

# UPPER BOUNDS FOR THE TIGHTNESS OF THE $G_\delta$ -TOPOLOGY

ANGELO BELLA AND SANTI SPADARO

ABSTRACT. We prove that if  $X$  is a regular space with no uncountable free sequences, then the tightness of its  $G_\delta$  topology is at most continuum and if  $X$  is in addition Lindelöf then its  $G_\delta$  topology contains no free sequences of length larger than the continuum. We also show that the higher cardinal generalization of our theorem does not hold, by constructing a regular space with no free sequences of length larger than  $\omega_1$ , but whose  $G_\delta$  topology can have arbitrarily large tightness.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Given a space  $X$ , the  $G_\delta$ -modification of  $X$  (or  $G_\delta$ -topology on  $X$ ),  $X_\delta$  is defined as the topology on  $X$  which is generated by the  $G_\delta$ -subsets of  $X$ . The problem of bounding the cardinal invariants of  $X_\delta$  in terms of those of  $X$  is a well-studied one in set-theoretic topology. For example if  $c$ ,  $s$ ,  $L$ ,  $t$  denote respectively the cellularity, the spread, the Lindelöf degree and the tightness of  $X$ , then  $c(X_\delta) \leq 2^{c(X)}$  for every compact space  $X$  (see [7]),  $s(X_\delta) \leq 2^{s(X)}$  for every Hausdorff space  $X$  (see [1]) and  $L(X_\delta) \leq 2^{L(X) \cdot t(X)}$  for every Hausdorff space  $X$  (see [10]). This is nothing but a small sample of bounds for the  $G_\delta$  topology that have been proved in the past; for more results and applications of the  $G_\delta$  topology to homogeneous compacta we refer the reader to our paper [1] and its bibliography.

Note that we have not mentioned a bound for the tightness of the  $G_\delta$  topology yet, and indeed finding such a bound seems to be particularly tricky. Answering a question posed in [1], Dow, Juhász, Soukup, Szentmiklóssy and Weiss [5] proved that the inequality  $t(X_\delta) \leq 2^{t(X)}$  holds within the realm of regular Lindelöf spaces. The Lindelöf property is essential in their argument, and in fact the authors were able to construct a consistent example of a regular countably tight space  $X$  such that  $t(X_\delta)$  can be as big as desired. They left open whether a countably

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54A25, 54D20, 54D55.

*Key words and phrases.* Free sequence, tightness, Lindelöf,  $G_\delta$ -topology.

tight space  $X$  such that  $t(X_\delta) > 2^{\aleph_0}$  can be found in ZFC. This question was later solved in the positive by Usuba [12], who also found a bound on the tightness of the  $G_\delta$ -modification of every countably tight space, modulo the consistency of a certain very large cardinal. More precisely, Usuba proved that if  $\kappa$  is an  $\omega_1$ -strongly compact cardinal then  $t(X_\delta) \leq \kappa$ , for every countably tight space  $X$ . Chen and Szeptycki [3] managed to prove a very tight consistent bound for the special class of Fréchet  $\alpha_1$ -spaces, namely  $t(X_\delta) \leq \aleph_1$  if the Proper Forcing Axiom holds.

Exploiting the notion of a free sequence, we will give another bound on the tightness of the  $G_\delta$  topology.

A free sequence is a special kind of discrete set that was introduced by Arhangel'skii and is one of the essential tools in his celebrated solution of the Alexandroff-Urysohn problem on the cardinality of first-countable compacta. Recall that the set  $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq X$  is a free sequence provided that  $\overline{\{x_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}} \cap \overline{\{x_\beta : \alpha \leq \beta < \kappa\}} = \emptyset$  for each  $\alpha < \kappa$ . We define  $F(X)$  to be the supremum of cardinalities of free-sequences in  $X$ . The cardinal functions  $F(X)$  and  $t(X)$  are intimately related. Indeed,  $F(X) \leq L(X)t(X)$  for every space  $X$  and  $t(X) = F(X)$ , for every compact Hausdorff space  $X$ . However, the gap between  $F(X)$  and  $t(X)$  can be arbitrarily large even for a Lindelöf space  $X$ , as observed by Okunev [9].

