

δ -Semi Normal and δ -Semi Compact Spaces

Afraa R. Sadek¹, Ayman A. Ali², Jalal H. Hussein³ and Haider Jebur Ali⁴

^{1,2}Department of mathematics, College of Science, Baghdad University

³Department of mathematics, College of Science Women, Baghdad University

⁴ Department of mathematics, College of Science, Al-Mustansiriya University

Article Info

Page Number: 2062 - 2069

Publication Issue:

Vol 71 No. 4 (2022)

Article History

Article Received: 25 March 2022

Revised: 30 April 2022

Accepted: 15 June 2022

Publication: 19 August 2022

Abstract

In this paper by using δ -semi.open sets we introduced the concept of weakly δ -semi.normal and δ -semi.normal spaces . Many properties and results were investigated and studied. Also we present the notion of δ -semi.compact spaces and we were able to compare with it δ -semi.regular spaces.

Keyword: Generalized separation axioms, \mathcal{R}_1 , \mathcal{R}_0 - spaces, δ -semi.open, regular and normal spaces.

1.Introduction and preliminaries.

In what follows \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{Y} denoted topological spaces. Let \mathcal{B} be a subset of a space \mathcal{X} , we denote the interior and closure of \mathcal{B} by $\text{Int}(\mathcal{B})$ and $\text{Cl}(\mathcal{B})$ respectively. Levine [4] introduced the concept of semi.open sets and semi. continuity in topological spaces. A subset \mathcal{B} is said to be semi.open if and only if $\mathcal{B} \subset \text{Cl}(\text{Int}(\mathcal{B}))$. The complement of semi.open is called semi.closed . A subset \mathcal{B} is called regular closed (resp.regular open) if $\text{Cl}(\text{Int}(\mathcal{B})) = \mathcal{B}$ (resp. $\text{Int}(\text{Cl}(\mathcal{B})) = \mathcal{B}$ [5]. A subset \mathcal{B} is said to be δ -open [5] if for each $x \in \mathcal{B}$ there exists regular open set \mathcal{H} such that $x \in \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{B}$. A subset \mathcal{B} is said δ -semi.open[2] if there exists a δ -open set \mathcal{V} of \mathcal{X} such that $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{B} \subset \text{Cl}(\mathcal{V})$. The complement of δ -semi.open called δ -semi.closed. We denote the family of all δ -semi.open (resp. δ -semi.closed) in a space \mathcal{X} by $\delta\text{-SO}(\mathcal{X})$ (resp. $\delta\text{-SC}(\mathcal{X})$).

The intersection of δ -semi.closed (resp. δ -semi.open) that contain a subset B is called the δ -semi.closure (resp. δ -semi.kernal) and denotes by $s.Cl_\delta(B)$ (resp. $s.ker_\delta(B)$) [2]. Recall that [2] a space X is δ -semi. \mathcal{T}_1 (resp. δ -semi. \mathcal{R}_0 , δ -semi. \mathcal{R}_1) if for any distinct pairs of point x and y in X , there are two δ -semi.open \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} such that

$x \in \mathcal{U} - \mathcal{V}$ and $y \in \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{U}$ (resp. If every δ -semi.open set contains the δ -semi.closure of each of its singleton, if for x, y in X with $s.Cl_\delta(\{x\}) \neq s.Cl_\delta(\{y\})$, there exist distinct δ -semi.open sets \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} such that $s.Cl_\delta(\{x\}) \subset \mathcal{U}$ and $s.Cl_\delta(\{y\}) \subset \mathcal{V}$). Finally A.A.Ali and A.R.Sadek [1] studied in depth the concept of δ -semi.regularity of spaces.

A space X is said to be δ -semi.regular if for each $x \in X$ and each semi.closed set \mathcal{H} such that $x \notin \mathcal{H}$ there exist disjoint $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \in \delta\text{-SO}(X)$ such that $x \in \mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{V}_2$. In this paper we introduced the δ -semi.normal and weakly δ -semi.normal spaces. Many results were proved as well as we investigated the relationship between δ -semi normal and δ -semi.regular by us the δ -semi.compact spaces.

2. Weakly δ -semi.normal spaces .

We will start with the following definition

Definition 2.1. A space X is called weakly δ -semi.normal (w. δ -semi.normal for short), if for each distinct closed subset \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 of X there exist disjoint δ - semi. open set \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} such that $\mathcal{E}_1 \subset \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{E}_2 \subset \mathcal{V}$.

