

**THE COMPLETE CHARACTERIZATIONS OF  
WEAKLY  $P_0$  AND  $T_0$ -IDENTIFICATION  
 $P$  PROPERTIES REVISITED WITH A CORRECTION**

**CHARLES DORSETT**

Department of Mathematics  
Texas A&M University-Commerce  
Texas 75429  
USA  
e-mail: [charles.dorsett@tamuc.edu](mailto:charles.dorsett@tamuc.edu)

**Abstract**

In recent papers  $T_0$ -identification spaces were used to define weakly  $P_0$  spaces and properties, and  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  properties. Initially, the search for properties that are weakly  $P_0$  or  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  was by trial and error, motivating a 2017 paper in which weakly  $P_0$  spaces and properties were characterized and  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  properties were thought to be characterized. Within this paper, a counterexample is given to the previously thought characterization of  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  properties and necessary corrections are made.

---

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 54B15, 54D10, 54D15.

Keywords and phrases:  $T_0$ -identification spaces, topological properties, weakly  $P_0$ .

Received August 16, 2018

## 1. Introduction and Preliminaries

$T_0$ -identification spaces were introduced in the 1936 paper [15].

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $(X, T)$  be a space,  $R$  be the equivalence relation on  $X$  defined by  $xRy$  iff  $Cl(\{x\}) = Cl(\{y\})$ ,  $X_0$  be the set of  $R$  equivalence classes of  $X$ , let  $N : X \rightarrow X_0$  be the natural map, and  $Q(X, T)$  be the decomposition topology on  $X_0$  determined by  $(X, T)$  and the natural map  $N$ . Then  $(X_0, Q(X, T))$  is the  $T_0$ -identification space of  $(X, T)$ .

Within the 1936 paper [15],  $T_0$ -identification spaces were used to jointly characterize pseudometrizable and metrizable: A space is pseudometrizable iff its  $T_0$ -identification space is metrizable.

Similarly, in the 1975 paper [14], the  $R_1$  separation axiom and  $T_0$ -identification spaces were used to further characterize the  $T_2$  property.

**Definition 1.2.** A space  $(X, T)$  is  $R_1$  iff for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$  such that  $Cl(\{x\}) \neq Cl(\{y\})$ , there exist disjoint open sets  $U$  and  $V$  such that  $x \in U$  and  $y \in V$  [1].

Since for any topological property  $P$  and any space with property  $P$ , its  $T_0$ -identification space exists, then there are no restrictions on spaces for which its  $T_0$ -identification space exists. Thus attention shifted from properties of spaces  $(X, T)$  for which its  $T_0$ -identification space  $(X_0, Q(X, T))$  exists to the properties of the  $T_0$ -identification spaces  $(X_0, Q(X, T))$ , motivating the definition and work below.

**Definition 1.3.** A topological property  $P$  is a  $T_0$ -identification space property iff there exists a space  $(X, T)$ , whose  $T_0$ -identification space has property  $P$ .

In the 1936 paper [15], it was shown that  $T_0$ -identification spaces satisfy the  $T_0$  separation axiom. Thus, for a topological property to be a  $T_0$ -identification space property,  $(P$  and  $T_0)$ , denoted by  $Po$ , would have to exist. Within the 2007 paper [2], it was shown that a space is  $T_0$  iff the natural map  $N$  from the space onto its  $T_0$ -identification space is a homeomorphism. Thus, for each topological property  $P$  for which  $Po$  exists,  $Po$  is a  $T_0$ -identification space property. Hence  $\{P \mid P \text{ is a topological property and a } T_0\text{-identification space property}\} = \{P \mid P \text{ is a topological property and } Po \text{ exists}\}$ .

Within the 1977 paper [3], several topological properties, including  $R_1$ , were shown to be simultaneously shared by a space and its  $T_0$ -identification space. Thus  $R_1$  is a  $T_0$ -identification space property that is not  $(R_1)o = T_2$  [1], raising questions about other topological properties that are  $T_0$ -identification space properties  $P$  for which  $P \neq Po$ .

In the 2015 paper [4], the use of  $T_0$ -identifications space to characterize each of metrizable and  $T_2$ , as given above, motivated the introduction and investigation of weakly  $Po$  spaces and properties.

**Definition 1.4.** Let  $P$  be a topological property for which  $Po$  exists. Then a space  $(X, T)$  is weakly  $Po$  iff its  $T_0$ -identification space  $(X_0, Q(X, T))$  has property  $P$ . A topological property  $Qo$  for which weakly  $Qo$  exists is called a weakly  $Po$  property.

Since the  $T_0$ -identification space of each space is  $T_0$ , then for a topological property  $Q$  for which weakly  $Qo$  exists, a space  $(X, T)$  is weakly  $Qo$  iff  $(X_0, Q(X, T))$  has property  $Qo$ , and, within  $(X_0, Q(X, T))$ ,  $Q$  and  $Qo$  are equivalent.

