

## Rectangular covers of products missing diagonals

YUKINOBU YAJIMA

*Abstract.* We give a characterization of a paracompact  $\Sigma$ -space to have a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal in terms of three rectangular covers of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ . Moreover, we show that a local property and a global property of a space  $X$  are given by the orthocompactness of  $(X \times \beta X) \setminus \Delta$ .

*Keywords:*  $\Sigma$ -space,  $G_\delta$ -diagonal,  $\sigma$ -closure-preserving,  $\sigma$ -cushioned, rectangular cover, orthocompact, metacompact, Fréchet space

*Classification:* 54B10, 54D20, 54E18

### 1. Main theorem

All spaces in this paper are assumed to be regular  $T_1$ . The diagonal of a space  $X$  is denoted by  $\Delta$ , that is,  $\Delta = \{(x, x) : x \in X\}$ .

Let  $X$  be a space and  $\mathcal{V}$  a collection of subsets of the square  $X^2$ . We say that  $\mathcal{V}$  is *rectangular* if each member of  $\mathcal{V}$  is a subset of the form  $U \times W$  in  $X^2$ . Note that if  $\mathcal{V}$  is a rectangular open cover of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ , then it covers  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  and each member of  $\mathcal{V}$  is a subset of the form  $U \times W$  such that  $U$  and  $W$  are disjoint open sets in  $X$ .

Gruenhagen and Pelant [4] proved that a paracompact  $\Sigma$ -space  $X$  has a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal (i.e. is a  $\sigma$ -space), if  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  is paracompact. Subsequently, Kombarov [7] proved that a paracompact  $\Sigma$ -space  $X$  has a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal if and only if there is a locally finite rectangular open cover of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ .

Our main theorem is an extension of these results in terms of three rectangular covers of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ .

**Theorem 1.** *The following are equivalent for a paracompact  $\Sigma$ -space  $X$ .*

- (a)  $X$  has a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal.
- (b) There is a  $\sigma$ -locally finite rectangular open cover of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ .
- (c) There is a  $\sigma$ -closure-preserving rectangular open cover of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ .
- (d) There is a rectangular open cover of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  which has a  $\sigma$ -cushioned open refinement.

The author announced Theorem 1 except (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) in [10], and asked whether (c) implies (a) in the conference. Answering this, we give a complete proof of Theorem 1 in the next section.

## 2. Proof of Theorem 1

The main idea of the proof of Theorem 1 is based on Gruenhage-Pelant's. In fact, it will be proceeded along the line of that of [4, Theorem 4]. Here, we have to do two kinds of parallel arguments.

Recall that a collection of  $\mathcal{V}$  of subsets of a space  $X$  is *closure-preserving* if  $\overline{\bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}'\}} = \bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}'\}$  for each  $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathcal{V}$ . We say that  $\mathcal{V}$  is  *$\sigma$ -closure-preserving* if it can be written as  $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{V}_n$  such that each  $\mathcal{V}_n$  is closure-preserving.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $X$  be a space with  $p \in X$ . Let  $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{V}_n$  be a  $\sigma$ -closure-preserving rectangular open cover of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ . If there is a countable subset  $M$  of  $X \setminus \{p\}$  such that  $p \in \overline{M}$ , then  $p$  is a  $G_\delta$ -point.*