We will prove a result about the tightness of the  $G_\delta$  modification which has the Dow, Juhász, Soukup, Szentmiklóssy and Weiss bound as a consequence and also implies the following new bound: if  $X$  is a regular space such that  $F(X) = \omega$ , then  $t(X_\delta) \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$ . The higher cardinal generalization of this is not true, as we will construct, for every cardinal  $\kappa$ , a regular space  $X$  such that  $F(X) = \omega_1 < \kappa = t(X_\delta)$ . As a byproduct of our bound we will obtain that if  $X$  is a Lindelöf regular space such that  $F(X) = \omega$  then  $F(X_\delta) \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$ .

Given a set  $S$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  the powerset of  $S$  and by  $[S]^{\leq \kappa}$  the set of all subsets of  $S$  which have cardinality at most  $\kappa$ . For undefined notions see [6], but our notation regarding cardinal functions follows [8].

## 2. THE TIGHTNESS OF THE $G_\delta$ -MODIFICATION

Let  $X$  be a space, let  $W$  be a subset of  $X$  and let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal. We say that a collection  $\mathcal{U}$  of subsets of  $X$  is a  $Cl_\kappa$ -cover of  $W$  provided that for any  $C \in [W]^{\leq \kappa}$  there is  $U_C \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $\overline{C} \subseteq U_C$ .

We say that a space  $X$  is  $Cl_\kappa$ -Lindelöf if whenever  $W$  is a subset of  $X$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  is an open  $Cl_\kappa$ -cover of  $W$ , then  $W$  is covered by countably many elements of  $\mathcal{U}$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Every Lindelöf space  $X$  is  $Cl_{t(X)}$ -Lindelöf.*

*Proof.* It suffices to observe that every open  $Cl_{t(X)}$ -cover of a set  $W \subseteq X$  is actually a cover of  $\overline{W}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** *Every space  $X$  satisfying  $F(X) = \omega$  is  $Cl_\omega$ -Lindelöf.*

*Proof.* Let  $W$  be a subset of  $X$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  be an open  $Cl_\omega$ -cover of  $W$ . Assume by contradiction that no countable subfamily of  $\mathcal{U}$  covers  $W$ . We will then construct a free sequence of cardinality  $\omega_1$  inside  $W$ .

Suppose that, for some  $\beta < \omega_1$ , we have chosen points  $\{x_\tau : \tau < \beta\} \subset W$  and elements  $U_\tau \in \mathcal{U}$  for every  $\tau < \beta$  with the property that  $\overline{\{x_\gamma : \gamma < \tau\}} \subseteq U_\tau$ . Choose  $U_\beta \in \mathcal{U}$  in such a way that  $\overline{\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\}} \subseteq U_\beta$ . By our assumption, the family  $\{U_\tau : \tau \leq \beta\}$  does not cover  $W$ , and therefore we can fix a point  $x_\beta \in W \setminus \bigcup\{U_\tau : \tau \leq \beta\}$ .

Eventually,  $\{x_\tau : \tau < \omega_1\}$  is a free sequence of cardinality  $\omega_1$  in  $X$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $X$  be a regular space and let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal. If  $X$  is  $Cl_\kappa$ -Lindelöf, then  $t(X_\delta) \leq 2^\kappa$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be any subset of  $X$  and fix a point  $p$  in the  $G_\delta$ -closure of  $A$ .

Let  $\mathcal{N}_\kappa(X) = \{C \in [X]^{\leq \kappa} : p \notin \overline{C}\}$ . By the regularity of  $X$ , for every  $C \in \mathcal{N}_\kappa(X)$ , we can find disjoint open sets  $U_C$  and  $V_C$  such that  $\overline{C} \subset U_C$  and  $p \in V_C$ .

Let  $\phi$  be a choice function on  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . We will build by induction an increasing family  $\{W_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^+\} \subset [A]^{2^\kappa}$ .

Let  $W_0$  be any subset of  $A$  of cardinality  $\leq 2^\kappa$  and assume we have already defined  $\{W_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ . If  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal then put  $W_\alpha = \bigcup\{W_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ . If  $\alpha = \gamma + 1$  then let:

$$W_\alpha = W_\gamma \cup \{\phi(A \cap \bigcap\{V_C : C \in \mathcal{C}\}) : \mathcal{C} \in [\mathcal{N}_\kappa(W_\gamma)]^{\leq \omega}\}$$

Note that  $|W_\alpha| \leq 2^\kappa$ .

Finally, let  $W = \bigcup\{W_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^+\}$ . Since  $|W| \leq 2^\kappa$ , it suffices to show that  $p$  is in the  $G_\delta$ -closure of  $W$ .

Indeed, let  $\{O_n : n < \omega\}$  be a family of open neighbourhoods of  $p$ .

**Claim.** There is a countable family  $\mathcal{C}_n \subset \mathcal{N}_\kappa(W \setminus O_n)$  such that  $W \setminus O_n \subset \bigcup\{U_C : C \in \mathcal{C}_n\}$ .

*Proof of Claim.* Since  $O_n$  is an open neighbourhood of  $p$ , we have that  $\mathcal{N}_\kappa(W \setminus O_n) = [W \setminus O_n]^{\leq \kappa}$  and therefore  $U_C$  is defined for every  $C \in [W \setminus O_n]^{\leq \kappa}$  and  $\overline{C} \subset U_C$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_C : C \in \mathcal{N}_\kappa(W \setminus O_n)\}$  is a  $Cl_\kappa$ -open cover of  $W \setminus O_n$ . Now, the statement of the claim follows from the fact that  $X$  is a  $Cl_\kappa$ -Lindelöf space.  $\triangle$

For every  $n < \omega$ , fix a family  $\mathcal{C}_n$  satisfying the Claim and let  $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup \{\mathcal{C}_n : n < \omega\}$  and  $S = \bigcup \mathcal{S}$ .

Since the set  $S$  has cardinality at most  $\kappa$ , there is an ordinal  $\delta < \kappa^+$  such that  $S \subset W_\delta$ . It follows then that the point  $q = \phi(\bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{S}} V_C \cap A)$  belongs to  $W_{\delta+1} \subset W$ .

Note that, for every  $n < \omega$ ,  $q \in \bigcap \{V_C : C \in \mathcal{C}_n\} \cap W \subset W \setminus \bigcup \{U_C : C \in \mathcal{C}_n\} \subset O_n \cap W$ . Therefore  $q \in \bigcap \{O_n : n < \omega\} \cap W$  and we are done.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.** (*Dow, Juhász, Soukup, Szentmiklóssy and Weiss [5]*) *If  $X$  is a Lindelöf regular space, then  $t(X_\delta) \leq 2^{t(X)}$ .*

**Corollary 5.** *If  $X$  is a regular space and  $F(X) = \omega$ , then  $t(X_\delta) \leq 2^\omega$ .*

It's natural to ask whether the higher cardinal version of Corollary 5 holds true. The following theorem shows that this is not the case.

Let  $\theta$  be a regular uncountable cardinal. Recall that an elementary submodel  $M$  of  $H(\theta)$  is said to be  $\omega$ -covering if for every countable subset  $A$  of  $M$  there is a countable set  $B \in M$  such that  $A \subset B$ . The union of any elementary chain of elementary submodels of length  $\omega_1$  is an  $\omega$ -covering elementary submodel, so  $\omega$ -covering submodels of cardinality  $\omega_1$  exist in ZFC (see [4]).

**Theorem 6.** *For every uncountable cardinal  $\kappa$ , there is a space  $Y$  such that  $F(Y) = \omega_1 < \kappa = t(Y_\delta)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X = \Sigma(2^\kappa) = \{x \in 2^\kappa : |x^{-1}(1)| \leq \aleph_0\}$  and let  $p \in 2^\kappa$  be the point defined by  $p(\alpha) = 1$ , for every  $\alpha < \kappa$ . We will prove that  $Y = X \cup \{p\}$  with the topology inherited from  $2^\kappa$  is the required example.

