

## ON TOPOLOGICAL SPACES THAT HAVE A BOUNDED COMPLETE DCPO MODEL

ZHAO DONGSHENG AND XI XIAOYONG

**ABSTRACT.** A dcpo model of a topological space  $X$  is a dcpo (directed complete poset)  $P$  such that  $X$  is homeomorphic to the maximal point space of  $P$  with the subspace topology of the Scott space of  $P$ . It has been previously proved by Xi and Zhao that every  $T_1$  space has a dcpo model. It is, however, still unknown whether every  $T_1$  space has a bounded complete dcpo model (a poset is bounded complete if each of its upper bounded subsets has a supremum). In this paper, we first show that the set of natural numbers equipped with the co-finite topology does not have a bounded complete dcpo model and then prove that a large class of topological spaces (including all Hausdorff  $k$ -spaces) have a bounded complete dcpo model. We shall mainly focus on the model formed by all of the nonempty closed compact subsets of the given space.

**Introduction.** In domain theory, one of the most useful intrinsic order topologies on a poset is the Scott topology. Although the definition of this topology was originally motivated mainly by problems in computer science, it soon found deep links with other mathematical structures. One of the classic results on the Scott topology was discovered by Dana Scott: the injective objects of the category of all  $T_0$  spaces are exactly the continuous lattices equipped with their Scott topologies [18]. A modern link between the Scott topology and general topological spaces was established via the maximal point spaces of Scott spaces. A poset model of a topological space  $X$  is a poset  $P$  such that  $\text{Max}(P)$  is homeomorphic to  $X$  [11]. Every space that has a poset model must be  $T_1$ . Edalat and Heckmann [2] proved that every

---

2010 AMS *Mathematics subject classification.* Primary 06B30, 06B35, 54A05.

*Keywords and phrases.* Scott topology, maximal point space, bounded complete dcpo model, CK-open set, CK-filter defined space.

The first author was supported by the NIE Academic Research (AcRF) fund, grant No. RI 3/16 ZDS. The second author was supported by the NSF of China, grant Nos. 11361028, 11671008.

Received by the editors on January 26, 2016, and in revised form on December 8, 2016.

complete metric space has a poset model that is a domain (continuous dcpo). Lawson [11] proved that a space has a domain model with a countable base and satisfies the Lawson condition if and only if it is a Polish space. Kopperman, Künzi and Waszkiewicz [10] proved that every complete metric space has a bounded complete domain model.

Spaces with other special types of poset models have also been considered by many other authors [1, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20].

A natural question which then arises is: which spaces have a poset model? Erné [4] and Zhao [22] proved that every  $T_1$  space has a bounded complete algebraic poset model. Thus the  $T_1$  spaces are exactly those spaces which have a poset model.

Recently, Zhao and Xi [21, 23] further proved that every  $T_1$  space has a dcpo model.

A subset  $A$  of a poset  $P$  is upper bounded if there is an element  $b \in P$  such that  $x \leq b$  for all  $x \in A$ . A poset is bounded complete if all of its upper bounded nonempty subsets have a supremum. The dcpo model constructed in [21, 23] for a  $T_1$  space is not bounded complete in general.

Hence, we have the following problem: does every  $T_1$  topological space have a bounded complete dcpo model?

In this paper, we first prove that, if  $P$  is a bounded complete dcpo, then, for any  $x \in P$ ,

$$\downarrow((\uparrow x) \cap \text{Max}(P))$$

is a Scott closed set and then deduce that the  $T_1$  space of the set all positive integers equipped with the co-finite topology does not have a bounded complete dcpo model. Next, we prove that a large class of topological spaces, including all Hausdorff  $k$ -spaces, have a bounded complete dcpo model.

Given a  $T_1$  space  $X$ , the set  $\text{CK}(X)$  of all nonempty closed compact subsets of  $X$  is a bounded complete dcpo with respect to the reverse inclusion order, and the set  $\text{Max}(\text{CK}(X))$  of maximal points of  $\text{CK}(X)$  consists of all singletons. Furthermore, there is a natural mapping

$$\eta_X : X \longrightarrow \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)),$$

where  $\eta_X(x) = \{x\}$  for each  $x \in X$ . In this paper, we shall investigate

the topological spaces  $X$  where  $\eta_X$  is a homeomorphism; such spaces  $X$  have  $\text{CK}(X)$  as a bounded complete dcpo model.