PROOF: Let  $M = \{x_n : n \in \omega\}$ . Let  $F_n = \bigcup\{\overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_n, j \leq n \text{ with } (p, x_n) \notin \overline{V}\}$  for each  $n \in \omega$ . Then each  $F_n$  is a closed subset in  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  such that  $(p, x_n) \notin F_n$ . For each  $n \in \omega$ , take a basic open neighborhood  $G_n \times H_n$  of  $(p, x_n)$  in  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ , disjoint from  $F_n$ . We show  $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} G_n = \{p\}$ . Assume that there is some  $y \in \bigcap_{n \in \omega} G_n$  with  $y \neq p$ . Take some  $V = U \times W \in \mathcal{V}$  such that  $(y, p) \in V$ . Choose  $m \in \omega$  with  $V \in \mathcal{V}_m$ . By  $p \notin \overline{U}$ , we have  $(p, x_n) \notin \overline{V}$ . Hence it follows that  $\overline{V} \subset F_n$  for each  $n \geq m$ . Choose some  $k \geq m$  with  $x_k \in W$ . Then it follows that  $(y, x_k) \in U \times W = V \subset \overline{V} \subset F_k$ . On the other hand, by  $(y, x_k) \in G_k \times H_k$ , we have  $(y, x_k) \notin F_k$ . This is a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{O}$  be two collections of subsets of a space  $X$ . Recall that  $\mathcal{V}$  is *cushioned in  $\mathcal{O}$*  if for each  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ , one can assign an  $O(V) \in \mathcal{O}$  such that for each  $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathcal{V}$ ,  $\overline{\bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}'\}} \subset \bigcup\{O(V) : V \in \mathcal{V}'\}$ . Such an assignment  $V \mapsto O(V)$ ,  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ , is called a *cushioned assignment* from  $\mathcal{V}$  into  $\mathcal{O}$ . We say that  $\mathcal{V}$  is  *$\sigma$ -cushioned in  $\mathcal{O}$*  if it can be written as  $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{V}_n$  such that each  $\mathcal{V}_n$  is cushioned in  $\mathcal{O}$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $X$  be a space with  $p \in X$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a rectangular open cover of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ . Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be a collection of open sets in  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  which is cushioned in  $\mathcal{O}$ . If there is a countable subset  $M$  of  $X \setminus \{p\}$  such that  $p \in \overline{M}$  and  $M \times \{p\} \subset \bigcup \mathcal{V}$ , then  $p$  is a  $G_\delta$ -point.*

PROOF: Let  $V \mapsto O(V)$  be a cushioned assignment from  $\mathcal{V}$  into  $\mathcal{O}$ , and let  $M = \{x_n : n \in \omega\}$ . For each  $n \in \omega$ , take  $V_n \in \mathcal{V}$  with  $(x_n, p) \in V_n$ , and let  $W_n = \{x \in X : (x_n, x) \in V_n\}$ . It suffices to show  $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} W_n = \{p\}$ . Assume that there is some  $y \in \bigcap_{n \in \omega} W_n$  with  $y \neq p$ . Let  $O(V_n) = P_n \times Q_n$  for each  $n \in \omega$ . By  $(x_n, p) \in V_n \subset O(V_n)$ , we have  $p \notin \overline{P_n}$  for each  $n \in \omega$ . So it follows that  $(p, y) \notin \bigcup_{n \in \omega} (P_n \times Q_n) = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} O(V_n) \supset \overline{\bigcup_{n \in \omega} V_n}$ . There is an open neighborhood  $G$  of  $p$  such that  $(G \times \{y\}) \cap (\bigcup_{n \in \omega} V_n) = \emptyset$ . By  $(x_n, y) \in V_n$ , each  $x_n$  is not in  $G$ . Hence we have  $p \notin \overline{M}$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

A space  $X$  is called a  *$\Sigma$ -space* if there are a closed cover  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $X$  by countably compact sets, and a  $\sigma$ -discrete closed cover  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $X$  such that whenever  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $U$  is open in  $X$  with  $C \subset U$ , then  $C \subset F \subset U$  for some  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ .

The class of paracompact  $\Sigma$ -spaces is a broad one which is countably productive (see [3], [8]).

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $X$  be a  $\Sigma$ -space. If there is a  $\sigma$ -closure-preserving rectangular open cover  $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{V}_n$  of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ , then each point of  $X$  is  $G_\delta$ .*

PROOF: Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  be two closed covers of  $X$ , described as above. Assume that some  $p \in X$  is not a  $G_\delta$ -point. As stated in the proof of [4, Lemma 3], there is a closed  $G_\delta$ -set  $Y$  in  $X$  containing  $p$  such that  $y \in Y$  and  $y \in C \in \mathcal{C}$  implies  $p \in C$ . Then note that  $p$  is not  $G_\delta$  in  $Y$ . Let  $V = U_V \times W_V$  for each  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}_n = \{U_V : V \in \mathcal{V}_n \text{ with } p \in W_V\}$  for each  $n \in \omega$ . Note that each  $\mathcal{U}_n$  is closure-preserving in  $X \setminus \{p\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{U}_n$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}$  is a  $\sigma$ -closure-preserving open cover of  $X \setminus \{p\}$ .

