

Research Article

On Open-Open Games of Uncountable Length

Andrzej Kucharski

Institute of Mathematics, University of Silesia, ul. Bankowa 14, 40-007 Katowice, Poland

Correspondence should be addressed to Andrzej Kucharski, akuchar@math.us.edu.pl

Received 31 March 2012; Revised 8 June 2012; Accepted 8 June 2012

Academic Editor: Irena Lasiecka

Copyright © 2012 Andrzej Kucharski. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The aim of this paper is to investigate the open-open game of uncountable length. We introduce a cardinal number $\mu(X)$, which says how long the Player I has to play to ensure a victory. It is proved that $c(X) \leq \mu(X) \leq c(X)^+$. We also introduce the class C_κ of topological spaces that can be represented as the inverse limit of κ -complete system $\{X_\sigma, \pi_\rho^\sigma, \Sigma\}$ with $w(X_\sigma) \leq \kappa$ and skeletal bonding maps. It is shown that product of spaces which belong to C_κ also belongs to this class and $\mu(X) \leq \kappa$ whenever $X \in C_\kappa$.

1. Introduction

The following game is due to Daniels et al. [1]: two players take turns playing on a topological space X ; a round consists of Player I choosing a nonempty open set $U \subseteq X$ and Player II choosing a nonempty open set $V \subseteq U$; a round is played for each natural number. Player I wins the game if the union of open sets which have been chosen by Player II is dense in X . This game is called the *open-open game*.

In this paper, we consider what happens if one drops restrictions on the length of games. If κ is an infinite cardinal and rounds are played for every ordinal number less than κ , then this modification is called *the open-open game of length κ* . The examination of such games is a continuation of [2–4]. A cardinal number $\mu(X)$ is introduced such that $c(X) \leq \mu(X) \leq c(X)^+$. Topological spaces, which can be represented as an inverse limit of κ -complete system $\{X_\sigma, \pi_\rho^\sigma, \Sigma\}$ with $w(X_\sigma) \leq \kappa$ and each X_σ is T_0 space and skeletal bonding map π_ρ^σ , are listed as the class C_κ . If $\mu(X) = \omega$, then $X \in C_\omega$. There exists a space X with $X \notin C_{\mu(X)}$. The class C_κ is closed under any Cartesian product. In particular, the cellularity number of X^I is equal κ whenever $X \in C_\kappa$. This implies Theorem of Kurepa that $c(X^I) \leq 2^\kappa$, whenever $c(X) \leq \kappa$. Undefined notions and symbols are used in accordance with books [5–7]. For example, if κ is a cardinal number, then κ^+ denotes the first cardinal greater than κ .

2. When Games Favor Player I

Let X be a topological space. Denote by \mathcal{T} the family of all nonempty open sets of X . For an ordinal number α , let \mathcal{T}^α denote the set of all sequences of the length α consisting of elements of \mathcal{T} . The space X is called κ -favorable whenever there exists a function

$$s : \bigcup \{(\mathcal{T})^\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}, \quad (2.1)$$

such that for each sequence $\{B_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ with $B_1 \subseteq s(\emptyset)$ and $B_{\alpha+1} \subseteq s(\{B_{\gamma+1} : \gamma < \alpha\})$, for each $\alpha < \kappa$, the union $\bigcup \{B_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is dense in X . We may also say that the function s is witness to κ -favorability of X . In fact, s is a winning strategy for Player I. For abbreviation we say that s is κ -winning strategy. Sometimes we do not precisely define a strategy. Just give hints how a player should play. Note that, any winning strategy can be arbitrary on steps for limit ordinals.

A family \mathcal{B} of open non-empty subset is called a π -base for X if every non-empty open subset $U \subseteq X$ contains a member of \mathcal{B} . The smallest cardinal number $|\mathcal{B}|$, where \mathcal{B} is a π -base for X , is denoted by $\pi(X)$.

Proposition 2.1. *Any topological space X is $\pi(X)$ -favorable.*

Proof. Let $\{U_\alpha : \alpha < \pi(X)\}$ be a π -base. Put $s(f) = U_\alpha$ for any sequence $f \in \mathcal{T}^\alpha$. Each family $\{B_\gamma : B_\gamma \subseteq U_\gamma \text{ and } \gamma < \pi(X)\}$ of open non-empty sets is again a π -base for X . So, its union is dense in X . \square

According to [6, p. 86] the cellularity of X is denoted by $c(X)$. Let $\text{sat}(X)$ be the smallest cardinal number κ such that every family of pairwise disjoint open sets of X has cardinality $< \kappa$, compare [8]. Clearly, if $\text{sat}(X)$ is a limit cardinal, then $\text{sat}(X) = c(X)$. In all other cases, $\text{sat}(X) = c(X)^+$. Hence, $c(X) \leq \text{sat}(X) \leq c(X)^+$. Let

$$\mu(X) = \min\{\kappa : X \text{ is a } \kappa\text{-favorable and } \kappa \text{ is a cardinal number}\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Proposition 2.1 implies $\mu(X) \leq \pi(X)$. The next proposition gives two natural strategies and gives more accurate estimation than $c(X) \leq \mu(X) \leq c^+(X)$.

