

Remarks on SHD spaces and more divergence properties

Carlos David Jiménez-Flores^{a,1}, Alejandro Ríos-Herrejón^{a,1}, Alejandro Darío Rojas-Sánchez^b, Artur Hideyuki Tomita^{c,2}, Elmer Enrique Tovar-Acosta^{a,1}

^aUniversidad Nacional Autónoma de México., Av. Universidad 3000, CDMX, 4510, México

^bUniversidad Panamericana, Augusto Rodin No. 498, Col. Insurgentes
Mixcoac, CDMX, 03920, México

^cUniversity of São Paulo, Rua do Matão, São Paulo, 1010, Brazil

Abstract

The class of SHD spaces was recently introduced in [12]. The first part of this paper focuses on answering most of the questions presented in that article. For instance, we exhibit an example of a non-SHD Tychonoff space X such that $\mathcal{F}[X]$, the Pixley-Roy hyperspace of X , βX , the Stone-Čech compactification of X , and $C_p(X)$, the ring of continuous functions over X equipped with the topology of pointwise convergence, are SHD.

In the second part of this work we will present some variations of the SHD notion, namely, the WSHD property and the OHD property. Furthermore, we will pay special attention to the relationships between X and $\mathcal{F}[X]$ regarding these new concepts.

Keywords:

2010 MSC: 54A20, 54A25, 54B20, 54G05

F' -space, sequentially discrete, selectively highly divergent, Stone-Čech compactification, Pixley-Roy hyperspace

1. Remarks on SHD spaces

All set-theoretic concepts whose definition is not included here must be assumed as in [13]. Our basic reference book for topological notions is [7], however, the specific material corresponding to cardinal functions should be understood as in [11]. Throughout this paper X will be a topological space with at least two points, τ_X will denote its topology and τ_X^+ will be the family $\tau_X \setminus \{\emptyset\}$.

Email addresses: carlosjf@ciencias.unam.mx (Carlos David Jiménez-Flores), chanchito@ciencias.unam.mx (Alejandro Ríos-Herrejón), adrojas@up.edu.mx (Alejandro Darío Rojas-Sánchez), tomita@ime.usp.br (Artur Hideyuki Tomita), elmer@ciencias.unam.mx (Elmer Enrique Tovar-Acosta)

¹The first, second and fifth authors acknowledge financial support from CONAHCyT grants no. 816193, 814282 and 829699, respectively.

²The fourth author acknowledges financial support from FAPESP 2021/00177-4

Recall that if $\{X_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is a family of topological spaces, then the collection

$$\mathcal{B} \left(\prod_{\alpha < \kappa} X_\alpha \right) := \left\{ \bigcap_{\alpha \in F} \pi_\alpha^{-1}[U_\alpha] : F \in [\kappa]^{<\omega} \setminus \{\emptyset\} \wedge \forall \alpha \in F (U_\alpha \in \tau_{X_\alpha}^+) \right\}$$

is the *canonical base* for the standard product topology. If $U \in \mathcal{B} \left(\prod_{\alpha < \kappa} X_\alpha \right)$, then the *support* of U is the set

$$\text{supp}(U) := \{ \alpha < \kappa : \pi_\alpha[U] \neq X_\alpha \}.$$

The class of SHD spaces appeared for the first time in [12]. Recall that X is *selectively highly divergent* (in short, *SHD*) if for every $\{U_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_X^+$ we can pick $x_n \in U_n$ for each $n \in \omega$ in such a way that the sequence (x_n) has no convergent subsequences. In this section we will answer most of the questions presented in [12] and prove several new results. Let us begin with the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *Let κ be an uncountable cardinal and $\{X_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$ be a collection of topological spaces. Suppose there is $D \subseteq \kappa$ such that $\{X_\alpha : \alpha \in D\}$ is a family of non-sequentially compact spaces. If D is dense in the set κ equipped with the co-countable topology, then $\prod_{\alpha \in \kappa} X_\alpha$ is SHD.*

PROOF. Set $X := \prod_{\alpha \in \kappa} X_\alpha$ and let $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{B}(X)$. Set $F := \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \text{supp}(U_n)$, fix $\beta \in D \cap (\kappa \setminus F)$ and let (y_n) be a sequence in X_β with no convergent subsequences. For each $n \in \omega$ define $x_n \in X$ by

$$x_n(\alpha) := \begin{cases} y_n, & \text{if } \alpha = \beta, \\ \in \pi_\alpha[U_n], & \text{if } \alpha \in \text{supp}(U_n), \\ \in X_\alpha, & \text{if } \alpha \in \kappa \setminus (\text{supp}(U_n) \cup \{\beta\}). \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $x_n \in U_n$ for every $n \in \omega$. Furthermore, since (y_n) has no convergent subsequences, (x_n) has no convergent subsequences.

Corollary 1. *If κ is an uncountable cardinal and X is not sequentially compact, then X^κ is SHD.*

Evidently, a sequentially compact space cannot be SHD. It turns out that in the case of uncountable topological powers both conditions are equivalent:

Proposition 2. *If κ is an uncountable cardinal, then X^κ is SHD if and only if X^κ is not sequentially compact.*

PROOF. Suppose that X^κ is not sequentially compact, let $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{B}(X^\kappa)$ and set $F := \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \text{supp}(U_n)$. Observe that if $I := \kappa \setminus F$, then X^κ is homeomorphic to X^I and thus, X^I is not sequentially compact. Fix a

sequence (y_n) in X^I with no convergent subsequences. For each $n \in \omega$ define $x_n \in X^\kappa$ by

$$x_n(\alpha) := \begin{cases} y_n(\alpha), & \text{if } \alpha \in I, \\ \in \pi_\alpha[U_n], & \text{if } \alpha \in \text{supp}(U_n), \\ \in X_\alpha, & \text{if } \alpha \in F \setminus \text{supp}(U_n). \end{cases}$$

Certainly, $x_n \in U_n$ for every $n \in \omega$. Moreover, since (y_n) has no convergent subsequences, (x_n) has no convergent subsequences.

Since there are no first countable SHD spaces it can be easily seen that the restriction on κ in Proposition 2 is essential. For example, if X is first countable and not sequentially compact, then X^ω is non-SHD and non-sequentially compact.

Recall that X is *ultraconnected* if there are no disjoint non-empty closed subsets of X . It is known that if \mathfrak{s} stands for the *splitting number* (see [9]) then the product of at least \mathfrak{s} spaces which are not ultraconnected is not sequentially compact (see [14, Lemma 4.2, p. 995]). Consequently, the following result holds.

Corollary 2. *If X is not ultraconnected and $\kappa \geq \mathfrak{s}$ is a cardinal number, then X^κ is SHD.*

It was shown in [12] that under the Generalized Continuum Hypothesis it happens that for every infinite cardinal κ there is a space X_κ that is Hausdorff, compact, zero-dimensional and SHD with $d(X_\kappa) = \kappa$ and $w(X_\kappa) = 2^\kappa$. With the previous result available we can get the same conclusion without using additional axioms.

Proposition 3. *For every infinite cardinal κ there exists a topological space X_κ that is Hausdorff, compact, zero-dimensional and SHD with $d(X_\kappa) = \kappa$ and $w(X_\kappa) = 2^\kappa$.*

PROOF. Let $\alpha D(\kappa)$ stand for the one-point compactification of the discrete space of size κ . Clearly, $X_\kappa := (\alpha D(\kappa))^{2^\kappa}$ is Hausdorff, compact and zero-dimensional. Moreover, a standard argument with cardinal functions shows that $d(X_\kappa) = \kappa$ and $w(X_\kappa) = 2^\kappa$. Finally, Corollary 2 implies that X_κ is SHD since $\mathfrak{s} \leq 2^\kappa$.