Now, we construct  $\{U_\alpha, G_\alpha, z_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ , satisfying the following conditions; for each  $\alpha \in \omega_1$ ,

- (i)  $U_\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $G_\alpha$  is an open set in  $Y$ ,
- (ii)  $\overline{U_\alpha} \cap Y \subset G_\alpha \subset \overline{G_\alpha} \subset Y \setminus \{p\}$ ,
- (iii)  $z_\alpha \in (U_\alpha \cap (Y \setminus \{p\})) \setminus \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} G_\beta$ .

In fact, for  $\alpha \in \omega_1$ , assume that  $\{U_\beta, G_\beta, z_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$  satisfies the above conditions. Since  $Y \setminus \{p\}$  is not  $F_\sigma$  in  $Y$ ,  $\{\overline{G_\beta} : \beta < \alpha\}$  does not cover  $Y \setminus \{p\}$ . However, as  $\mathcal{U}$  covers  $X \setminus \{p\}$ , we can choose the desired  $z_\alpha$  and  $U_\alpha$ . By the choice of  $\mathcal{U}_n$ , note that  $p \notin \overline{U_\alpha}$ . Since  $X$  is regular, we can choose the desired  $G_\alpha$ .

Here we may assume without loss of generality that  $\{U_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\} \subset \mathcal{U}_m$  for some  $m \in \omega$ . Let  $Z = \{z_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ . Then  $Z$  is uncountable. Moreover,  $Z$  is closed discrete in  $Y \setminus \{p\}$ . For, pick any  $x \in \overline{Z} \setminus \{p\}$ . Since  $\mathcal{U}_m$  is closure-preserving,  $\overline{Z} \setminus \{p\} \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} \overline{U_\alpha}$ . Let  $\alpha_0 = \min\{\alpha \in \omega_1 : x \in \overline{U_\alpha}\}$ . Let  $N = G_{\alpha_0} \setminus \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha_0} \overline{U_\beta}$ . Then  $N$  is an open neighborhood of  $x$  in  $Y$  such that  $N \cap Z \subset \{z_{\alpha_0}\}$ .

It follows from Lemma 1 that  $p \notin \overline{M}$  for each countable subset  $M$  of  $Z$ . The remaining argument is the same as in the proof of [4, Lemma 3].  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $X$  be a  $\Sigma$ -space. If there is a rectangular open cover  $\mathcal{O}$  of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  which has a  $\sigma$ -cushioned open refinement  $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{V}_n$ , then each point of  $X$  is  $G_\delta$ .*

PROOF: Let  $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F}, p$  and  $Y$  be the same as in the above proof. Let  $V \mapsto O(V)$ ,  $V \in \mathcal{V}_n$ , be a cushioned assignment of  $\mathcal{V}_n$  into  $\mathcal{O}$ . Let  $U_V = \{x \in X : (x, p) \in V\}$  and  $O(V) = P_V \times Q_V$  for each  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . Moreover, let  $\mathcal{U}_n = \{U_V : V \in \mathcal{V}_n\}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_n = \{P_V : V \in \mathcal{V}_n \text{ with } p \in Q_V\}$  for each  $n \in \omega$ . Let  $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{U}_n$  and  $\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{P}_n$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}$  is an open cover of  $X \setminus \{p\}$  and each  $\mathcal{U}_n$  is cushioned in  $\mathcal{P}_n$  with the cushioned assignment  $U_V \mapsto P_V$  in  $X \setminus \{p\}$ . Since  $p \notin \overline{P}$  for each  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $Y \setminus \{p\}$  is not  $F_\sigma$  in  $Y$ ,  $\{P \cap Y : P \in \mathcal{P}\}$  has no countable subcover of  $Y \setminus \{p\}$ . So we can inductively choose  $\{U_\alpha, P_\alpha, z_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ , satisfying for each  $\alpha \in \omega_1$ ,

- (iv)  $U_\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $P_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ ,
- (v)  $z_\alpha \in (U_\alpha \cap (Y \setminus \{p\})) \setminus \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} P_\beta$ .