Proposition 2.2. $c(X) \leq \mu(X) \leq \text{sat}(X)$.

Proof. Suppose $c(X) > \mu(X)$. Fix a family $\{U_\xi : \xi < \mu(X)^+\}$ of pairwise disjoint open sets. If Player II always chooses an open set, which meets at most one U_ξ , then he will not lose the open-open game of the length $\mu(X)$, a contradiction.

Suppose sets $\{B_{\gamma+1} : \gamma < \alpha\}$ are chosen by Player II. If the set

$$X \setminus \text{cl} \bigcup \{B_{\gamma+1} : \gamma < \alpha\} \quad (2.3)$$

is non-empty, then Player I chooses it. Player I wins the open-open game of the length $\text{sat}(X)$, when he will use this rule. This gives $\mu(X) \leq \text{sat}(X)$. \square

Note that, $\omega_0 = c(\{0, 1\}^\kappa) = \mu(\{0, 1\}^\kappa) \leq \text{sat}(\{0, 1\}^\kappa) = \omega_1$, where $\{0, 1\}^\kappa$ is the Cantor cube of weight κ . There exists a separable space X which is not ω_0 -favorable, see Szymański [9] or [1, p.207-208]. Hence we get

$$\omega_0 = c(X) < \mu(X) = \text{sat}(X) = \omega_1. \quad (2.4)$$

3. On Inverse Systems with Skeletal Bonding Maps

Recall that, a continuous surjection is *skeletal* if for any non-empty open sets $U \subseteq X$ the closure of $f[U]$ has non-empty interior. If X is a compact space and Y is a Hausdorff space, then a continuous surjection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is skeletal if and only if $\text{Int } f[U] \neq \emptyset$, for every non-empty and open $U \subseteq X$, see Mioduszewski and Rudolf [10].

Lemma 3.1. *A skeletal image of κ -favorable space is a κ -favorable space.*

Proof. A proof follows by the same method as in [11, Theorem 4.1]. In fact, repeat and generalize the proof given in [4, Lemma 1]. \square

According to [5], a directed set Σ is said to be κ -complete if any chain of length $\leq \kappa$ consisting of its elements has the least upper bound in Σ . An inverse system $\{X_\sigma, \pi_\sigma^\sigma, \Sigma\}$ is said to be a κ -complete, whenever Σ is κ -complete and for every chain $A \subseteq \Sigma$, where $|A| \leq \kappa$, such that $\sigma = \sup A \in \Sigma$ we get

$$X_\sigma = \lim_{\leftarrow} \{X_\alpha, \pi_\alpha^\beta, A\}. \quad (3.1)$$

In addition, we assume that bonding maps are surjections.

For ω -favorability, the following lemma is given without proof in [1, Corollary 1.4]. We give a proof to convince the reader that additional assumptions on topology are unnecessary.

Lemma 3.2. *If $Y \subseteq X$ is dense, then X is κ -favorable if and only if Y is κ -favorable.*

Proof. Let a function σ_X be a witness to κ -favorability of X . Put

$$\sigma_Y(\emptyset) = \sigma_X(\emptyset) \cap Y. \quad (3.2)$$

If Player II chooses open set $V_1 \cap Y \subseteq \sigma_Y(\emptyset)$, then put

$$V'_1 = V_1 \cap \sigma_X(\emptyset) \subseteq \sigma_X(\emptyset). \quad (3.3)$$

We get $V'_1 \cap Y = V_1 \cap Y \subseteq \sigma_Y(\emptyset)$, since $V_1 \cap Y \subseteq \sigma_X(\emptyset) \cap Y$. Then we put

$$\sigma_Y(V_1 \cap Y) = \sigma_X(V'_1) \cap Y. \quad (3.4)$$

Suppose we have already defined

$$\sigma_Y(\{V_{\alpha+1} \cap Y : \alpha < \gamma\}) = \sigma_X(\{V'_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \gamma\}) \cap Y, \quad (3.5)$$

for $\gamma < \beta < \kappa$. If Player II chooses open set $V_{\beta+1} \cap Y \subseteq \sigma_Y(\{V_{\alpha+1} \cap Y : \alpha < \beta\})$, then put

$$V'_{\beta+1} = V_{\beta+1} \cap \sigma_X(\{V'_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \beta\}) \subseteq \sigma_X(\{V'_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \beta\}). \quad (3.6)$$

Finally, put

$$\sigma_Y(\{V_{\alpha+1} \cap Y : \alpha \leq \beta\}) = \sigma_X(\{V'_{\alpha+1} : \alpha \leq \beta\}) \cap Y \quad (3.7)$$

and check that σ_Y is witness to κ -favorability of Y .