Example 2.2. let (X, τ) be a topological space such that $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and

$\tau = \{\phi, X, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$ implies $\tau^c = \{\phi, X, \{b, c, d\}, \{a, c, d\}, \{c, d\}\}$. Clearly the family of all δ -open sets is the family τ and $\delta.S.O(X) = \{\phi, X, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}$

$\{a, c\}, \{b, c\}, \{b, d\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{a, b, d\}, \{a, c, d\}, \{b, c, d\}$. It is not difficult to check that (X, τ) is not normal while it is w. δ -semi.normal space.

Theorem 2.3. A space \mathcal{X} is $w.\delta$ -semi-normal if for each closed set \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{X} , the δ -semi-closed neighborhood of \mathcal{F} form a basis of neighborhood of \mathcal{F} .

Proof: Let \mathcal{F} be a closed set in \mathcal{X} and let \mathcal{N} be a neighborhood of \mathcal{F} , so there is an open set \mathcal{O} in \mathcal{X} such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$. Thus \mathcal{F} and $\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{O}$ are distinct closed sets in

\mathcal{X} , and by the $w.\delta$ -semi-normality, we have $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}, (\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{O}) \subset \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \emptyset$. Hence $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U} \subset (\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{V}) \subset \mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$, thus $\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{V}$ is δ -semi-closed neighborhood of \mathcal{F} contains in \mathcal{N} . ■

Recall that [1] a map $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is said to be δ -semi-open (resp. δ -semi-irresolute) if $f(\mathcal{V}) \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{Y})$ where $\mathcal{V} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ (resp. $f^{-1}(\mathcal{U}) \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ where $\mathcal{U} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{Y})$).

Theorem 2.4. Let $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a surjective, continuous and δ -semi-open map, then the image of $w.\delta$ -semi-normal space is $w.\delta$ -semi-normal.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be a disjoint closed sets in the space \mathcal{Y} . By the continuity of f we have $f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_1), f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ are closed in \mathcal{X} . Now $f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_1) \cap f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_2) = \emptyset$ [6], so by the $w.\delta$ -semi-normality of the space \mathcal{X} , there are two disjoint sets $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ such that $f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_1) \subset \mathcal{U}$ and $f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_2) \subset \mathcal{V}$. Further $f(f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_1)) = \mathcal{E}_1 \subset f(\mathcal{U})$, $f(f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_2)) = \mathcal{E}_2 \subset f(\mathcal{V})$ and since f is δ -semi-open the proof is complete ■

Theorem 2.5. Let $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be an injective, closed and δ -semi-irresolute map. Then \mathcal{X} is $w.\delta$ -semi-normal space if \mathcal{Y} is δ -semi-normal.

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are two disjoint closed subsets of \mathcal{X} and since f is injective and closed, so $f(\mathcal{E}_1), f(\mathcal{E}_2)$ are disjoint closed in \mathcal{Y} . But \mathcal{Y} is $w.\delta$ -semi-normal, hence there are two disjoint $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{Y})$ such that $f(\mathcal{E}_1) \subset \mathcal{U}$, $f(\mathcal{E}_2) \subset \mathcal{V}$. Now $\mathcal{E}_1 \subset f^{-1}(f(\mathcal{E}_1)) \subset f^{-1}(\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{E}_2 \subset f^{-1}(f(\mathcal{E}_2)) \subset f^{-1}(\mathcal{V})$ [6] and since $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \emptyset$, therefore $f^{-1}(\mathcal{U})$ and $f^{-1}(\mathcal{V})$ are required subsets. ■

3. δ -semi.normal and δ -semi.compact spaces .

We present in this section a new type of spaces, we called it δ -semi.normal space. Many properties of this space were studied. First, we introduce the following definition.

Definition 3.1. A space \mathcal{X} is said to be δ -semi.normal if for each disjoint semi.closed sets \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K} of \mathcal{X} . There exist $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \phi$.