We may assume that  $\{U_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\} \subset \mathcal{U}_m$  and  $\{P_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\} \subset \mathcal{P}_m$  for some  $m \in \omega$ . Then  $U_\alpha \mapsto P_\alpha, \alpha \in \omega_1$ , is a cushioned assignment. Let  $Z = \{z_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ . Similarly,  $Z$  is closed discrete in  $Y \setminus \{p\}$ . Here, using Lemma 2 instead of Lemma 1, the remaining argument is the same as above.  $\square$

A space  $X$  is called a  $\beta$ -space if there is a function  $g : \omega \times X \rightarrow \tau(X)$ , where  $\tau(X)$  denotes the topology of  $X$ , satisfying for each  $x \in X$ ,

- (i)  $x \in \bigcap_{n \in \omega} g(n, x)$ ,
- (ii) if  $x \in g(n, x_n)$  for each  $n \in \omega$ , then  $\{x_n : n \in \omega\}$  has a cluster point in  $X$ .

Since  $\Sigma$ -spaces and semi-stratifiable spaces are  $\beta$ -spaces (see [3, Theorem 7.8 (i)]), the class of  $\beta$ -spaces is fairly broad.

The definition of  $W_\delta$ -diagonal in terms of the notion of a sieve is seen in [3], [4]. We do not restate it here. It is shown in [2] (or [3, Theorem 6.6]) that a submetacompact space with a  $W_\delta$ -diagonal has a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $X$  be a  $\beta$ -space such that each point of  $X$  is  $G_\delta$ . If there is a  $\sigma$ -closure-preserving rectangular open cover  $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{V}_n$  of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ , then  $X$  has a  $W_\delta$ -diagonal.*

PROOF: Let  $g : \omega \times X \rightarrow \tau(X)$  be a function, described as above. Let  $h : \omega \times X \rightarrow \tau(X)$  be a function such that  $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} h(n, x) = \{x\}$  for each  $x \in X$ . As in the proof of [4, Theorem 4], we can construct a sieve  $(G, X^{<\omega})$ , satisfying the following: If  $s = \langle x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \rangle \in X^{<\omega}$  and  $x \in G(s)$ , then  $G(s \frown \langle x \rangle)$  is an open neighborhood of  $x$  such that

- (i)  $\overline{G(s \frown \langle x \rangle)} \subset G(s) \cap g(n, x) \cap h(n, x)$ ,
- (ii) if  $i < n$  and  $x_i \neq x$ , then

$$(\{x_i\} \times G(s \frown \langle x \rangle)) \cap \left( \bigcup \{ \overline{V} : V \in \mathcal{V}_j, j \leq n \text{ with } (x_i, x) \notin \overline{V} \} \right) = \emptyset.$$

Assume that  $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} G(s \upharpoonright n)$  contains two distinct points for some  $s = \langle x_0, x_1, \dots \rangle \in X^\omega$ . Then, by (i), no point of  $X$  is repeated infinitely many times in the sequence  $s$ . By the choice of  $g$  and (i),  $\{x_n : n \in \omega\}$  has a cluster point  $y$ . Then we have  $y \in \bigcap_{n \in \omega} \overline{G(s \upharpoonright n)} = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} G(s \upharpoonright n)$ . There is some  $z \in \bigcap_{n \in \omega} G(s \upharpoonright n)$  with  $y \neq z$ . Choose an  $n_0 \in \omega$  and a  $V_0 = U \times W \in \mathcal{V}_{n_0}$  with  $(y, z) \in V_0$ . Find some  $k, m \in \omega$  such that  $m > k > n_0$ ,  $x_k \neq x_m$  and  $\{x_k, x_m\} \subset U$ . By  $x_m \notin \overline{W}$ , note  $(x_k, x_m) \notin \overline{V_0}$ . By (ii), we have  $(\{x_k\} \times G(s \upharpoonright m + 1)) \cap \overline{V_0} = \emptyset$ . On the other hand, we have  $(x_k, z) \in (\{x_k\} \times G(s \upharpoonright m + 1)) \cap \overline{V_0}$ . This is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $X$  be a  $\beta$ -space such that each point of  $X$  is  $G_\delta$ . If there is a rectangular open cover  $\mathcal{O}$  of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  which has a  $\sigma$ -cushioned open refinement  $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \mathcal{V}_n$ , then  $X$  has a  $W_\delta$ -diagonal.*

