

## Separation Axioms and $\delta$ - Open Sets in Bitopological Spaces

Asaad M.A. Alhosaini

University of Babylon , college of Education , Dept. Mathematics

### Abstract

In this paper we study especial cases of separation axioms in bitopological spaces by considering  $\delta$ -open sets and prove some results about them comparing with similar cases in topological spaces.

### Keywords

Bitopological space (B.S) ,  $\delta$ -open set , pre open set ,  $\delta$ - $T_i$  B.S (i=0,  $\frac{1}{2}$ , 1, 2,  $2\frac{1}{2}$ , 3, 4) ,  $\delta$ -regular ,  $\delta$ -normal B.S .

$\delta$

### 1.Introduction

The study of bitopological spaces was initiated by (Kelly, 1963).

A triple  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is called bitopological space if  $X, \tau$  and  $X, \Omega$  are two topological spaces.

This notion was studied in different senses ,one of these is the  $\delta$ -open sets ,that suggested by (Jaleel, 2003).We have study especial case of connectedness and especial case of compactness in bitopological spaces in the sense of  $\delta$ -open sets in (Alhosaini, 2007; Alswidi and Alhosaini, 2007).

Other sense in bitopological spaces ,is the pre open sets that was suggested by Abdul (Raaof , 2005).In this paper we first (in section 2) introduce a comparable studying between

$\delta$ -open and pre open sets ,and then (in section 3) we study especial case of separation axioms in bitopological spaces in the sense of  $\delta$ -open sets.

### 2.pre open sets and $\delta$ - open sets

**2.1 Definition :**Let  $X, \tau$  and  $X, \Omega$  be two topological spaces then  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is called a bitopological space (B.S). A subset A in  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is called pre open set if  $A \subseteq \tau\text{-int}(\Omega\text{-cl}A)$ . The set of all pre open sets in  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is denoted by  $\text{pr-o}(X)$ , (Raaof, 2005).

A subset A in  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is called  $\delta$ -open set if  $A \subseteq \tau\text{-int}(\Omega\text{-cl}(\tau\text{-int}A))$ .The set of all  $\delta$ -open sets in  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is denoted by  $\delta\text{-o}(X)$ , (Jaleel, 2003)..

**2.2 Remark :**In general  $\text{pr-o}(X)$  and  $\delta\text{-o}(X)$  do not form a topology on X. In fact ,the union of any family of elements in  $\text{pr-o}(X)$  ( $\delta\text{-o}(X)$ ) is an element of  $\text{pr-o}(X)$  ( $\delta\text{-o}(X)$ ),but the intersection of any two elements of  $\text{pr-o}(X)$  ( $\delta\text{-o}(X)$ ) need not be an element of  $\text{pr-o}(X)$  ( $\delta\text{-o}(X)$ ), (Jaleel, 2003; Raaof , 2005).Of course X and  $\phi$  are always elements of  $\text{pr-o}(X)$  ( $\delta\text{-o}(X)$ ).

**2.3 Remark :** If  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is a B.S, then  $\tau \subseteq \delta\text{-o}(X) \subseteq \text{pr-o}(X)$ .

proof:  $A \in \tau$  implies  $\tau\text{-int}A=A, A \subseteq \Omega\text{-cl}A$  implies  $\tau\text{-int}A \subseteq \tau\text{-int}(\Omega\text{-cl}A)$  so  $A \in \tau$  implies  $A \subseteq \tau\text{-int}(\Omega\text{-cl}A) = \tau\text{-int}(\Omega\text{-cl}(\tau\text{-int}A))$  i.e  $\tau \subseteq \delta\text{-o}(X)$  and  $\tau \subseteq \text{pr-o}(X)$ . Now since  $\tau\text{-int}A \subseteq A$  so,  $\tau\text{-int}(\Omega\text{-cl}(\tau\text{-int}A)) \subseteq \tau\text{-int}(\Omega\text{-cl}A)$  which implies, if  $A \subseteq \tau\text{-int}(\Omega\text{-cl}(\tau\text{-int}A))$  then  $A \subseteq \tau\text{-int}(\Omega\text{-cl}A)$  i.e  $\delta\text{-o}(X) \subseteq \text{pr-o}(X)$ .

**2.4 Remark :** A necessary condition for a non empty set  $A$  to be  $\delta$ -open set is  $\tau\text{-int} A \neq \phi$ , (Jaleel, 2003). This is not true for pr open sets, see the following example.

