

QH-singularity of partially ordered spaces

Vroegrijk, Tom

DOI

[10.1016/j.topol.2019.05.030](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.topol.2019.05.030)

Publication date

2019

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in

Topology and its Applications

Citation (APA)

Vroegrijk, T. (2019). QH-singularity of partially ordered spaces. *Topology and its Applications*, 263, 107-116.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.topol.2019.05.030>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

QH-SINGULARITY OF PARTIALLY ORDERED SPACES

TOM VROEGRIJK

Dedicated to Cheyenne Sels

ABSTRACT. Each partial order generates a transitive quasi-uniformity. In this article we will study the properties of quasi-uniformities that are defined by a partial order and are QH -singular.

1. INTRODUCTION

In exercise 17 on page 35 of Isbells book [1] on uniform spaces it is claimed that if \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are distinct uniformities on a set X , the topologies defined by the Hausdorff uniformities on the hyperspace of X are also distinct. In [7] Smith showed that this claim was false. From that point on uniformities on a set X that do generate the same hyperspace topology were called H -equivalent. A uniformity \mathcal{U} for which there is no distinct uniformity \mathcal{V} that is H -equivalent to \mathcal{U} is called H -singular.

After Smiths article [7] several papers on the properties of H -singular uniform spaces appeared (see for example [9] and [10]). Some recent results on this topic can be found in [2] and [6]. With the publications [3] and [5] Cao, Künzi and Reilly started the study of H -singularity in the asymmetric case. With each quasi-uniformity \mathcal{U} on a set X we can associate a quasi-uniform structure on the hyperspace of X called the Hausdorff quasi-uniformity. Here too we can ask ourselves if there exist quasi-uniformities \mathcal{U} for which there is no distinct quasi-uniformity \mathcal{V} such that \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} define Hausdorff quasi-uniformities that have the same underlying topology. Such quasi-uniformities will be called QH -singular.

In [8] the author obtained some general results on QH -singularity of quasi-uniform spaces. The purpose of this article is to investigate the properties of QH -singular quasi-uniformities that are defined by a partial order.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let X be a set and $U, V \subseteq X \times X$ relations on X . For an $x \in X$ we define $U(x)$ as $\{y \in X \mid (x, y) \in U\}$. The relation $V \circ U$ contains all (x, z) for which there is a $y \in X$ such that $y \in U(x)$ and $z \in V(y)$. We will denote $U \circ U$ as U^2 and $U \circ U^n$ as U^{n+1} whenever $n \geq 2$.

A filter \mathcal{U} on $X \times X$ is called a *quasi-uniformity* iff it has the following properties:

- (1) $\forall x \in X \forall U \in \mathcal{U} : (x, x) \in U$,
- (2) $\forall U \in \mathcal{U} \exists V \in \mathcal{U} : V^2 \subseteq U$.

The elements of a quasi-uniformity \mathcal{U} will be called *entourages*. The pair (X, \mathcal{U}) is a *quasi-uniform space*. A subset $\mathcal{U}' \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ is a *base* for \mathcal{U} iff each $U \in \mathcal{U}$ contains a $U' \in \mathcal{U}'$. A *transitive* quasi-uniformity is a quasi-uniformity with a base that

consists of transitive relations. For an extensive monograph on quasi-uniform spaces we refer the reader to [4].

Each quasi-uniformity \mathcal{U} has an underlying topology $\tau(\mathcal{U})$. In this topology the neighbourhoodfilter of a point x is generated by the sets $U(x)$ with $U \in \mathcal{U}$.

The quasi-uniformity \mathcal{U}^{-1} is called the *conjugate of \mathcal{U}* and consists of all entourages U^{-1} , where $U^{-1} = \{(y, x) \mid (x, y) \in \mathcal{U}\}$.

The set of all subsets of X will be denoted as $\mathcal{P}(X)$. For a subset $A \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and an entourage $U \in \mathcal{U}$ we define $U(A)$ as the union of all $U(x)$ with $x \in A$. For any relation U on X we define

$$U_+ = \{(A, B) \in \mathcal{P}(X) \times \mathcal{P}(X) \mid B \subseteq U(A)\}$$

and

$$U_- = \{(A, B) \in \mathcal{P}(X) \times \mathcal{P}(X) \mid A \subseteq U^{-1}(B)\}.$$

If (X, \mathcal{U}) is a quasi-uniform space, then the filter generated by the sets U_- is a quasi-uniformity \mathcal{U}_H^- on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ that we will call the lower Hausdorff quasi-uniformity. Analogously, the sets U_+ generate the upper Hausdorff quasi-uniformity \mathcal{U}_H^+ on $\mathcal{P}(X)$. We will denote the intersection $U_- \cap U_+$ as U_H . The Hausdorff quasi-uniformity \mathcal{U}_H on the hyperspace $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is the filter that is generated by the sets U_H .

If \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are two quasi-uniformities on a set X , then we say that \mathcal{V} is *QH-finer* than \mathcal{U} (or that \mathcal{U} is *QH-coarser* than \mathcal{V}) iff $\tau(\mathcal{U}_H) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{V}_H)$. If the topologies $\tau(\mathcal{U}_H)$ and $\tau(\mathcal{V}_H)$ are equal, then we say that \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are *QH-equivalent*. The set of all quasi-uniformities on X that are *QH-equivalent* with \mathcal{U} is the *QH-equivalence class* of \mathcal{U} . A quasi-uniformity \mathcal{U} is called *QH-singular* iff its *QH-equivalence class* only contains \mathcal{U} . We will say that \mathcal{U} is *transitively QH-singular* iff there is no transitive quasi-uniformity \mathcal{V} that is distinct from \mathcal{U} and *QH-equivalent* with \mathcal{U} .