Assume that σ_Y is a witness to κ -favorability of Y . If $\sigma_Y(\emptyset) = U_0 \cap Y$ and $U_0 \subseteq X$ is open, then put $\sigma_X(\emptyset) = U_0$. If Player II chooses open set $V_1 \subseteq \sigma_X(\emptyset)$, then $V_1 \cap Y \subseteq \sigma_Y(\emptyset)$. Put $\sigma_X(V_1) = U_1$, where $\sigma_Y(V_1 \cap Y) = U_1 \cap Y$ and $U_1 \subseteq X$ is open. Suppose

$$\sigma_Y(\{V_{\alpha+1} \cap Y : \alpha < \gamma\}) = U_\gamma \cap Y, \quad \sigma_X(\{V_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \gamma\}) = U_\gamma \quad (3.8)$$

have been already defined for $\gamma < \beta < \kappa$. If II Player chooses open set $V_{\beta+1} \subseteq \sigma_X(\{V_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \beta\})$, then put $\sigma_X(\{V_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \beta + 1\}) = U_{\beta+1}$, where open set $U_{\beta+1} \subseteq X$ is determined by $\sigma_Y(\{V_{\alpha+1} \cap Y : \alpha < \beta + 1\}) = U_{\beta+1} \cap Y$. \square

The next theorem is similar to [12, Theorem 2]. We replace a continuous inverse system with indexing set being a cardinal, by κ -complete inverse system, and also $c(X)$ is replaced by $\mu(X)$. Let κ be a fixed cardinal number.

Theorem 3.3. *Let X be a dense subset of the inverse limit of the κ -complete system $\{X_\sigma, \pi_\sigma^\sigma, \Sigma\}$, where $\kappa = \sup\{\mu(X_\sigma) : \sigma \in \Sigma\}$. If all bonding maps are skeletal, then $\mu(X) = \kappa$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, one can assume that $X = \lim_{\leftarrow} \{X_\sigma, \pi_\sigma^\sigma, \Sigma\}$. Fix functions $\mathbf{s}_\sigma : \mathcal{T}_\sigma^{<\kappa} \rightarrow T_\sigma$, each one is a witness to $\mu(X_\sigma)$ -favorability of X_σ . This does not reduce the generality, because $\mu(X_\sigma) \leq \kappa$ for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$. In order to explain the induction, fix a bijection $f : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa \times \kappa$ such that

- (1) if $f(\alpha) = (\beta, \zeta)$, then $\beta, \zeta \leq \alpha$;
- (2) $f^{-1}(\beta, \gamma) < f^{-1}(\beta, \zeta)$ if and only if $\gamma < \zeta$;
- (3) $f^{-1}(\gamma, \beta) < f^{-1}(\zeta, \beta)$ if and only if $\gamma < \zeta$.

One can take as f an isomorphism between κ and $\kappa \times \kappa$, with canonical well-ordering, see [7]. The function f will indicate the strategy and sets that we have taken in the following induction.

We construct a function $\mathbf{s} : \mathcal{T}^{<\kappa} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ which will provide κ -favorability of X . The first step is defined for $f(0) = (0, 0)$. Take an arbitrary $\sigma_1 \in \Sigma$ and put

$$\mathbf{s}(\emptyset) = \pi_{\sigma_1}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_{\sigma_1}(\emptyset)). \quad (3.9)$$

Assume that Player II chooses non-empty open set $B_1 = \pi_{\sigma_2}^{-1}(V_1) \subseteq \mathbf{s}(\emptyset)$, where $V_1 \subseteq X_{\sigma_2}$ is open. Let

$$\mathbf{s}(\{B_1\}) = \pi_{\sigma_1}^{-1}(\mathbf{s}_{\sigma_1}(\{\text{Int cl } \pi_{\sigma_1}(B_1) \cap \mathbf{s}_{\sigma_1}(\emptyset)\})) \quad (3.10)$$

and denote $D_0^0 = \text{Int cl } \pi_{\sigma_1}(B_1) \cap \mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_1}(\emptyset)$. So, after the first round and the next respond of Player I, we know: indexes σ_1 and σ_2 , the open set $B_1 \subseteq X$ and the open set $D_0^0 \subseteq X_{\sigma_1}$.

Suppose that sequences of open sets $\{B_{\alpha+1} \subseteq X : \alpha < \gamma\}$, indexes $\{\sigma_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \gamma\}$, and sets $\{D_\zeta^\varphi : f^{-1}(\varphi, \zeta) < \gamma\}$ have been already defined such that.

If $\alpha < \gamma$ and $f(\alpha) = (\varphi, \eta)$, then

$$B_{\alpha+1} = \pi_{\sigma_{\alpha+2}}^{-1}(V_{\alpha+1}) \subseteq \mathfrak{s}(\{B_{\xi+1} : \xi < \alpha\}) = \pi_{\sigma_{\varphi+1}}^{-1}\left(\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{\varphi+1}}\left(\{D_\nu^\varphi : \nu < \eta\}\right)\right), \tag{3.11}$$

where $D_\nu^\varphi = \text{Int cl } \pi_{\sigma_{\varphi+1}}(B_{f^{-1}((\varphi, \nu))+1}) \cap \mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{\varphi+1}}(\{D_\zeta^\varphi : \zeta < \nu\})$ and $V_{\alpha+1} \subseteq X_{\sigma_{\alpha+2}}$ are open.