Example 3.2. Consider the following topology $\tau = \{\phi, \mathcal{X}, \{c_1\}, \{c_2\}, \{c_1, c_2\}\}$ on the set $\mathcal{X} = \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$. Then $\delta.SO(\mathcal{X}) = \{\phi, \mathcal{X}, \{c_1\}, \{c_2\}, \{c_1, c_2\}, \{c_2, c_3\}, \{c_1, c_3\}\}$ and the family of semi.closed are $S.C(\mathcal{X}) = \{\phi, \mathcal{X}, \{c_2, c_3\}, \{c_1, c_3\}, \{c_3\}, \{c_1\}, \{c_2\}\}$. Now it is not difficult to show that the space \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.normal.

Some properties are holds in a δ -semi.normal spaces as shown in the next theorem and remark.

Theorem 3.3. Let \mathcal{X} be a δ -semi.normal space, then for each semi.closed $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{X}$ and for every δ -semi.open set \mathcal{V} containing \mathcal{F} there exists $\mathcal{U} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U} \subset sCl_\delta(\mathcal{U}) \subset \mathcal{V}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{X}$ and let \mathcal{V} be any δ -semi.open set containing \mathcal{F} . Now $\mathcal{F} \cap (\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{V}) = \phi$ and $(\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{V})$ is δ -semi.closed, hence it is semi.closed [5]. By the δ -semi.normality of \mathcal{X} , there exist $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{G} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}, (\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{V}) \subset \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{G} = \phi$. Thus $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{G}$ and since $(\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{G})$ is δ -semi.closed, hence $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U} \subset sCl_\delta(\mathcal{U}) \subset (\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{G}) \subset \mathcal{V}$. ■

Remark 3.4. If \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.normal space than for any two distinct semi.closed sets \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K} , then $sker_\delta(\mathcal{F}) \cap sker_\delta(\mathcal{K}) = \phi$.

Proof. From δ -semi.normality of \mathcal{X} we have $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \phi$ and since $sker_\delta(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{U}, sker_\delta(\mathcal{K}) \subset \mathcal{V}$ [2], hence $sker_\delta(\mathcal{F}) \cap sker_\delta(\mathcal{K}) = \phi$.

Caldas [2] shows that any δ -semi \mathcal{R}_1 space is δ -semi \mathcal{R}_0 . In the following preposition we will show the converse is true in δ -semi.normal spaces .

Proposition 3.5. A δ -semi \mathcal{R}_0 and δ -semi.normal space is δ -semi \mathcal{R}_1 .

Proof. Let \mathcal{X} be a space and $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $sCl_\delta(\{x\}) \neq sCl_\delta(\{y\})$. Since \mathcal{X}

is δ -semi \mathcal{R}_0 , hence $sCl_\delta(\{x\}) \cap sCl_\delta(\{y\}) = \emptyset$ [2, p.123]. But $sCl_\delta(\{x\}), sCl_\delta(\{y\})$ are δ -semi.closed sets [2] consequently semi.closed sets [5], hence by the δ -semi.normality of \mathcal{X} there exist $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ such that $sCl_\delta(\{x\}) \subset \mathcal{U}, sCl_\delta(\{y\}) \subset \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \emptyset$. Thus, \mathcal{X} is δ -semi \mathcal{R}_1 .

■

The following two theorems are good characterizations for δ -semi.normal spaces.

Theorem 3.6. A space \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.normal if and only if for each disjoint semi.closed sets \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} , there exists a δ -semi.open set \mathcal{U} containing \mathcal{E} such that $\mathcal{F} \cap sCl_\delta(\mathcal{U}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{X} is a δ -semi.normal space, and $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E} = \emptyset$, where \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} are semi.closed sets in \mathcal{X} . Thus there exist $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \emptyset$, hence \mathcal{V} is δ -semi.open containing \mathcal{F} which not intersect \mathcal{U} , implies $\mathcal{F} \cap sCl_\delta(\mathcal{U}) = \emptyset$. For sufficiency since there exists $\mathcal{U} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ containing \mathcal{E} such that $\mathcal{F} \cap sCl_\delta(\mathcal{U}) = \emptyset$ where \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{E} as in the assumption, that is mean there exist a family $\{\mathcal{V}_\alpha, \alpha \in \Delta\}$ of δ -semi.open sets containing x_α for all $x_\alpha \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}_\alpha = \emptyset, \alpha \in \Delta$. But $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \Delta} \{\mathcal{V}_\alpha\}$ is δ -semi.open [2] which complete the proof. ■

Theorem 3.7. In any topological space the following are equivalent.