Remark 1. Let X be a non-ultraconnected sequentially compact space. If \mathfrak{t} stands for the *tower number* (see [9]) and $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{t}$, it turns out that X^{ω_1} is sequentially compact (see [4, Theorem 6.9(a), p. 132]) and thus, X^{ω_1} is not SHD. On the other hand, $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{s}$ implies that X^{ω_1} is SHD thanks to Corollary 2. Hence, the statement “the ω_1 -th power of a non-ultraconnected sequentially compact space is SHD” is independent of ZFC.

In the case of Cantor cubes, A. Bella proved in [2] that $D(2)^\kappa$ is SHD if and only if $\kappa \geq \mathfrak{s}$. Our next goal is to prove a strengthening of Bella’s result.

Theorem 1. *Let X be a compact Hausdorff space and κ be an uncountable cardinal. If $w(X) \leq \omega_1$ or X is dyadic (i.e., X is a continuous image of a Cantor cube) and $w(X) < \mathfrak{s}$, then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. X^κ is SHD.
2. X^κ is not sequentially compact.
3. $\kappa \geq \mathfrak{s}$.

PROOF. Items (1) and (2) are equivalent thanks to Proposition 2. On the other hand, Corollary 2 guarantees that (3) implies (1). For our remaining implication suppose that (2) holds and let's concentrate on proving (3). If $w(X) \leq \omega_1$, then $w(X^\kappa) = \kappa$ and thus, since X^κ is compact and not sequentially compact, it follows from [4, Theorem 6.1, p. 129] that $\kappa \geq \mathfrak{s}$.

In the case where X is dyadic and $w(X) < \mathfrak{s}$, there exists a continuous surjection from $D(2)^{w(X)}$ onto X (see [7, 3.12.12(b), p. 231]), which in turn produces a continuous surjection from $D(2)^{w(X) \cdot \kappa}$ onto X^κ . Now, since X^κ is not sequentially compact, $D(2)^{w(X) \cdot \kappa}$ cannot be sequentially compact and therefore, Bella's theorem combined with Proposition 2 yields the inequality $w(X) \cdot \kappa \geq \mathfrak{s}$; hence, $\kappa \geq \mathfrak{s}$.

Recall that if p is an element of X and κ is an infinite cardinal, then

$$\sigma(X, p, \kappa) := \left\{ x \in X^\kappa : \left| \{ \alpha \in \kappa : x(\alpha) \neq p \} \right| < \omega \right\} \text{ and}$$

$$\Sigma(X, p, \kappa) := \left\{ x \in X^\kappa : \left| \{ \alpha \in \kappa : x(\alpha) \neq p \} \right| \leq \omega \right\}.$$

Remark 2. Let $\kappa \geq \mathfrak{s}$ and $p \in D(2)$. It is well-known that $\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$ is a sequentially compact dense subspace of $D(2)^\kappa$. Hence, $\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$ is a non-SHD dense subspace of the SHD space $D(2)^\kappa$. The case $\kappa = \mathfrak{c}$ was first shown in [2].

One of the questions discussed in [12] was whether it was possible to establish a connection with respect to the SHD property between a Tychonoff space X and βX , its Stone-Ćech compactification. It turns out that X does not have to be SHD even if βX is:

Theorem 2. *If $\kappa \geq \mathfrak{s}$ is a cardinal number and X is a dense subspace of $D(2)^\kappa$, then βX is SHD.*

PROOF. Set $Y := D(2)^\kappa$. Let $\{W_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a subset of $\tau_{\beta X}^+$ and pick $\{V_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_{\beta X}^+$ with $V_n \subseteq \text{cl}_{\beta X}(V_n) \subseteq W_n$ for every $n \in \omega$. Since $\{V_n \cap X : n \in \omega\}$ is a subset of τ_X^+ , there is a family $\{O_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_Y^+$ such that $V_n \cap X = O_n \cap X$ whenever $n \in \omega$. For every $n \in \omega$ let $U_n \in \mathcal{B}(Y)$ satisfy $U_n \subseteq O_n$. Set $F := \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \text{supp}(U_n)$ and $Z := D(2)^{\kappa \setminus F}$. Since Z is not

sequentially compact (see Theorem 1), there is a sequence (z_n) in Z with no convergent subsequences. For each $n \in \omega$ define $y_n \in Y$ by

$$y_n(\alpha) := \begin{cases} z_n(\alpha), & \text{if } \alpha \in \kappa \setminus F, \\ \in \pi_\alpha[U_n], & \text{if } \alpha \in \text{supp}(U_n), \\ 0, & \text{if } \alpha \in F \setminus \text{supp}(U_n). \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $y_n \in U_n$ for every $n \in \omega$.

Observe that since Y is a compactification of X , there exists a continuous surjective function $\beta i : \beta X \rightarrow Y$ such that its restriction to X is the identity function. We claim that U_n is a subset of $\beta i[W_n]$ for every $n \in \omega$. To prove this fix $n \in \omega$ and notice three facts: first, $U_n \cap X = \beta i[U_n \cap X] \subseteq \beta i[\text{cl}_{\beta X}(U_n \cap X)]$; second, $\text{cl}_{\beta X}(U_n \cap X) \subseteq \text{cl}_{\beta X}(V_n) \subseteq W_n$, and third, $\beta i[\text{cl}_{\beta X}(U_n \cap X)]$ is a closed subset of Y since $\text{cl}_{\beta X}(U_n \cap X)$ is a compact subset of βX . Therefore, $U_n = \text{cl}_Y(U_n) = \text{cl}_Y(U_n \cap X) \subseteq \beta i[\text{cl}_{\beta X}(U_n \cap X)] \subseteq \beta i[W_n]$.

For each $n \in \omega$ let $w_n \in W_n$ satisfy $\beta i(w_n) = y_n$. To finish our proof suppose that $A \in [\omega]^\omega$ and $w \in \beta X$ are such that $(w_n)_{n \in A}$ converges to w in βX . Hence, since $\beta i : \beta X \rightarrow Y$ and the natural projection $\pi : Y \rightarrow Z$ are continuous, $(z_n)_{n \in A}$ converges to $\pi(\beta i(w))$ in Z , a contradiction. Thus, (w_n) has no convergent subsequences.

Remark 2 and Theorem 2 yield the following corollary.

Corollary 3. *If $\kappa \geq \mathfrak{s}$ and $p \in D(2)$, then $\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$ is not SHD and $\beta\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$ is SHD.*

In a similar vein to the question of X versus βX , a natural question that arose in [12] was whether it was possible to obtain something similar regarding X versus $\mathcal{F}[X]$, the Pixley-Roy hyperspace of X . A. Bella and S. Spadaro proved in [2] the following theorem:

Theorem 3. *If X is T_1 and SHD, then $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is SHD.*

On the other hand, similarly to what happened with βX , the presence of the SHD property in $\mathcal{F}[X]$ does not imply that X has it. To establish this fact we first need to prove an auxiliary lemma. For what follows we will use the symbol $\text{CO}(X)$ to denote the set formed by all clopen subsets of a topological space X .