If $f(\gamma) = (\theta, \lambda)$ and $\beta < \lambda$, then take

$$D_\beta^\theta = \text{Int cl } \pi_{\sigma_{\theta+1}}(B_{f^{-1}((\theta, \beta))+1}) \cap \mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{\theta+1}}(\{D_\zeta^\theta : \zeta < \beta\}) \tag{3.12}$$

and put

$$\mathfrak{s}(\{B_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \gamma\}) = \pi_{\sigma_{\theta+1}}^{-1}\left(\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{\theta+1}}\left(\{D_\alpha^\theta : \alpha < \lambda\}\right)\right). \tag{3.13}$$

Since Σ is κ -complete, one can assume that the sequence $\{\sigma_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is increasing and $\sigma = \sup\{\sigma_{\xi+1} : \xi < \kappa\} \in \Sigma$.

We will prove that $\bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} B_{\alpha+1}$ is dense in X . Since $\pi_\sigma^{-1}(\pi_\sigma(B_{\alpha+1})) = B_{\alpha+1}$ for each $\alpha < \kappa$ and π_σ is skeletal map, it is sufficient to show that $\bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} \pi_\sigma(B_{\alpha+1})$ is dense in X_σ . Fix arbitrary open set $(\pi_{\sigma_{\xi+1}}^\sigma)^{-1}(W)$ where W is an open set of $X_{\xi+1}$. Since $\mathfrak{s}_{\sigma_{\xi+1}}$ is winning strategy on $X_{\sigma_{\xi+1}}$, there exists D_α^ξ such that $D_\alpha^\xi \cap W \neq \emptyset$, and $D_\alpha^\xi \subseteq \text{Int cl } \pi_{\sigma_{\xi+1}}(B_{f^{-1}((\xi, \alpha))+1})$. Therefore we get

$$\left(\pi_{\sigma_{\xi+1}}^\sigma\right)^{-1}(W) \cap \pi_\sigma(B_{\delta+1}) \neq \emptyset, \tag{3.14}$$

where $\delta = f^{-1}((\xi, \alpha))$. Indeed, suppose that $(\pi_{\sigma_{\xi+1}}^\sigma)^{-1}(W) \cap \pi_\sigma(B_{\delta+1}) = \emptyset$. Then

$$\emptyset = \pi_{\sigma_{\xi+1}}^\sigma \left[\left(\pi_{\sigma_{\xi+1}}^\sigma\right)^{-1}(W) \cap \pi_\sigma(B_{\delta+1}) \right] = W \cap \pi_{\sigma_{\xi+1}}^\sigma [\pi_\sigma(B_{\delta+1})] = W \cap \pi_{\sigma_{\xi+1}}(B_{\delta+1}). \tag{3.15}$$

Hence we have $W \cap \text{Int cl } \pi_{\sigma_{\xi+1}}(B_{\delta+1}) = \emptyset$, a contradiction. □

Corollary 3.4. *If X is dense subset of an inverse limit of $\mu(X)$ -complete system $\{X_\sigma, \pi_\sigma^\sigma, \Sigma\}$, where all bonding map are skeletal, then*

$$c(X) = \sup\{c(X_\sigma) : \sigma \in \Sigma\}. \tag{3.16}$$

Proof. Let $X = \lim_{\leftarrow} \{X_\sigma, \pi_\sigma^\sigma, \Sigma\}$. Since $c(X) \geq c(X_\sigma)$, for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, we will show that

$$c(X) \leq \sup\{c(X_\sigma) : \sigma \in \Sigma\}. \tag{3.17}$$

Suppose that $\sup\{c(X_\sigma) : \sigma \in \Sigma\} = \tau < c(X)$. Using Proposition 2.2 and Theorem 3.3, check that

$$\mu(X) = \sup\{\mu(X_\sigma) : \sigma \in \Sigma\} \leq \sup\{c(X_\sigma)^+ : \sigma \in \Sigma\} \leq \tau^+ \leq c(X). \quad (3.18)$$

So, we get $\mu(X) = c(X) = \tau^+$. Therefore, there exists a family \mathcal{R} , of size τ^+ , which consists of pairwise disjoint open subset of X . We can assume that

$$\mathcal{R} \subseteq \left\{ \pi_\sigma^{-1}(U) : U \text{ is an open subset of } X_\sigma, \sigma \in \Sigma \right\}. \quad (3.19)$$

Since $\{X_\sigma, \pi_\sigma^\sigma, \Sigma\}$ is $\mu(X)$ -complete inverse system and $|\mathcal{R}| = \mu(X)$, there exists $\beta \in \Sigma$ such that

$$\mathcal{R} \subseteq \left\{ \pi_\beta^{-1}(U) : U \text{ is an open subset of } X_\beta \right\}, \quad (3.20)$$

a contradiction with $c(X_\beta) < \tau^+$. □

The above corollary is similar to [12, Theorem 1], but we replaced a continuous inverse system, whose indexing set is a cardinal number by κ -complete inverse system.

