

Weak Continuity Properties of Topologized Groups

Jiling Cao

`jiling.cao@aut.ac.nz`

School of Computing and Mathematical Sciences

Auckland University of Technology

Auckland 1142

New Zealand

This is joint work with R. Drozdowski and Z. Piotrowski

Topologized groups

A **topologized group** is a triple (G, \cdot, τ) such that (G, \cdot) is a group and (G, τ) is a topological space. If both the multiplication m and the inversion i of G are continuous, then (G, \cdot, τ) is called a **topological group**.

Topologized groups

A **topologized group** is a triple (G, \cdot, τ) such that (G, \cdot) is a group and (G, τ) is a topological space. If both the multiplication m and the inversion i of G are continuous, then (G, \cdot, τ) is called a **topological group**.

If m is continuous, then (G, \cdot, τ) is called a **paratopological group**. In case that m is separately continuous, then (G, \cdot, τ) is called a **semitopological group**. If left translations are continuous, (G, \cdot, τ) is called a **left semitopological group**. Right semitopological groups can be defined similarly.

Topologized groups

A **topologized group** is a triple (G, \cdot, τ) such that (G, \cdot) is a group and (G, τ) is a topological space. If both the multiplication m and the inversion i of G are continuous, then (G, \cdot, τ) is called a **topological group**.

If m is continuous, then (G, \cdot, τ) is called a **paratopological group**. In case that m is separately continuous, then (G, \cdot, τ) is called a **semitopological group**. If left translations are continuous, (G, \cdot, τ) is called a **left semitopological group**. Right semitopological groups can be defined similarly.

It is known that weaker and less restrictive assumptions which can be used to characterize a group topology.

Montgomery's theorem

In the literature, a lot of research work has been done in this line. Probably, the following theorem by [Montgomery](#) in 1936 is the first one.

Montgomery's Theorem: A semitopological group (G, \cdot, τ) with a Polish topology τ is a topological group.

Montgomery's theorem

In the literature, a lot of research work has been done in this line. Probably, the following theorem by [Montgomery](#) in 1936 is the first one.

Montgomery's Theorem: A semitopological group (G, \cdot, τ) with a Polish topology τ is a topological group.

This suggests the question of studying "nice" topological conditions on (G, \cdot, τ) to make (G, \cdot, τ) a topological group. Also, the question as to when a separately continuous mapping is (jointly) continuous arises.

Arhangel'skii and Reznichenko

In 2005, Arhangel'skii and Reznichenko obtained the following result.

Arhangel'skii-Reznichenko Theorem: Every Hausdorff paratopological group (G, \cdot, τ) such that (G, τ) is a **symmetrizable** Baire space is a metrizable topological group.

Arhangel'skii and Reznichenko

In 2005, Arhangel'skii and Reznichenko obtained the following result.

Arhangel'skii-Reznichenko Theorem: Every Hausdorff paratopological group (G, \cdot, τ) such that (G, τ) is a **symmetrizable** Baire space is a metrizable topological group.

To show this theorem, they employed the condition:

$$e \in \overline{\text{int}(\overline{U^{-1}})}$$

for every open neighborhood U of the neutral element e .

Ferri, Hernández and Wu

In 2006, **Ferri, Hernández and Wu** considered topologized groups with a Baire metrizable topology, and use some weaker conditions on left and right translations to characterize a group topology.

Almost continuity: A mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called almost continuous if for each non-empty open subset V of Y , $f^{-1}(V)$ contains a non-empty open subset of X .

Ferri, Hernández and Wu

In 2006, **Ferri, Hernández and Wu** considered topologized groups with a Baire metrizable topology, and use some weaker conditions on left and right translations to characterize a group topology.

Almost continuity: A mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called almost continuous if for each non-empty open subset V of Y , $f^{-1}(V)$ contains a non-empty open subset of X .

First, this definition has a little flaw. Second, we know that this concept has appeared in the literature under two different names: **feebly continuous** (**Frolík**, 1961) and **somewhat continuous** (**Gentry and Hoyle**, 1971).

Near and quasi- continuity

One common thing that is involved in the recent work of Arhangel'skii and Reznichenko, Ferri, Hernández and Wu is that certain types of weak continuity properties have used.

Near and quasi-continuity

One common thing that is involved in the recent work of Arhangel'skii and Reznichenko, Ferri, Hernández and Wu is that certain types of weak continuity properties have used.