**1. Not every  $T_1$  space has a bounded complete dcpo model.**

For any subset  $A$  of a poset  $P$ , let

$$\downarrow A = \{x \in P : x \leq y \text{ for some } y \in A\}$$

and

$$\uparrow A = \{x \in P : x \geq y \text{ for some } y \in A\}.$$

A nonempty subset  $D$  of a poset  $P$  is a directed set if every two elements in  $D$  have an upper bound in  $D$ . A poset  $P$  is called a *directed complete poset*, or dcpo for short, if, for any directed subset of  $D \subseteq P$ ,

$$\sup D = \bigvee D$$

exists in  $P$ .

A subset  $U$  of a poset  $P$  is Scott open if:

(i)  $U = \uparrow U$  (called an upper set) and

(ii) for any directed subset  $D$ ,  $\bigvee D \in U$  implies  $D \cap U \neq \emptyset$ , whenever  $\bigvee D$  exists.

All Scott open sets of poset  $P$  form a topology on  $P$ , denoted by  $\sigma(P)$  and called the Scott topology on  $P$ . The space  $(P, \sigma(P))$  is denoted by  $\Sigma P$ , and called the Scott space of  $P$ . It follows that a subset  $F$  of  $P$  is Scott closed if:

(i)  $F = \downarrow F$  (called a lower set), and

(ii) for any directed subset  $D$  of  $P$ ,  $D \subseteq F$  implies  $\bigvee D \in F$  if  $\bigvee D$  exists.

For more about the Scott topology and related structures, see [7, 8].

In the following, we shall always assume that the topology on the set  $\text{Max}(P)$  of maximal points of a poset  $P$  is the inherited subspace topology from  $\Sigma P$ , and we call the space  $\text{Max}(P)$  the *maximal point space* of  $P$ .

A poset model of a topological space  $X$  is a poset  $P$  such that  $\text{Max}(P)$  is homeomorphic to  $X$  [11]. Every space having a poset model is  $T_1$ .

The poset of all nonempty closed intervals of real numbers with the reverse inclusion order is a dcpo model of the real line with the Euclidean topology (see [7, Example V-6.8] for a more general result).

In [23], it was proven that every  $T_1$  space  $X$  has a dcpo model. However, the dcpo model of  $X$  constructed in [23] is generally not bounded complete. It is still unknown whether every  $T_1$  space has a bounded complete dcpo model. We give a negative answer to this question. Firstly, we prove a general result on bounded complete dcpos.

**Lemma 1.1.** *If  $P$  is a bounded complete dcpo, then for any  $x \in P$ , the set  $\downarrow((\uparrow x) \cap \text{Max}(P))$  is Scott closed.*

*Proof.* Let

$$D \subseteq \downarrow((\uparrow x) \cap \text{Max}(P))$$

be a directed set. For each  $d \in D$ , the subset  $\{d, x\}$  has an upper bound in  $(\uparrow x) \cap \text{Max}(P)$ ; thus,  $d \vee x$  exists. Then,

$$\{d \vee x : d \in D\}$$

is a directed set, and clearly,

$$\bigvee D \leq \bigvee \{d \vee x : d \in D\}.$$

The element  $\bigvee \{d \vee x : d \in D\}$  is below some maximal element  $v$ , which is clearly in  $(\uparrow x) \cap \text{Max}(P)$ . Thus,

$$\bigvee \{d \vee x : d \in D\} \in \downarrow((\uparrow x) \cap \text{Max}(P)),$$

implying

$$\bigvee D \in \downarrow((\uparrow x) \cap \text{Max}(P)).$$

Since  $\downarrow((\uparrow x) \cap \text{Max}(P))$  is clearly a lower set, it is Scott closed.  $\square$

For any element  $x$  in a dcpo  $P$ ,

$$\uparrow x \cap \text{Max}(P) = (\downarrow((\uparrow x) \cap \text{Max}(P))) \cap \text{Max}(P).$$

Thus, by Lemma 1.1, we deduce the following.