3. QH-SINGULARITY OF SUBSPACES

Each partial order defines a unique transitive quasi-uniformity. In the preliminaries we defined the *QH-equivalence class* of a quasi-uniformity. The purpose of this article is to get some insight into the structure of the *QH-equivalence class* of a quasi-uniformity defined by a partial order and to discover some properties of quasi-uniformities within this equivalence class.

Definition 1. For a partial order \leq on a set X we define U_{\leq} as

$$\{(x, y) \in X \times X \mid x \leq y\}.$$

The filter that consists of all subsets of $X \times X$ that contain U_{\leq} is a transitive quasi-uniformity that we will denote as \mathcal{U}_{\leq} .

Proposition 1. *If \leq is a partial order on X , then \mathcal{U}_{\leq} is a the finest element in its *QH-equivalence class*.*

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{V} is a quasi-uniformity that is *QH-equivalent* to \mathcal{U} . Take a $V \in \mathcal{V}$ and an $x \in X$. By assumption we have that there is a $U \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $U_H(\{x\}) \subseteq V_H(\{x\})$ and thus $(U_{\leq})_H(\{x\}) \subseteq V_H(\{x\})$. This implies $U_{\leq}(x) \subseteq V(x)$ and because x was chosen arbitrarily we get $U_{\leq} \subseteq V$. Hence we obtain that $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\leq}$. \square

Proposition 2. *If \mathcal{V} is a quasi-uniformity that is coarser than \mathcal{U}_{\leq} , then \mathcal{V} is QH-equivalent with \mathcal{U}_{\leq} iff for each $A \subseteq X$ there is a $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V(A) \subseteq U_{\leq}(A)$ and for each $x \in A$ there is a $y \in A$ with the property $V(y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(x)$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{V} is a quasi-uniformity that is coarser than \mathcal{U}_{\leq} we automatically obtain that \mathcal{V} is QH-coarser than \mathcal{U}_{\leq} . This means that both quasi-uniformities are QH-equivalent iff \mathcal{V} is QH-finer than \mathcal{U}_{\leq} . That this is true iff for each $A \subseteq X$ there is a $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V(A) \subseteq U_{\leq}(A)$ and for each $x \in A$ there is a $y \in A$ with the property $V(y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(x)$ is a direct consequence of the first corollary of [8]. \square

The following results describe how QH-singularity transfers to certain types of subspaces of partially ordered sets. We will use these results in the final section to prove the main theorems of this article.

A subset Y of a partially ordered space (X, \leq) is a *downset* (*upset*) iff $x \in Y$ whenever there is a $y \in Y$ such that $x \leq y$ ($x \geq y$).

Proposition 3. *Let Y be a downset in a partially ordered space (X, \leq) . If (X, \leq) is transitively QH-singular, then the partially ordered subspace (Y, \leq) is transitively QH-singular.*

Proof. Suppose that (Y, \leq) is not transitively QH-singular and that \mathcal{V} is a transitive quasi-uniformity on Y that is QH-equivalent with \mathcal{U}_{\leq_Y} , where \leq_Y is the restriction of the partial order \leq to Y . Take a transitive $V \in \mathcal{V}$. Define V^\dagger such that $V^\dagger(x)$ is equal to $U_{\leq}(x)$ whenever $x \notin Y$ and equal to $V(x) \cup U_{\leq}(x)$ for $x \in Y$. It is easy to verify that V^\dagger is a transitive relation if Y is a downset. Because $V_1^\dagger \cap V_2^\dagger$ equals $(V_1 \cap V_2)^\dagger$ whenever V_1, V_2 are transitive elements of \mathcal{V} , the collection of all relations V^\dagger forms a base for a quasi-uniformity. Let \mathcal{V}^\dagger be this quasi-uniformity.

It is clear that \mathcal{V}^\dagger is coarser than \mathcal{U}_{\leq} . Take a subset A of X . Because \mathcal{V} is QH-equivalent with (\mathcal{U}_{\leq_Y}) we can use proposition 2 to find a transitive $V \in \mathcal{V}$ that satisfies $V(A \cap Y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(A \cap Y)$ and for each $x \in A \cap Y$ there is a $y \in A \cap Y$ with the property $V(y) \subseteq U_{\leq_Y}(x)$.

To prove that $V^\dagger(A) \subseteq U_{\leq}(A)$ take an $x \in A$. If x is not an element of $A \cap Y$, then $V^\dagger(x)$ is simply $U_{\leq}(x)$, so $V^\dagger(x) \subseteq U_{\leq}(A)$. In case $x \in A \cap Y$ and $y \in V^\dagger(x)$ we know that y is either contained in $V(x)$ or in $U_{\leq}(x)$. If $y \in V(x)$, then $y \in Y$ and therefore $y \in V(A \cap Y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(A \cap Y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(A)$. On the other hand, if y is not contained in $V(x)$, then $y \in U_{\leq}(x) \subseteq U_{\leq}(A)$.

Take an $x \in A$. We only need to prove that there is a $y \in A$ such that $V^\dagger(y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(x)$. If x is not contained in $A \cap Y$, then this is trivially true since $V^\dagger(x) = U_{\leq}(x)$. Suppose that $x \in A \cap Y$. We know that there must be a $y \in A \cap Y$ such that $V(y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(x)$. This yields that $x \leq y$ and thus we obtain $V^\dagger(y) = V(y) \cup U_{\leq}(y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(x)$. \square

In the following three results (X, \leq) will be a partially ordered space, Y will be a subset of X and \mathcal{V} will be a quasi-uniformity on Y . Throughout these propositions we will define $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ as the filter on $X \times X$ generated by all relations \tilde{V} where $\tilde{V}(x)$ is equal to $U_{\leq}(x)$ if $x \notin Y$ and equal to $V(x)$ when $x \in Y$.