Nearly continuity: A mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called **nearly continuous** at $x \in X$ if for every open neighborhood V of $f(x)$, then set $\overline{f^{-1}(V)}$ is a neighborhood of x (Pták, 1958).

Near and quasi-continuity

One common thing that is involved in the recent work of Arhangel'skii and Reznichenko, Ferri, Hernández and Wu is that certain types of weak continuity properties have used.

Nearly continuity: A mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called **nearly continuous** at $x \in X$ if for every open neighborhood V of $f(x)$, then set $\overline{f^{-1}(V)}$ is a neighborhood of x (Pták, 1958).

Quasi-continuity: A mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called **quasi-continuous** at $x \in X$ if for every open neighborhood V of $f(x)$ and every open neighborhood U of x , there is an open set $O \subseteq U$ such that set $O \subseteq f^{-1}(V)$ (Kempisty, 1932).

Bouziad and Reznichenko

In 1990s, the nearly and quasi- continuity came to the play, due to Bouziad and Reznichenko.

Bouziad-Reznichenko Theorem: For a paratopological group (G, \cdot, τ) , the following are equivalent:

- (i) (G, \cdot, τ) a topological group;
- (ii) i is quasi-continuous;
- (iii) i is nearly continuous.

Bouziad and Reznichenko

In 1990s, the nearly and quasi-continuity came to the play, due to Bouziad and Reznichenko.

Bouziad-Reznichenko Theorem: For a paratopological group (G, \cdot, τ) , the following are equivalent:

- (i) (G, \cdot, τ) a topological group;
- (ii) i is quasi-continuous;
- (iii) i is nearly continuous.

The reference for the equivalence of (i) and (ii) is a paper by **Kenderov, Korezov and Moors** in 2001.

A common generalization

Is there a common generalization of both near and quasi-continuity? How is this result related to the condition used by Arhangel'skii and Reznichenko?

A common generalization

Is there a common generalization of both near and quasi-continuity? How is this result related to the condition used by Arhangel'skii and Reznichenko?

To answer these questions, we need the following concept introduced by [Andrijević](#) in 1986.

Semi-precontinuity: A subset A of X is **semi-preopen** if $A \subseteq \overline{\text{int}(\overline{A})}$.

A mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called **semi-precontinuous** at $x \in X$ if for every open neighborhood V of $f(x)$, $f^{-1}(V)$ is a semi-preopen set in X .

The first theorem

Theorem 1. Let (G, \cdot, τ) be a paratopological group. Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (i) (G, \cdot, τ) is a topological group;
- (ii) i is quasi-continuous;
- (iii) i of (G, \cdot, τ) is nearly continuous;
- (iv) i is semi-precontinuous;
- (v) For every open neighbourhood U of e , $e \in \text{int} \left(\overline{U^{-1}} \right)$;
- (vi) For every open neighbourhood U of e , $e \in \text{int} \left(\overline{U \cap U^{-1}} \right)$;
- (vii) For every open neighbourhood U of e , $\text{int} \left(\overline{U \cap U^{-1}} \right) \neq \emptyset$.

Comments and remarks

There are paratopological groups with a feebly continuous inversion, which are not topological groups. In deed, [Guran](#) called such paratopological groups [saturated](#). In a series of papers, [Banakh and Ravsky](#) showed that saturated paratopological groups behave much like topological groups in many aspects.

Comments and remarks

There are paratopological groups with a feebly continuous inversion, which are not topological groups. In deed, [Guran](#) called such paratopological groups [saturated](#). In a series of papers, [Banakh and Ravsky](#) showed that saturated paratopological groups behave much like topological groups in many aspects.

We may consider the “dual problem” of Theorem 1. That is, for a given topologized group (G, \cdot, τ) with a continuous inversion, what can we say about the weak continuity properties of the multiplication m ?

We will see that, to study weak continuity properties of m , we need put more conditions on the topology τ .

Two examples

Example 1. Let $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +)$ be the group of integers modulo 2 with the usual addition. Let τ be the **Sierpiński topology** on \mathbb{Z}_2 . Then $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +, \tau)$ is a topologized group such that m is both quasi-continuous and nearly continuous. Also, i is continuous. But, $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +, \tau)$ is not a paratopological group.

Two examples

Example 1. Let $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +)$ be the group of integers modulo 2 with the usual addition. Let τ be the **Sierpiński topology** on \mathbb{Z}_2 . Then $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +, \tau)$ is a topologized group such that m is both quasi-continuous and nearly continuous. Also, i is continuous. But, $(\mathbb{Z}_2, +, \tau)$ is not a paratopological group.