The following Claim was proved by the second author in [11] for the case  $\kappa = \omega_2$ , but the argument works for any uncountable cardinal  $\kappa$  without any modifications. We include it for the reader's convenience.

**Claim.**  $L(X) = \aleph_1$ .

*Proof of Claim.* Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be an open cover of  $X$ . Without loss of generality we can assume that for every  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ , there is a finite partial function  $\sigma : \kappa \rightarrow 2$  such that  $U = \{x \in 2^\kappa : \sigma \subset x\}$ . The domain of  $\sigma$  will then be called the *support of  $U$*  and we will write  $\text{supp}(U) = \text{dom}(\sigma)$ .

Let  $\theta$  be a large enough regular cardinal and  $M$  be an  $\omega$ -covering elementary submodel of  $H(\theta)$  such that  $X, \mathcal{U}, \kappa \in M$  and  $|M| = \aleph_1$ .

We claim that  $\mathcal{U} \cap M$  covers  $X$ . Indeed, let  $x \in X$  be any point and let  $A \in M$  be a countable set such that  $x^{-1}(1) \cap M \subset A$ .

Let  $Z = \{y \in X : (\forall \alpha \in \kappa \setminus A)(y(\alpha) = 0)\}$ . Then  $Z \in M$  and  $Z$  is a compact subspace of  $X$ . So there is a finite subfamily  $\mathcal{V} \in M$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  such that  $Z \subset \bigcup \mathcal{V}$ . Since  $\mathcal{V}$  is finite, we have  $\mathcal{V} \subset M$ . It then follows that  $\mathcal{U} \cap M$  covers  $Z$ .

Let  $a$  be the point such that  $a(\alpha) = x(\alpha)$  for all  $\alpha \in M \cap \kappa$  and  $a(\alpha) = 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \kappa \setminus M$ . The fact that  $x^{-1}(1) \cap M \subset A$  implies that  $a \in Z$  and hence there is  $U \in \mathcal{U} \cap M$  such that  $a \in U$ . Note that  $\text{supp}(U)$  is a finite element of  $M$  and hence  $\text{supp}(U) \subset M$ . But since  $x$  and  $a$  coincide on  $M$  we then have that  $x \in U$  as well, as we wanted.

This proves  $L(X) \leq \aleph_1$ , but we can't have  $L(X) = \aleph_0$  because  $X$  is countably compact non-compact. Hence  $L(X) = \aleph_1$ .

△

It is well known that  $X$  is Fréchet-Urysohn and hence  $X$  has countable tightness. Since  $F(X) \leq L(X) \cdot t(X)$  we have  $F(X) \leq \omega_1$ , but then also  $F(Y) \leq \omega_1$ . It's easy to see that  $t(p, Y_\delta) = \kappa$ . □

In [2] Carlson, Porter and Ridderbos proved the following improvement of the Pytkeev inequality  $L(X_\delta) \leq 2^{L(X) \cdot t(X)}$  mentioned in the introduction.

**Theorem 7.** [2] *(Theorem 2.7) If  $X$  is a Hausdorff space, then  $L(X_\delta) \leq 2^{L(X)F(X)}$ .*

Putting together Corollary 5 and the above theorem we obtain:

**Corollary 8.** *Let  $X$  be a regular Lindelöf space such that  $F(X) = \omega$ . Then  $F(X_\delta) \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$ .*

We don't know whether the Lindelöf property can be removed from the above corollary.

**Question 9.** *Let  $X$  be a regular space satisfying  $F(X) = \omega$ . Is it true that  $F(X_\delta) \leq 2^\omega$ ?*

It's reasonable to conjecture that the higher cardinal version of Corollary 8 holds, at least for Lindelöf spaces.

**Question 10.** *Let  $X$  be a regular (Lindelöf) space. Is it true that  $F(X_\delta) \leq 2^{F(X)}$ ?*

Note that neither the consistent example from [5] of a regular countably tight space  $X$  such that  $t(X_\delta)$  can be arbitrarily large nor the example from Theorem 6 work for the above question since  $F(X) = |X|$  for the former and  $F(X_\delta) \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$  for the latter.