Lemma 1. *Let Y be an upset in a partially ordered space (X, \leq) and let \mathcal{V} be a transitive quasi-uniformity on Y that is coarser than \mathcal{U}_{\leq_Y} and that satisfies $z \geq x$ whenever $z \in V(y)$ and $y \geq x$ whenever $V \in \mathcal{V}$, $x \notin Y$ and $y \in Y$. $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ is a transitive quasi-uniformity on X .*

Proof. Take a transitive $V \in \mathcal{V}$ and $x, y, z \in X$ such that $z \in \tilde{V}(y)$ and $y \in \tilde{V}(x)$. If x and y are not in Y , then we have $z \geq y \geq x$ and therefore $z \in \tilde{V}(x)$. In the case that $x \in Y$ we automatically obtain $y \in Y$ and thus $z \in V^2(x) \subseteq \tilde{V}(x)$. Finally, if $x \notin Y$ and $y \in Y$, then we have $z \in V(y)$ and $y \geq x$. By assumption this yields $z \geq x$ and thus $z \in \tilde{V}(x)$. \square

Proposition 4. *Let Y be an upset in a partially ordered space (X, \leq) and let \mathcal{V} be a transitive quasi-uniformity on Y that is QH -equivalent to \mathcal{U}_{\leq_Y} and that satisfies $z \geq x$ whenever $z \in V(y)$ and $y \geq x$ for some $V \in \mathcal{V}$, $x \notin Y$ and $y \in Y$. The quasi-uniformity $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ is QH -equivalent with \mathcal{U}_{\leq} .*

Proof. By definition we have that $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ is coarser than \mathcal{U}_{\leq} . Let A be a subset of X . Proposition 2 tells us that we can find a $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V(A \cap Y) \subseteq U_{\leq_Y}(A \cap Y)$ and for each $x \in A \cap Y$ there is a $y \in A \cap Y$ with the property $V(y) \subseteq U_{\leq_Y}(x)$.

Take an $x \in A$ and a $z \in \tilde{V}(x)$. If $x \in Y$, then we have

$$z \in \tilde{V}(x) = V(x) \subseteq V(A \cap Y) \subseteq U_{\leq_Y}(A \cap Y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(A).$$

For $x \notin Y$ we have that $\tilde{V}(x) = U_{\leq}(x)$ and thus $z \in U_{\leq}(A)$. This proves that $\tilde{V}(A) \subseteq U_{\leq}(A)$.

Finally, we want to show that there is a $y \in A$ such that $\tilde{V}(y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(x)$. In case $x \notin Y$ we can simply choose y to be equal to x , since $\tilde{V}(y) = \tilde{V}(x) = U_{\leq}(x)$. If x is an element of Y , then we know that there is a $y \in A \cap Y$ with the property $V(y) \subseteq U_{\leq_Y}(x)$. This implies $\tilde{V}(y) = V(y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(x)$. \square

Proposition 5. *Let Y be a subset of a partially ordered space (X, \leq) such that $x \leq y$ for each $y \in Y$ whenever $x \notin Y$. If (X, \leq) is transitively QH -singular, then (Y, \leq) is transitively QH -singular.*

Proof. Suppose that there exists a transitive quasi-uniformity \mathcal{V} on Y that is QH -equivalent with \mathcal{U}_{\leq} . Because $x \leq y$ for each $y \in Y$ whenever $x \notin Y$ we have that Y is an upset. On the other hand, this also implies that $z \geq x$ whenever $V \in \mathcal{V}$, $x \notin Y$, $y \in Y$ and $z \in X$ such that $z \in V(y)$ and $y \geq x$. The previous proposition now yields that $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ is a transitive quasi-uniformity that is QH -equivalent with \mathcal{U}_{\leq} . \square

4. THE ORDERED SPACE ω

That the ordered space ω is not QH -singular was already established in [3]. In this section we will characterise all quasi-uniformities that are in the QH -equivalence class of the quasi-uniformity \mathcal{U}_ω determined by the order on ω . We will denote U_{\leq} as U_ω if \leq is the order relation on ω .

Proposition 6. *A quasi-uniformity \mathcal{V} on ω is QH -coarser than \mathcal{U}_ω iff $\tau(\mathcal{V})$ is coarser than $\tau(\mathcal{U}_\omega)$.*

Proof. It follows from the definition that the underlying topology of \mathcal{V} is coarser than $\tau(\mathcal{U})$ whenever $\tau(\mathcal{V}_H) \subseteq \tau((\mathcal{U}_\omega)_H)$. On the other hand, if $\tau(\mathcal{V}) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{U}_\omega)$, then we have for each $n \in \omega$ and $V \in \mathcal{V}$ that $U_\omega(n) \subseteq V(n)$. This implies $U_\omega \subseteq V$ and thus $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_\omega$. The latter yields that \mathcal{V} is QH -coarser than \mathcal{U}_ω . \square

A subset Y of a quasi-uniform space (X, \mathcal{U}) will be called *relatively \mathcal{U} -precompact* iff for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$ there is a finite set $K \subseteq X$ such that $Y \subseteq U(K)$.

Proposition 7. *Let \mathcal{V} be a quasi-uniformity on ω . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) for each $A \subseteq \omega$ there is a $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that for each $x \in A$ there is a $y \in A$ with the property $V(y) \subseteq U_\omega(x)$,
- (2) each relatively \mathcal{V}^{-1} -precompact subset of ω is finite.