(1) \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.normal space.

(2) For any two distinct δ -semi.closed sets \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{K} there exists two δ -semi.open sets \mathcal{V}_1 and \mathcal{V}_2 such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{V}_1$ and $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{V}_2$ and $sCl_\delta(\mathcal{V}_1) \cap sCl_\delta(\mathcal{V}_2) = \emptyset$.

Proof. (2) \rightarrow (1) obviously.

(1) \rightarrow (2) Take any two distinct semi.closed sets \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{K} there exist disjoint δ -semi.open sets \mathcal{V}_1 and \mathcal{V}_2 such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{V}_1$, and $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{V}_2$. By [1] we have two δ -semi.open sets \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U} \subset sCl_\delta(\mathcal{U}) \subset \mathcal{V}_1$ and $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{V} \subset sCl_\delta(\mathcal{V}) \subset \mathcal{V}_2$ since $\mathcal{V}_1 \cap \mathcal{V}_2 = \emptyset$ implies $sCl_\delta(\mathcal{U}) \cap sCl_\delta(\mathcal{V}) = \emptyset$ and we have done. ■

A δ -semi.normal space is δ -semi.regular under a given condition as shown in the following remark.

Remark. 3.8. A δ -semi.normal and δ -semi \mathcal{T}_1 space is δ -semi.regular.

Proof. Let \mathcal{F} be a semi.closed subset in \mathcal{X} and let x be any point in \mathcal{X} such that $x \notin \mathcal{F}$. Now since \mathcal{X} is δ -semi \mathcal{T}_1 , then every singleton in \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.closed and, then is semi.closed [5]. Thus there exist a disjoint $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \delta.SO(\mathcal{X})$ such that $x \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{V}$, hence \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.regular.

■

Corollary 3.9. A δ -semi.normal and δ -semi \mathcal{T}_1 space is δ -semi \mathcal{R}_1 .

Proof. Follows by remark (3.8) and proposition (3.5) since each δ -semi.regular is δ -semi \mathcal{R}_0 [1, p.956]. ■

Before we will give the next theorem, we present the following definitions.

Definition 3.10. A covering of a set \mathcal{X} is a family \mathfrak{B} of subsets of \mathcal{X} such that

$\mathcal{X} = \cup \{ \mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{B} \}$. If \mathcal{X} is a topological space and every member of \mathfrak{B} is δ -semi.open, then \mathfrak{B} is called δ -semi.open cover of \mathcal{X} .

Definition 3.11. A space \mathcal{X} is said to be δ -semi.compact if every δ -semi. open cover of \mathcal{X} has a finite subcover.

The following is an example of δ -semi.compact space

Example 3.12. Let $(\mathbb{R}, \tau_{\text{ind}})$ the Indiscrete topological space on the set of the real number \mathbb{R} . It is not difficult to check that $(\mathbb{R}, \tau_{\text{ind}})$ is δ -semi.compact space.

Theorem 3.13. A δ -semi.compact, δ -semi.regular and δ -semi \mathcal{T}_1 space is δ -semi.normal space.

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.regular and δ -semi \mathcal{T}_1 then \mathcal{X} is δ -semi \mathcal{T}_2 [1]. Now let \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F} be a disjoint semi.closed sets. Fix $e \in \mathcal{E}$ since \mathcal{X} is δ -semi \mathcal{T}_2 , then for each $f \in \mathcal{F}$ there exist δ -semi.open sets $\mathcal{U}_\alpha, \mathcal{V}_\alpha$ such that $e \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha, f \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{V}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{U}_\alpha = \emptyset$. Thus $\{ \mathcal{U}_\alpha; \alpha \in \Delta \}$ is δ -semi.open cover of \mathcal{F} and since \mathcal{F} is δ -semi.compact so there exists a finite sub cover $\{ \mathcal{U}_{\alpha_1}, \mathcal{U}_{\alpha_2}, \dots, \mathcal{U}_{\alpha_n} \}$.