We finish with two easy bounds for the tightness of the  $G_\delta$  topology, by making use of the weight and the spread.

**Proposition 11.** *Let  $X$  be a regular space. Then:*

- (1)  $t(X_\delta) \leq 2^{d(X)}$ .
- (2)  $t(X_\delta) \leq 2^{s(X)}$ .

*Proof.* To prove (1) recall that  $w(X) \leq 2^{d(X)}$  for every regular space  $X$  (see [8]). Now  $t(X_\delta) \leq w(X_\delta) \leq w(X)^\omega \leq 2^{d(X) \cdot \omega} = 2^{d(X)}$ .

To prove (2) recall that  $nw(X) \leq 2^{s(X)}$  for every regular space  $X$  (see [8]) and proceed as before.  $\square$

Proposition 11, (1) is not true for Hausdorff spaces, as the following example shows.

**Example 12.** *There is a separable Hausdorff space  $X$  such that  $t(X_\delta) > 2^{\aleph_0}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $Y$  be the Katětov extension of the integer. That is, if  $\mathcal{U}$  is the set of all non-principal ultrafilters on  $\omega$  then  $Y = \omega \cup \mathcal{U}$ , every point of  $\omega$  is isolated and a basic neighbourhood of  $p \in \mathcal{U}$  is a set of the form  $\{p\} \cup A \setminus F$ , where  $A \in p$  and  $F$  is finite.

Let  $X = Y \cup \{\infty\}$ , where  $\infty \notin Y$  and declare  $V \subset X$  to be a neighbourhood of  $\infty$  if and only if  $|X \setminus V| \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$ . It is easy to see that  $X$  is a separable Hausdorff space and  $t(X_\delta) > 2^{\aleph_0}$ .  $\square$

### 3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to INdAM-GNSAGA for partial financial support and to Lajos Soukup for pointing out an error in a previous version of the paper.

### REFERENCES

- [1] A. Bella and S. Spadaro, *Cardinal invariants for the  $G_\delta$ -topology*, Colloquium Math., **156** (2019), 123–133.
- [2] N. A. Carlson, J. R. Porter and G. J. Ridderbos, *On cardinality bounds for homogeneous spaces and the  $G_\kappa$ -modification of a space*, Topology Appl. **159** (2012), 2932–2941.
- [3] W. Chen-Mertens and P. Szeptycki, *The effect of forcing axioms on the tightness of the  $G_\delta$ -modification*, preprint.
- [4] A. Dow, *An introduction to applications of elementary submodels to topology*, Topology Proc. **13** (1988), 17–72.

- [5] A. Dow, I. Juhász, L. Soukup, Z. Szentmiklóssy and W. Weiss, *On the tightness of  $G_\delta$ -modifications*, Acta Mathematica Hungarica **158** (2019), 294–301.
- [6] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, PWN, Warsaw, 1977.
- [7] I. Juhász, *On two problems of A.V. Archangel'skii*, General Topology and its Applications **2** (1972) 151-156.
- [8] I. Juhász, *Cardinal Functions in Topology - Ten Years Later*, Math. Centre Tracts **123**, Amsterdam, 1980.
- [9] O. Okunev, *A  $\sigma$ -compact space without uncountable free sequences can have arbitrary tightness*, Questions Answers Gen. Topology **23** (2005), 107–108.
- [10] E.G. Pytkeev, *About the  $G_\chi$ -topology and the power of some families of subsets on compacta*, Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai, 41. Topology and Applications, Eger (Hungary), 1983, pp.517-522.
- [11] S. Spadaro, *Countably compact weakly Whyburn spaces*, Acta Math. Hungar. **149** (2016), 254–262.
- [12] T. Usuba, *A note on the tightness of  $G_\delta$ -modifications*, Topology Appl. **265** (2019), 106820.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF  
CATANIA, VIALE A. DORIA 6, 95125 CATANIA, ITALY  
*E-mail address:* bella@dmi.unict.it

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF  
CATANIA, VIALE A. DORIA 6, 95125 CATANIA, ITALY  
*E-mail address:* santidspadaro@gmail.com