

FUNCTIONS AND REGULARITY OF TOPOLOGICAL SPACES

ZBIGNIEW DUSZYŃSKI

Abstract. Preservation of regularity, almost regularity, and s -regularity of topological spaces, is considered.

1. Introduction

It is known that regularity is preserved under continuous closed surjections with compact point inverses (i.e., under perfect functions). In 1978, Noiri [19] proved that if $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is a continuous semi-closed surjection with compact point inverses, and (X, τ) is regular, then (Y, σ) is s -regular. Murdeshwar [15] showed that regularity is preserved under surjections that are open, continuous, and closed. In 1986, Greenwood and Reilly gave a certain generalization of the Murdeshwar's result. In this paper we, in turn, generalize the Greenwood and Reilly's result [7, Proposition 8]. Moreover, we propose a number of further theorems related to preservation of regularity, almost regularity, and s -regularity of spaces, under surjections.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout, (X, τ) (and (Y, σ)) means a topological space (briefly: a space). Let $S \subset X$ be a subset of a space (X, τ) . The **closure** of S and the **interior** of S will be denoted by $\text{cl}_\tau(S)$ and $\text{int}_\tau(S)$ (or simply $\text{cl}(S)$ and $\text{int}(S)$), respectively. The set S is said to be *regular open* (resp. *α -open* [16]; *semi-open* [10]; *preopen* [13]) in (X, τ) , if $S = \text{int}(\text{cl}(S))$ (resp. $S \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(\text{int}(S)))$; $S \subset \text{cl}(\text{int}(S))$; $S \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(S))$). The S is said to be *α -closed* (resp. *semi-closed* [3]) in (X, τ) , if $\text{cl}(\text{int}(\text{cl}(S))) \subset S$ (resp. $\text{int}(\text{cl}(S)) \subset S$). The collection of all regular open (resp. α -open; semi-open; preopen) subsets of (X, τ) is denoted by $\text{RO}(X, \tau)$ (resp. τ^α ; $\text{SO}(X, \tau)$; $\text{PO}(X, \tau)$). It is known that $\tau \subset \tau^\alpha$ (the equality does not hold, in general), and that τ^α forms a topology on X . Obviously, S is semi-closed in (X, τ) iff $X \setminus S$ is semi-open in (X, τ) . Moreover, S is semi-closed in (X, τ) iff $S = \text{scl}_\tau(S)$ [3, Theorem 1.4(2)], where $\text{scl}_\tau(S)$ (the semi-closed of S in (X, τ)) is defined analogously to the ordinary closure. It is known that $\tau^\alpha = \text{SO}(X, \tau) \cap \text{PO}(X, \tau)$ [21, Lemma 2.1].

Received March 23, 2007; revised September 23, 2007.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54C08.

Key words and phrases. Almost regular, s -regular spaces, almost open, α -open, α -closed, semi-closed functions, almost continuity, \mathcal{R} -mapness, α -irresolutness.

A function $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is called **almost open in the sense of Wilansky** (briefly **a.o.W.**) [27, for injections], [20, Definition 1.3], if $f^{-1}(\text{cl}_\sigma(V)) \subset \text{cl}_\tau(f^{-1}(V))$ for every $V \in \sigma$. In 1984, Rose [24, Theorem 11] has proved that f is a.o.W. iff $f(U) \in \text{PO}(Y, \sigma)$ for every $U \in \tau$ (i.e., iff f is preopen [13]). A function $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is called **almost open in the sense of the Singals** (briefly **a.o.S.**) [24], if $f(U) \in \sigma$ for every $U \in \text{RO}(X, \tau)$. A function f is said to be **α -open** [14] (resp. **pre- α -open**; **s -open** [1]), if $f(U) \in \sigma^\alpha$ (resp. $f(U) \in \sigma^\alpha$; $f(U) \in \sigma$) for any set $U \in \tau$ (resp. $U \in \tau^\alpha$; $U \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$). A function f is called **α -closed** [14] (resp. **pre- α -closed** [5]; **semi-closed** [17]; **pre-semi-closed** [26]), if $f(U)$ is an α -closed (resp. an α -closed; a semi-closed; a semi-closed) subset of (Y, σ) for each closed (resp. α -closed; closed; semi-closed) subset U of (X, τ) .

A function $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is **almost continuous in the sense of the Singals** (briefly **a.c.S.**) [24] (resp. an **\mathcal{R} -map** [2]; **α -irresolute** [12]), if the preimage $f^{-1}(V) \in \tau$ [24, Theorem 2.2(b)] (resp. $f^{-1}(V) \in \text{RO}(X, \tau)$; $f^{-1}(V) \in \tau^\alpha$) for every set $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$ (resp. $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$; $V \in \sigma^\alpha$). Every \mathcal{R} -map is a.c.S., but the converse is false in general [22, Example 4.14]. It is known that α -irresoluteness and continuity are independent notions [12, Examples 1 & 2].

A space (X, τ) is called **extremally disconnected** (briefly **e.d.**) if $\text{cl}(S) \in \tau$ for every $S \in \tau$. A space (X, τ) is e.d. iff $\tau^\alpha = \text{SO}(X, \tau)$ [8, Theorem 2.9].

A space (X, τ) is called **almost regular** [25, Theorem 2.2(b)] (resp. **s -regular** [11, Theorem 2(b)]) if for each point $x \in X$ and each set $V \in \text{RO}(X, \tau)$ (resp. $V \in \tau$) containing x , there exists a set $U \in \text{RO}(X, \tau)$ (resp. $U \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$) such that $x \in U \subset \text{cl}(U) \subset V$ (resp. $x \in U \subset \text{scl}(U) \subset V$). Every regular space is almost regular (resp. s -regular) and the converse is not always true [18, Remark 1] (resp. [11, Example 1]). Conditions of almost regularity and s -regularity are independent of each other [11, Examples 1 and 2]. Recall that (X, τ) is called **semi-regular** if for each $x \in X$ and each $V \in \tau$ with $x \in V$, there exists a set $U \in \text{RO}(X, \tau)$ such that $x \in U \subset V$.

3. Almost regular spaces

Theorem 1. [7, Proposition 8]. *If $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is an open, continuous, and α -closed surjection, and (X, τ) is regular, then (Y, σ) is regular.*

It is clear that for any bijection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$, the properties of being α -closed and being α -open are equivalent. Thus, Theorem 1 leads to the well known result: *every homeomorphism preserves the regularity property.*

In order to generalize Theorem 1 we need the following lemma, which is, in turn, a generalization of [7, Lemma 2].

Lemma 1. *Let (X, τ) be a space, $U \in \text{PO}(X, \tau)$ and $U \subset V$. Then $\text{cl}(U) \subset \text{cl}(\text{int}(\text{cl}(V)))$.*

Proof. We have $U \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(U))$, whence as $\text{int}(\text{cl}(U)) \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(V))$ we get $\text{cl}(U) \subset \text{cl}(\text{int}(\text{cl}(V)))$.

Theorem 2. *Let a function $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be an a.o.W., continuous, and α -closed surjection. If (X, τ) is regular, then (Y, σ) is regular.*

Proof. Let $y \in Y$ and $U \in \sigma$, $U \ni y$, be arbitrary, and let $x \in X$ be such that $f(x) = y$. By regularity of (X, τ) there exists a set $G \in \tau$ such that $x \in G \subset \text{cl}_\tau(G) \subset f^{-1}(U)$. Then $y \in f(G) \subset f(\text{cl}_\tau(G)) \subset U$. But, f is a.o.W. and so, by Lemma 1, $f(G) \subset \text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(f(G))) \subset \text{cl}_\sigma(f(G)) \subset \text{cl}_\sigma(\text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(f(\text{cl}_\sigma(G)))))$. Put $V = \text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(f(G))) \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$. We obtain $y \in V \subset \text{cl}_\sigma(V) \subset U$. This shows that (Y, σ) is regular.

Corollary 1. *Let a bijection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be α -open and continuous. If (X, τ) is regular, then so is (Y, σ) .*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 2. Just use the fact that each α -open mapping is a.o.W.

An analysis of the proof of Theorem 2 leads to Theorems 3 and 4 below. The details are left to the reader.

Theorem 3. *Let $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be an a.o.W., a.c.S., and α -closed surjection. If (X, τ) is regular, then (Y, σ) is almost regular.*

Corollary 2. *Let a bijection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be α -open and a.c.S. If (X, τ) is regular, then (Y, σ) is almost regular.*

Theorem 4. *Let a surjection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be an a.o.S. and α -closed \mathcal{R} -map. If (X, τ) is almost regular, then (Y, σ) is almost regular.*

Corollary 3. *Assume a bijection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is an open \mathcal{R} -map. If (X, τ) is almost regular, then (Y, σ) is almost regular.*

Noiri has stated [20, Examples 1.6 & 1.7] that a.o.W. and a.o.S. are independent notions. The following examples show that these notions remain independent if considered within the class of bijective mappings.

Example 1. (a). Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X\}$. The identity $\text{id} : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ is a.o.W. and not a.o.S.

(b). Let $X = \{a, b\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X, \{b\}\}$. Then: $\text{id} : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ and id^{-1} are a.o.S., but not a.o.W.

Now, we provide an example of bijection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ which is continuous (and so a.c.S.), but is not an \mathcal{R} -map (compare this example to [22, Example 4.14] for the non-bijective case).

Example 2. Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{b\}, \{c\}, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$. Let $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ be defined as follows: $f(a) = c$, $f(b) = a$, $f(c) = b$. Then f is not an \mathcal{R} -map since $f^{-1}(\{a\}) \notin \text{RO}(X, \tau)$.

\mathcal{R} -mapness and continuity are independent notions, even in the class of bijections. Because of Example 2, it is enough to indicate an \mathcal{R} -map which is not continuous.

Example 3. Let $X = \{a, b\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}\}$. The identity $\text{id} : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ is an \mathcal{R} -map which is not continuous.

Remark 1. An a.c.S. function (even a bijection) need not be continuous (compare the following example to [24, Example 2.2]) nor an \mathcal{R} -map. Let $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X, \{b\}, \{c\}, \{b, c\}, \{b, c, d\}\}$, and let $f(a) = c$, $f(b) = b$, $f(c) = a$, $f(d) = d$.

Theorem 5. *Let (X, τ) be a space. If (X, τ^α) is regular, then (X, τ) is regular.*

Proof. Assume (X, τ^α) is regular. Suppose $x \in X$ and $U \in \tau$ such that $x \in U$, are arbitrary. By the hypothesis, there is a set $V \in \tau^\alpha$ such that $x \in V \subset \text{cl}_{\tau^\alpha}(V) \subset U$. But, $\text{cl}_{\tau^\alpha}(V) = \text{cl}_\tau(V)$ [6, Lemma 1(i)] and as $V \in \text{PO}(X, \tau)$ we get $x \in V \subset \text{int}_\tau(\text{cl}_\tau(V)) \subset \text{cl}_\tau(\text{int}_\tau(\text{cl}_\tau(V))) \subset \text{cl}_\tau(V)$. This shows (X, τ) is regular.

The converse to Theorem 5 may not be true as the following example shows.

Example 4. Consider the real line \mathbb{R} endowed with the Euclidean topology τ_e . The space $(\mathbb{R}, \tau_e^\alpha)$ is not regular: take into account $x = 0$ and its α -neighbourhood $V = [-1, 1] \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{-\frac{1}{i}, \frac{1}{i}\}$.

Lemma 2. [9, Corollary 2.4(a)]. $\text{RO}(X, \tau) = \text{RO}(X, \tau^\alpha)$ for each space (X, τ) .

Theorem 6. *A space (X, τ) is almost regular if and only if (X, τ^α) is almost regular.*

Proof. Clear by Lemma 2 and the fact that $\text{cl}_\tau(S) = \text{cl}_{\tau^\alpha}(S)$ for each $S \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$ [6, Lemma 1(i)].

Definition 1. A function $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is α -**a.o.W.** if $f(U) \in \text{PO}(Y, \sigma)$ for every $U \in \tau^\alpha$.

Obviously, each α -a.o.W. function is a.o.W. The converse implication does not hold.

Example 5. Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$. The identity $\text{id} : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ is open (and hence a.o.W.), but it is not α -a.o.W. because $\text{id}(\{a, c\}) \notin \text{PO}(X, \sigma)$.

Lemma 3. *Let (X, τ) be a space. Then,*

- ① [9, Corollary 2.5(a)]. $\text{PO}(X, \tau) = \text{PO}(X, \tau^\alpha)$;
- ② [16, Proposition 10]. $\tau^\alpha = (\tau^\alpha)^\alpha$.

Theorem 7. *Let a surjection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be α -a.o.W. α -irresolute, pre- α -closed. If (X, τ^α) is regular then (Y, σ^α) is regular.*

Proof. By Lemma 3, the surjection $f_* : (X, \tau^\alpha) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma^\alpha)$, where $f_*(x) = f(x)$ for each $x \in X$ (see [9, page 86, line 11]), is also a.o.W., continuous, and α -closed. Thus by Theorem 2 we get (Y, σ^α) is regular.

Since every bijection is pre- α -closed if and only if it is pre- α -open, one obtains the well known result for homeomorphisms: $(X, \tau^\alpha) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma^\alpha)$ (the one stated right under Theorem 1).

Recall that a function $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is a semi-homeomorphism [4] if it is bijective, pre-semi-open ($f(U) \in \text{SO}(Y, \sigma)$ for every $U \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$), and irresolute ($f^{-1}(V) \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$ for every $V \in \text{SO}(Y, \sigma)$). The following result is known: *a function $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is a semi-homeomorphism if and only if $f_* : (X, \tau^\alpha) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma^\alpha)$ is a semi-homeomorphism* [6, Theorem 1].

Corollary 4. *Let a function $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be a semi-homeomorphism. If (X, τ^α) is regular, then (Y, σ^α) is also regular.*

This corollary is interesting in regard for Theorem 5 and Example 4 above, and the fact that the image of a regular space under a semi-homeomorphism is not necessarily regular [4, Example 1.5]. Moreover, by Corollary 4 and Theorem 5, [4, Example 1.5] is another illustration that regularity of (X, τ) need not imply regularity of (X, τ^α) .

The next theorem is a simple consequence of Theorems 3, 5, and 6.

Theorem 8. *Let $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be an a.o.W., a.c.S., and α -closed surjection. If (X, τ^α) is regular, then (Y, σ^α) is almost regular.*

Corollary 5. *Let a bijection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be α -open and a.c.S. If (X, τ^α) is regular, then (Y, σ^α) is almost regular.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 8.

In the class of bijective mappings, α -irresoluteness and continuity are independent of each other [12, Examples 1 & 2].

Example 6. (a). Let $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}\}$. The identity $\text{id} : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ is continuous (hence a.c.S.) and not α -irresolute, since $\text{id}^{-1}(\{a, b\}) \notin \tau^\alpha$.

(b). Let $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$, $\sigma = \tau^\alpha = \tau \cup \{\{a, b, c\}\}$. Then $\text{id} : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ is discontinuous but α -irresolute.

Problem 1. *Find an α -irresolute bijection (or just a surjection) which is not a.c.S.*

Theorem 9. *Let $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be a surjective α -closed and a.o.S. \mathcal{R} -map. If (X, τ^α) is regular, then (Y, σ^α) is almost regular.*

Proof. We apply Theorems 5, 4, and 6, respectively.

Corollary 6. *Let a bijection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be an open \mathcal{R} -map. If (X, τ^α) is regular then (Y, σ^α) is almost regular.*

Comparing Theorems 7 and 9 it is worthy of notice that α -a.o.W. and a.o.S. are independent notions, even within the class of bijections.

Example 7. (a). Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X\}$. Then, $\text{id} : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ is α -a.o.W. and not a.o.S., because for $S = \{a\}$ (or $S = \{b\}$), $\text{id}(S) \notin \sigma$.

(b). Let $X = \{a, b\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X, \{b\}\}$. The identity $\text{id} : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ is a.o.S. and not α -a.o.W.

In order to see that α -irresoluteness and \mathcal{R} -mapness are independent of each other, it is enough to apply Examples 2 and 3.

4. s -regular spaces

It is well-known that regularity implies semi-regularity. Examples of spaces which are semi-regular and not regular are also known [25, Remark 3.2] and [11, Example 1].

Theorem 10. *If a space (X, τ) is semi-regular, then it is s -regular.*

Proof. We shall use [9, Proposition 2.7(a)]: $\text{scl}(S) = \text{int}(\text{cl}(S))$ for any $S \in \text{PO}(X, \tau)$. Let $x \in X$ and $U \in \tau$ be such that $x \in U$. By hypothesis there exists a set $V \in \text{RO}(X, \tau)$ with $x \in V \subset U$. So, $x \in \text{int}(\text{cl}(V)) = \text{scl}(V) \subset U$.

Problem 2. One does not know an example of s -regular space that fails to be semi-regular.

Theorem 11. *Let an (X, τ) be e.d. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) (X, τ) is regular,
- (b) (X, τ) is semi-regular,
- (c) (X, τ) is s -regular.

Proof. Since the implication (b) \Rightarrow (a) is clear by the definition of e.d. space, only (c) \Rightarrow (b) requires a proof. Let $x \in X$ and $U \in \tau$ be such that $x \in U$. By hypothesis, there exists a set $G \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$ with $x \in G \subset \text{scl}(G) \subset U$. Since $\text{int}(\text{cl}(S)) \subset \text{scl}(S)$ for any $S \subset X$ [21, Lemma 4.14] and $\text{SO}(X, \tau) \subset \text{PO}(X, \tau)$ [9, Proposition 4.1], one obtains $x \in V \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(V)) \subset U$ for $V = \text{int}(\text{cl}(G))$. Therefore (X, τ) is semi-regular.

Notice that s -regularity and e.d. are independent one of the other [11, Examples 1 and 2]. Recall also, that there is an almost regular and e.d. space which is not s -regular [11, Example 2], and a semi-regular not e.d. space which is almost regular [11, Example 1].

Theorem 12. *Let a surjection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be α -a.o.W., continuous, and semi-closed. If (X, τ) is s -regular and e.d., then (Y, σ) is semi-regular.*

Proof. Let $y \in Y$ and $U \in \sigma$ with $y \in U$. Let for an $x \in X$, $y = f(x)$. By s -regularity of (X, τ) we have $x \in V \subset \text{scl}_\tau(V) \subset f^{-1}(U)$ for a certain $V \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$. Hence $y \in f(V) \subset f(\text{scl}_\tau(V)) \subset U$. But (X, τ) is e.d., so by [8, Theorem 2.9], $\text{scl}_\tau(V) = \text{cl}_{\tau^\alpha}(V)$. On the other hand $\text{cl}_{\tau^\alpha}(V) = \text{cl}_\tau(V)$ [6, Lemma 1(i)]. As f is semi-closed, $\text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(f(V))) \subset \text{scl}_\sigma(f(\text{int}_\tau(\text{cl}_\tau(\text{int}_\tau(V)))) \subset f(\text{cl}_\tau(V))$; [21, Lemma 4.14] and [8, Theorem 2.9]. Put $G = \text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(f(V)))$. Thus $y \in G \subset \text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(G)) \subset U$, because f is α -a.o.W. This completes the proof.

Definition 2. A mapping $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is s -a.o.W. if $f(U) \in \text{PO}(Y, \sigma)$ for every $U \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$.

Obviously, each s -a.o.W. mapping is α -a.o.W. The converse is false, even for bijections.

Example 8. Let $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$, $\tau = \sigma \cup \{\{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$. Then, $\text{id} : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ is α -a.o.W. and not s -a.o.W., because $\text{id}(\{a, d\}) \notin \text{PO}(X, \sigma)$.

We notice that α -a.o.W. with openness and s -a.o.W. with openness, are couples of independent notions; see the examples below.

Example 9. (a). Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X\}$. The identity from (X, τ) to (X, σ) is s -a.o.W., but it is not open.

(b). Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$. The identity from (X, τ) to (X, σ) is open and not α -a.o.W., since $\text{id}(\{a, c\}) \notin \text{PO}(X, \sigma)$.

Theorem 13. *Let a surjection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be s -a.o.W., continuous, and pre-semi-closed. If (X, τ) is s -regular, then (Y, σ) is semi-regular.*

Proof. Let $y \in Y$ and $U \in \sigma$ with $y \in U$, and let $x \in X$ be such that $f(x) = y$. As (X, τ) is s -regular, there exists a set $V \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$ such that $x \in V \subset \text{scl}_\tau(V) \subset f^{-1}(U)$. So, $y \in f(V) \subset f(\text{scl}_\tau(V)) \subset U$. From pre-semi-closedness of f and from [21, Lemma 4.14] it follows that

$$\text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(f(\text{int}_\tau(\text{cl}_\tau(V)))) \subset \text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(f(\text{scl}_\tau(V)))) \subset f(\text{scl}_\tau(V)).$$

Continuity of f implies $f(\text{cl}_\tau(\text{int}_\tau(\text{cl}_\tau(V)))) \subset \text{cl}_\sigma(f(\text{int}_\tau(\text{cl}_\tau(V))))$. But, f is s -a.o.W. and thus

$$f(V) \subset \text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(f(V))) \subset \text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(f(\text{cl}_\tau(\text{int}_\tau(\text{cl}_\tau(V)))) \subset \text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(f(\text{scl}_\tau(V)))).$$

Put $G = \text{int}_\sigma(\text{cl}_\sigma(f(\text{scl}_\tau(V))))$. This shows (Y, σ) is semi-regular.

Definition 3. A function $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is α -open if $f(U) \in \sigma^\alpha$ for every $U \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$.

Corollary 7. *Let a bijection $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be continuous and α -open. If (X, τ) is s -regular, then (Y, σ) is semi-regular.*

Proof. By Theorem 13 and [21, Lemma 3.1].

Each s -open mapping is α -open, but the reverse implications does not hold in general, even for bijections.

Example 10. Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{a, c\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}\}$. The identity from (X, τ) to (X, σ) is α -open and not s -open (consider $\{a, b\} \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$, for instance).

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to referee for his/her helpful suggestions and comments.

References

- [1] D. E. Cameron and G. Woods, *s-continuous and s-open mappings*, preprint.
- [2] D. A. Carnahan, Some properties related to compactness in topological spaces, Ph.D. thesis, University of Arkansas, 1973.
- [3] C. G. Crossley and S. K. Hildebrand, *Semi-closure*, Texas J. Sci. **22**(1971), 99-112.
- [4] C. G. Crossley and S. K. Hildebrand, *Semi-topological properties*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **74**(1972), 233-254.

- [5] Z. Duszyński, *Some remarks on almost α -continuous functions*, Kyungpook Math. J. **44**(2004), 249–260.
- [6] G. L. Garg and D. Sivaraj, *Semitopological properties*, Mat. Vesnik **36**(1984), 137–142.
- [7] S. Greenwood and I. L. Reilly, *On feebly closed mappings*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. **17**(1986), 1101–1105.
- [8] D. S. Janković, *On locally irreducible spaces*, Ann. Soc. Sci. Bruxelles **97**(1983), 59–72.
- [9] D. S. Janković, *A note on mappings of extremally disconnected spaces*, Acta Math. Hungar. **46**(1985), 83–92.
- [10] N. Levine, *Semi-open sets and semi-continuity in topological spaces*, Amer. Math. Monthly **70**(1963), 36–41.
- [11] S. N. Maheshwari and R. Prasad, *On s -regular spaces*, Glasnik Mat. **10**(1975), 347–350.
- [12] S. N. Maheshwari and S. S. Thakur, *On α -irresolute mappings*, Tamkang J. Math. **11**(1980), 205–214.
- [13] A. S. Mashhour, M. E. Abd El-Monsef and S. N. El-Deeb, *On precontinuous and weak precontinuous mappings*, Proc. Math. and Phys. Soc, Egypt **53**(1982), 47–53.
- [14] A. S. Mashhour, I. A. Hasanein and S. N. El-Deeb, *α -continuous and α -open mappings*, Acta Math. Hungar. **41**(1983), 213–218.
- [15] M. G. Murdeshwar, *General Topology*, Halstead Press, New York, 1983.
- [16] O. Njåstad, *On some classes of nearly open sets*, Pacific J. Math. **15**(1965), 961–970.
- [17] T. Noiri, *A generalization of closed mappings*, Lincei-Rend. Sc. Fis. Mat. e Nat. **54**(1971), 412–415.
- [18] T. Noiri, *A note on semi-regularizations*, Glasnik Mat. **10**(30)(1975), 141–143.
- [19] T. Noiri, *A note on s -regular spaces*, Glasnik Mat. **13**(33)(1978), 107–110.
- [20] T. Noiri, *Semi-continuity and weak-continuity*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal **31**(106)(1981), 314–321.
- [21] T. Noiri, *On α -continuous functions*, Čas. pěst. mat. **109**(1984), 118–126.
- [22] T. Noiri, *Super-continuity and some strong forms of continuity*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. **15**(1984), 241–250.
- [23] D. A. Rose, *Weak continuity and almost continuity*, Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci. **7**(1984), 311–318.
- [24] M. K. Singal and Asha Rani Singal, *Almost-continuous mappings*, Yokohama Math. J. **16**(1968), 63–73.
- [25] M. K. Singal and Shashi Prabha Arya, *On almost-regular spaces*, Glasnik Mat. **4**(24)(1969), 89–99.
- [26] D. Sivaraj, *Semihomomorphisms*, Acta Math. Hungar. **48**(1986), 139–145.
- [27] A. Wilansky, *Topics in Functional Analysis*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **45**, Springer-Verlag, 1967.

Institute of Mathematics, Casimirus the Great University, Pl. Weysenhoffa 11, 85-072, Bydgoszcz, Poland.

E-mail: imath@ukw.edu.pl