X \setminus B) = 0$ . We show that  $\prec$  and  $\prec_1$  are equivalent. Let  $A \prec_1 B$  hold. Then we have from Lemma 2.1 of Jas and Banerjee (1981)  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \prec_1 B$ , and so  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \prec_1 \tau\text{-int}(B)$  and hence  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \subset \tau\text{-int}(B)$  i.e.,  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \cap \tau\text{-cl}(X \setminus B) = \emptyset$  i.e.,  $A \prec B$ . Conversely suppose  $A \prec B$  holds. So  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \cap \tau\text{-cl}(X \setminus B) = \emptyset$ . By pairwise normality of the space we find  $\tau$ -l.s.c. and  $\mathbf{V}$ -u.s.c. function  $g : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  satisfying  $g(A) = 1$  and  $g(X \setminus B) = 0$ . This means  $A \prec_1 B$ .

Finally let  $\prec_2$  be any  $q$ -proximity compatible with  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$ . The proof will be complete upon showing that  $\prec$  and  $\prec_2$  are equivalent. Let  $A \prec_2 B$ , then we deduce as above that  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \cap \tau\text{-cl}(X \setminus B) = \emptyset$ , and hence  $A \prec B$  holds. Conversely suppose  $A \prec B$  holds i.e., we have  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \cap \tau\text{-cl}(X \setminus B) = \emptyset$ . Let  $x \in \mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A)$ ; clearly  $x \notin \tau\text{-cl}(X \setminus B)$ . i.e.,  $x \in X \setminus \tau\text{-cl}(X \setminus B) = \tau\text{-int}(B) = \tau_{\prec_2}\text{-int}(B)$ . So  $\{x\} \prec_2 B$  holds. So there exists a subset  $C$  of  $X$  such that  $\{x\} \prec_2 C \prec_2 B$ . By Lemma 2.1 of Jas and Banerjee (1981), we have  $\{x\} \prec_2 \tau_{\prec_2}\text{-int}(C) \subset C \prec_2 B$ . So there exists  $\tau$ -open sets  $H_x$  such that  $[H_x : x \in \mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A)]$  is a  $\tau$ -open cover of  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A)$ . Hence  $[H_x : x \in \mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A)] \cup (X \setminus \mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A)) \subset \tau \cup \mathbf{V}$ , is a pairwise open cover of  $X$  and thus has a finite subcover. Hence there exists a finite set of points  $[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$  in  $X$  such that

$A \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^n H_{x_k}$ , and  $H_{x_k} \prec_2 B, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . By Q4 we have  $\bigcup_{k=1}^n H_{x_k} \prec_2 B$ . So

$A \prec_2 B$ . Hence  $\prec$  and  $\prec_2$  are equivalent.

*Corollary 2.1*—Every pairwise Hausdorff and pairwise compact bitopological space  $(X, \tau, \mathbf{V})$  has a compatible unique  $q$ -proximity  $\prec$  defined by  $A \prec B$  iff  $\mathbf{V}\text{-cl}(A) \cap \tau\text{-cl}(X \setminus B) = \emptyset$ .

#### REFERENCES

- Dugundji, J. (1975). *Topology*, Allyn and Bacon, Prentice-Hall of India, Ex. 3, pp. 144.  
 Fletcher, P., Hoyle, H. B. (III), and Patty, C. W. (1969). The Comparison of topologies. *Duke Math. J.*, **36**, 325–32.  
 Jas, Monoranjan, and Banerjee, Chanda (1981). Quasi-proximity and associated bitopological spaces. *Indian J. pure appl. Math.*, **12**, (8), 945–49.  
 Kelley, J. L. (1955). *General Topology*. D. Van Nostrand Co. New York.  
 Kelly, J. C. (1963). Bitopological spaces. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3), **13**, 71–89.  
 Lane, E. P. (1967). Bitopological spaces and quasi-uniform spaces. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3), **17**, 241–56.  
 Naimpally, S. A., and Warrack, B. D. (1970). *Proximity spaces*, Cambridge University Press, 105.