PROOF: Let  $V \mapsto O(V)$  be a cushioned assignment from  $\mathcal{V}_n$  into  $\mathcal{O}$  for each  $n \in \omega$ . Let  $g$  and  $h$  be the same functions as above. Moreover, we can also construct

a similar sieve  $(G, X^{<\omega})$  as above, where we only replace the condition (ii) with the following;

(ii') if  $i < n$  and  $x_i \neq x$ , then

$$(\{x_i\} \times G(s \smallfrown \langle x \rangle)) \cap \left( \bigcup \{V \in \mathcal{V}_j, j \leq n, (x_i, x) \notin O(V)\} \right) = \emptyset.$$

Take  $s, y$  and  $z$  as above. Choose an  $n_0 \in \omega$  and a  $V_0 \in \mathcal{V}_{n_0}$  with  $(y, z) \in V_0$ . Take an open neighborhood  $U$  of  $y$  such that  $U \times \{z\} \subset V_0$ . Find some  $k, m \in \omega$  with  $m > k > n_0, x_k \neq x_m$  and  $\{x_k, x_m\} \subset U$ . Let  $O(V_0) = P \times Q$ . Since  $x_m \in U \subset P$ , it follows that  $(x_k, x_m) \notin O(V_0)$ . By (ii'), we have  $(\{x_k\} \times G(s \upharpoonright m + 1)) \cap V_0 = \emptyset$ . On the other hand, we have

$$(x_k, z) \in (\{x_k\} \times G(s \upharpoonright m + 1)) \cap (U \times \{z\}) \subset (\{x_k\} \times G(s \upharpoonright m + 1)) \cap V_0.$$

This is a contradiction. □

We say that an open cover  $\mathcal{O}$  of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  is *rectangular cozero* if each member of  $\mathcal{O}$  is a subset of the form  $P \times Q$  such that  $P$  and  $Q$  are disjoint cozero sets in  $X$ .

Since each open  $F_\sigma$ -set in a normal space is exactly a cozero set, so is each open set in a metric space. So, Kombarov [7] actually showed the following.

**Lemma 7.** *If a paracompact space  $X$  has a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal, then there is a locally finite rectangular cozero cover of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$ .*

Now, we complete the proof of our main theorem.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1: (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b): This follows from Lemma 7 (or [7, Theorem 1]).

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c): Obvious.

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (d): Since a  $\sigma$ -locally finite rectangular cozero cover of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  has a  $\sigma$ -cushioned (rectangular) open refinement, this also follows from Lemma 7.

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a): Remember that each  $\Sigma$ -space is a  $\beta$ -space, and that a submetacompact space has a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal iff it has a  $W_\delta$ -diagonal. So this follows from Lemmas 3 and 5.

(d)  $\Rightarrow$  (a): Similarly, this follows from Lemmas 4 and 6. □

### 3. Orthocompactness of $(X \times \beta X) \setminus \Delta$

Arhangel'skiĭ and Kombarov [1] proved that a compact space  $X$  is first countable if  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  is normal. First, we consider what local property of a compact space  $X$  can be obtained if the normality of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  is replaced by the orthocompactness of it. For this, we also use some rectangular open covers.

Recall that an open cover  $\mathcal{V}$  of a space  $X$  is *interior-preserving* if  $\bigcap \mathcal{V}'$  is open in  $X$  for each  $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathcal{V}$ .

A space  $X$  is called a *Fréchet space* if for each  $p \in X$  and each subset  $M$  of  $X$  with  $p \in \overline{M}$ , there is a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  of points in  $M$  which converges to  $p$ .

Note that point-finite open covers of a space are interior-preserving, and that first countable spaces and Lašnev spaces are Fréchet.