Lemma 4. *Let κ be an uncountable cardinal, p be an element of $D(2)$ and X be a dense subspace of $\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$. If $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$ is a subset of τ_X^+ and $F \in \mathcal{F}[X]$, then there are $V \in \text{CO}(D(2)^\kappa)$ and $\{x_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq X$ such that $F \subseteq V$ and $x_n \in U_n \setminus V$ for every $n \in \omega$.*

PROOF. Let $m \in \omega \setminus 1$ and suppose that $\{y_i : 0 \leq i \leq m\}$ is a faithful enumeration of F .

Claim. There exist $\{\alpha_i : 0 \leq i \leq m\} \subseteq \kappa$ and $\{V(n, i) : n \in \omega \wedge 0 \leq i \leq m\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(D(2)^\kappa)$ such that the following conditions hold for every $0 \leq i \leq m$:

1. $\alpha_i \in \kappa \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \text{supp}(V(n, i))$;
2. $y_i \in \pi_{\alpha_i}^{-1}\{p\}$;
3. $V(n, 0) \cap X \subseteq U_n$ for every $n \in \omega$ and
4. if $i > 0$, then $V(n, i) \subseteq V(n, i-1) \setminus \pi_{\alpha_{i-1}}^{-1}\{p\}$.

We will do the construction by finite recursion. First, for every $n \in \omega$ there is $V(n, 0) \in \mathcal{B}(D(2)^\kappa)$ such that $V(n, 0) \cap X \subseteq U_n$. For this step we only need to notice that, since $y_0^{-1}\{p\}$ has κ elements, there exists $\alpha_0 \in \kappa \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \text{supp}(V(n, 0))$ with $y_0(\alpha_0) = p$.

Now suppose that for some $0 \leq \ell \leq m$ we have produced $\{\alpha_i : 0 \leq i \leq \ell\}$ and $\{V(n, i) : n \in \omega \wedge 0 \leq i \leq \ell\}$ with the desired properties. Since $\{V(n, \ell) \setminus \pi_{\alpha_\ell}^{-1}\{p\} : n \in \omega\}$ is formed by non-empty open subsets of $D(2)^\kappa$, for every $n \in \omega$ there is $V(n, \ell+1) \in \mathcal{B}(D(2)^\kappa)$ with $V(n, \ell+1) \subseteq V(n, \ell) \setminus \pi_{\alpha_\ell}^{-1}\{p\}$. Finally observe that, since $y_{\ell+1}^{-1}\{p\}$ has κ elements, there is $\alpha_{\ell+1} \in \kappa \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \text{supp}(V(n, \ell+1))$ such that $y_{\ell+1}(\alpha_{\ell+1}) = 0$. This completes our construction.

To finish our proof set $V := \bigcup_{i=0}^m \pi_{\alpha_i}^{-1}\{p\}$ and for every $n \in \omega$ let x_n be an element of $X \cap (V(n, m) \setminus \pi_{\alpha_m}^{-1}\{p\})$. Clearly, V and $\{x_n : n \in \omega\}$ satisfy everything required.

It turns out that for the class of spaces mentioned in Lemma 4 the Pixley-Roy hyperspace is always SHD.

Theorem 5. *If κ is an uncountable cardinal, p is an element of $D(2)$ and X is a dense subspace of $\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$, then $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is SHD.*

PROOF. Let $Y := D(2)^\kappa$ and $\{[F_n, U_n] : n \in \omega\}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{F}[X]$. The proof of the following statement will be by recursion.

Claim 1. There are $\{V_m : m \in \omega\} \subseteq \text{CO}(Y)$ and $\{x(n, m) : (n, m) \in \omega \times \omega\} \subseteq X$ such that the following conditions hold for every $m \in \omega$:

1. $x(n, m) \in U_n \setminus V_m$ whenever $n \in \omega$ and
2. $F_m \cup \{x(m, i) : 0 \leq i \leq m\} \subseteq V_{m+1}$.

For the base case apply Lemma 4 to the sequence $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$ and to the set $\{\bar{0}\}$ to obtain $V_0 \in \text{CO}(Y)$ and $\{x(n, 0) : n \in \omega\} \subseteq X$ such that $\bar{0} \in V_0$ and $x(n, 0) \in U_n \setminus V_0$ whenever $n \in \omega$. Now, suppose that for some $m \in \omega$ we have constructed $\{V_i : 0 \leq i \leq m\}$ and $\{x(n, i) : n \in \omega \wedge 0 \leq i \leq m\}$ with the desired properties. By Lemma 4 applied to the sequence $\{U_n \setminus V_m : n \in \omega\}$ and to the set $F_m \cup \{x(m, i) : 0 \leq i \leq m\}$ there exist $V_{m+1} \in \text{CO}(Y)$ and $\{x(n, m+1) : n \in \omega\} \subseteq X$ such that $F_m \cup \{x(m, i) : 0 \leq i \leq m\} \subseteq V_{m+1}$ and $x(n, m+1) \in U_n \setminus V_{m+1}$ whenever $n \in \omega$.

For each $m \in \omega$ let $G_m := F_m \cup \{x(m, i) : 0 \leq i \leq m\}$. Clearly, $G_m \in [F_m, U_m]$ for all $m \in \omega$. Our next statement essentially concludes the proof.

Claim 2. The family $\{\{G_n\} : n \in \omega\}$ is locally finite, i.e., for every $G \in \mathcal{F}[X]$ there exists $V \in \tau_X$ with $G \subseteq V$ and such that $\{n \in \omega : G_n \in [G, V]\}$ is finite.

If $G \in \mathcal{F}[X]$ and there is no $n \in \omega$ such that $G \not\subseteq G_n$, then $V := X$ satisfies $\{n \in \omega : G_n \in [G, V]\} = \emptyset$. When there is $m \in \omega$ with $G \subseteq G_m$ what happens is that, for every $n > m + 1$, the point $x(n, m + 1)$ belongs to $F_n \cap (U_n \setminus V_{m+1})$ and, therefore, $V := V_{m+1} \cap X$ satisfies $G_n \notin [F_n, V]$; consequently, $\{n \in \omega : G_n \in [G, V]\} \subseteq \{i \in \omega : 0 \leq i \leq m\}$.

Finally, since the sequence (G_n) satisfies that $\{\{G_n\} : n \in \omega\}$ is locally finite, it follows that (G_n) has no convergent subsequences. Hence, $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is SHD.

By Remark 2 follows that $\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$ is not SHD whenever $\kappa \geq \mathfrak{s}$ and $p \in D(2)$, Theorem 5 yields the following corollary.

Corollary 4. *If $\kappa \geq \mathfrak{s}$ and $p \in D(2)$, then $\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$ is not SHD and $\mathcal{F}[\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)]$ is SHD.*

2. More divergence properties I

We say that X is *weakly selectively highly divergent* (in short, *WSHD*) if for every $\{U_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_X^+$ there exists $A \in [\omega]^\omega$ such that, for every $n \in A$, we can choose $x_n \in U_n$ with the property that the sequence $(x_n)_{n \in A}$ has no convergent subsequences.

If $\{U_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_X^+$ and $x \in X$, we shall say that (U_n) *converges to x* if for every open set U with $x \in U$ there is $m \in \omega$ such that $U_n \subseteq U$ whenever $n \geq m$. We will say that X is *openly highly divergent* (in short, *OHD*) if there are no convergent sequences formed by elements of τ_X^+ .

A π -*local basis* for X in x is a family $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \tau_X^+$ with the property that for any $U \in \tau_X$ with $x \in U$ there exists $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $B \subseteq U$. When \mathcal{B} is a π -local basis for X in x and $x \in \bigcap \mathcal{B}$ we say that \mathcal{B} is a *local base* for X in x .

The *local character* and π -*local character* of X in x are, respectively, the cardinal numbers

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(x, X) &:= \min \{|\mathcal{B}| : \mathcal{B} \text{ is a local basis for } X \text{ in } x\} \\ \pi\chi(x, X) &:= \min \{|\mathcal{B}| : \mathcal{B} \text{ is a } \pi\text{-local basis for } X \text{ in } x\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we will say that X is a *UC* space (resp., π -*UC*) if for every $x \in X$ happens that $\chi(x, X) > \omega$ (resp., $\pi\chi(x, X) > \omega$).

Let us start with some basic relationships between these new concepts. It is clear that SHD implies WSHD, π -UC implies OHD and OHD implies UC. The fact that WSHD implies OHD requires a brief argument. Suppose that X is not OHD and let $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a subset of τ_X^+ that is convergent to $x \in X$. Then, if $A \in [\omega]^\omega$ and for every $n \in A$ we pick $x_n \in U_n$, it turns out that $(x_n)_{n \in A}$ converges to x . Thus, X is not WSHD.

Unlike the SHD property (see Corollary 3), the OHD property is inherited to dense subsets in the realm of regular spaces.

Proposition 4. *If X is a regular OHD space and D is a dense subset of X , then D is OHD.*

PROOF. Let $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a subset of τ_D^+ and for each $n \in \omega$ let $V_n \in \tau_X^+$ satisfy $U_n = V_n \cap D$. Suppose $x \in D$ is such that (U_n) converges to x in D . Our goal is to prove that (V_n) converges to x in X . Let $V \in \tau_X$ be such that $x \in V$ and fix $W \in \tau_X$ with $x \in W \subseteq \text{cl}_X W \subseteq V$. Observe that if $n \in \omega$ satisfies $U_n \subseteq W \cap D$, then $V_n \cap D \subseteq W \cap D$ and, therefore, $\text{cl}_X (V_n \cap D) \subseteq \text{cl}_X (W \cap D)$; that is, $\text{cl}_X V_n \subseteq \text{cl}_X W$, which in turn implies that $V_n \subseteq V$. Consequently, $|\{n \in \omega : V_n \not\subseteq V\}| \leq |\{n \in \omega : U_n \not\subseteq W \cap D\}| < \omega$.

A standard fact is that if $p \in X$ and κ is an infinite cardinal, then $\sigma(X, p, \kappa)$ is contained in $\Sigma(X, p, \kappa)$ and is dense in X^κ . This together with Proposition 4 implies the following result:

Proposition 5. *Let X be a regular space, $p \in X$ and κ be an infinite cardinal. If X^κ is OHD, then $\Sigma(X, p, \kappa)$ is OHD. Furthermore, when $\Sigma(X, p, \kappa)$ is OHD, it is satisfied that $\sigma(X, p, \kappa)$ is OHD.*

On the other hand, if X admits a sequence of non-empty open sets that is convergent to $p \in X$, and $p^\omega \in X^\omega$ denotes the sequence $p^\omega(n) := p$, then $\sigma(X, p, \omega)$ admits a sequence of non-empty open sets that is convergent to p^ω .

Proposition 6. *If there exists a sequence $\{U_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_X^+$ converging to $p \in X$, then there exists a sequence $\{V_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_{\sigma(X, p, \omega)}^+$ converging to p^ω .*

PROOF. For each $n \in \omega$ let

$$V_n := \sigma(X, p, \omega) \cap \bigcap_{k=0}^n \pi_k^{-1}[U_n].$$

If W is an open subset of $\sigma(X, p, \omega)$ with $p^\omega \in W$, there exist $F \in [\omega]^{<\omega} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ and $\{W_k : k \in F\} \subseteq \tau_X$ such that

$$p^\omega \in \sigma(X, p, \omega) \cap \bigcap_{k \in F} \pi_k^{-1}[W_k] \subseteq W.$$

Then, the condition $p \in \bigcap_{k \in F} W_k$ implies the existence of $m \in \omega$ such that $U_n \subseteq \bigcap_{k \in F} W_k$ for any $n \geq m$. Finally, a routine argument shows that $V_n \subseteq W$ for all $n \geq m + \max F$.

Furthermore, if κ is uncountable it is satisfied that the κ -th power of a T_1 space is OHD.

Proposition 7. *If X is a T_1 space and κ is an uncountable cardinal, then X^κ is OHD.*

PROOF. Let $x \in X^\kappa$ and $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{B}(X^\kappa)$. Since the set $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} \text{supp}(U_n)$ is countable, there exists $\beta \in \kappa \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \text{supp}(U_n)$. Fix $n \in \omega$ and for every $\alpha \in \text{supp}(U_n)$ let $y_\alpha \in \pi_\alpha[U_n]$. Furthermore, let $U \in \tau_X$ satisfy $x(\beta) \in U$ and $X \setminus U \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, if $z \in X \setminus U$, then

$$y := \{(\alpha, y_\alpha) : \alpha \in \text{supp}(U_n)\} \cup \left((\kappa \setminus \text{supp}(U_n)) \times \{z\} \right)$$

is an element of $U_n \setminus \pi_\beta^{-1}[U]$, in particular, $U_n \not\subseteq \pi_\beta^{-1}[U]$. Thus, (U_n) does not converge to x .

Propositions 5, 6 and 7 are the proof of the following result.

Theorem 6. *If X is a T_3 space, X admits a non-empty open sequence converging to $p \in X$ and κ is an infinite cardinal, then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. X^κ is OHD.
2. $\Sigma(X, p, \kappa)$ is OHD.
3. $\sigma(X, p, \kappa)$ is OHD.
4. $\kappa > \omega$.

In particular, since the discrete space $D(2)$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 6, we obtain the next corollary.

Corollary 5. *The following statements are equivalent for an infinite cardinal κ and $p \in D(2)$.*

1. $D(2)^\kappa$ is OHD.
2. $\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$ is OHD.
3. $\sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$ is OHD.
4. $\kappa > \omega$.

Finally, since $\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$ is not WSHD because it is sequentially compact, Corollary 5 yields the following result.

Corollary 6. *For every cardinal $\kappa > \omega$ and $p \in D(2)$ it is satisfied that $\Sigma(D(2), p, \kappa)$ is OHD and not WSHD.*

3. More divergence properties II

The purpose of this section is to study the behavior of the OHD property between X and $\mathcal{F}[X]$. To begin with, the following lemma will be useful to characterize the OHD property in $\mathcal{F}[X]$ in terms of X when the latter is T_2 .

Lemma 7. *If X is a Hausdorff space and $F \in \mathcal{F}[X]$, then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. X has countable character at every point of F .

2. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ has countable character in F .
3. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ has π -countable character in F .
4. There is a sequence $\{V_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_{\mathcal{F}[X]}^+$ converging to F .
5. There are $\{F_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}[X]$ and $\{U_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_X^+$ such that $\{[F_n, U_n] : n \in \omega\}$ converges to F .