Example 2. Let $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ be the reals equipped with the usual addition and the following metric

$$d(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x = y; \\ \max\{|x|, |y|\}, & x \neq y. \end{cases}$$

Then $(\mathbb{R}, +, \tau_d)$ is a topologized group such that m is feebly continuous, but not quasi-continuous. Moreover, it can be checked easily that i is continuous.

The Novak number

The **Novak number** of a space X is defined by

$$\text{Nov}(X) = \min\{\kappa : X \text{ is covered by } \leq \kappa \text{ n. d. sets}\}.$$

Then X is of second Baire category iff $\text{Nov}(X) \geq \aleph_1$, and X is Baire if and only if $\text{Nov}(O) \geq \aleph_1$ for any nonempty open set $O \subseteq X$.

The Novak number

The **Novak number** of a space X is defined by

$$\text{Nov}(X) = \min\{\kappa : X \text{ is covered by } \leq \kappa \text{ n. d. sets}\}.$$

Then X is of second Baire category iff $\text{Nov}(X) \geq \aleph_1$, and X is Baire if and only if $\text{Nov}(O) \geq \aleph_1$ for any nonempty open set $O \subseteq X$.

A classical result says that a homogeneous space is Baire if and only if it is of second category. Similarly, one can show the following:

If (G, \cdot, τ) is a left (or right) semitopological group, then $\text{Nov}(G) = \text{Nov}(O)$ for every nonempty open set $O \subseteq G$.

Developability number

The **developability number** of a space X , is defined by

$$\text{dev}(X) = \min\{\kappa : \exists \text{ open covers } \{\mathcal{U}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \text{ of } X \\ \text{s. t. } \{\text{st}(x, \mathcal{U}_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\} \text{ is a local base at } x\}.$$

A regular space X is a Moore space iff $\text{dev}(X) = \aleph_0$.

Developability number

The **developability number** of a space X , is defined by

$$\text{dev}(X) = \min\{\kappa : \exists \text{ open covers } \{\mathcal{U}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \text{ of } X \\ \text{s. t. } \{\text{st}(x, \mathcal{U}_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\} \text{ is a local base at } x\}.$$

A regular space X is a Moore space iff $\text{dev}(X) = \aleph_0$.

Theorem 2. If (G, \cdot, τ) is a left (or right) semitopological group such that $\text{dev}(G) < \text{Nov}(G)$, then i is nearly continuous.

Developability number

The **developability number** of a space X , is defined by

$$\text{dev}(X) = \min\{\kappa : \exists \text{ open covers } \{\mathcal{U}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \text{ of } X \\ \text{s. t. } \{\text{st}(x, \mathcal{U}_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\} \text{ is a local base at } x\}.$$

A regular space X is a Moore space iff $\text{dev}(X) = \aleph_0$.

Theorem 2. If (G, \cdot, τ) is a left (or right) semitopological group such that $\text{dev}(G) < \text{Nov}(G)$, then i is nearly continuous.

Corollary 2.1. If (G, \cdot, τ) is a left (or right) semitopological group such that (G, τ) is a Baire and Moore space, then i is nearly continuous.

The third theorem

Theorem 3. Let (G, \cdot, τ) be a topologized group endowed with a regular topology τ such that $\text{dev}(G) < \text{Nov}(G)$. If one type of translations are feebly continuous, and the other type of translations are continuous, then (G, \cdot, τ) is a topological group.

The third theorem

Theorem 3. Let (G, \cdot, τ) be a topologized group endowed with a regular topology τ such that $\text{dev}(G) < \text{Nov}(G)$. If one type of translations are feebly continuous, and the other type of translations are continuous, then (G, \cdot, τ) is a topological group.

As an immediate consequence, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 3.1. Let (G, \cdot, τ) be a topologized group such that (G, τ) is a Baire Moore space. If one type of translations are feebly continuous, and the other type of translations are continuous, then (G, \cdot, τ) is a metrizable topological group.

Comparison

It is easy to see that our results extend the following two theorems:

Piotrowski's Theorem: Every Baire Moore semitopological group is a paratopological group (1998).

Reznichenko's Theorem: Every semitopological group which is a Baire metrizable space is a topological group.

Comparison

It is easy to see that our results extend the following two theorems:

Piotrowski's Theorem: Every Baire Moore semitopological group is a paratopological group (1998).

Reznichenko's Theorem: Every semitopological group which is a Baire metrizable space is a topological group.

Comparing our results with the Arhangel'skii-Reznichenko theorem, we have the following question.