4. Classes \mathcal{C}_κ

Let κ be an infinite cardinal number. Consider inverse limits of κ -complete system $\{X_\sigma, \pi_\sigma^\sigma, \Sigma\}$ with $w(X_\sigma) \leq \kappa$. Let \mathcal{C}_κ be a class of such inverse limits with skeletal bonding maps and X_σ being T_0 -space. Now, we show that the class \mathcal{C}_κ is stable under Cartesian products.

Theorem 4.1. *The Cartesian product of spaces from \mathcal{C}_κ belongs to \mathcal{C}_κ .*

Proof. Let $X = \prod\{X_s : s \in S\}$ where each $X_s \in \mathcal{C}_\kappa$. For each $s \in S$, let $X_s = \lim_{\leftarrow} \{X_\sigma, \pi_\sigma^\sigma, \Sigma_s\}$ be a κ -complete inverse system with skeletal bonding map such that each T_0 -space X_σ has the weight $\leq \kappa$. Consider the union

$$\Gamma = \bigcup \left\{ \prod_{s \in A} \Sigma_s : A \in [S]^\kappa \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Introduce a partial order on Γ as follows:

$$f \preceq g \iff \text{dom}(f) \subseteq \text{dom}(g), \quad \forall a \in \text{dom}(f) f(a) \leq_a g(a), \quad (4.2)$$

where \leq_a is the partial order on Σ_a . The set Γ with the relation \preceq is upward directed and κ -complete.

If $f \in \Gamma$, then Y_f denotes the Cartesian product

$$\prod \{X_{f(a)} : a \in \text{dom}(f)\}. \quad (4.3)$$

If $f \leq g$, then put

$$p_f^g = \left(\prod_{a \in \text{dom}(f)} a_{f(a)}^{g(a)} \right) \circ \pi_{\text{dom}(f)}^{\text{dom}(g)}, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\pi_{\text{dom}(f)}^{\text{dom}(g)}$ is the projection of $\prod\{X_{g(a)} : a \in \text{dom}(g)\}$ onto $\prod\{X_{g(a)} : a \in \text{dom}(f)\}$ and $\prod_{a \in \text{dom}(f)} a_{f(a)}^{g(a)}$ is the Cartesian product of the bonding maps $a_{f(a)}^{g(a)} : X_{g(a)} \rightarrow X_{f(a)}$. We get the inverse system $\{Y_f, p_f^g, \Gamma\}$ which is κ -complete, bonding maps are skeletal and $w(Y_f) \leq \kappa$. So, we can take $Y = \lim_{\leftarrow} \{Y_f, p_f^g, \Gamma\}$.

Now, define a map $h : X \rightarrow Y$ by the following formula:

$$h(\{x_s\}_{s \in S}) = \{x_f\}_{f \in \Gamma}, \tag{4.5}$$

where $x_f = \{x_{f(a)}\}_{a \in \text{dom}(f)} \in Y_f$ and $f \in \prod\{\Sigma_a : a \in \text{dom}(f)\}$ and $\text{dom}(f) \in [S]^\kappa$. By the property

$$\{x_s\}_{s \in S} = \{t_s\}_{s \in S} \iff \forall s \in S \forall \sigma \in \Sigma_s, \quad x_\sigma = t_\sigma \iff \forall f \in \Gamma, \quad x_f = t_f, \tag{4.6}$$

the map h is well defined and it is injection.

The map h is surjection. Indeed, let $\{b_f\}_{f \in \Gamma} \in Y$. For each $s \in S$ and each $\sigma \in \Sigma_s$ we fix $f_\sigma^s \in \Gamma$ such that $s \in \text{dom}(f_\sigma^s)$ and $f_\sigma^s(\sigma) = \sigma$. Let $\pi_{f(s)} : Y_f \rightarrow X_{f(s)}$ be a projection for each $f \in \Gamma$.