Proof. Suppose that there is an infinite relatively \mathcal{V}^{-1} -precompact subset A of ω . Take an arbitrary $V \in \mathcal{V}$. By assumption there is an $n \in \omega$ such that $A \subseteq V^{-1}([0, n])$. Choose $x \in A$ such that $n < x$. Because A is infinite such an x must exist. Since $A \subseteq V^{-1}([0, n])$ we now have that for each $y \in A$ the set $V(y)$ intersects with $[0, n]$. This means that there is no $y \in A$ such that $V(y) \subseteq U_\omega(x)$.

To prove the converse we assume that there is an $A \subseteq \omega$ such that for each $V \in \mathcal{V}$ there is an $x \in A$ with the property that $V(y) \not\subseteq U_\omega(x)$ for any $y \in A$. Take $V \in \mathcal{V}$ and choose an $x \in A$ with this property. Whenever V is an element of \mathcal{V} we know that $V(y)$ is not contained in $U_\omega(x)$. Clearly, x cannot be equal to 0, since this would imply that $U_\omega(x)$ equals ω . For any $y \in A$ the set $V(y)$ intersects with $[0, x-1]$ and thus $A \subseteq V^{-1}([0, x-1])$. Because V was arbitrary we have that A is relatively \mathcal{V}^{-1} -precompact. \square

Proposition 8. *A quasi-uniformity \mathcal{V} on ω is QH-equivalent to \mathcal{U}_ω iff the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $\tau(\mathcal{V}) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{U}_\omega)$,
- (2) for each $n \in \omega$ there is a $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V^{-1}([0, n]) = [0, n]$,
- (3) each relatively \mathcal{V}^{-1} -precompact subset of ω is finite.

Proof. First we will prove the necessity of these conditions. That QH-equivalence of \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{U}_ω implies conditions (1) and (3) follows from the previous propositions and proposition 2. To prove that the second condition holds let us assume that there is an $n \in \omega$ such that for each $V \in \mathcal{V}$ the set $V^{-1}([0, n])$ is not equal to $[0, n]$. If we define A as $[n+1, +\infty[$, then $V(A)$ intersects with $[0, n]$ for each $V \in \mathcal{V}$. Clearly the set $U_\omega(A)$ is equal to A and thus there is no $V \in \mathcal{V}$ for which $V(A) \subseteq U_\omega(A)$. This contradicts with the assumption that \mathcal{V} on ω is QH-equivalent to \mathcal{U}_ω .

Now suppose that the three stated conditions are true. The first condition yields that \mathcal{V}_H is coarser than (\mathcal{U}_ω) . By proposition 2 this means that in order to prove that \mathcal{V} is QH-equivalent to \mathcal{U}_ω we still need to show that for each $A \subseteq \omega$ there is a $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V(A) \subseteq U_\omega(A)$. Assume that this is not the case. This means that we can find an $A \subseteq \omega$ such that for each $V \in \mathcal{V}$ we have $V(A) \not\subseteq U_\omega(A)$. The set A does not contain 0, because in this case $U_\omega(A)$ would be equal to ω . Define n as $\min(A) - 1$. Since $V(A)$ hits $[0, n]$ for each $V \in \mathcal{V}$ we obtain that there is no entourage $V \in \mathcal{V}$ for which $V^{-1}([0, n]) \subseteq [0, n]$ \square

Proposition 9. *A quasi-uniformity \mathcal{V} on ω is QH-equivalent to \mathcal{U}_ω iff the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $\tau(\mathcal{V}) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{U}_\omega)$,
- (2) $\tau(\mathcal{U}_\omega^{-1}) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{V}^{-1})$,
- (3) each relatively \mathcal{V}^{-1} -precompact subset of ω is finite.

Proof. Let \mathcal{V} be a quasi-uniformity that is QH-equivalent to \mathcal{U}_ω . It was established in [5] that the conjugates of QH-equivalent quasi-uniformities generate the same topology. It follows from the previous result that \mathcal{V} satisfies conditions (1) and (3).

To prove the converse assume that the quasi-uniformity \mathcal{V} satisfies the three given conditions. Because of the previous result we only need to prove that for each $n \in \omega$

there is a $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V^{-1}([0, n]) = [0, n]$ to show that \mathcal{V}_H and $(\mathcal{U}_\omega)_H$ generate the same topology. From the second condition we obtain that for each $k \in \omega$ there is a $V_k \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V_k^{-1}(k) \subseteq U_\omega^{-1}(k) = [0, k]$. Take $n \in \omega$ and define V as $V_0 \cap \dots \cap V_n$. This entourage is clearly an element of \mathcal{V} and $V^{-1}([0, n]) \subseteq [0, n]$. \square

Example 1. Define the entourage W_k on ω such that $W_k(n)$ is equal to $U_\omega(n-1)$ whenever n is odd and $n \geq k$ and equal to $U_\omega(n)$ in all other cases. It is an easy exercise to check that these relations are transitive. Because $W_{k'} \subseteq W_k$ whenever $k \leq k'$ we obtain that these entourages also form a base for a transitive quasi-uniformity \mathcal{W} .

The quasi-uniformity \mathcal{W} in fact satisfies all the conditions in the previous proposition. First of all it follows directly from the definition that $U_\omega(n) \subseteq W_k(n)$ for all $k, n \in \omega$, so this means $\tau(\mathcal{V}) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{U}_\omega)$.

Now take an $n \in \omega$ and define k as $n+2$. If $m \leq n$, then $W_k(m)$ equals $U_\omega(m)$ and thus $n \in W_k(m)$. In case $m > n$ we have that $W_k(m) \subseteq U_\omega(n+1)$ and therefore $n \notin W_k(m)$. Hence we obtain that $W_k^{-1}(n) = [0, n] = U_\omega^{-1}(n)$. This yields $\tau(\mathcal{U}_\omega^{-1}) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{V}^{-1})$.