By the results above,  $R_1 = \text{weakly } (R_1)o = \text{weakly } T_2$ , which will be used later. Hence  $R_1$  is weakly  $Po$ , and  $R_2$  is a weakly  $Po$  property. Also, in the 2015 paper [4], it was shown that for a topological property  $Q$  for which weakly  $Qo$  exists, weakly  $Qo$  is simultaneously shared by both a space and its  $T_0$ -identification space, which when combined with the results above, led to the introduction and investigation of  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  properties.

**Definition 1.5.** A topological property  $S$  is a  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  property iff  $S$  is simultaneously shared by both a space and its  $T_0$ -identification space [5].

Then, by definition, for a topological property  $Q$ ,  $Q$  is weakly  $Po$  iff  $Q$  is a  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  property and weakly  $Po$  and  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  are equivalent properties.

In the 2015 paper [4], the search for topological properties that fail to be weakly  $Po$  properties led to the need and use of  $T_0$  and “not- $T_0$ ” revealing  $T_0$  and “not- $T_0$ ” as useful topological properties, motivating the addition of the long-neglected topological property “not- $P$ ” into the study of topology, where  $P$  is a topological property for which “not- $P$ ” exists. Thus far, the addition and use of “not- $P$ ” in the study of topology has led to the discovery of the never before imagined least of all topological properties  $L = (T_0 \text{ or “not-}T_0\text{”})$  [6] and that there is no strongest topological property [7]. As is expected, the existence of the never before imagined topological property  $L$  revealed needed changes in classical topology, including both product [8] and subspace properties [9] leading to new, meaningful, never before imagined properties and examples for each of those two properties, expanding and changing the study of topology forever.

Initially, the search for properties that are weakly  $P_o$  or equivalently  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  was by trial and error. As established above, for a topological property  $Q$  for which  $Q_o$  exists, a topological property  $W$  was sought such that for a space with property  $W$  its  $T_0$ -identification space has property  $Q_o$ , which, in turn, implies the initial space has property  $W$ . Since the trial and error search process was tedious, time consuming, uncertain, and never ending, there was a need to completely characterize each of weakly  $P_o$  spaces and properties. Within the 2017 paper [10], when it was not realized that weakly  $P_o$  and  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  are equivalent topological properties, weakly  $P_o$  was characterized and  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  was thought to be characterized. Below a counterexample is given for the once believed characterization of  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  and necessary changes are made.

## 2. Preliminaries and a Counterexample

Within the 2017 paper [10], for a topological property  $Q$  for which  $Q_o$  exists, a property  $QNO$  was defined.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $Q$  be a topological property such that  $Q_o$  exists. A space  $(X, T)$  has property  $QNO$  iff  $(X, T)$  is “not- $T_0$ ” and  $(X_0, Q(X, T))$  has property  $Q_o$ .

In that paper [10], it was shown that for a topological property for which  $Q_o$  exists,  $QNO$  exists and is a topological property, and a space has property  $(Q_o$  or  $QNO)$  iff its  $T_0$ -identification space has property  $(Q_o$  or  $QNO)$ . Thus for a topological property  $Q$  for which  $Q_o$  exists,  $(Q_o$  or  $QNO)$  is a  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  property and  $(Q_o$  or  $QNO) = \text{weakly } (Q_o \text{ or } QNO)_o$ . Since  $QNO$  is “not- $T_0$ ”, then  $(Q_o \text{ and } QNO)_o = Q_o$ . Thus  $\{U_o \mid U \text{ is a topological property for which } U_o \text{ exists}\} \subseteq \{U_o \mid U \text{ is a topological property and } U_o \text{ is a weakly } P_o \text{ property}\} = \{U_o \mid U \text{ is a topological property and } T_0\text{-identification } P\}$  and since  $\{U_o \mid U \text{ is a topological$

property and  $U_o$  is a weakly  $P_o$  property}  $\subseteq$   $\{U_o \mid U \text{ is a topological property for which } U_o \text{ exists}\}$ , then the three sets are equal and the weakly  $P_o$  properties are completely characterized replacing the uncertainty of selecting  $Q_o$  in the trial and error search process by certainty.

Also, the following statement was thought to be true.

**Statement 2.1.** For a topological property  $Q$  for which both  $Q_o$  and  $(Q \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{"})$  exist,  $Q$  is a  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  property,  $QNO = (Q \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{"})$ , and  $Q = \text{weakly } Q_o = (Q_o \text{ or } (Q \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{"}))$ .

The following example shows Statement 2.1 not to be true.