For each $t \in S$ let define $b_t = \{b_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \Sigma_t}$, where $b_\sigma = \pi_{f_\sigma^t(t)}(b_{f_\sigma^t})$. We will prove that an element b_t is a thread of the space X_t . Indeed, if $\sigma \geq \rho$ and $\sigma, \rho \in \Sigma_t$, then take functions f_σ^t and g_ρ^t . For abbreviation, denote $f = f_\sigma^t$ and $g = g_\rho^t$. Define a function $h : \text{dom}(f) \cup \text{dom}(g) \rightarrow \bigcup\{\Sigma_t : t \in \text{dom}(f) \cup \text{dom}(g)\}$ in the following way:

$$h(s) = \begin{cases} g(s), & \text{if } s \in \text{dom}(g) \setminus \text{dom}(f), \\ f(s), & \text{if } s \in \text{dom}(f). \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

The function h is element of Γ and $f, g \leq h$. Note that $h \upharpoonright \text{dom}(f) = f$ and $h \upharpoonright \text{dom}(g) \setminus \{t\} = g \upharpoonright \text{dom}(g) \setminus \{t\}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \{b_{g(s)}\}_{s \in \text{dom}(g)} &= b_g = p_g^h(b_h) = \left(\prod_{s \in \text{dom}(g)} s_{g(s)}^{h(s)} \right) \left(\pi_{\text{dom}(g)}^{\text{dom}(h)}(b_h) \right) \\ &= \left(\prod_{s \in \text{dom}(g)} s_{g(s)}^{h(s)} \right) \left(\{b_{h(s)}\}_{s \in \text{dom}(g)} \right) = \{s_{g(s)}^{h(s)}(b_{h(s)})\}_{s \in \text{dom}(g)}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

we get

$$b_\rho = b_{g(t)} = s_{g(t)}^{h(t)}(b_{h(t)}) = s_{g(t)}^{f(t)}(b_{f(t)}) = s_\rho^\sigma(b_\sigma). \quad (4.9)$$

It is clear that $h(\{a_t\}_{t \in S}) = \{b_f\}_{f \in \Gamma}$.

We shall prove that the map h is continuous. Take an open subset $U = \prod_{s \in \text{dom}(f)} A_{f(s)} \subseteq Y_f$ such that

$$A_{f(s)} = \begin{cases} V, & \text{if } s = s_0, \\ X_{f(s)}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

where $V \subseteq X_{f(s_0)}$ is open subset. A map p_f is projection from the inverse limit Y to Y_f . It is sufficient to show that

$$h^{-1}\left((p_f)^{-1}(U)\right) = \prod_{s \in S} B_s, \quad (4.11)$$

where

$$B_s = \begin{cases} W, & \text{if } s = s_0, \\ X_s, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

and $W = \pi_{f(s_0)}^{-1}(V)$ and $\pi_{f(s_0)} : Y_f \rightarrow X_{\sigma_0}$ is the projection and $f(s_0) = \sigma_0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \{x_s\}_{s \in S} \in h^{-1}\left((p_f)^{-1}(U)\right) &\iff p_f(h(\{x_s\}_{s \in S})) \in U \\ &\iff p_f(\{x_f\}_{f \in \Gamma}) = x_f \in U \iff x_{f(s_0)} \in V \\ &\iff x_{s_0} \in W \iff x \in \prod_{s \in S} B_s \subseteq \prod_{s \in S} X_s = X. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Since the map h is bijection and

$$(p_f)^{-1}(U) = h\left(h^{-1}\left((p_f)^{-1}(U)\right)\right) = h\left(\prod_{s \in S} B_s\right) \quad (4.14)$$

for any subbase subset $\prod_{s \in S} B_s \subseteq X$, the map h is open. \square

In the case $\kappa = \omega$ we have well-known results that product of I -favorable space is I -favorable space (see [1] or [2]).

Corollary 4.2. *Every I -favorable space is stable under any product.*

If D is a set and κ is cardinal number then we denote $\bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} D^\alpha$ by $D^{<\kappa}$.

The following result probably is known but we give a proof for the sake of completeness.

Theorem 4.3. *Let κ be an infinite cardinal and let T be a set such that $|T| \geq \kappa^\kappa$. If $A \in [T]^\kappa$ and $f_\delta : T^{<\kappa} \rightarrow T$ for all $\delta < \kappa^{<\kappa}$ then there exists a set $B \subseteq T$ such that $|B| \leq \tau$ and $A \subseteq B$ and $f_\delta(C) \in B$ for every $C \in B^{<\kappa}$ and every $\delta < \kappa^{<\kappa}$, where*

$$\tau = \begin{cases} \kappa^{<\kappa}, & \text{for regular } \kappa, \\ \kappa^\kappa, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{4.15}$$

Proof. Assume that κ is regular cardinal. Let $A \in [T]^\kappa$ and let $f_\delta : \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} T^\alpha \rightarrow T$ for $\delta < \kappa^{<\kappa}$. Let $A_0 = A$. Assume that we have defined A_α for $\alpha < \beta$ such that $|A_\alpha| \leq \kappa^{|\alpha|}$. Put

$$A_\beta = \left(\bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha \right) \cup \left\{ f_\delta(C) : C \in \left(\bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha \right)^{<\beta}, \delta < \kappa^{|\beta|} \right\}. \tag{4.16}$$

Calculate the size of the set A_β :

$$|A_\beta| \leq \left| \left(\bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha \right) \right| \left| \kappa^{|\beta|} \right| \left| \left(\bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha \right)^{<\beta} \right| \leq \kappa^{|\beta|} \left(\kappa^{|\beta|} \right)^{|\beta|} \leq \kappa^{|\beta|}. \tag{4.17}$$

Let $B = \bigcup_{\beta < \kappa} A_\beta$, so we get $|B| \leq \kappa^{<\kappa}$. Fix a sequence $\langle b_\alpha : \alpha < \beta \rangle \subseteq B$ and f_γ . Since $\text{cf}(\kappa) = \kappa$ there exists $\delta < \kappa$ such that $C = \{b_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\} \subseteq A_\delta$ and $f_\gamma(C) \in A_{\sigma+1}$ for some $\sigma < \kappa$.