Finally, let Y be a relatively \mathcal{W}^{-1} -precompact subset of ω . By definition we have that $W_0^{-1}(n) \subseteq [0, n+1]$ for all $n \in \omega$. Now let K be a finite subset of ω such that $Y \subseteq W_0^{-1}(K)$. If k_0 is the maximum of K , then $W_0^{-1}(K) \subseteq [0, k_0+1]$ and this means that Y must be finite.

This example suggests that the existence of a totally ordered subspace implies QH -singularity. In the following section we will see that this is not the case, but that there is some sort of upper bound for the size of totally ordered subspaces in QH -singular partially ordered spaces. In fact we will construct quasi-uniformities similar to the one in the previous example to prove the main results of this article.

5. CHAINS AND ANTICHAINS

A subset of a partially ordered space that is totally ordered is called a *chain*. An *antichain* is a subset of which all distinct elements are incomparable. In this section we investigate the behaviour of chains and antichains in QH -singular partially ordered spaces.

Proposition 10. *A partially ordered set (X, \leq) that is equal to a finite union of antichains is QH -singular.*

Proof. Suppose that X can be written as $A_0 \cup \dots \cup A_n$ where each A_k is an antichain. Let \mathcal{V} be a quasi-uniformity that is QH -equivalent to \mathcal{U}_\leq . We already saw that \mathcal{V} must be coarser than \mathcal{U}_\leq . From theorem 2.4 of [3] we obtain that for each $0 \leq k \leq n$ we can find a $V_k \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V_k(x) \subseteq U_\leq(x)$ whenever $x \in A_k$. If we define V as the intersection of all V_k we obtain an element of \mathcal{V} with the property that $V \subseteq U_\leq$. Hence \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{U}_\leq must be equal. \square

Definition 2. We will define the *depth* of an element $x \in X$ as the supremum of all $n \in \omega$ with the property that there exists a chain of length n of which x is the smallest element.

Proposition 11. *Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set. If there is an $n \in \omega$ such that $|C| \leq n$ for each chain C in X , then (X, \leq) is QH -singular.*

Proof. Let A_k be the collection of all $x \in X$ with depth equal to k . It is clear that X is equal to $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n$. We will now show that each A_k is in fact an antichain. Take $x, y \in A_k$ with $x < y$. By definition we can find a chain $y_1 < \dots < y_k$ such that y equals y_1 . We now have that the chain $x < y_1 < \dots < y_k$ consists of $k + 1$ elements and x is the smallest element in the chain, but this is impossible since the depth of x is equal to k . By using the previous proposition we obtain that (X, \leq) is QH-singular. \square

Definition 3. The supremum of all cardinalities of antichains in X will be called the *width* of X .

Example 2. The space $\omega \times \omega$ with the pointwise ordering (i.e. $(n_1, m_1) \leq (n_2, m_2)$ iff $n_1 \leq n_2$ and $m_1 \leq m_2$) only has finite antichains, but it has countable width.

Suppose the elements $(n_k, m_k)_{k \in \omega}$ form an antichain. Define N as $\{k \in \omega \mid n_k \leq n_0\}$ and M as $\{k \in \omega \mid m_k \leq m_0\}$. Since all elements (n_k, m_k) are incomparable the set $N \cup M$ must be equal to ω . This means that either N or M must be infinite. Let us assume that N is an infinite set. This yields that there is an $n \leq n_0$ such that there is an infinite number of elements (n_k, m_k) that satisfy $n_k = n$. This would of course imply that the elements $(n_k, m_k)_{k \in \omega}$ do not form an antichain. Hence we can conclude that each antichain must be finite.

On the other hand, the subset $A_k = \{(n, m) \in \omega \times \omega \mid n + m = k\}$ is clearly an antichain with $k + 1$ elements, so $\omega \times \omega$ has countable width.

Definition 4. Let β be an ordinal. For a map $\Lambda : \beta \rightarrow X$ we define $\lambda_\Lambda(x)$ as $\min\{\gamma \in \beta \mid x \not\leq \Lambda(\gamma)\}$ and $\lambda_\Lambda^*(x)$ as $\min\{\gamma \in \beta \mid x \leq \Lambda(\gamma)\}$.

Definition 5. Let Λ be a map from an ordinal β to X . Define the relation V_Λ^α , with $\alpha \in \beta$, such that $V_\Lambda^\alpha(x)$ is equal to the union of $U_{\leq}(x)$ and the set of all $y \in X$ for which there is an even α' that is greater than or equal to α and satisfies the properties $x \leq \Lambda(\alpha')$ and $\Lambda(\alpha' + 1) \leq y$.

Lemma 2. *If β is an ordinal and $\Lambda : \beta \rightarrow X$ is strictly decreasing, then V_Λ^α is a transitive relation.*

Proof. Suppose (x, y) and (y, z) are both elements of the relation V_Λ^α . If either $x \leq y$ or $y \leq z$, then it is easy to see that $z \in V_\Lambda^\alpha(x)$.

Now let us take a look at the situation where $x \not\leq y$ and $y \not\leq z$. This means that we can find an even ordinal $\alpha' \geq \alpha$ such that $x \leq \Lambda(\alpha')$ and $\Lambda(\alpha' + 1) \leq y$ and an even ordinal $\alpha'' \geq \alpha$ such that $y \leq \Lambda(\alpha'')$ and $\Lambda(\alpha'' + 1) \leq z$. First of all this implies that $x \leq \Lambda(\alpha')$ and $y \leq \Lambda(\alpha'')$. Moreover, we have that $\Lambda(\alpha' + 1) \leq y \leq \Lambda(\alpha'')$. Since both α' and α'' are both even and Λ is strictly decreasing we obtain that $\Lambda(\alpha' + 1) \leq \Lambda(\alpha'' + 1)$. This yields $\Lambda(\alpha' + 1) \leq \Lambda(\alpha'' + 1) \leq z$ and thus $z \in V_\Lambda^\alpha(x)$. \square

It follows from the definition that $V_\Lambda^\alpha \supseteq V_\Lambda^{\alpha'}$ whenever $\alpha \leq \alpha'$. This implies that the sets V_Λ^α form a filter basis on $X \times X$ that consists of transitive relations. The filter generated by these sets is therefore a transitive quasi-uniformity.