**Counterexample.** Let  $W = R_1$ . Then  $W_o = (R_1 \text{ and } T_0) = T_2$  [1] exists. Since  $R_1$  is a  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  property, then  $WNO = (R_1 \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{")}$ . Let  $Q = (T_0 \text{ or } (R_1 \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{"}))$ . Then  $Q_o = T_0$  and  $(Q \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{")} = (R_1 \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{")}$  exist and by Statement 2.1,  $Q$  is a  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  property. Hence  $Q$  is weakly  $P_o$  and  $Q = \text{weakly } Q_o = \text{weakly } (T_0 \text{ or } (R_1 \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{"}))_o = T_0$ , but, since  $L = \text{weakly } L_o = \text{weakly } T_0$  [11], then  $L = (T_0 \text{ or } (R_1 \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{"}))$ , which is a contradiction. Thus Statement 2.1 is not true.

### 3. A Correction

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $Q$  be a topological property. Then the following are equivalent: (a)  $Q$  is a  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  property, (b)  $Q$  is weakly  $P_o$ , (c) both  $Q_o$  and  $(Q \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{")}$  exists, and  $(Q \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{")} = QNO$ , and (d)  $Q = (Q_o \text{ and } QNO)$ .

**Proof.** Clearly, by the results above, (a) and (b) are equivalent.

(b) implies (c): Let  $(X, T)$  be a space with property  $Q$ . Then  $(X, T)$  has property  $Q = \text{weakly } Qo$ ,  $Qo$  exists, and  $(X_0, Q(X, T))$  has property  $Qo$ , which implies  $(X, T)$  has property  $(Qo \text{ or } QNO)$ , where  $Qo$  and  $QNO$  are distinct topological properties. Thus  $Q$  is a  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  property and  $Q = (Qo \text{ or } (Q \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{"}))$  [12], which implies  $(Q \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{"}) = QNO$ .

(c) implies (d): Since both  $Qo$  and  $(Q \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{"})$  exist, then  $Q = (Qo \text{ or } (Q \text{ and "not-}T_0\text{"})) = (Qo \text{ or } QNO)$ , which is a  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  property.

Thus, the uncertainty in the trial and error search process for selecting the starting place  $Qo$  is resolved leaving only the uncertainty of determining weakly  $Qo$ . Within the paper [13], each of the  $T_0$ -identification space and weakly  $Po$  processes were internalized greatly simplifying the search for weakly  $Qo$ .

## References

- [1] A. Davis, Indexed systems of neighborhoods for general topological spaces, Amer. Math. Monthly 68(9) (1961), 886-893.  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2311686>
- [2] C. Dorsett, New characterizations of separation axioms, Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society 99(1) (2007), 37-44.
- [3] C. Dorsett, Characterizations of spaces using  $T_0$ -identification spaces, Kyungpook Mathematical Journal 17(2) (1977), 175-179.
- [4] C. Dorsett, Weakly  $P$  properties, Fundamental Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences 3(1) (2015), 83-90.
- [5] C. Dorsett,  $T_0$ -identification  $P$  and weakly  $P$  properties, Pioneer Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences 15(1) (2015), 1-8.
- [6] C. Dorsett, Weakly  $P$  corrections and new, fundamental topological properties and facts, Fundamental Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences 5(1) (2016), 11-20.

- [7] C. Dorsett, Another important use of “not- $P$ ”, where  $P$  is a topological property, *Pioneer Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences* 18(2) (2016), 97-99.
- [8] C. Dorsett, Pluses and needed changes in topology resulting from additional properties, *Far East Journal of Mathematical Sciences* 101(4) (2017), 803-811.  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17654/MS101040803>
- [9] C. Dorsett, New properties, tools, and changes for subspace properties and singleton set spaces, *Pioneer Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences* 17(2) (2016), 79-85.
- [10] C. Dorsett, Complete characterizations of weakly  $P_0$  and related spaces and properties, *Journal of Mathematical Sciences: Advances and Applications* 45 (2017), 97-109.  
DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.18642/jmsaa\\_7100121834](http://dx.doi.org/10.18642/jmsaa_7100121834)
- [11] C. Dorsett, Corrections and more insights for weakly  $P_0$ ,  $T_0$ -identification  $P$ , and their negations, *Fundamental Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences* 8(1) (2017), 1-7.
- [12] C. Dorsett, Weakly  $P_0$ ,  $T_0$ -identification  $P$ , and not topological properties, *Pioneer Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences* 17(1) (2016), 41-49.
- [13] C. Dorsett, Additional properties for weakly  $P_0$  and related properties with an application, *Journal of Mathematical Sciences: Advances and Applications* 47(1) (2017), 53-64.  
DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.18642/jmsaa\\_7100121877](http://dx.doi.org/10.18642/jmsaa_7100121877)
- [14] W. Dunham, Weakly Hausdorff spaces, *Kyungpook Math. J.* 15(1) (1975), 41-50.
- [15] M. Stone, Application of Boolean algebras to topology, *Mat. Sb.* 1 (1936), 765-771.