PROOF. The implication (1) \rightarrow (2) and the equivalence (2) \leftrightarrow (3) can be found in [17, Proposition 1, p. 336]. Furthermore, it is evident that (2) \rightarrow (4) and (4) \rightarrow (5). To check that (5) \rightarrow (1), suppose that $\{F_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}[X]$ and $\{U_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_X^+$ are such that $\{[F_n, U_n] : n \in \omega\}$ converges to F . Let $m \in \omega$ be such that if $n \geq m$, then $[F_n, U_n] \subseteq [F, X]$. Use the Hausdorff property to produce a family $\{V_x : x \in F\} \subseteq \tau_X^+$ such that $x \in V_x$ and $V_x \cap V_y = \emptyset$ whenever $x, y \in F$ are different.

Let x be an element of F . Our goal is to show that $\{U_n \cap V_x : n \geq m\}$ is a local basis for X in x . First, for any $n \geq m$ the inclusion $[F_n, U_n] \subseteq [F, X]$ implies that $F \subseteq U_n$; in particular, $x \in U_n$. On the other hand, if U belongs to τ_X and $x \in U$, then for $V := U \cup \left(\bigcup_{y \in F \setminus \{x\}} V_y\right)$ there is $k \in \omega$ such that $[F_n, U_n] \subseteq [F, V]$ when $n \geq k$. Finally, since $U_{m+k} \subseteq V$, it is satisfied that $U_{m+k} \cap V_x \subseteq V \cap V_x = U \cap V_x \subseteq U$.

Our next theorem can be deduced from Lemma 7.

Theorem 8. *The following statements are equivalent for a Hausdorff space X .*

1. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is OHD.
2. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is UC.
3. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is π -UC.
4. X is UC.

By Theorem 3 follows that any SHD space X satisfies that $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is SHD. In fact, a simple modification of that argument can be used to prove that if X is WSHD, then $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is WSHD. On the other hand, Theorem 8 guarantees that $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is OHD whenever X is a Hausdorff UC space. What follows is to show that $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is WSHD if X is regular and OHD. In order to do this we first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 9. *Let X be a regular OHD space. If A is an infinite subset of ω , $\{U_n : n \in A\}$ is a subset of τ_X^+ and F is an element of $\mathcal{F}[X]$, then there is a closed neighbourhood V of F (i.e., V is a closed subset of X and $F \subseteq \text{int } V$) in such a way that the set $\{n \in A : U_n \setminus V \neq \emptyset\}$ is infinite.*

PROOF. Let $\{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ be an enumeration with no repetitions of F . Since X is a regular OHD space, a finite recursion argument can be employed to construct a sequence $\{V_i : 0 \leq i \leq m\} \subseteq P(X)$ and a decreasing sequence $\{A_i : 0 \leq i \leq m\} \subseteq [A]^\omega$ such that:

1. V_i is a closed neighbourhood of x_i for every $0 \leq i \leq m$;

2. $A_0 \subseteq \{n \in A : U_n \setminus V_0 \neq \emptyset\}$; and
- 3.

$$A_i \subseteq \left\{ n \in A_{i-1} : U_n \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^i V_j \neq \emptyset \right\}$$

whenever $0 < i \leq m$.

Hence, $V := \bigcup_{i=0}^m V_i$ is a closed neighbourhood of F and A_m is an infinite subset of $\{n \in A : U_n \setminus V \neq \emptyset\}$.

With the previous result available, we are all set to prove one of the central theorems of this section.

Theorem 10. *If X is a regular OHD space, then $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is WSHD.*

PROOF. Let $\{F_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}[X]$ and $\{U_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_X$ be such that $\{[F_n, U_n] : n \in \omega\}$ is a sequence of non-empty open subsets of $\mathcal{F}[X]$. The following statement is the cornerstone of our proof.

Claim. There are a decreasing sequence $\{A_k : k \in \omega\} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$, $\{G_k : k \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}[X]$, $\{V_k : k \in \omega\} \subseteq P(X)$ and $\{x(n, k) : (n, k) \in \omega \times \omega\}$ in such a way that the following properties hold for every $k \in \omega$:

1. V_0 is a closed neighbourhood of F_0 ;
2. for each $n \in A_k$, $x(n, k) \in (U_n \setminus F_n) \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^k V_i$;
3. $G_k := F_k \cup \{x(k, m) : m \leq k \wedge k \in A_m\}$; and
4. V_k is a closed neighbourhood of $\bigcup_{i=0}^{k-1} G_i$ whenever $k > 0$.

We proceed by recursion. Since our hypothesis imply that $\{U_n \setminus F_n : n \in \omega\}$ is a sequence of non-empty open subsets of X , Lemma 9 produces $A_0 \in [\omega]^\omega$ and V_0 , a closed neighbourhood of F_0 , such that $(U_n \setminus F_n) \setminus V_0 \neq \emptyset$ for every $n \in A_0$. For each $n \in A_0$ let $x(n, 0)$ be an element of $(U_n \setminus F_n) \setminus V_0$. Set

$$G_0 := \begin{cases} F_0 \cup \{x(0, 0)\}, & \text{if } 0 \in A_0, \\ F_0, & \text{if } 0 \notin A_0, \end{cases}$$

i.e., $G_0 = F_0 \cup \{x(0, m) : m \leq 0 \wedge 0 \in A_m\}$.

Now suppose that for $k \in \omega$ we have constructed $\{A_i : 0 \leq i \leq k\}$, $\{G_i : 0 \leq i \leq k\}$, $\{V_i : 0 \leq i \leq k\}$ and $\{x(n, i) : 0 \leq i \leq k \wedge n \in A_i\}$ with the desired properties. From Lemma 9 we can obtain $A_{k+1} \in [A_k]^\omega$ and V_{k+1} , a closed neighbourhood of $\bigcup_{i=0}^k G_i$, such that $(U_n \setminus F_n) \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{k+1} V_i \neq \emptyset$ for every $n \in A_{k+1}$. For each $n \in A_{k+1}$ let $x(n, k+1)$ be an element of $(U_n \setminus F_n) \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{k+1} V_i$. Finally, set

$$G_{k+1} := F_{k+1} \cup \{x(k+1, m) : m \leq k+1 \wedge k+1 \in A_m\}.$$

This completes our construction.

It is clear that $G_n \in [F_n, U_n]$ for every $n \in \omega$. Now, recursively generate a strictly increasing sequence (n_k) in such a way that $n_k \in A_k$ for every $k \in \omega$. Our final goal is to prove that, if $A := \{n_k : k \in \omega\}$, then $(G_n)_{n \in A}$ has no convergent subsequences.

Before we begin we need to make a key remark: if $j \in \omega$ and $n \in A$ satisfy $n_j \leq n$, then $n \in A_j$ and $x(n, j) \in G_n$. Indeed, if $k \in \omega$ is such that $n = n_k$, then $j \leq k$ and thus, the relations $n = n_k \in A_k \subseteq A_j$ imply $n \in A_j$; consequently, $x(n, j) \in G_n$ since $j \leq n_j \leq n$.

To finish our proof suppose, in search of a contradiction, that $B \in [A]^\omega$ and $H \in \mathcal{F}[X]$ are such that $(G_n)_{n \in B}$ converges to H in $\mathcal{F}[X]$. Let $s \in \omega$ satisfy $\{G_n : n \in B \cap [s, \omega)\} \subseteq [H, X]$ and set $m := \min(B \setminus s)$. Notice that since $H \subseteq G_m \subseteq \text{int } V_{m+1}$, then $[H, \text{int } V_{m+1}]$ is an open neighbourhood of H and therefore, $\{G_n : n \in B \cap [t, \omega)\} \subseteq [H, \text{int } V_{m+1}]$ for some $t \in \omega$.

Let $k \in \omega$ satisfy $m = n_k$ and fix $j \in \omega$ with $n_k < j$. For every $n \in B$ such that $n_j \leq n$, our key remark ensures that $x(n, j) \in G_n$. Furthermore, since $x(n, j) \notin \bigcup_{i=0}^j V_i$ and $m = n_k < j$, it follows that $x(n, j) \notin V_{m+1}$; in particular, $x(n, j) \in G_n \setminus \text{int } V_{m+1}$. Consequently, $B \cap [n_j, \omega)$ is an infinite subset of $\{n \in B : G_n \not\subseteq [H, \text{int } V_{m+1}]\}$, which contradicts the last line of the previous paragraph.

We will show next that in the realm of regular P -spaces and Hausdorff topological groups a lot of the properties we have presented so far are, in fact, equivalent.

Proposition 8. *If X is a regular P -space and $x \in X$, then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. X has countable character in x .
2. There exists $\{U_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_X^+$ converging to x .
3. X has π -countable character in x .

PROOF. We only need to see that (3) \rightarrow (1). Suppose that $\{V_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_X^+$ is a local π -base for X in x . Since every regular P -space is zero-dimensional (see [16, 1W, p. 69]), for every $n \in \omega$ there exists C_n , a non-empty clopen subset of X , with $C_n \subseteq V_n$. Evidently, $\{C_n : n \in \omega\}$ is a local π -basis for X in x .

Claim. If $I := \{n \in \omega : x \in C_n\}$, then $\{C_n : n \in I\}$ is a local basis for X in x .

Indeed, if $U \in \tau_X$ satisfies $x \in U$ and $V := U \cap \bigcap_{n \in \omega \setminus I} (X \setminus C_n)$, then V is an open subset of X with $x \in V$. Hence, there exists $n \in \omega$ with $C_n \subseteq V$ and thus, the inclusion $C_n \subseteq \bigcap_{m \in \omega \setminus I} (X \setminus C_m)$ implies that $n \in I$; consequently, $x \in C_n \subseteq U$.

Thus, we have the following result.

Theorem 11. *If X is a regular P -space, then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is SHD.

2. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is WSHD.
3. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is OHD.
4. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is UC.
5. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is π -UC.
6. X is SHD.
7. X is WSHD.
8. X is OHD.
9. X is UC.
10. X is π -UC.

PROOF. The implications (1) \rightarrow (2) \rightarrow (3) \rightarrow (4) and (6) \rightarrow (7) \rightarrow (8) \rightarrow (9) always hold. Since X is a Hausdorff space, Theorem 8 ensures that (3) – (5) and (9) are equivalent. On the other hand, the fact that (8) – (10) are equivalent follows from Proposition 8. Finally, (6) \rightarrow (1) by virtue of Theorem 3 and (9) \rightarrow (6) thanks to [12, Proposition 2, p. 4].

Proposition 9. *If G is a topological group, $x \in G$ and $e \in G$ is the neutral element of G , then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. G has countable character in e .
2. G has countable character in x .
3. There exists $\{U_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_G^+$ converging to x .
4. G has π -countable character in x .
5. G has π -countable character in e .

PROOF. Clearly, (2) \rightarrow (3) \rightarrow (4). On the other hand, the homogeneity of G certifies that (1) \rightarrow (2) and (4) \rightarrow (5). To see that (5) \rightarrow (1) suppose that $\{V_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \tau_G^+$ is a π -local basis for G in e . Our goal is to verify that $\{V_n \cdot (V_n)^{-1} : n \in \omega\}$ is a local basis for G in e . Indeed, if $U \in \tau_G$ satisfies $e \in U$, then there exists $V \in \tau_G$ with $e \in V$ and $V \cdot V^{-1} \subseteq U$. Then, if $n \in \omega$ satisfies $V_n \subseteq V$, it follows that $e \in V_n \cdot (V_n)^{-1} \subseteq U$.

Theorem 2 and Proposition 9 allow us to obtain a result similar to Theorem 11 in the realm of Hausdorff topological groups.

Theorem 12. *If G is a Hausdorff topological group, then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. $\mathcal{F}[G]$ is WSHD.
2. $\mathcal{F}[G]$ is OHD.
3. $\mathcal{F}[G]$ is UC.
4. $\mathcal{F}[G]$ is π -UC.
5. G is OHD.
6. G is UC.
7. $\chi(e, G) > \omega$.

8. G is π -UC.
9. $\pi\chi(e, G) > \omega$.

PROOF. Since G is a Hausdorff space, Theorem 8 guarantees that (2) – (4) and (8) are equivalent. On the other hand, (5) – (9) are equivalent thanks to Proposition 9. To finish the proof, recall that (1) \rightarrow (2) is always true and notice that (5) \rightarrow (1) by virtue of Theorem 10.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to add the statement “ G is WSHD” in the list of Theorem 12 since $\Sigma(D(2), 0, \mathfrak{c})$ is a Hausdorff topological group that is not WSHD and its Pixley-Roy hyperspace does have that property (see Corollary 4).

Finally, if X is a Tychonoff space and $C_p(X)$ stands for the ring of continuous function equipped with the topology of pointwise convergence, it is well-known that $C_p(X)$ is a topological group. In this particular case we can prove the following strengthening of Theorem 12.

Theorem 13. *The following statements are equivalent for a Tychonoff space X .*

1. $\mathcal{F}[C_p(X)]$ is SHD.
2. $\mathcal{F}[C_p(X)]$ is WSHD.
3. $\mathcal{F}[C_p(X)]$ is OHD.
4. $\mathcal{F}[C_p(X)]$ is UC.
5. $\mathcal{F}[C_p(X)]$ is π -UC.
6. $C_p(X)$ is SHD.
7. $C_p(X)$ is WSHD.
8. $C_p(X)$ is OHD.
9. $C_p(X)$ is UC.
10. $\chi(\bar{0}, C_p(X)) > \omega$.
11. $C_p(X)$ is π -UC.
12. $\pi\chi(\bar{0}, C_p(X)) > \omega$.
13. X is uncountable.

PROOF. Items (2) – (5) and (8) – (12) are all equivalent to each other by virtue of Theorem 12. Furthermore, (1) \rightarrow (2) and (6) \rightarrow (7) \rightarrow (8) always hold. On the other hand, (6) \rightarrow (1) follows from Theorem 3 and (10) \rightarrow (13) since $\chi(C_p(X)) = |X|$ (see [1, Theorem I.1.1, p. 25]). The argument for (13) \rightarrow (6) goes as follows.

Let $\{U_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a subset of $\tau_{C_p(X)}^+$ formed by canonical elements of the standard base. For every $n \in \omega$, let $f_n \in C_p(X)$, $\varepsilon_n \in (0, \infty)$ and $F_n \in [X]^{<\omega}$ be such that $U_n = [f_n; F_n; \varepsilon_n]$. Notice that, since X is uncountable, there is a point $z \in X \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \omega} F_n$. For each $n \in \omega$, let $G_n := F_n \cup \{z\}$ and let $g_n : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as

$$g_n(x) := \begin{cases} f_n(x), & \text{if } x \in F_n, \\ n, & \text{if } x = z. \end{cases}$$

Since every G_n is C^* -embedded in X , there is a continuous function $h_n : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that its restriction to G_n coincides with g_n ; in particular, $g_n \in U_n$ for every $n \in \omega$. However, for every $h \in C_p(X)$ the open set $[h; \{z\}; 1/2]$ intersects $\{h_n : n \in \omega\}$ in at most one point; consequently, (h_n) has no convergent subsequences.

We have mentioned several times that there are no first countable SHD spaces. A natural question is whether there are SHD spaces that are Fréchet-Urysohn. Since for a compact Hausdorff space X it is satisfied that $C_p(X)$ is Fréchet-Urysohn if and only if X is scattered (see [1, Theorem III.1.2, p. 91]), Theorem 13 provides a list of examples of the sort; namely, any uncountable, scattered, compact and Hausdorff space X satisfies that $C_p(X)$ is a Fréchet-Urysohn SHD space. In particular, $C_p([0, \omega_1])$ has the desired properties.

4. More divergence properties III

The space X will be called *sequentially discrete* (in short, *SD*) if every convergent sequence in X is eventually constant. It was proven in [12, Proposition 1, p. 4] that any SD space in which every non-empty open set is infinite is SHD. On the other hand, a Tychonoff space X is an F' -space if any two disjoint cozero sets have disjoint closures. It is known that any F' -space is SD (see [10, Fact 3.2, p. 574]).

Our first task in the present section is to prove that a T_1 space is SD if and only if its Pixley-Roy hyperspace is SD. We begin with an auxiliary result.

Lemma 14. *If X a T_1 space and $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is not SD, then there is an injective sequence $\{F_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}[X]$ in such a way that, if $F := \bigcap_{n \in \omega} F_n$, then (F_n) converges to F .*

PROOF. Let $\{G_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a non-trivial sequence in $\mathcal{F}[X]$ in such a way that (G_n) converges to a set $G \in \mathcal{F}[X]$. Firstly, since (G_n) is not eventually the constant G , the set $A := \{n \in \omega : G_n \neq G\}$ is infinite. Notice that since $(G_n)_{n \in A}$ is a sequence converging to G , $G \notin \{G_n : n \in A\}$ and $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is a T_1 space, it must be the case that $\{G_n : n \in A\}$ is an infinite set. Let $\{F_n : n \in \omega\}$ be an enumeration with no repetitions of $\{G_n : n \in A\}$.

Now, since $[G, X]$ is an open set in $\mathcal{F}[X]$, there is $m \in \omega$ such that $\{F_n : n \geq m\} \subseteq [G, X]$, which in turn implies that $G \subseteq \bigcap_{n \geq m} F_n$. Finally, if $F := \bigcap_{n \geq m} F_n$ and $U \in \tau_X$ satisfies $F \subseteq U$, then $[G, U]$ is an open set in $\mathcal{F}[X]$ and therefore, there is $k \geq m$ in such a way that $F_n \in [G, U]$ for every $n \geq k$; consequently, $F_n \in [F, U]$ for whenever $n \geq k$. Thus, $\{F_n : n \geq m\}$ satisfies the properties required in our lemma.

Equipped with the above lemma we are ready to prove that the SD property appears in X and only if it does so in $\mathcal{F}[X]$.

Proposition 10. *If X is a T_1 space, then X is SD if and only if $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is SD.*

PROOF. Since every convergent sequence in X naturally induces a convergent sequence in $\mathcal{F}[X]$, it follows that X is SD whenever $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is SD. For the remaining implication let us assume by contradiction that X is SD and $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is not SD. Use Lemma 14 to fix an injective sequence $\{F_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}[X]$ in such a way that, if $F := \bigcap_{n \in \omega} F_n$, then (F_n) converges to F .

Let $A := \{n \in \omega : F_n \neq F\}$, pick $x_n \in F_n \setminus F$ for every $n \in A$ and let $\{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ be a faithful enumeration of F . Since X is a T_1 SD space, a finite recursion argument can be used to construct a sequence $\{U_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\} \subseteq \tau_X^+$ and a decreasing sequence $\{A_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\} \subseteq [A]^\omega$ such that, for every $1 \leq i \leq k$, $U_i \cap F = \{z_i\}$ and

$$\{x_n : n \in A_i\} \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^i U_j = \emptyset.$$

Finally, if $U := \bigcup_{i=1}^k U_i$, then $[F, U]$ is an open set in $\mathcal{F}[X]$ and thus, there is $m \in \omega$ such that $F_n \in [F, U]$ for every $n \in A_k \cap [m, \infty)$; consequently, $\{x_n : n \in A_k \cap [m, \infty)\} \subseteq U$, a contradiction. Hence, $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is SD.

Gillman constructed in [8] a P -space X and an extremally disconnected space Y such that $X \times Y$ is Tychonoff and not an F' -space. Notice that $X \times Y$ is SD since X and Y are SD (see [16, 6L, p. 505]). Hence, we have proven the following statement.

Proposition 11. *There exists a Tychonoff SD space which is not an F' -space.*

On the other hand, there are examples of Pixley-Roy hyperspaces which are SHD but not SD.

Proposition 12. *There exists a Hausdorff space X such that $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is SHD and not SD.*

PROOF. Let X be a Hausdorff SHD space with a non-trivial convergent sequence (x_n) (see [12, Example 2, p. 5]). It follows from Theorem 3 that $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is SHD. Now, let $z \in X$ be convergence point of (x_n) and define $F_n := \{x_n, z\}$ for every $n \in \omega$. A standard argument shows that $\{F_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ is a non-trivial sequence in $\mathcal{F}[X]$ converging to $\{z\}$. Thus, $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is not SD.

Regarding the F' property between X and $\mathcal{F}[X]$, it turns out that this concept does not reflect from X onto the hyperspace $\mathcal{F}[X]$.

Proposition 13. *There exists a compact Hausdorff F' -space X such that $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is not an F' -space.*

PROOF. Let Y and Z be disjoint copies of $\beta\omega$ such that $\beta\omega = Y \cup Z$. Now, [15, Theorem 2.6, p. 145] implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}[\beta\omega] &\cong \mathcal{F}[Y] \oplus \mathcal{F}[Z] \oplus (\mathcal{F}[Y] \times \mathcal{F}[Z]) \\ &\cong \mathcal{F}[\beta\omega] \oplus \mathcal{F}[\beta\omega] \oplus (\mathcal{F}[\beta\omega] \times \mathcal{F}[\beta\omega]). \end{aligned}$$

Looking for a contradiction, suppose that $\mathcal{F}[\beta\omega]$ is an F' -space. Since $\mathcal{F}[\beta\omega] \times \mathcal{F}[\beta\omega]$ is C^* -embedded in $\mathcal{F}[\beta\omega] \oplus \mathcal{F}[\beta\omega] \oplus (\mathcal{F}[\beta\omega] \times \mathcal{F}[\beta\omega])$, it follows that $\mathcal{F}[\beta\omega] \times \mathcal{F}[\beta\omega]$ is an F' -space (see [5, Theorem 0.1, p. 276]) and therefore, $\mathcal{F}[\beta\omega]$ is a P -space (see [3, Theorem, p. 51]). Then, it follows from [12, Proposition 5] that $\beta\omega$ is a P -space, which in turn implies that $\beta\omega$ is finite ([16, 4AG, p. 353]). In sum, $\beta\omega$ is an F' -space and $\mathcal{F}[\beta\omega]$ is not.