For a collection  $\mathcal{V}$  of open sets in a product  $X \times C$  and an  $(x, y) \in X \times C$ , let  $\bigcap \mathcal{V}(x, y) = \bigcap \{V \in \mathcal{V} : (x, y) \in V\}$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $C$  be a countably compact space and  $X$  a subspace of  $C$ . If there is a rectangular open cover of  $(X \times C) \setminus \Delta$  which has an interior-preserving open refinement, then  $X$  is a Fréchet space.*

PROOF: Let  $M$  be a subset of  $X$  with  $p \in \overline{M} \setminus M$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a rectangular open cover of  $(X \times C) \setminus \Delta$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  an interior-preserving open refinement of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Since  $p$  is not isolated in  $X$  and each  $\bigcap \mathcal{V}(p, x)$  is an open neighborhood of  $(p, x)$  in  $X \times C$ , we can inductively choose a sequence  $\{x_n : n \in \omega\}$  of distinct points in  $M$  such that  $(x_n, x_i) \in \bigcap \mathcal{V}(p, x_i)$  for each  $i < n$  and each  $n \in \omega$ . We show that  $\{x_n : n \in \omega\}$  converges to  $p$ . Assume the contrary. This is an open neighborhood  $U$  of  $p$  in  $X$  such that  $x_n \notin U$  for infinitely many  $n$ 's. There is a cluster point  $y$  of  $\{x_n \in X \setminus U : n \in \omega\}$  in  $C$ . By  $y \neq p$ , we can find a  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  and an  $O = P \times Q \in \mathcal{O}$  such that  $(p, y) \in V \subset O$ . Take an open neighborhood  $W$  of  $y$  in  $C$  such that  $\{p\} \times W \subset \bigcap \mathcal{V}(p, y)$ . Moreover, take some  $k, m \in \omega$  such that  $k < m$  and  $\{x_k, x_m\} \subset W$ . Since  $(p, x_k) \in \bigcap \mathcal{V}(p, y)$ , it follows that  $\bigcap \mathcal{V}(p, x_k) \subset \bigcap \mathcal{V}(p, y)$ . Hence we have

$$(x_m, x_k) \in \bigcap \mathcal{V}(p, x_k) \subset \bigcap \mathcal{V}(p, y) \subset V \subset O = P \times Q.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$(p, x_m) \in \{p\} \times W \subset \bigcap \mathcal{V}(p, y) \subset V \subset O = P \times Q.$$

Thus we obtain  $x_m \in P \cap Q$ . This is a contradiction.  $\square$

The author first showed in Theorem 2 that  $X$  has countable tightness. Subsequently, N. Kemoto kindly pointed out that  $X$  is a Fréchet space.

We say that a space  $X$  is *orthocompact* if every open cover of  $X$  has an interior-preserving open refinement.

As an analogue of [1, Theorem 10], we immediately have

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $X$  be a countably compact space. If  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  is orthocompact, then  $X$  is a Fréchet space.*

For a Tychonoff space  $X$ , we denote by  $\beta X$  the Stone-Čech compactification of  $X$ . Junnila [5] proved that the orthocompactness of  $X \times \beta X$  gives the metacompactness of  $X$ . Finally, we show that the orthocompactness of  $(X \times \beta X) \setminus \Delta$  gives not only the local property of  $X$  but also the global property of  $X$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $X$  be a Tychonoff space and  $\gamma X$  a compactification of  $X$ . If  $(X \times \gamma X) \setminus \Delta$  is orthocompact, then  $X$  is metacompact.*

PROOF: The proof is obtained by modifying that of [9, Theorem 2.2]. Let  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}^*$ ,  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  be the same ones as in the proof of it. There is an interior-preserving