**Corollary 1.2.** *For any element  $x$  in a bounded complete dcpo  $P$ ,  $\uparrow x \cap \text{Max}(P)$  is a closed subset of  $\text{Max}(P)$ .*

**Remark 1.3.** By Zorn’s lemma, every element in a dcpo  $P$  is below some maximal point. It thus follows that, in any dcpo  $P$ ,

$$\downarrow(\uparrow x) = \downarrow((\uparrow x) \cap \text{Max}(P))$$

holds for every  $x \in P$ . Therefore, for any  $x$  in a bounded complete dcpo  $P$ ,  $\downarrow(\uparrow x)$  is a Scott closed subset of  $P$ .

**Example 1.4.** The set  $\mathbb{N}$  of all positive integers equipped with the co-finite topology  $\tau_{\text{cof}}$  does not have a bounded complete dcpo model. Here,  $U \in \tau_{\text{cof}}$  if and only if either  $U = \emptyset$  or  $\mathbb{N} - U$  is a finite set. In fact, suppose, on the contrary, that  $P$  is a bounded complete dcpo model of  $(\mathbb{N}, \tau_{\text{cof}})$ . To simplify the argument, we assume  $\mathbb{N} = \text{Max}(P)$ . As  $\mathbb{N} - \{1\}$  is not closed in  $(\mathbb{N}, \tau_{\text{cof}})$ , the set  $\downarrow(\mathbb{N} - \{1\})$  is not a Scott closed set of  $P$  (otherwise  $\mathbb{N} - \{1\} = \downarrow(\mathbb{N} - \{1\}) \cap \text{Max}(P)$  would be closed). Hence, there is a directed set

$$D \subseteq \downarrow(\mathbb{N} - \{1\})$$

such that  $\bigvee D \notin \downarrow(\mathbb{N} - \{1\})$ . It follows that  $\bigvee D \leq 1$  and  $\bigvee D \not\leq 2$ . Hence, there is a  $d \in D$  such that  $d \not\leq 2$ . Then, by Corollary 1.2,  $\uparrow d \cap \text{Max}(P)$  is a closed (and proper) subset of  $\text{Max}(P) = \mathbb{N}$ . By the definition of  $\tau_{\text{cof}}$ ,  $\uparrow d \cap \text{Max}(P)$  must be a finite set, say

$$\uparrow d \cap \text{Max}(P) = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}.$$

Clearly,  $1 \in \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$  since  $\bigvee D \leq 1$ . Assume that  $u_1 = 1$  and

$$\{u_2, u_3, \dots, u_n\} \subset \mathbb{N} - \{1\}.$$

Then,

$$D \subseteq \downarrow\{u_2, u_3, \dots, u_n\} \neq \emptyset,$$

which implies that  $D \subseteq \downarrow u_m$  holds for some fixed  $m \geq 2$ . However, this implies

$$\bigvee D \in \downarrow u_m \subseteq \downarrow(\mathbb{N} - \{1\}),$$

contradicting the assumption on  $D$ . This contradiction shows that  $(\mathbb{N}, \tau_{\text{cof}})$  does not have a bounded complete dcpo model.

**Remark 1.5.** It is well known that the co-finite topology  $\tau_{\text{cof}}$  on a set  $X$  is the coarsest  $T_1$  topology on  $X$ . If  $X$  is finite, then  $(X, \tau_{\text{cof}})$  is a discrete space; hence, it has a bounded complete dcpo model. If  $X$  is

an infinite set, then using a similar proof as for  $(\mathbb{N}, \tau_{\text{cof}})$ , it may also be shown that  $(X, \tau_{\text{cof}})$  does not have a bounded complete dcpo model.

At this time, it remains unknown whether the set  $\mathbb{R}$  of all real numbers equipped with the co-countable topology has a bounded complete dcpo model.

**2. Spaces whose closed compact sets form a model.** In this section, we prove some positive results on spaces which have a bounded complete dcpo model.

For any  $T_1$  space  $(X, \tau)$ , let  $\text{CK}(X)$  be the set of all nonempty closed compact subsets of  $X$ .

The poset  $(\text{CK}(X), \supseteq)$  is directed complete: for any directed subset  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \text{CK}(X)$ ,

$$\bigcap \mathcal{D} = \bigvee_{\text{CK}(X)} \mathcal{D}.$$

The set of maximal points of  $\text{CK}(X)$  are the singleton sets:

$$\text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)) = \{\{x\} : x \in X\}.$$

It is then natural to ask when the dcpo  $\text{CK}(X)$  is a model of  $X$ , or more specifically, when the following mapping is a homeomorphism:

$$\eta_X : X \longrightarrow \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)), \quad \eta_X(x) = \{x\}, \quad x \in X.$$

**Definition 2.1.** A subset  $U$  of a topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is called CK-open if, for any filter base  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \text{CK}(X)$  with  $|\bigcap \mathcal{F}| = 1$ , that is,  $\bigcap \mathcal{F}$  is a singleton, and  $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subseteq U$ , then  $F \subseteq U$  for some  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ .

Let  $\tau_{\text{CK}}$  be the set of all CK-open sets of  $X$ . Obviously,  $\emptyset$  and  $X$  are CK-open. It is easy to verify that  $\tau_{\text{CK}}$  is indeed a topology on  $X$  and  $\tau \subseteq \tau_{\text{CK}}$ . For the reader's convenience, we give here a brief explanation.

If  $U$  and  $V$  are CK-open and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \text{CK}(X)$  is a filter base such that  $\bigcap \mathcal{F} = \{x\}$  and  $x \in U \cap V$ , then  $x \in U$  and  $x \in V$ ; thus, there are  $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$  satisfying  $F_1 \subseteq U, F_2 \subseteq V$ . Choose  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $F \subseteq F_1 \cap F_2$ . Then  $F \subseteq U \cap V$ . Hence,  $U \cap V$  is CK-open. It is more straightforward to verify that the union of any collection of CK-open sets of  $X$  is CK-open. Hence,  $\tau_{\text{CK}}$  is a topology on  $X$ .

Now, let  $U$  be a nonempty open set of  $(X, \tau)$ , i.e.,  $U \in \tau$ , and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \text{CK}(X)$  a filter base such that  $\bigcap \mathcal{F} = \{x\}$  and  $x \in U$ . Choose an  $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}$  and consider

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \{F \in \mathcal{F} : F \subseteq F_0\}.$$

Clearly,  $\bigcap \mathcal{F}_0 = \bigcap \mathcal{F} = \{x\}$ . The set

$$F_0 - U = F_0 \cap (X - U),$$

as a closed subset of the compact set  $F_0$ , is compact. In addition,  $\{X - F : F \in \mathcal{F}_0\}$  is an open cover of  $F_0 - U$ , so there is an  $F \in \mathcal{F}_0$  such that  $F_0 - U \subseteq X - F$  (note that  $\{X - F : F \in \mathcal{F}_0\}$  is a directed family of open sets). Thus,

$$F \cap (F_0 - U) \subseteq F \cap (X - F) = \emptyset.$$

Since  $F \subseteq F_0$ , we have

$$F \cap (F_0 - U) = F - U = \emptyset,$$

implying  $F \subseteq U$ . Hence, every open set of  $(X, \tau)$  is CK-open, that is,  $\tau \subseteq \tau_{\text{CK}}$ .

**Definition 2.2.** A topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is called *CK-filter defined* if  $\tau_{\text{CK}} = \tau$ .

**Example 2.3.** Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$  be the set of all real numbers and  $\tau$  the topology on  $X$ , where  $U \in \tau$  if and only if  $U = V - A$  for some Euclidean open set  $V$  and a countable set  $A$ . Then,  $\text{CK}(X)$  is the family of all nonempty finite subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Thus, every subset is CK-open, so  $(X, \tau)$  is not CK-filter defined.

A space  $X$  is a  $k$ -space (or compactly generated space) if a subset  $U$  of  $X$  is open if and only if for any compact set  $K$ ,  $U \cap K$  is open in the subspace  $K$ . Equivalently, a subset  $B$  is closed if and only if for any compact set  $K$ ,  $B \cap K$  is closed in the subspace  $K$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *Every Hausdorff  $k$ -space is CK-filter defined.*

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a Hausdorff  $k$ -space, and let  $U$  be CK-open. Let  $K$  be a compact subset of  $(X, \tau)$ . Assume that  $K \cap (X - U)$  is not

closed in  $K$ . Then, it is not a closed set. Thus, there is a net

$$\{x_n : n \in D\} \subseteq K \cap (X - U)$$

that converges to an element  $x_0$  and  $x_0 \notin K \cap (X - U)$ . However, as  $K$  is closed since it is a compact subset of a Hausdorff space, so  $x_0 \in K$ . It thus follows that  $x_0 \in U$ . For each  $n \in D$ , let  $F_n = \text{cl}(\{x_k : k \geq n\})$ . