# The $\theta$ -topology - some basic questions \*

A. Foroutan, M. Ganster and M. Steiner

#### Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to raise some very fundamental questions about the  $\theta$ -topology which we encountered during our research. We acknowledge the possibility that some of our questions may have already been answered somewhere in the literature. Nevertheless we consider it to be quite useful to pose these basic questions (maybe again) as they appear in one form or another fairly often. We strongly hope that current researchers will come up with new and interesting answers.

#### **1** Introduction and Preliminaries

Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space. We shall denote the closure and the interior of a subset  $A \subseteq X$  by  $cl^{\tau}(A)$  and  $int^{\tau}(A)$ , respectively, or simply by cl(A) and int(A) if there is no danger of confusion.  $CO(X, \tau)$  denotes the family of all subsets of  $(X, \tau)$  that are both open and closed in  $(X, \tau)$ . If  $A \subseteq X$  then |A| denotes the cardinality of A, and  $\tau|_A$  will denote the subspace topology on A. For each  $x \in X$ , the families of all neighbourhoods (resp. all open neigbourhoods, all closed neighbourhoods) of x will be denoted by  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{U}^o(x)$ ,  $\mathcal{U}^c(x)$ ). A space  $(X, \tau)$  will be called regular if for each closed set  $A \subseteq X$  and each point  $x \notin A$  there exist open sets U and V such that  $A \subseteq U, x \in V$  and  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ .

The definition of the  $\theta$ -topology has its origin in the famous paper of Veličko [8] on *H*-closed topological spaces. Recall that a space  $(X, \tau)$  is called *H*-closed if every open cover of  $(X, \tau)$ has a finite subfamily whose closures cover X. Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and let

<sup>\*2000</sup> Math. Subject Classification — Primary: ABCD, Secondary: CDEF. Key words and phrases — topology.

 $A \subseteq X$ . A point  $x \in X$  is called a  $\theta$ -contact point [8] (resp. a  $\delta$ -contact point [8]) of A if  $A \cap \operatorname{cl}(U) \neq \emptyset$  (resp.  $A \cap \operatorname{int}(\operatorname{cl}(A)) \neq \emptyset$ ) for every open set U containing x. The set of all  $\theta$ -contact points (resp.  $\delta$ -contact points) of  $A \subseteq X$  is called the  $\theta$ -closure [8] (resp.  $\delta$ -closure [8]) of A and denoted by  $\operatorname{cl}_{\theta}(A)$  (resp.  $\operatorname{cl}_{\delta}(A)$ ). The set  $A \subseteq X$  is said to be  $\theta$ -closed [8] (resp.  $\delta$ -closed [8]) if  $\operatorname{cl}_{\theta}(A) = A$  (resp.  $\operatorname{cl}_{\delta}(A) = A$ ). Complements of  $\theta$ -closed sets (resp.  $\delta$ -closed sets) are called  $\theta$ -open (resp.  $\delta$ -open). It has been pointed out in [8] that  $\operatorname{cl}(A) \subseteq \operatorname{cl}_{\theta}(A)$  and that  $\operatorname{cl}_{\theta}(A) \subseteq \operatorname{cl}_{\theta}(B)$  for any subsets  $A \subseteq B \subseteq X$ . Moreover, the families of all  $\theta$ -open sets (resp.  $\delta$ -open sets) are topologies on X, called the  $\theta$ -topology (resp.  $\delta$ -topology) and denoted by  $\tau_{\theta}$  (resp.  $\tau_{\delta}$ ). It follows straightforward from the definitions that we have  $\tau_{\theta} \subseteq \tau_{\delta} \subseteq \tau$  and that  $\tau_{\theta} = \tau$  if and only if  $(X, \tau)$  is regular. Observe also that a subset  $U \subseteq X$  is  $\theta$ -open (resp.  $\delta$ -open) if for each  $x \in U$  there exists  $V \in \tau$  such that  $x \in V \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(V) \subseteq U$  (resp.  $x \in V \subseteq \operatorname{int}(\operatorname{cl}(V)) \subseteq U$ ). The space  $(X, \tau_{\delta})$ , having the regular open subsets of  $(X, \tau)$  as a base, is frequently also called the semi-regularization of  $(X, \tau)$ .

**Definition 1** A topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is called

(i) semi-regular, if  $\tau_{\delta} = \tau$ ,

(ii) almost regular [6], if for each regular closed set  $F \subseteq X$  and each point  $x \notin F$  there exist disjoint open sets containing F and x respectively,

(iii) locally indiscrete, if every open subset of  $(X, \tau)$  is closed.

#### 2 Very basic questions

The most immediate question that comes to mind is the question concerning the existence of non-trivial  $\theta$ -open sets in a topological space, i.e. we want to know when the  $\theta$ -topology fails to be indiscrete. While we have not been able to resolve this question in a fully satisfactory way, we do have some interesting results.

**Definition 2** A topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is said to have the (P)-property if for each collection  $(O_i)_{i \in I}$  of open subsets satisfying  $\bigcup_{i \in I} O_i \notin \{\emptyset, X\}$  we have that  $\bigcup_{i \in I} O_i \neq \bigcup_{i \in I} \operatorname{cl}(O_i)$ .

**Proposition 2.1** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space. Then  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is indiscrete if and only if  $(X, \tau)$  has the (P)-property.

**Proof.** Suppose that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is indiscrete and that  $(X, \tau)$  does not have the (P)-property. Then there is a collection  $(O_i)_{i \in I}$  of  $\tau$ -open sets with  $\bigcup_{i \in I} O_i \notin \{\emptyset, X\}$  and  $\bigcup_{i \in I} O_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} \operatorname{cl}(O_i)$ . Let  $V = \bigcup_{i \in I} O_i$ . If  $x \in V$  then there is some  $i \in I$  such that  $x \in O_i$ . By assumption we clearly have  $x \in O_i \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(O_i) \subseteq V$  and so  $V \in \tau_{\theta}$ , a contradiction.

To show the converse, suppose that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is not indiscrete. Then there exists  $V \in \tau_{\theta}$  with  $V \notin \{\emptyset, X\}$ . For each  $x \in V$  there exists some  $\tau$ -open set  $O_x$  such that  $\operatorname{cl}(O_x) \subseteq V$ . Clearly we have that  $V = \bigcup_{x \in V} O_x = \bigcup_{x \in V} \operatorname{cl}(O_x)$  and so  $(X, \tau)$  does not have the (P)-property.

**Proposition 2.2** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space. Suppose there is some  $x \in X$  such that  $\mathcal{U}^c(x) \setminus \{X\}$  is a base for  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ . Then  $(X, \tau_\theta)$  is not indiscrete.

**Proof.** We write the (nonempty) family  $\mathcal{U}^c(x) \setminus \{X\}$  in the form  $(W_i)_{i \in I}$  and claim that  $\bigcap_{i \in I} W_i = \bigcap_{i \in I} \operatorname{int}(W_i)$ . Suppose that  $y \in \bigcap_{i \in I} W_i$  and there exists  $j \in I$  such that  $y \notin \operatorname{int}(W_j)$ . Since  $\operatorname{int}(W_j)$  is an open neighbourhood of x, there exists  $k \in I$  such that  $W_k \subseteq \operatorname{int}(W_j)$  and so  $y \notin W_k$ , a contradiction. Thus our claim is proved. Now let  $O_i = X \setminus W_i$  for each  $i \in I$ . Then  $(O_i)_{i \in I}$  is a collection of  $\tau$ -open sets satisfying  $\bigcup_{i \in I} O_i \notin \{\emptyset, X\}$  and  $\bigcup_{i \in I} O_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} \operatorname{cl}(O_i)$ . Hence  $(X, \tau)$  does not have the (P)-property. By Proposition 2.1,  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  fails to be indisrete.

**Proposition 2.3** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space with |X| > 1. Then  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is indiscrete if and only if for each subset  $T \subseteq X$  with  $T \neq X$  there exists some  $x \notin T$  such that T and  $\{x\}$  cannot be separated by open sets.

**Proof.** Suppose that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is indiscrete. Let  $T \subseteq X$  with  $T \notin \{\emptyset, X\}$ . Hence, if  $O = X \setminus T$  then  $O \notin \tau_{\theta}$  and so there exists  $x \in O$  such that for no  $\tau$ -open set V we have that  $x \in V \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(V) \subseteq O$ . But this means that T and  $\{x\}$  cannot be separated by open sets. To show the converse, suppose that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is not indiscrete. Then there exists a subset  $O \in \tau_{\theta}$  with  $O \notin \{\emptyset, X\}$ . Let  $T = X \setminus O$ . If  $x \in O$ , i.e. if  $x \notin T$ , there is a  $\tau$ -open set V

such that  $x \in V \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(V) \subseteq O$ . Clearly  $x \in V$  and  $T \subseteq X \setminus \operatorname{cl}(V)$ , and so T and  $\{x\}$  can be separated by open sets.

Recall that a space  $(X, \tau)$  is said to be hyperconnected if every open subset is dense. It is very well known that  $(X, \tau)$  is hyperconnected if and only if  $(X, \tau_{\delta})$  is indiscrete. We shall say that a point  $p \in X$  is a point of hyperconnectedness if every (open) neighbourhood of pis dense.

**Proposition 2.4** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space such that  $p \in X$  is a point of hyperconnectedness. Then  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is indiscrete.

**Proof.** Let  $W \in \tau_{\theta}$  be nonempty and let  $x \in W$ . Hence there is a  $\tau$ -open set  $U_x$  such that  $x \in U_x \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(U_x) \subseteq W$ . Since every neighbourhood of p is dense it follows that  $p \in \operatorname{cl}(U_x)$  and so  $p \in W$ . So there has to be a  $\tau$ -open set  $V_p$  such that  $p \in V_p \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(V_p) \subseteq W$ . Consequently, W = X.

**Remark 2.5** Consider the space  $(X, \tau)$  from Example 2.5 in [1]. Proposition 2.4 immediately shows that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  has to be indiscrete while it is easily established that  $(X, \tau_{\delta})$  fails to be indiscrete. Hence the fact that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is indiscrete does not imply that  $(X, \tau_{\delta})$  must be indiscrete.

**Question 1** What are some other necessary and sufficient conditions on a space  $(X, \tau)$  such that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  has to be indiscrete?

We shall next consider the relationships between  $\tau$ ,  $\tau_{\delta}$  and  $\tau_{\theta}$ . It is clear that  $CO(X, \tau_{\theta}) = CO(X, \tau) \subseteq \tau_{\theta} \subseteq \tau_{\delta} \subseteq \tau$ . Furthermore,  $\tau_{\delta} = \tau$  if and only if  $(X, \tau)$  is semi-regular,  $\tau_{\theta} = \tau_{\delta}$  if and only if  $(X, \tau)$  is almost regular (see [2] and [4]),  $\tau_{\theta} = \tau$  if and only if  $(X, \tau)$  is regular, and  $CO(X, \tau) = \tau$  if and only if  $(X, \tau)$  is locally indiscrete. We also observe that  $CO(X, \tau) = \tau_{\theta}$  if and only if  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is locally indiscrete. This leads to the question which property the space  $(X, \tau)$  has to satisfy to make  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  locally indiscrete.

**Definition 3** A topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is said to have the (P1)-property if for each collection  $(O_i)_{i \in I}$  of open subsets satisfying  $\bigcup_{i \in I} O_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} \operatorname{cl}(O_i)$  we have that  $\bigcup_{i \in I} O_i$  is closed.

**Proposition 2.6** For a space  $(X, \tau)$  the following are equivalent:

- (1)  $CO(X,\tau) = \tau_{\theta}$ ,
- (2)  $(X, \tau)$  has the (P1)-property.

**Proof.** (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) : Suppose that  $(X, \tau)$  does not have the (P1)-property. Then there is a collection  $(O_i)_{i\in I}$  of  $\tau$ -open subsets with  $\bigcup_{i\in I} O_i = \bigcup_{i\in I} \operatorname{cl}(O_i)$  such that  $\bigcup_{i\in I} O_i$  is not closed. If  $V = \bigcup_{i\in I} O_i$  then clearly  $V \in \tau_{\theta}$ , and so, by assumption, V has to be  $\tau$ -closed, a contradiction.

 $(2) \Rightarrow (1)$ : We have to show that  $\tau_{\theta} \subseteq CO(X, \tau)$ . Let  $V \in \tau_{\theta}$  and for each  $x \in V$  let  $U_x$  be a  $\tau$ -open set with  $x \in U_x \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(U_x) \subseteq V$ . We clearly have that  $V = \bigcup_{x \in V} U_x = \bigcup_{x \in V} \operatorname{cl}(U_x)$ and so, by assumption, V has to be also  $\tau$ -closed.

Now let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space,  $W \in \tau_{\theta}$  and  $y \in cl^{\tau}(W)$ . Suppose that V is a finite  $\tau$ -open neighbourhood of y and that  $y \notin W$ . Then  $V \cap W$  is nonempty and finite. For each  $x \in V \cap W$  there is a  $\tau$ -open set  $U_x$  such that  $x \in U_x \subseteq cl(U_x) \subseteq W$ , and, since  $y \notin cl(U_x)$ , there is a  $\tau$ -open set  $V_x$  such that  $y \in V_x$  and  $V_x \cap U_x = \emptyset$ . Clearly,  $V \cap \bigcap_{x \in V \cap W} V_x$  is a  $\tau$ -open neighbourhood of y having empty intersection with W, a contradiction. Hence  $y \in W$ . As a consequence we have

**Proposition 2.7** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and suppose that each  $x \in X$  has a finite neighbourhood. Then  $CO(X, \tau) = \tau_{\theta}$ .

It is very well known that for every topological space  $(X, \tau)$  we have  $(\tau_{\delta})_{\delta} = \tau_{\delta}$ . What can be said about the corresponding relation  $(\tau_{\theta})_{\theta} = \tau_{\theta}$ ? Clearly,  $(\tau_{\theta})_{\theta} = \tau_{\theta}$  if and only if  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$ is regular. Recall that a space  $(X, \tau)$  is said to be Urysohn if for each pair  $x, y \in X$  with  $x \neq y$  there exist open sets U and V such that  $x \in U, y \in V$  and  $\operatorname{cl}(U) \cap \operatorname{cl}(V) = \emptyset$ .

**Proposition 2.8** For a topological space  $(X, \tau)$ , in general  $(\tau_{\theta})_{\theta} \neq \tau_{\theta}$  holds.

**Proof.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a space that is Hausdorff but not Urysohn (see e.g. [7]). Observe that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is  $T_1$ , i.e. singletons are  $\tau_{\theta}$ -closed, since  $(X, \tau)$  is Hausdorff. Suppose that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is regular and let  $x, y \in X$  with  $x \neq y$ . Hence there exist  $V_x, V_y \in \tau_{\theta}$  such that  $x \in V_x, y \in V_y$  and  $V_x \cap V_y = \emptyset$ . Consequently there exist  $\tau$ -open sets  $O_x$  and  $O_y$  with  $x \in O_x \subseteq cl(O_x) \subseteq V_x$  and  $y \in O_y \subseteq cl(O_y) \subseteq V_y$  and so  $cl(O_x) \cap cl(O_y) = \emptyset$ . But this shows that  $(X, \tau)$  is Urysohn, a contradiction. Observe also, that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  fails to be regular.

**Question 2** Characterize in additional ways the spaces  $(X, \tau)$  such that  $(\tau_{\theta})_{\theta} = \tau_{\theta}$ .

**Remark 2.9** The referee pointed out that  $(\tau_{\theta})_{\theta} = \tau_{\theta}$  whenever  $(X, \tau)$  is almost regular. To see this, let  $(X, \tau)$  be almost regular. Then  $\tau_{\theta} = \tau_{\delta}$  (see [2] and [4]) and  $(X, \tau_{\delta})$  is regular. Consequently,  $(\tau_{\theta})_{\theta} = (\tau_{\delta})_{\theta} = \tau_{\delta} = \tau_{\theta}$ .

### 3 On identifying and constructing $\theta$ -open sets

In general it seems to be fairly difficult to describe the family of  $\theta$ -open sets of a given space  $(X, \tau)$ . Moreover, effective ways to construct  $\theta$ -open subsets in a (non-regular) space seem to be rare. By utilizing the concept of a simple extension of a space  $(X, \tau)$  (due to N. Levine [3]) there is at least one non-trivial way to work with the  $\theta$ -topology. Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and let  $D \subseteq X$  be a non-open subset. The simple extension of  $\tau$  by D is the (strictly) finer topology  $\sigma$  defined by  $\sigma = \{O \cup (U \cap D) : O, U \in \tau\}$ . Levine [3] pointed out that  $\mathrm{cl}^{\sigma}(A) = \mathrm{cl}^{\tau}(A) \cap ((X \setminus D) \cup (D \cap \mathrm{cl}^{\tau}(A \cap D)))$  and  $\mathrm{cl}^{\sigma}(A \cap D) = \mathrm{cl}^{\tau}(A \cap D)$  for any subset  $A \subseteq X$ . Moreover, if D is dense in  $(X, \tau)$  then  $(X, \sigma)$  fails to be regular. The following observation is probably well known and easily proved.

**Lemma 3.1** Let  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$  be topologies on X with  $\tau \subseteq \sigma$ . Then  $\tau_{\theta} \subseteq \sigma_{\theta}$ .

**Proposition 3.2** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be regular and let  $D \subseteq X$  be non-open and dense. If  $\sigma$  denotes the simple extension of  $\tau$  by D then  $\tau = \sigma_{\theta}$ .

**Proof.** Since  $(X, \tau)$  is regular we have  $\tau_{\theta} = \tau \subseteq \sigma$  and by Lemma 3.1 we conclude that  $\tau \subseteq \sigma_{\theta}$ .

Now let  $U \in \sigma_{\theta}$  and let  $x \in U$ . Then there exists  $V \in \sigma$  such that  $x \in V \subseteq cl^{\sigma}(V) \subseteq U$ . Let  $O, O^* \in \tau$  such that  $V = O \cup (O^* \cap D)$ . Since D is dense in  $(X, \tau)$ , it is easily checked that  $cl^{\tau}(V \cap D) = cl^{\tau}(V) = cl^{\tau}(O \cup O^*)$  and thus  $cl^{\tau}(V) = cl^{\sigma}(V)$ . Hence, if  $W = O \cup O^*$ , then  $W \in \tau$ ,  $x \in W$  and  $cl^{\tau}(W) \subseteq U$ , proving that  $U \in \tau$ .

**Example 3.3** Let  $X = [0,1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be the unit interval equipped with the usual topology denoted by  $\tau$ . Let D be a non-open dense subset of  $(X, \tau)$  and let  $\sigma$  be the simple extension of  $\tau$  by D. Then  $(X, \sigma)$  is a non-regular Hausdorff space which, of course, cannot be compact. However,  $(X, \sigma_{\theta})$  obviously is a compact Hausdorff space (and thus normal), since  $\sigma_{\theta} = \tau$ .

#### 4 Some topological properties

There are, of course, numerous topological properties that are worth to be discussed with respect to the  $\theta$ -topology. We have picked out a few of them along with some interesting questions.

**Proposition 4.1** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space. Then  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is connected if and only if  $(X, \tau)$  is connected.

**Proof.** Follows from the fact that  $CO(X, \tau_{\theta}) = CO(X, \tau)$ .

Concerning separation axioms we first observe the following result whose proof is elementary.

**Proposition 4.2** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space. Then  $(X, \tau)$  is Hausdorff if and only if  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is  $T_1$  if and only if  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is  $T_0$ .

**Example 4.3** Consider the space  $(X, \tau)$  of Example 75 in [7], i.e. the irrational slope topology. Then  $(X, \tau)$  and thus  $(X, \tau_{\delta})$  are Hausdorff while  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is  $T_1$  by Proposition 4.2. Since any two nonempty regular closed sets have nonempty intersection,  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  cannot be Hausdorff.

Clearly, if  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is Hausdorff, then  $(X, \tau)$  has to be Urysohn. Therefore, the following two natural questions arise.

**Question 3** Is there an Urysohn space  $(X, \tau)$  such that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  fails to be Hausdorff?

Question 4 Find necessary and sufficient conditions on a space  $(X, \tau)$  such that  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  is Hausdorff.

Concerning subspaces we offer the following result.

**Proposition 4.4** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and let  $A \subseteq X$ . Then  $(\tau_{\theta})|_{A} \subseteq (\tau|_{A})_{\theta}$ . **Proof.** Let  $V \in (\tau_{\theta})|_{A}$ . Then there exists  $U \in \tau_{\theta}$  such that  $V = U \cap A$ . For each  $x \in V$ there exists  $U_{x} \in \tau$  such that  $x \in U_{x} \subseteq \operatorname{cl}^{\tau}(U_{x}) \subseteq U$ . If  $V_{x} = U_{x} \cap A$ , then  $x \in V_{x}$  and  $V_{x} \in \tau|_{A}$ . Thus  $x \in V_{x} \subseteq \operatorname{cl}^{\tau|_{A}}(V_{x}) = \operatorname{cl}^{\tau}(V_{x}) \cap A = \operatorname{cl}^{\tau}(U_{x} \cap A) \cap A \subseteq V$ . Consequently  $V \in (\tau|_{A})_{\theta}$ .

The following example shows that the inclusion in Proposition 4.4 cannot be reserved.

**Example 4.5** Let  $X = \mathbb{R} \cup Y$  where  $\mathbb{R}$  denotes the set of reals and Y is an infinite set disjoint from  $\mathbb{R}$ . We define a topology  $\tau$  on X in the following way: any cofinite subset of Y is open and a basic open neighbourhood of a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  is the union of an open interval of  $\mathbb{R}$  and a cofinite subset of Y. Since each point of Y is a point of hyperconnectedness,  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  has to be indiscrete by Propostion 2.4. Now let  $A = \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $(\tau_{\theta})|_A$  is clearly indiscrete. Obviously,  $\tau|_A$  is the usual topology on  $A = \mathbb{R}$  and so  $(\tau|_A)_{\theta} = \tau|_A$ , showing that  $(\tau_{\theta})|_A \neq (\tau|_A)_{\theta}$ .

Question 5 Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space. Characterize the subspaces  $A \subseteq X$  such that  $(\tau_{\theta})|_{A} = (\tau|_{A})_{\theta}$ .

Question 6 Characterize the spaces  $(X, \tau)$  such that for every subspace  $A \subseteq X$  we have  $(\tau_{\theta})|_{A} = (\tau|_{A})_{\theta}$ .

**Question 7** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and let  $\tau \times \tau$  be the product topology on  $X \times X$ . What is the relationship between the topologies  $(\tau \times \tau)_{\theta}$  and  $\tau_{\theta} \times \tau_{\theta}$ ?

#### 5 On the $\theta$ -closure operator

In [8] Veličko already noted that the  $\theta$ -closure  $cl_{\theta}(A)$  of a subset A of a space  $(X, \tau)$  does not define a Kuratowski closure operator in general, hence cannot be the closure of A with respect to  $(X, \tau_{\theta})$  which we shall denote by  $\overline{A}^{\theta}$ . It is easily checked that  $cl_{\theta}(A) \subseteq \overline{A}^{\theta}$  but this implication cannot be reversed in general (see [5], page 313). In fact,  $cl_{\theta}$  is a Kuratowski closure operator if and only if it is idempotent, i.e. if  $cl_{\theta}(cl_{\theta}(A)) = cl_{\theta}(A)$  for every subset  $A \subseteq X$ . Of course, this leads to the question which conditions a space must satisfy so that  $cl_{\theta}$  is a Kuratowski closure operator.

**Proposition 5.1** (see [2]) A space  $(X, \tau)$  is almost regular if and only if  $cl_{\theta}$  is idempotent.

If we restrict ourselves to H-closed topological spaces, the following results are available in the literature.

**Proposition 5.2** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be Hausdorff and *H*-closed.

- (1) [8] If  $(X, \tau)$  is in addition Urysohn, then  $cl_{\theta}$  is a Kuratowski closure operator.
- (2) [5] If  $(X, \tau)$  fails to be Urysohn, then  $cl_{\theta}$  need not be a Kuratowski closure operator.

Suppose that  $(X, \tau)$  is regular but not Hausdorff. Then  $cl_{\theta}$  clearly is a Kuratowski closure operator as it coincides with the usual closure. Hence such a space need not necessarily be Urysohn. However, it has been shown in [6], Theorem 3.2, that every almost regular Hausdorff space is Urysohn.

Acknowledgement. The authors wish to express their sincere gratitude to the referee for his/her valuable comments.

## References

- [1] M. Ganster and M. Steiner, On some questions about b-open sets , Q & A in General Topology **25** (1) (2007), 45–52.
- [2] R. A. Hermann,  $\theta$ -rigidity and the idempotent  $\theta$ -closure , Math. Seminar Notes, Kobe Univ. 6 (1978), 217–219.
- [3] N. Levine, Simple extensions of topologies, Amer. Math. Monthly 71 (1964), 22–25.
- [4] T. Noiri, A characterization of almost regular spaces, Glasnik Mat. 13 (1978), 335–338.
- [5] J.R. Porter and R.G. Woods, *Extensions and Absolutes of Hausdorff Spaces*, Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York, 1988.
- [6] M.K. Singal and S.P. Arya, On almost-regular spaces, Glasnik Mat. Ser III, 4(24) (1969), 89–99.
- [7] L.A. Steen and J.A. Seebach, Jr., *Counterexamples in topology*, Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York, 1978.
- [8] N.V. Veličko, *H*-closed topological spaces, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. 78 (1968), 103–118.

Adresses. Andreas Foroutan, Maximilian Ganster and Markus Steiner

Department of Mathematics, Graz University of Technology, Steyrergasse 30, A-8010 Graz; AUSTRIA