**2.5 Example :**  $X = \{a, b, c\}, \tau = \{X, \phi, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}, \Omega = \{X, \phi, \{c\}\}$  then  $\delta\text{-o}(X) = \tau$  but  $\text{pr-o}(X) = \tau \cup \{\{c\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}\}$ . Not that  $\tau\text{-int} \{c\} = \phi$ .

**2.6 Remark :** In  $X, I, \Omega$ , where  $I$  is the indiscrete and  $\Omega$  is any topology on  $X$ ,  $\delta\text{-o}(X) = I$  but  $\text{pr-o}(X)$  may contain subsets other than  $X$  and  $\phi$ .

Proof: The first part follows from Remark 2.4 and the second is shown in the following example.

**2.7 Example:**  $X = \{a, b, c, d\}, I = \{X, \phi\}, \Omega = \{X, \phi, \{a\}\}$ , then  $\delta\text{-o}(X) = I$  but  $\text{pr-o}(X) = \{X, \phi, \{a\}, \{a, b\}, \{a, c\}, \{a, d\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{a, b, d\}\}$ .

**2.8 Remark :** If  $D$  is the discrete and  $\Omega$  is any topology on  $X$ , then in  $X, D, \Omega$  we have  $\delta\text{-o}(X) = \text{pr-o}(X) = D$ .

proof: It follows from 2.3.

**2.9 Remark :** If  $\tau$  is any topology and  $D$  is the discrete topology on  $X$ , then in  $X, \tau, D$  we have;  $\delta\text{-o}(X) = \text{pr-o}(X) = \tau$ .

Proof: It follows from the facts 1)  $D\text{-cl} A = A$ , 2)  $D\text{-cl}(\tau\text{-int} A) = \tau\text{-int} A$ , and 3)  $A \subseteq \tau\text{-int} A$  if and only if  $A \in \tau$ .

**2.10 Remark :** If  $\tau$  is any topology and  $I$  is the indiscrete topology on  $X$ , then in  $X, \tau, I$  we have  $\text{pr-o}(X) = P(X)$ , set of all subsets of  $X$ , but  $\delta\text{-o}(X)$  need not equal  $P(X)$ .

**2.11 Example :**  $X = \{a, b, c\}, \tau = \{X, \phi, \{a\}\}, I = \{X, \phi\}$ , then  $\text{pr-o}(X) = P(X)$ , where  $\delta\text{-o}(X) = \{X, \phi, \{a\}, \{a, b\}, \{a, c\}\}$ .

**2.12 Remark :** If  $I$  is the indiscrete and  $\tau$  is any topology on  $X$ , then in  $X, \tau, I$  we have  $\delta\text{-o}(X) = \{A \subseteq X \mid A \text{ contains some non empty } \tau\text{-open set}\} \cup \{\phi\}$ .

**2.13 Remark :** If  $I$  is the indiscrete and  $\Omega$  any topology on  $X$ , then in  $X, I, \Omega$  we have: a non empty subset  $A$  of  $X$  is pre open if and only if  $\Omega\text{-cl} A = X$  i.e  $\text{pr-o}(X) = \{A \subseteq X \mid A \text{ is } \Omega\text{-dense subset of } X\} \cup \{\phi\}$ .

The following table summarize the above Remarks;

Case	first topology	second topology	$\text{pr-o}(X)$	$\delta\text{-o}(X)$
1	$D$	$\Omega$	$D$	$D$
2	$\tau$	$D$	$\tau$	$\tau$
3	$I$	$\Omega$	not fixed	$I$
4	$\tau$	$I$	$D$	not fixed

where  $I$  is the indiscrete,  $D$ , the discrete,  $\tau$  and  $\Omega$  are any topologies on  $X$ .

### 3. Separation axioms in bitopological spaces

We first recall some definitions and notations from (Jaleel, 2003) ;

A subset  $F$  of  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is called  $\delta$ -closed if  $X-F$  is  $\delta$ -open.

$\delta\text{-cl } A = \cap \{F \mid F \text{ is } \delta\text{-closed and } A \subseteq F\}$  it is called  $\delta$ -closure of  $A$ .

A set  $A$  is said to be a  $\delta$ -neighborhood of a point  $x$  if there exists a  $\delta$ -open set  $U$  such that  $x \in U \subseteq A$ .

**3.1 Definition :** Let  $X, \tau, \Omega$  be a B.S ; two subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $X$  are  $\delta$ -separated if each is disjoint from the other's  $\delta$ -closure. (i.e  $A \cap \delta\text{-cl } B = \emptyset$  and  $(\delta\text{-cl } A) \cap B = \emptyset$ ).

Two points  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$  are  $\delta$ -distinguishable if they do not have exactly the same  $\delta$ -neighborhoods (i.e there exists a  $\delta$ -open set containing  $x$  but not containing  $y$  or containing  $y$  but not containing  $x$ ).

Two points  $x$  and  $y$  are  $\delta$ -separated if the singletons  $\{x\}$  and  $\{y\}$  are  $\delta$ -separated.

**3.2 Definition :** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is called  $\delta\text{-}T_0$  if any two distinct points are  $\delta$ -distinguishable.

**3.3 Remark :** If  $X, \tau$  is a  $T_0$  space then for any topology  $\Omega$  on  $X$  the B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_0$ .

proof: It follows from the fact that any  $\tau$ -open set is a  $\delta$ -open set in  $X, \tau, \Omega$ .

**3.4 Remark :** The converse of 3.3 is not true ,see the following example.

**3.5 Example :**  $X = \{a, b, c, d\}, \tau = \{X, \emptyset, \{a\}, \{a, d\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}\}, \Omega = \{X, \emptyset, \{a\}\}$ , then

$\delta\text{-o}(X) = \tau \cup \{\{a, b\}, \{a, b, d\}, \{a, c\}, \{a, c, d\}\}$  and it is clear that  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_0$  but

$X, \tau$  is not  $T_0$  space since the points  $b$  and  $c$  are not distinguishable.

**3.6 Theorem :** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_0$  if and only if for each two distinct points  $x$  and  $y$   $\delta\text{-cl } \{x\} \neq \delta\text{-cl } \{y\}$ .

Proof: Suppose that  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_0$  and let  $x \neq y$  be two points of  $X$  such that

$\delta\text{-cl } \{x\} = \delta\text{-cl } \{y\}$ , therefore  $x \in \delta\text{-cl } \{y\}$  and  $y \in \delta\text{-cl } \{x\}$ . If  $U$  is a  $\delta$ -open set such that  $x \in U$  and  $y \notin U$ , then  $y \in X-U$  (a  $\delta$ -closed set) so  $\delta\text{-cl } \{y\} \subseteq X-U$  which means  $\delta\text{-cl } \{x\} \subseteq X-U$  and so  $x \in X-U$  i.e  $x \notin U$  a contradiction!. Similarly the assumption that

$x \notin V$  and  $y \in V$  (for some  $\delta$ -open set  $V$ ) leads to a contradiction ,that is  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is not a  $\delta\text{-}T_0$ .

On the other hand suppose that for each  $x, y \in X$  and  $x \neq y$  we have  $\delta\text{-cl } \{x\} \neq \delta\text{-cl } \{y\}$ , therefore either  $x \notin \delta\text{-cl } \{y\}$  and so  $x \in X - \delta\text{-cl } \{y\}$  but  $y \notin X - \delta\text{-cl } \{y\}$ , or  $y \notin \delta\text{-cl } \{x\}$  and so  $y \in X - \delta\text{-cl } \{x\}$  but  $x \notin X - \delta\text{-cl } \{x\}$  ( where  $X - \delta\text{-cl } \{x\}$  and  $X - \delta\text{-cl } \{y\}$  are  $\delta$ -open sets in  $X, \tau, \Omega$ ) i.e  $x$  and  $y$  are  $\delta$ -distinguishable, hence  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_0$ .

**3.7 Theorem :** If  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is a  $\delta\text{-}T_0$  B.S and  $Y$  is a subset of  $X$  then  $Y, \tau_Y, \Omega_Y$  is a  $\delta\text{-}T_0$  too.

Proof: It follows from the fact that the  $\delta$ -open sets of  $Y, \tau_Y, \Omega_Y$  are the intersections of  $Y$  with the  $\delta$ -open sets of  $X, \tau, \Omega$ .

**3.8 Definition :** A subset  $A$  of a B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is said to be  $\delta$ -g-closed set if  $\delta\text{-cl } A \subseteq U$  whenever  $A \subseteq U$  and  $U$  is a  $\delta$ -open set in  $X, \tau, \Omega$ .

**3.9 Definition :** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is said to be  $\delta\text{-}T_{1/2}$  if every  $\delta$ -g-closed set in  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ -closed.

**3.10 Lemma :** A subset  $A$  of  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ -g-closed set if and only if

$\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} \cap A \neq \emptyset$  for each  $x \in \delta\text{-cl}A$ .

Proof: Suppose that  $A$  is a  $\delta$ -g-closed set, and for some  $x \in \delta\text{-cl}A$ ,  $\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} \cap A = \emptyset$ , then  $A \subseteq X - (\delta\text{-cl}\{x\})$ , where  $X - (\delta\text{-cl}\{x\})$  is a  $\delta$ -open set, so by definition 3.8

$\delta\text{-cl}A \subseteq X - (\delta\text{-cl}\{x\})$ , hence  $x \in X - (\delta\text{-cl}\{x\})$  i.e.  $x \notin \delta\text{-cl}\{x\}$  which is a contradiction.

Conversely assume that for each  $x \in \delta\text{-cl}A$ ,  $\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} \cap A \neq \emptyset$ ; if there is a  $\delta$ -open set  $U$  such that  $A \subseteq U$  but  $\delta\text{-cl}A \not\subseteq U$  then there exists  $x \in \delta\text{-cl}A$  and  $x \notin U$ , so  $x \in X - U$  which implies  $\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} \subseteq X - U$  (since  $X - U$  is  $\delta$ -closed) i.e.  $\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} \cap A = \emptyset$ , a contradiction. Therefore  $A$  is  $\delta$ -g-closed set.

**3.11 Lemma :** If  $\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} \cap A \neq \emptyset$  for each  $x \in \delta\text{-cl}A$ , then  $(\delta\text{-cl}A) - A$  does not contain a non empty  $\delta$ -closed set.

proof: Suppose  $(\delta\text{-cl}A) - A$  contains a non empty  $\delta$ -closed set, say  $B$ , then  $x \in B$  implies

$\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} \subseteq B \subseteq \delta\text{-cl}A - A$ , and  $\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} \cap A = \emptyset$ , which contradicts the hypothesis.

**3.12 Theorem :** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  if and only if, for each  $x \in X$ ,  $\{x\}$  is  $\delta$ -closed or  $\delta$ -open.

Proof: Assume that  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\{x\}$  is neither  $\delta$ -closed nor  $\delta$ -open then

$X - \{x\}$  is not  $\delta$ -closed so  $\delta\text{-cl}(X - \{x\}) = X \subseteq X$  i.e.  $X - \{x\}$  is a  $\delta$ -g-closed set, by definition of  $\delta\text{-}T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ ,  $X - \{x\}$  must be  $\delta$ -closed, a contradiction with the assumption.

On the other hand suppose that for each  $x$  in  $X, \tau, \Omega$ ,  $\{x\}$  is  $\delta$ -closed or  $\delta$ -open. Let  $A$  be a  $\delta$ -g-closed set in  $X, \tau, \Omega$ , then by 2.10 and 2.11  $(\delta\text{-cl}A) - A$  does not contain a non empty  $\delta$ -closed set, so if  $x \in (\delta\text{-cl}A) - A$  then  $\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} \not\subseteq (\delta\text{-cl}A) - A$  i.e.

$\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} \neq \{x\}$  which means  $\{x\}$  is not  $\delta$ -closed, so it must be  $\delta$ -open, but  $\{x\} \cap A = \emptyset$  implies  $x \notin \delta\text{-cl}A$ , a contradiction, hence  $(\delta\text{-cl}A) - A = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $A$  is  $\delta$ -closed, and so  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

**3.13 Theorem :** If  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  then it is  $\delta\text{-}T_0$ .

proof: Suppose  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ , by 2.12 every singleton is either  $\delta$ -closed or  $\delta$ -open. Let  $x \neq y$  (in  $X$ ), if  $\{x\}$  is  $\delta$ -closed then  $X - \{x\}$  is a  $\delta$ -open set containing  $y$  but not containing  $x$ ; and if  $\{x\}$   $\delta$ -open then it is containing  $x$  but not containing  $y$ . So  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_0$ .

**3.14 Remark :** The converse of 2.13 is not true, see the following example.

**3.15 Example :**  $X = \{a, b, c\}$ ,  $\tau = \{X, \emptyset, \{a\}, \{a, b\}\}$ ,  $\Omega = D$  (the discrete topology on  $X$ ) then  $\delta\text{-}o(X) = \tau$  and  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is a  $\delta\text{-}T_0$  but not  $\delta\text{-}T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  (since  $\{b\}$  is neither  $\delta$ -closed nor  $\delta$ -open).

**3.16 Theorem:** If  $X, \tau$  is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  space, then for any topology  $\Omega$  on  $X$ , the B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

proof: It follows the fact that  $\tau \subseteq \delta\text{-}o(X)$  and theorem 3.12.

**3.17 Remark :** The converse of 3.26 is not true, see the following example.

**3.18 Example :**  $X = \{a, b, c\}$ ,  $\tau = \{X, \phi, \{a\}, \{a, b\}\}$ ,  $\Omega = I$  (the indiscrete topology on  $X$ ) then  $\delta\text{-o}(X) = \tau \cup \{\{a, c\}\}$  and  $X, \tau$  is not  $T_{1/2}$  but  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_{1/2}$ .

**3.19 Definition :** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is said to be  $\delta\text{-}T_1$  if any two distinct points in  $X$  are  $\delta$ -separated.

**3.20 Theorem:** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_1$  if and only if every singleton of  $X$  is  $\delta$ -closed.

Proof: Suppose  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_1$ , and  $x \in X$ , if  $y \in \delta\text{-cl}\{x\}$  but  $y \neq x$  then

$\delta\text{-cl}\{y\} \subseteq \delta\text{-cl}\{x\}$  on the other hand by definition of  $\delta\text{-}T_1$  we have

$$\{y\} \cap \delta\text{-cl}\{x\} = \phi$$

which is a contradiction, so  $\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} = \{x\}$  i.e  $\{x\}$  is a  $\delta$ -closed set.

Conversely if for each  $x$ ,  $\{x\}$  is  $\delta$ -closed then  $\delta\text{-cl}\{x\} = \{x\}$  and any two distinct points of  $X$  are  $\delta$ -separated i.e  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_1$ .

is  $\delta\text{-}T_1$ .

proof: It follows from the fact that in  $T_1$ -space every singleton is a closed set in  $X, \tau$ , also any closed set in  $X, \tau$  is a  $\delta$ -closed set in  $X, \tau, \Omega$ .

**3.22 Remark :** The converse of 3.21 is not true, see the following example.

**3.23 Example :**

$$X = \{a, b, c, d\}, \tau = \{X, \phi, \{a\}, \{d\}, \{a, d\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{b, c, d\}\}, \Omega = \{X, \phi, \{a\}, \{d\}, \{a, d\}\},$$

then  $\delta\text{-o}(X) = \tau \cup \{\{a, b\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, d\}, \{c, d\}, \{a, c, d\}, \{a, b, d\}\}$ , so  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_1$  since all singletons are  $\delta$ -closed sets but  $X, \tau$  is not a  $T_1$ -space since  $\{b\}$  and  $\{c\}$  are not closed sets.

**3.24 Theorem:** If  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_1$  and  $Y$  is a subset of  $X$  then  $Y, \tau_Y, \Omega_Y$  is a  $\delta\text{-}T_1$  too.

Proof: It follows from theorem 3.20.

**3.25 Theorem:** If  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_1$  then it is  $\delta\text{-}T_{1/2}$ .

proof: It follows from theorems 3.20 and 3.12.

**3.26 Remark :** The converse of 3.25 is not true, see the following example.

**3.27 Example :**  $X = \{a, b\}$ ,  $\tau = \{X, \phi, \{a\}\}$ ,  $\Omega = D$  (the discrete topology on  $X$ ), then

$\delta\text{-o}(X) = \tau$  (for  $X, \tau, \Omega$ ), and  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_{1/2}$  (since  $\{a\}$  is  $\delta$ -open and  $\{b\}$  is  $\delta$ -closed), but not  $\delta\text{-}T_1$  since  $\{a\}$  is not  $\delta$ -closed.

**3.28 Definition :** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is called  $\delta\text{-}T_2$  or  $\delta$ -Hausdorff if any two distinct points in  $X$  are separated by  $\delta$ -neighborhoods (i.e if for each  $x, y \in X$ ,  $x \neq y$  there is  $\delta$ -open sets  $U$  and  $V$  such that  $x \in U$ ,  $y \in V$  and  $U \cap V = \phi$ ).

**3.29 Theorem:** If  $X, \tau$  is a  $T_2$  space, then for any topology  $\Omega$  on  $X$ , the B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_2$ .

proof: It follows from the fact that  $\tau \subseteq \delta\text{-o}(X)$ .

**3.30 Remark :** The converse of 3.29 is not true, see the following example.

**3.31 Example :**  $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ ,  $\tau = \{X, \phi, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\}, \{a, b\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$ ,  $\Omega = I$  (the indiscrete topology on  $X$ ), then

$\delta\text{-o}(X) = \tau \cup \{\{a, d\}, \{b, d\}, \{c, d\}, \{a, b, d\}, \{a, c, d\}, \{b, c, d\}\}$  and  $X, \tau$  is not  $T_2$  space but  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta\text{-}T_2$ .

**3.32 Remark :** If  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ - $T_2$  then it is  $\delta$ - $T_1$  too. But the converse is not true see the following example.

**3.33 Example :**  $X = \{a, b, c, d\}, \tau = \{X, \phi, \{c\}, \{a, b, d\}\}, \Omega = \{X, \phi, \{c\}\}$  then

$\delta$ -o(X) =  $\tau \cup \{\{a, b, c\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, c, d\}, \{b, c, d\}, \{c, d\}\}$  and it is clear that  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ - $T_1$  (since all singletons are  $\delta$ -closed sets ) but it is not  $\delta$ - $T_2$  (since the points a and b are not separated by  $\delta$ -neighborhoods).

**3.34 Theorem:** If  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is a  $\delta$ - $T_2$  B.S and Y is a subset of X ,then  $Y, \tau_Y, \Omega_Y$  is  $\delta$ - $T_2$  too.

Proof : It is obvious.

**3.35 Definition :** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is called  $\delta$ - $T_{2\frac{1}{2}}$ , or  $\delta$ -Urysohn , if any two distinct points in X are separated by  $\delta$ -closed neighborhoods . Not that a  $\delta$ - $T_{2\frac{1}{2}}$  B.S must be  $\delta$ - $T_2$ .

**3.36 Definition :** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is called  $\delta$ -regular if given any point x and  $\delta$ -closed set F in X such that  $x \notin F$  , then they are separated by  $\delta$ -neighborhoods.

**3.37 Remark :** If  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is a B.S ,then the cases that  $X, \tau$  is regular and  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ -regular are independent, see the following two examples.

**3.38 Example :**

$X = \{a, b, c, d\}, \tau = \{X, \phi, \{a\}, \{c\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}, \{c, d\}, \{a, c, d\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{b, c, d\}\}, \Omega = \{X, \phi, \{a\}\}$  then  $\delta$ -o(X) =  $\tau \cup \{\{a, b\}, \{a, d\}, \{a, b, d\}\}$  and  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ -regular but  $X, \tau$  is not regular since the point b and the closed set  $\{a, d\}$  are not separated by neighborhoods.

**3.39 Example :**  $X = \{a, b, c, d\}, \tau = \{X, \phi, \{a\}, \{d\}, \{a, d\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{b, c, d\}\},$

$\Omega = \{X, \phi, \{a\}\}$  ,then  $\delta$ -o(X) =  $\tau \cup \{\{a, b\}, \{a, c\}, \{a, b, d\}, \{a, c, d\}\}$  and it is clear that  $X, \tau$  is regular but  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is not  $\delta$ -regular ,since the point b and the  $\delta$ -closed set  $\{c, d\}$  are not separated by  $\delta$ -neighborhoods.

**3.40 Remark :** The notions of  $\delta$ - $T_1$  and  $\delta$ -regular are independent ,and the notions of  $\delta$ - $T_2$  and  $\delta$ -regular are independent too. In example 3.39  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ - $T_1$  and  $\delta$ - $T_2$  but not  $\delta$ -regular, for the other part see the following example .

**3.41 Example :**  $X = \{a, b, c\}, \tau = \{X, \phi, \{a\}, \{b, c\}\}, \Omega = \{X, \phi, \{a\}, \{c\}, \{a, c\}\}$  ,then

$\delta$ -o(X) =  $\tau$  and  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ -regular but it is neither  $\delta$ - $T_1$  nor  $\delta$ - $T_2$ .