Definition 6. Define \mathcal{V}_Λ as the transitive quasi-uniformity on X generated by the entourages V_Λ^α with $\alpha \in \beta$.

The construction of this quasi-uniformity is based on the quasi-uniformity on ω in example 1. It was in fact this example that led to the ideas behind the main results of this article.

Lemma 3. *Let Λ be a strictly decreasing map from an ordinal β to X and A a subset of X . If A does not contain an antichain A' for which $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda(x) \mid x \in A'\}$ is equal to β , then we can find an $\alpha \in \beta$ such that for each $x \in A$ with $\alpha < \lambda_\Lambda(x)$ there exists a $y \in A$ with $\lambda(y) < \lambda(x)$ that satisfies $x \leq y$.*

Proof. Suppose that for each $\alpha \in \beta$ there is an $x \in A$ with $\alpha < \lambda_\Lambda(x)$ such that for each $y \in A$ with $\lambda_\Lambda(y) < \lambda_\Lambda(x)$ it holds that $x \not\leq y$. Choose an $x_0 \in A$ such that $0 < \lambda_\Lambda(x_0)$ and therefore $x_0 \leq \Lambda(0)$. Assume that for some $\gamma \in \beta$ we have found a family $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \gamma}$ of elements in A such that $x_{\alpha'} \not\leq x_\alpha$ and $\lambda_\Lambda(x_\alpha) < \lambda_\Lambda(x_{\alpha'})$ whenever $\alpha < \alpha'$.

Suppose that $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda(x_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \gamma\}$ is not equal to β . Because of our initial assumption we can find an $x_\gamma \in A$ with $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda(x_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \gamma\} < \lambda_\Lambda(x_\gamma)$ and such that for each $y \in A$ with $\lambda_\Lambda(y) < \lambda_\Lambda(x_\gamma)$ it holds that $x_\gamma \not\leq y$. This means that $x_\gamma \not\leq x_\alpha$ and $\lambda_\Lambda(x_\alpha) < \lambda_\Lambda(x_\gamma)$ whenever $\alpha < \gamma$.

Using transfinitive induction we obtain an indexed family $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \gamma_0}$ in A such that the supremum of all $\lambda_\Lambda(x_\alpha)$ with $\alpha \in \gamma_0$ is equal to β . By construction we have that $x_{\alpha'} \not\leq x_\alpha$ whenever $\alpha < \alpha'$.

Now suppose that $x_\alpha \leq x_{\alpha'}$. This means that for each $\gamma \in \beta$ we have $x_{\alpha'} \not\leq \Lambda(\gamma)$ if $x_\alpha \not\leq \Lambda(\gamma)$ and therefore $\lambda_\Lambda(x_{\alpha'}) \leq \lambda_\Lambda(x_\alpha)$. This contradicts the fact that $\lambda_\Lambda(x_\alpha) < \lambda_\Lambda(x_{\alpha'})$ whenever $\alpha < \alpha'$. Hence we obtain that distinct elements in the family $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \gamma_0}$ are incomparable and that the subset of all elements x_α is an antichain. \square

Proposition 12. *Let β be an ordinal and $\Lambda : \beta \rightarrow X$ a strictly decreasing function. If X does not contain an antichain Y such that $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda(y) \mid y \in Y\}$ equals β , then \mathcal{V}_Λ is QH -equivalent with \mathcal{U}_\leq .*

Proof. It is clear that \mathcal{V}_Λ is coarser than \mathcal{U}_\leq . Now take a subset A of X . In case $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda(x) \mid x \in A\}$ is strictly smaller than β we have that $V_\Lambda^\alpha(x) = U_\leq(x)$, with α equal to $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda(x) \mid x \in A\}$, for all $x \in A$. This implies that V_Λ^α satisfies the conditions of proposition 2.

Now suppose that $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda(x) \mid x \in A\}$ is equal to β . By assumption A cannot contain an antichain A' such that $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda(x) \mid x \in A'\}$ equals β . Using the previous proposition we obtain that there is an $\alpha \in \beta$ such that for each $x \in A$ with $\alpha < \lambda_\Lambda(x)$ there exists a $y \in A$ with $\lambda_\Lambda(y) < \lambda_\Lambda(x)$ that satisfies $x \leq y$. We will show that V_Λ^α satisfies the conditions of proposition 2.

Take a $y \in V_\Lambda^\alpha(A)$. We want to show that y is an element of $U_\leq(A)$. Choose a $z \in A$ such that $y \in V_\Lambda^\alpha(z)$. If $z \leq y$, then there is nothing left to prove, so we will assume that this is not the case. This means that we can find an even $\alpha' \in \beta$ such that $\Lambda(\alpha' + 1) \leq y$ and $\alpha \leq \alpha' < \lambda_\Lambda(z)$. Because $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda(x) \mid x \in A\} = \beta$ we know that there is an $x \in A$ with the property $\lambda_\Lambda(x) > \alpha' + 1$ and thus $x \leq \Lambda(\alpha' + 1)$. This implies that $x \leq y$ and that $y \in U_\leq(A)$.

Let z be an element of A . To complete this proof we need to show that there is a $y \in A$ such that $V_\Lambda^\alpha(y) \subseteq U_\leq(z)$. If $\lambda_\Lambda(z) \leq \alpha$, then $V_\Lambda^\alpha(z) = U_\leq(z)$ so we can simply choose y to be equal to z . In case $\lambda_\Lambda(z) > \alpha$ there must be a $y \in A$ such that $\lambda_\Lambda(y) < \lambda_\Lambda(z)$ and $z \leq y$. Take an element $y' \in V_\Lambda^\alpha(y)$. If $y \leq y'$, then we have $z \leq y \leq y'$ and thus $y' \in U_\leq(z)$. If $y \not\leq y'$, then $\Lambda(\alpha' + 1) \leq y'$ for some even α' with the property $\alpha \leq \alpha' < \lambda_\Lambda(y)$. Because $\alpha' < \lambda_\Lambda(y) < \lambda_\Lambda(z)$ we know that $z \leq \Lambda(\alpha' + 1)$ and thus $z \leq y'$. \square

Theorem 1. *Let (X, \leq) be a QH-singular partially ordered space. If $C \subseteq X$ is a chain, then there is an antichain Y such that $|Y|$ is at least the coinitality of C .*

Proof. Denote the coinitality of C as β . If β is finite, then it must be equal to 1 because C is a chain. In this case the proposition is obviously true. If β is infinite, then it is an infinite cardinal and thus a limit ordinal. The quasi-uniformity \mathcal{V}_Λ is distinct from U_\leq . For each $\alpha \in \beta$ we can take an even $\alpha' \in \beta$ that is greater than or equal to α . We now have that $\Lambda(\alpha' + 1) \in V_\Lambda^\alpha(\Lambda(\alpha))$, but because Λ is strictly decreasing we know that $\Lambda(\alpha' + 1) \notin U_\leq(\Lambda(\alpha))$.

Choose a coinital well-ordered subset C' of C such that $|C'|$ is equal to β . Define $\Lambda : \beta \rightarrow X$ as the unique decreasing function that maps β bijectively onto C' . Since (X, \leq) is QH-singular the previous proposition implies that there is an antichain A such that $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda(y) \mid y \in C'\}$ is equal to β .

Choose a family $(a_i)_{i \in I}$ in A with the property that $\lambda_\Lambda(a_i) \neq \lambda_\Lambda(a_j)$ whenever $i \neq j$ and such that $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda(a_i) \mid i \in I\} = \beta$. The set $\{\lambda_\Lambda(a_i) \mid i \in I\}$ is by definition cofinal in β . Because β is the coinitality of C it is a regular cardinal. This means that the cardinal number of $\{\lambda_\Lambda(a_i) \mid i \in I\}$ is β and thus $\beta \leq |A|$. \square

Using the same techniques as in the previous results we can now prove a similar theorem about the cofinality of chains in QH-singular partially ordered spaces.

Definition 7. Let Λ be a map from an ordinal β to X . Define the relation W_Λ^α , with $\alpha \in \beta$, such that $W_\Lambda^\alpha(x)$ is equal to the union of $U_\leq(x)$ and the set of all $y \in X$ for which there is an even α' that is greater than or equal to α and satisfies the properties $x \leq \Lambda(\alpha' + 1)$ and $\Lambda(\alpha) \leq y$.

Lemma 4. *If β is an ordinal and $\Lambda : \beta \rightarrow X$ a strictly increasing, then W_Λ^α is a transitive relation.*

Proof. The proof of this result is analogous to that of lemma 2. \square

Definition 8. Define \mathcal{W}_Λ as the transitive quasi-uniformity on X generated by the entourages W_Λ^α with $\alpha \in \beta$.

Lemma 5. *Let β be an ordinal and $\Lambda : \beta \rightarrow X$ a strictly increasing function. If $A \subseteq X$ does not contain an antichain A' such that*

$$\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda^*(x) \mid x \in A'\} = \beta,$$

then we can find an $\alpha \in \beta$ such that for each $x \in A$ with $\alpha < \lambda_\Lambda^(x)$ there exists a $y \in A$ with $\lambda_\Lambda^*(x) < \lambda_\Lambda^*(y)$ that satisfies $x \leq y$.*

Proof. The proof of this result is analogous to that of lemma 3. \square

Proposition 13. *Let β be an ordinal and $\Lambda : \beta \rightarrow X$ a strictly increasing function. If X does not contain an antichain Y such that $\sup\{\lambda_\Lambda^*(y) \mid y \in Y\}$ is equal to β , then \mathcal{W}_Λ is QH-equivalent with U_\leq .*

Proof. The quasi-uniformity \mathcal{W}_Λ is clearly coarser than U_\leq . Once more we will use proposition 2 to prove that these quasi-uniformities are actually QH-equivalent. Let A be a subset of X . Suppose that the supremum of $\{\lambda_\Lambda^*(x) \mid x \in A\}$ is not equal to β . Choose an $\alpha \in \beta$ such that $\lambda_\Lambda^*(x) < \alpha$ for each $x \in A$. Whenever $\alpha \leq \alpha' + 1$ we have $\lambda_\Lambda^*(x) \leq \alpha'$ for each $x \in A$ and thus $U_\leq(\Lambda(\alpha')) \subseteq U_\leq(x)$. This implies that for each element $x \in A$ the set $W_\Lambda^\alpha(x)$ is equal to $U_\leq(x)$.

Let us now assume that the supremum $\{\lambda_\Lambda^*(x) \mid x \in A\}$ is indeed equal to β . Choose an arbitrary $\alpha_1 \in \beta$ for which there is an $x_1 \in A$ such that $x_1 \leq \Lambda(\alpha_1)$ and use the previous proposition to obtain an $\alpha_2 \in \beta$ with the property that for each $x \in A$ with $\alpha_2 < \lambda_\Lambda^*(x)$ there exists a $y \in A$ with $\lambda_\Lambda^*(x) < \lambda_\Lambda^*(y)$ that satisfies $x \leq y$. Define α_0 as the maximum of α_1 and α_2 .