Question 1. Must every symmetrizable Hausdorff Baire semitopological group be a topological group?

Ferri-Hernández-Wu Theorem

Ferri-Hernández-Wu Theorem: Let G be a group, which is a Baire metrizable space. Suppose that there is a dense subset S of second category in G such that the right translations ρ_s and $\rho_{s^{-1}}$ are continuous for all $s \in S$. Suppose further that, for each $s \in G$, there is a residual subset R_s of G such that the left translation λ_s is **feebly continuous** on R_s , $\lambda_s(R_s)$ is residual, and $\lambda_{s^{-1}}$ is **feebly continuous** on $\lambda_s(R_s)$. Then G is a topological group.

Ferri-Hernández-Wu Theorem

Ferri-Hernández-Wu Theorem: Let G be a group, which is a Baire metrizable space. Suppose that there is a dense subset S of second category in G such that the right translations ρ_s and $\rho_{s^{-1}}$ are continuous for all $s \in S$. Suppose further that, for each $s \in G$, there is a residual subset R_s of G such that the left translation λ_s is **feebly continuous** on R_s , $\lambda_s(R_s)$ is residual, and $\lambda_{s^{-1}}$ is **feebly continuous** on $\lambda_s(R_s)$. Then G is a topological group.

Question 2. Can we relax the condition all right translations are continuous to there is a dense subset S of second category in G such that the right translations ρ_s and $\rho_{s^{-1}}$ are continuous for all $s \in S$?

One more example

In general, the conclusion of Theorem 3 may not hold for a topologized group (G, \cdot, τ) when both left and right translations are feebly continuous, under the same assumption on the topology τ .

One more example

In general, the conclusion of Theorem 3 may not hold for a topologized group (G, \cdot, τ) when both left and right translations are feebly continuous, under the same assumption on the topology τ .

Example 3. Let $G = [0, 1)$ be equipped with the following multiplication operation

$$x \cdot y = \begin{cases} x + y, & \text{if } x + y < 1; \\ x + y - 1 & x + y \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

and the usual topology τ . Then, (G, \cdot, τ) is a topologized group with a separable metrizable Baire topology. It can be checked that m is separately quasi-continuous, but neither m nor i is continuous.

Two more questions

In Example 3, it can be checked that m is not continuous at any point of $\{(x, y) \in G \times G : x + y = 1\}$. However, this outcome is somehow not surprising.

Two more questions

In Example 3, it can be checked that m is not continuous at any point of $\{(x, y) \in G \times G : x + y = 1\}$. However, this outcome is somehow not surprising.

If (G, \cdot, τ) is a topologized group equipped with a separable, metrizable and Baire topology τ such that m is separately quasi-continuous, by a result of [Neubrunn](#), then m is quasi-continuous. Thus the set of points of continuity of m is a dense G_δ -set in $G \times G$.

Two more questions

In Example 3, it can be checked that m is not continuous at any point of $\{(x, y) \in G \times G : x + y = 1\}$. However, this outcome is somehow not surprising.

If (G, \cdot, τ) is a topologized group equipped with a separable, metrizable and Baire topology τ such that m is separately quasi-continuous, by a result of [Neubrunn](#), then m is quasi-continuous. Thus the set of points of continuity of m is a dense G_δ -set in $G \times G$.

Question 3. Let (G, \cdot, τ) be a topologized group with a Polish topology τ such that m is separately quasi-continuous. Must (G, \cdot, τ) be a topological group?

Here is another question that we could not solve at the moment.

Question 4. Let (G, \cdot, τ) be a topologized group equipped with a separable, metrizable and Baire topology τ such that m is separately feebly continuous. Must m be feebly continuous?

Here is another question that we could not solve at the moment.

Question 4. Let (G, \cdot, τ) be a topologized group equipped with a separable, metrizable and Baire topology τ such that m is separately feebly continuous. Must m be feebly continuous?

If the answer is “yes”, then $C(m)$ is somewhere dense, and thus non-empty. Therefore, we can view Question 4 as an analog of [Talagrand’s](#) problem in 1985.

Here is another question that we could not solve at the moment.

Question 4. Let (G, \cdot, τ) be a topologized group equipped with a separable, metrizable and Baire topology τ such that m is separately feebly continuous. Must m be feebly continuous?

If the answer is “yes”, then $C(m)$ is somewhere dense, and thus non-empty. Therefore, we can view Question 4 as an analog of [Talagrand’s](#) problem in 1985.

Thank you very much!