**3.42 Theorem:** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ -regular if and only if for each  $\delta$ -open set U and  $x \in U$  there exists a  $\delta$ -open set V such that  $x \in V$  and  $\delta$ -clV  $\subseteq$  U.

proof: Suppose that  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is a  $\delta$ -regular B.S ,and let  $x \in U$  where U is a  $\delta$ -open set, take  $H = X - U$  ,then H is  $\delta$ -closed and  $x \notin H$  ,so there exist two  $\delta$ -open sets V and W such that  $x \in V$  ,  $H \subseteq W$  and  $V \cap W = \phi$  i.e  $V \subseteq X - W$  , which implies  $\delta$ -clV  $\subseteq \delta$ -cl(X - W) = X - W. On the other hand  $H \subseteq W$  implies  $X - W \subseteq X - H = U$  ,therefore  $\delta$ -clV  $\subseteq U$ .

Conversely ,if H is a  $\delta$ -closed set and  $x \notin H$  , then  $x \in X - H (=U)$  ,U is a  $\delta$ -open set, and by the condition of the theorem there exists a  $\delta$ -open set V such that  $x \in V$  and  $\delta$ -clV  $\subseteq U$  therefore  $H \subseteq X - \delta$ -clV,  $x \in V$  and  $V \cap X - (\delta$ -clV) =  $\phi$ .

Hence  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ -regular.

**3.43 Definition :** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is said to be  $\delta$ - $T_3$  , if it is  $\delta$ - $T_1$  and  $\delta$ -regular.  $\delta$ - $T_1$  and

**3.44 Definition :** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is said to be  $\delta$ -normal if any two disjoint  $\delta$ -closed sets in  $X$  are separated by  $\delta$ -neighborhoods.

**3.45 Remark :** The notions of  $\delta$ - $T_1$  and  $\delta$ -normal are independent, and the notions of  $\delta$ - $T_2$  and  $\delta$ -normal are independent too. See examples 3.39 and 3.41.

**3.46 Remark :** If  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is a B.S, then the cases that  $X, \tau$  is normal and  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ -normal are independent. In example 3.38  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ -normal but  $X, \tau$  is not normal since the closed sets  $\{b\}$  and  $\{a, d\}$  are not separated by neighborhoods.

On the other hand, in example 3.39  $X, \tau$  is a normal space where the B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is not  $\delta$ -normal, since the closed sets  $\{b\}$  and  $\{c, d\}$  are not separated by  $\delta$ -neighborhoods.

**3.47 Definition :** A B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is said to be  $\delta$ - $T_4$  if it is  $\delta$ - $T_1$  and  $\delta$ -normal.

**3.48 Theorem:** If  $Y$  is a  $\delta$ -closed subset of a  $\delta$ - $T_4$  B.S  $X, \tau, \Omega$ , then the B.S  $Y, \tau_Y, \Omega_Y$  is  $\delta$ - $T_4$  too.

Proof: Since  $X, \tau, \Omega$  is  $\delta$ - $T_1$ ,  $Y, \tau_Y, \Omega_Y$  is  $\delta$ - $T_1$  (3.24). Since  $Y$  is  $\delta$ -closed, a subset  $F$  of  $Y$  is  $\delta$ -closed in  $Y$  if and only if  $F$  is  $\delta$ -closed in  $X$ . Therefore if  $F$  and  $H$  are disjoint  $\delta$ -closed subsets of  $Y$ , they are also disjoint  $\delta$ -closed subsets of  $X$ . there are thus  $\delta$ -open sets  $U$  and  $V$  such that  $F \subseteq U$ ,  $H \subseteq V$  and  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ . But then  $F \subseteq Y \cap U$ ,  $H \subseteq Y \cap V$  where  $Y \cap U$  and  $Y \cap V$  are disjoint subsets of  $Y$  which are  $\delta$ -open in  $Y$ . Therefore  $Y$  is  $\delta$ -normal, hence  $Y$  is  $\delta$ - $T_4$ .

## References

- Abdul Raaof A.E. (2005). "Pre open set in bitopological spaces" Ms. Thesis, Babylon University .
- Alhosaini, A.M.A. (2007) "Especial case of compactness in bitopological spaces" to appear in Journal of Babylon University.
- Alswidi L.A. and Alhosaini, A. M.A. (2007). "Especial case of connectedness in topological spaces" to appear in Journal of Babylon University.
- Jaleel, I.D. (2003). " $\delta$ -open set in bitopological space" Ms. Thesis, Babylon University .
- Kelly, C.J. (1963). "Bitopological spaces", Proc. London Math. Soc.13 ,11-89.
- Sai G. Sundara Krishnan, "A New class of semi open sets in topological spaces" Topology Atlas Preprint # 535.