We mentioned at the beginning of Section 2 that π -UC implies OHD and OHD implies UC. We will show below that these implications are not reversible. For our next results the symbol ω^* will denote the space $\beta\omega \setminus \omega$, i.e., the remainder of the Stone-Ćech compactification of ω .

Proposition 14. *There exists a UC space which is not OHD.*

PROOF. For each $\alpha \in \omega_1$ let X_α stand for the space $\omega^* \times \{\alpha\}$. Define $X := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \omega_1} X_\alpha$, fix a point $p \notin X$ and set $Y := X \cup \{p\}$. Declare X to be an open subset of Y and let

$$\left\{ Y \setminus \bigcup_{\alpha \in F} X_\alpha : F \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega} \right\}$$

be a local basis for Y in p .

Clearly, each member of $Y \setminus \{p\}$ has uncountable character. Now, if $\{F_n : n \in \omega\}$ is a subset of $[\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ and $\beta \in \omega_1 \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \omega} F_n$, then for every $n \in \omega$ it is satisfied that

$$Y \setminus \bigcup_{\alpha \in F_n} X_\alpha \not\subseteq Y \setminus X_\beta.$$

Thus, $\chi(p, Y) > \omega$. Finally, since $\{X_n : n \in \omega\}$ is a sequence in τ_Y^+ converging to p , it follows that Y is not OHD.

Regarding OHD versus π -UC, we can even produce an SD space that is not π -UC.

Proposition 15. *There exists an SD space which is not π -UC.*

PROOF. For each $n \in \omega$ let X_n be the space $\omega^* \times \{n\}$. For every $U \in \tau_{\beta\omega}$ define

$$U^* := (U \cap \omega^*) \cup \left(\bigcup_{n \in U} X_n \right).$$


Set $X := \bigoplus_{n \in \omega} X_n$ and $Y := X \cup \omega^*$. Declare X to be an open subset of Y and for every $p \in \omega^*$ let $\{U^* : p \in U \wedge U \in \tau_{\beta\omega}\}$ be a local basis for Y in p .

Evidently, $\{X_n : n \in \omega\}$ is a local π -base for Y in every point of ω^* ; therefore, Y is not π -UC. In order to prove that Y is SD, let (y_n) be an injective sequence in Y . Since each X_n is open in Y and is homeomorphic to the SD space ω^* , it cannot happen that (y_n) converges to a point in X . Now, if $A := \{n \in \omega : y_n \in$

ω^* is infinite, then $(y_n)_{n \in A}$ is a non-trivial sequence in the SD space ω^* and thus, (y_n) cannot converge to any element of ω^* .

In the case where A is finite, for every $n \in \omega \setminus A$ let $m(n) \in \omega$ satisfy $y_n \in X_{m(n)}$ and fix $y \in \omega^*$. Since the sequence $(m(n))_{n \in \omega \setminus A} \subseteq \omega$ does not converge to y in $\beta\omega$, there is $U \in \tau_{\beta\omega}$ with $y \in U$ such that $B := \{n \in \omega \setminus A : m(n) \notin U\}$ is infinite. Notice that for every $n \in B$ the condition $m(n) \notin U$ implies that $U^* \cap X_{m(n)} = \emptyset$; in particular, $y_n \notin U^*$. Thus, $\{y_n\}_{n \in B}$ is disjoint from U^* and hence, $\{y_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ does not converge to y in Y .

To conclude this section we include a diagram that summarizes most of the results presented throughout the text. It is necessary to mention that the implications marked with (*) need non-empty open sets to be infinite in the corresponding space to be true. Finally, the indication “ $+T_i$ ” means that X needs to be a T_i space for the implication to be valid.



5. Questions

In this article we have answered most of the questions presented in [12], however, some of them continue to be open. Furthermore, new questions have arisen from the topics presented in this text.

Question 1. *Is there a Hausdorff zero-dimensional SHD space X such that βX is not zero-dimensional?*

The natural candidate to solve Question 1 is the space constructed in [6] but we have not been able to determine if it does not have isolated points.

Question 2. *Does it hold that if X is a Tychonoff non-compact SHD space, then βX is SHD?*

Theorem 2 reinforces the hope of having a positive answer to Question 2.

Question 3. *Is it true that if X is Tychonoff, non-compact, locally compact and Lindelöf, then $\beta X \setminus X$ is SHD.*

Regarding Question 3, the statement obtained by changing the word “Lindelöf” to “ σ -compact” was proved in [12].

Finally, concerning Sections 2, 3 and 4 of this article, the following questions remain unanswered.

Question 4. *Does it hold that every WSHD space is SHD?*

Question 5. *Is X OHD whenever $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is WSHD?*

Question 6. *Are the following statements are equivalent?*

1. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is SHD.
2. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is WSHD.
3. $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is OHD.

Question 7. *Is it true that if $\mathcal{F}[X]$ is an F' -space, then X is an F' -space?*

References

- [1] A. V. Arhangel'skiĭ, *Topological function spaces*, Kluwer academic publishers, Mathematics and its applications, vol. 78, 1992.
- [2] A. Bella and S. Spadaro, *On some questions on selectively highly divergent spaces*, to appear on Applied General Topology.
- [3] P. C. Curtis, *A note concerning certain product spaces*, Archiv der Mathematik **11** (1960), 50–52.
- [4] E. K. van Douwen, *The integers and topology*, Handbook of set-theoretic topology (K. Kunen y J. E. Vaughan, eds.) (1984), 111–167.
- [5] A. Dow, *On F -spaces and F' -spaces*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **108** (1983), no. 2, 274–284.
- [6] A. Dow and K. P. Hart, *A zero-dimensional F -space that is not strongly zero-dimensional*, Topology and its Applications **310** (2022), 1–8.
- [7] R. Engelking, *General Topology: Revised and completed edition*, Heldermann, Berlin, 1989.
- [8] L. Gillman, *A P -space and an extremally disconnected space whose product is not an F -space*, Archiv der Mathematik **11** (1960), no. 1, 53–55.
- [9] L. J. Halbeisen, *Combinatorial set theory. With a gentle introduction to forcing*, Springer monographs in mathematics, Springer-Verlag London (2012).
- [10] R. Hernández-Gutiérrez and Á. Tamariz-Mascarúa, *Disconnectedness properties of hyper-spaces*, Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae **52** (2011), no. 4, 569–591.
- [11] R. Hodel, *Cardinal functions I*, Handbook of set-theoretic topology (K. Kunen y J. E. Vaughan, eds.) (1984), 1–61.
- [12] C. D. Jiménez-Flores, A. Ríos-Herrejón, A. D. Rojas-Sánchez, and E. E. Tovar-Acosta, *On selectively highly divergent spaces*, arXiv:2307.11992v3 (2023).

- [13] K. Kunen, *Set theory*, Studies in logic and foundations, London college publications, vol. 34, 2013.
- [14] P. Lipparini, *Topological spaces compact with respect to a set of filters*, Cent. Eur. J. Math. **12(7)** (2014), 991–991.
- [15] D. J. Lutzer, *Pixley-Roy Topology*, Topology Proceedings **3** (1978), 139-158.
- [16] J. Porter and R. Woods, *Extensions and Absolutes of Hausdorff Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- [17] S. Sakai, *Cardinal functions on Pixley-Roy hyperspaces*, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. **89(2)** (1983), 336–340.