In the second case $\text{cf}(\kappa) < \kappa$, we proceed the above induction up to $\beta = \kappa$. Let $B = A_\kappa$, so we get $|B| \leq \kappa^\kappa$ and $B = \bigcup_{\beta < \kappa^+} A_\beta$. Similarly to the first case we get that B is closed under all function $f_\delta, \delta < \kappa^{<\kappa}$. □

Theorem 4.4. *If X belongs to the class \mathcal{C}_κ then $c(X) \leq \kappa$.*

Proof. If $X \in \mathcal{C}_\kappa$ then by Theorems 3.3 and Proposition 2.2 we get $c(X) \leq \mu(X) \leq \kappa$. □

We apply some facts from the paper [3]. Let \mathcal{D} be a family of open subset of topological space X and $x, y \in X$. We say that $x \sim_{\mathcal{D}} y$ if and only if $x \in V \Leftrightarrow y \in V$ for every $V \in \mathcal{D}$. The family of all sets $[x]_{\mathcal{D}} = \{y : y \sim_{\mathcal{D}} x\}$ we denote by X/\mathcal{D} . Define a map $q : X \rightarrow X/\mathcal{D}$ as follows $q[x] = [x]_{\mathcal{D}}$. The set X/\mathcal{D} is equipped with topology $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}}$ generated by all images $q[V]$ where $V \in \mathcal{D}$.

Recall Lemma 1 from paper [3]: if \mathcal{D} is a family of open set of X and \mathcal{D} is closed under finite intersection then the mapping $q : X \rightarrow X/\mathcal{D}$ is continuous. Moreover if $X = \bigcup \mathcal{D}$ then the family $\{q[V] : V \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is a base for the topology $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}}$.

Notice that if \mathcal{D} has a property

$$\begin{aligned} \forall (W \in \mathcal{D}) \exists (\{V_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}) \exists (\{U_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}), \\ W = \bigcup_{n < \omega} U_n, \quad \forall (n < \omega) U_n \subseteq X \setminus V_n \subseteq U_{n+1}, \end{aligned} \tag{seq}$$

then $\bigcup \mathcal{D} = X$ and by [3, Lemma 3] the topology $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is Hausdorff. Moreover if \mathcal{D} is closed under finite intersection then by [3, Lemma 4] the topology $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is regular. Theorem 5 and Lemma 9 [3] yeild.

Theorem 4.5. *If \mathcal{D} is a set of open subset of topological space X such that*

- (1) *is closed under κ -winning strategy, finite union and intersection,*
- (2) *has property (seq),*

then X/\mathcal{D} with topology $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is completely regular space and $q : X \rightarrow X/\mathcal{D}$ is skeletal.

If a topological space X has the cardinal number $\mu(X) = \omega$ then $X \in \mathcal{C}_{\omega}$, but for $\mu(X)$ equals for instance ω_1 we get only $X \in \mathcal{C}_{\omega_1}$.

Theorem 4.6. *Each Tichonov space X with $\mu(X) = \kappa$ can be dense embedded into inverse limit of a system $\{X_{\sigma}, \pi_{\sigma}^{\tau}, \Sigma\}$, where all bonding map are skeletal, indexing set Σ is τ -complete each X_{σ} is Tichonov space with $\omega(X_{\sigma}) \leq \tau$ and*

$$\tau = \begin{cases} \kappa^{<\kappa}, & \text{for regular } \kappa, \\ \kappa^{\kappa}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.18)$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{B} be a π -base for topological space X consisting of cozero sets and $\sigma : \bigcup \{\mathcal{B}^{\alpha} : \alpha < \kappa\} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a κ -winning strategy. We can define a function of finite intersection property and finite union property as follows: $g(\{B_0, B_1, \dots, B_n\}) = B_0 \cap B_1 \cap \dots \cap B_n$ and $h(\{B_0, B_1, \dots, B_n\}) = B_0 \cup B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_n$. For each cozero set $V \in \mathcal{B}$ fix a continuous function $f_V : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $V = f_V^{-1}((0, 1])$. Put $\sigma_{2n}(V) = f_V^{-1}((1/n, 1])$ and $\sigma_{2n+1}(V) = f_V^{-1}([0, 1/n))$. By Theorem 4.3 for each $\mathcal{R} \in [\mathcal{B}]^{\kappa}$ and all functions h, g, σ_n, σ there is subset $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ such that

- (1) $|\mathcal{D}| \leq \tau$, where

$$\tau = \begin{cases} \kappa^{<\kappa}, & \text{for regular } \kappa, \\ \kappa^{\kappa}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4.19)$$

- (2) $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$,
- (3) \mathcal{D} is closed under κ -winning strategy σ , function of finite intersection property and finite union property,
- (4) \mathcal{D} is closed under σ_n , $n < \omega$, hence \mathcal{D} holds property (seq).