$\dots, \mathcal{U}_{\alpha n}\}$, put $\mathcal{U}_e = \mathcal{U}_{\alpha 1} \cup \mathcal{U}_{\alpha 2} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{U}_{\alpha n}$ and $\mathcal{V}_e = \mathcal{V}_{\alpha 1} \cap \mathcal{V}_{\alpha 2} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{V}_{\alpha n}$ is δ -semi.open [2] and since \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.regular, then $\mathcal{V}_{\alpha i}$, $i=1, 2, \dots, n$ are also δ -semi.closed[1]. Thus \mathcal{V}_e is δ -semi.closed [2]. Thus we have $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}_e \in \mathcal{V}_e$ and $\mathcal{V}_e \cap \mathcal{U}_e = \phi$. Now let e vary throughout \mathcal{E} , so we obtain a δ -semi.open cover $\{\mathcal{V}_e; e \in \mathcal{E}\}$ of \mathcal{E} . As \mathcal{E} is δ -semi.compact there exists a finite sub cover $\mathcal{V}_{e_1}, \mathcal{V}_{e_2}, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{e_r}$ means $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_{e_1} \cup \mathcal{V}_{e_2} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{V}_{e_r}$ and $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{e_1} \cap \mathcal{U}_{e_2} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{U}_{e_n}$. Now \mathcal{V} is δ -semi.open [2] and the δ -semi.regularity \mathcal{U} is also δ -semi.open. Then $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \phi$, hence \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.normal. ■

Lemma 3.14. [3] If $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is continuous and open map, and if \mathcal{A} is semi.open in \mathcal{X} , then $f(\mathcal{A})$ is semi.open in \mathcal{Y} .

Under the same condition of f in the above lemma we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.15. Let $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be an injective, δ -semi.irresolute map, and \mathcal{Y} is δ -semi.normal space, then \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.normal space.

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are any disjoint semi.closed subset of \mathcal{X} . Now $f(\mathcal{E}_1), f(\mathcal{E}_2)$ are semi.closed (3.14) and disjoint since f is injective. Thus by the δ -semi.normality of \mathcal{Y} , there exist disjoint $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \delta$.SO(\mathcal{Y}) such that $f(\mathcal{E}_1) \subset \mathcal{U}, f(\mathcal{E}_2) \subset \mathcal{V}$. But $\mathcal{E}_1 \subset f^{-1}(f(\mathcal{E}_1)) \subset f^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), \mathcal{E}_2 \subset f^{-1}(f(\mathcal{E}_2)) \subset f^{-1}(\mathcal{V})$, clear that each of $f^{-1}(\mathcal{U}), f^{-1}(\mathcal{V})$ are δ -semi.open further they are disjoint [7]. Hence \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.normal space ■

Theorem 3.16. Let $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be an injective, continuous, and δ -semi.open, then \mathcal{Y} is δ -semi.normal if \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.normal space.

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{X} is δ -semi.normal space. Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ are two disjoint semi.closed subset in \mathcal{Y} . Now since f is bijective and irresolute continuous, thus $f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_1), f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ are disjoint and semi.closed in \mathcal{X} , so by the δ -semi.normality of \mathcal{X} there exist $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \delta$.SO(\mathcal{X}) such that $f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_1) \subset \mathcal{U}, f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_2) \subset \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \phi$, hence $f(f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_1)) = \mathcal{E}_1 \subset f(\mathcal{U})$ and $f(f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_2)) = \mathcal{E}_2 \subset f(\mathcal{V})$. It is clear $f(\mathcal{U}), f(\mathcal{V})$ are disjoint and since f is δ -semi.open map so we have done. ■

Reference

- [1] A.A.Ali and A.R.Sadek, On regular δ -semi-open space, Journal of interdisciplinary of mathematics 24(4), (2021), pp.953-960.
- [2] M.Caldas and T.Noiri, More on δ -semi-open sets, Note di Mathematica.22 (2)(2003), pp.113-126.
- [3] S.G. Crossley and S.K. Hildebrand, Semi-topological properties, Fundamenta Mathematicae 74(3), (1972), pp.233-257.
- [4] N.Levine, Semi-open sets and continuity in topological space, The American Mathematical Monthly, 70(1), (1963), pp.36-41.
- [5] T. Noiri, Remarks on δ -semi-open sets and δ -preopen sets, Demonstratio Mathematica, 36, (2003), pp.1007-1020.
- [6] S.Willard, General Topology, Dover Publications, (2012).
- [7] A.R.Sadek, More on the minimal set of periods, Iraqi Journal of science 56(4A), (2015), pp.2453-2958.