To prove that $W_\Lambda^{\alpha_0}(A) \subseteq U_{\leq}(A)$ take a $y \in A$ and a $z \in W_\Lambda^{\alpha_0}(y)$. If $y \leq z$ there is nothing left to prove, so let us assume that this is not the case. This means that there is an even $\alpha' \in \beta$ such that $\alpha_0 \leq \alpha'$, $\lambda_\Lambda^*(y) \leq \alpha' + 1$ and $\Lambda(\alpha') \leq z$. Because $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha'$ we have $x_1 \leq \Lambda(\alpha_1) \leq \Lambda(\alpha') \leq z$ and therefore we obtain that $z \in U_{\leq}(A)$.

Finally we need to show that for each $z \in A$ there is a $y \in A$ that satisfies $W_\Lambda^{\alpha_0}(y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(z)$. Take $z \in A$. If $\lambda_\Lambda^*(z) \leq \alpha_0$, then $z \leq \Lambda(\alpha')$ for each even α' that is greater than α_0 and thus $W_\Lambda^{\alpha_0}(z) = U_{\leq}(z)$. This means that we can choose y to be equal to z . If $\alpha_0 < \lambda_\Lambda^*(z)$ then we know that there is a $y \in A$ with $\lambda_\Lambda^*(z) < \lambda_\Lambda^*(y)$ and $z \leq y$. If $y \not\leq x$ and $x \in W_\Lambda^{\alpha_0}(y)$, then there is an even α' that is greater than or equal to α_0 such that $\lambda_\Lambda^*(y) \leq \alpha' + 1$ and $\Lambda(\alpha') \leq x$. Since $\lambda_\Lambda^*(z) < \lambda_\Lambda^*(y)$ we know that $\lambda_\Lambda^*(z) \leq \alpha'$ and thus $z \leq \Lambda(\alpha') \leq x$. Hence we can conclude that $W_\Lambda^{\alpha_0}(y) \subseteq U_{\leq}(z)$. \square

Theorem 2. *Let (X, \leq) be a QH -singular partially ordered space. If $C \subseteq X$ is a chain, then there is an antichain Y such that $|Y|$ is at least the cofinality of C .*

Proof. The proof of this result is analogous to the proof of theorem 1. \square

Example 3. It follows from the previous theorem that the space $\omega \times \omega$ from example 2 is not QH -singular. It is clear that the set $(n, 0)_{n \in \omega}$ is a countable chain, but we already saw that $\omega \times \omega$ only has finite antichains.

Theorem 3. *If (X, \leq) is a QH -singular partially ordered set, then both the coinitiality and cofinality of each chain in X are less than or equal to the width of X .*

Proof. This follows from theorems 1 and 2. \square

Example 4. We will define the partial order relation \preceq on $\omega \times \omega$ such that $(n_1, m_1) \preceq (n_2, m_2)$ iff $n_1 = n_2$ and $m_1 \leq m_2$. The space $\omega \times \omega$ endowed with this particular partial order is not QH -singular. If it were QH -singular, then it would also be transitively QH -singular. This would imply that the subspace $\{(0, m) \mid m \in \omega\}$, which is a downset, would also be transitively QH -singular according to proposition 3. The subspace $\{(0, m) \mid m \in \omega\}$, however, is clearly order isomorphic to the ordinal ω and we already saw in the previous section that the latter is in fact not transitively QH -singular.

The partially ordered space $(\omega \times \omega, \preceq)$ does in fact satisfy the conditions stated in the previous theorem. The subspace $\{(n, 0) \mid n \in \omega\}$ is an antichain, so the width of this space is at least countable. Moreover, it is clear that each chain is contained in a subset $\{(n_0, m) \mid m \in \omega\}$ for some n_0 . This means that both the coinitiality and cofinality of each chain are less than or equal to the width of X .

Proposition 14. *If (X, \leq) is QH -singular and totally ordered, then (X, \leq) is finite.*

Proof. Since (X, \leq) is totally ordered its width is equal to 1. From the previous proposition we obtain that the coinitiality and cofinality of each chain in X are at most 1. Therefore (X, \leq) cannot contain any infinite increasing or decreasing sequences and must be finite. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J.R. Isbell, *Uniform spaces*, Mathematical Surveys **12**, American Mathematical Society (Providence, R.I. 1964).
- [2] A. Bouziad, Uniformities with the same Hausdorff hypertopology, *Top. Appl.* **156** (2009), 1315-1326.
- [3] J. Cao, H. Künzi, I. Reilly, Hausdorff quasi-uniformities inducing the same hypertopologies, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **67** (2005), 27-40.
- [4] P. Fletcher, W. Lindgren, *Quasi-uniform spaces*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics **77** (Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1982).
- [5] H. Künzi, Iterations of quasi-uniform hyperspace constructions, *Acta Math. Hungar.* **113** (2006), 213-225.
- [6] M. Rosa, P. Vitolo, A question related to the Isbell problem, *Top. Appl.* **160** (2013), 1829-1848.
- [7] D. Smith, Hyperspaces of a uniformisable space, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **62** (1966), 25-28.
- [8] T. Vroegrijk, Proximally well-monotone covers and QH-singularity, *Acta Math. Hung.* **148** (2016), 437-449.
- [9] A. Ward, On H -equivalence of uniformities, *Pacific J. Math.* **22** (1967), 189-196.
- [10] A. Ward, On H -equivalence of uniformities II, *Pacific J. Math.* **28** (1969), 207-215.