Therefore by Theorem 4.5 we get skeletal mapping $q_{\mathcal{D}} : X \rightarrow X/\mathcal{D}$. Let $\Sigma \subseteq [\mathcal{B}]^{\leq \tau}$ be a set of families which satisfies above condition (1), (2), (3) and the (4). If Σ is directed by inclusion. It is easy to check that Σ is τ -complete. Similar to [3, Theorem 11] we define a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ as follows $f(x) = \{f_{\mathcal{D}}(x)\}$, where $f(x)_{\mathcal{D}} = q_{\mathcal{D}}(x)$ and $Y = \lim_{\leftarrow} \{X/\mathcal{R}, q_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{C}\}$. If $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$, then $q_{\mathcal{D}}^{\mathcal{R}}(f(x)_{\mathcal{R}}) = f(x)_{\mathcal{D}}$. Thus $f(x)$ is a thread, that is, $f(x) \in Y$. It easy to see that f is homeomorphism onto its image and $f[X]$ is dense in Y , compare [3, proof of Theorem 11]. \square

Theorem 4.6 suggests question.

Does each space X belong to $\mathcal{C}_{\mu(X)}$?

Fleissner [13] proved that there exists a space Y such that $c(Y) = \aleph_0$ and $c(Y^3) = \aleph_2$. Hence, we get $\mu(Y) = \aleph_1$, by Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 4.2. Suppose that $Y \in \mathcal{C}_{\mu(X)}$ then $c(Y^3) \leq \aleph_1$, by Theorem 4.4, a contradiction.

Corollary 4.7. *If X is topological space with $\mu(X) = \kappa$ then $c(X^I) \leq \tau$ and*

$$\tau = \begin{cases} \kappa^{<\kappa}, & \text{for regular } \kappa, \\ \kappa^\kappa, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.20)$$

Proof. By Theorem 4.3 we get $X^I \in \mathcal{C}_\tau$. Hence by Theorems 4.4 and 4.1 we have $c(X^I) \leq \tau$. \square

By above Corollary we get the following.

Corollary 4.8 (see [14, Kurepa]). *If $\{X_s : s \in S\}$ is a family of topological spaces and $c(X_s) \leq \kappa$ for each $s \in S$, then $c(\prod\{X_s : s \in S\}) \leq 2^\kappa$.*

Acknowledgment

The author thanks the referee for careful reading and valuable suggestions.

References

- [1] P. Daniels, K. Kunen, and H. X. Zhou, "On the open-open game," *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, vol. 145, no. 3, pp. 205–220, 1994.
- [2] A. Kucharski and S. Plewik, "Game approach to universally Kuratowski-Ulam spaces," *Topology and Its Applications*, vol. 154, no. 2, pp. 421–427, 2007.
- [3] A. Kucharski and S. Plewik, "Inverse systems and I-favorable spaces," *Topology and its Applications*, vol. 156, no. 1, pp. 110–116, 2008.
- [4] A. Kucharski and S. Plewik, "Skeletal maps and I-favorable spaces," *Mathematica et Physica*, vol. 51, pp. 67–72, 2010.
- [5] A. Chigogidze, *Inverse Spectra*, vol. 53 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1996.
- [6] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, PWN-Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw, Poland, 1977.
- [7] T. Jech, *Set Theory*, Springer, 2002.
- [8] P. Erdős and A. Tarski, "On families of mutually exclusive sets," *Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 44, pp. 315–329, 1943.
- [9] A. Szymański, "Some applications of tiny sequences," *Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo*, vol. 3, pp. 321–329, 1984.
- [10] J. Mioduszewski and L. Rudolf, " H -closed and extremally disconnected Hausdorff spaces," vol. 66, p. 55, 1969.
- [11] B. Balcar, T. Jech, and J. Zapletal, "Semi-Cohen Boolean algebras," *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 87, no. 3, pp. 187–208, 1997.
- [12] A. Błaszczyk, "Souslin number and inverse limits," in *Proceedings of the 3rd Conference on Topology and Measure*, pp. 21–26, Vitte-Hiddensee, 1982.
- [13] W. G. Fleissner, "Some spaces related to topological inequalities proven by the Erdős-Rado theorem," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 71, no. 2, pp. 313–320, 1978.
- [14] D. Kurepa, "The Cartesian multiplication and the cellularity number," *Publications de l'Institut Mathématique*, vol. 2, pp. 121–139, 1963.



Hindawi

Submit your manuscripts at
<http://www.hindawi.com>