open refinement  $\mathcal{H}$  of  $\mathcal{G} \setminus (X \times \gamma X) \setminus \Delta$ . For each  $x \in X$ , fix a  $V_x \in \mathcal{V}$  with  $x \in V_x$ . For each  $(x, x') \in (X \times \gamma X) \setminus \Delta$ , we take a basic open neighborhood  $P_{x,x'} \times Q_{x,x'}$  of  $(x, x')$  which is contained in some member of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Pick  $x \in X$ . Since  $\gamma X \setminus V_x$  is compact, there is a finite subset  $F(x)$  of  $\gamma X \setminus V_x$  such that  $\gamma X \setminus V_x \subset \bigcup_{z \in F(x)} Q_{x,z}$ . Let  $W_x = (\bigcap_{z \in F(x)} P_{x,z}) \cap V_x$ . Here, we set  $\mathcal{W} = \{W_x : x \in X\}$ . It suffices from [6, Theorem 3.6] to show that there is a finite subcollection  $\mathcal{U}_x$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  such that  $\text{St}(x, \mathcal{W}) \subset \bigcup \mathcal{U}_x$  and  $x \in \bigcap \mathcal{U}_x$  for each  $x \in X$ . For this, it also suffices to show that  $\text{Cl}_{\gamma X} \text{St}(x, \mathcal{W}) \subset \text{St}(x, \mathcal{U}^*)$  for each  $x \in X$ . Assuming the contrary, we pick some  $x \in X$  and some  $q \in \text{Cl}_{\gamma X} \text{St}(x, \mathcal{W}) \setminus \text{St}(x, \mathcal{U}^*)$ . By  $x \neq q$ ,  $\bigcap \mathcal{H}(x, q)$  is an open neighborhood of  $(x, q)$ . Take a basic open neighborhood  $S \times T$  of  $(x, q)$  contained in  $\bigcap \mathcal{H}(x, q)$ . Pick  $p \in T \cap \text{St}(x, \mathcal{W})$ , and pick  $y \in X$  with  $x \in W_y$  and  $p \in W_y$ . Since  $x \in W_y \subset V_y \subset U_{V_y}^* \in \mathcal{U}^*$ , it follows that

$$q \in \gamma X \setminus \text{St}(x, \mathcal{U}^*) \subset \gamma X \setminus V_y \subset \bigcup_{z \in F(y)} Q_{y,z}.$$

Find  $z \in F(y)$  with  $q \in Q_{y,z}$ . By the same argument as in the proof of [9, Theorem 2.2], we obtain that  $\{(x, q), (x, p), (p, q)\} \subset H_0$  for some  $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ , and so that  $\{(x, p), (p, q)\} \subset (V_0 \cap X) \times (\gamma X \setminus \text{Cl}_{\gamma X} V_0)$  for some  $V_0 \in \mathcal{V}$ . This is a contradiction.  $\square$

By Theorems 2 and 3, we obtain

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $X$  be a Tychonoff space. If  $(X \times \beta X) \setminus \Delta$  is orthocompact, then  $X$  is metacompact and Fréchet.*

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Arhangel'skiĭ A.V., Kombarov A.P., *On  $\nabla$ -normal spaces*, Topology and Appl. **35** (1990), 121–126.
- [2] Chaber J., Čoban M., Nagami N., *On monotonic generalizations of Moore spaces, Čech-complete spaces, and  $p$ -spaces*, Fund. Math. **83** (1974), 107–119.
- [3] Gruenhage G., *Generalized metric spaces*, Handbook of Set-theoretic Topology (K. Kunen and J.E. Vaughan, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 423–501.
- [4] Gruenhage G., Pelant J., *Analytic spaces and paracompactness of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$* , Topology and Appl. **28** (1988), 11–15.
- [5] Junnila H.J.K., *Metacompactness, paracompactness and interior-preserving open covers*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **249** (1979), 373–385.
- [6] ———, *On submetacompactness*, Topology Proc. **3** (1978), 375–405.
- [7] Kombarov A.P., *On rectangular covers of  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$* , Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **30** (1989), 81–83.
- [8] Nagami K.,  *$\Sigma$ -spaces*, Fund. Math. **65** (1969), 169–192.
- [9] Yajima Y., *A characterization of submetacompactness in terms of products*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **112** (1991), 291–296.
- [10] ———, *Subspaces of squares;  $X^2 \setminus \Delta$  and others*, Abstracts of Short Conference of Uniform Mathematics and its Applications, Bern, 1991.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KANAGAWA UNIVERSITY, YOKOHAMA 221, JAPAN

(Received May 20, 1993)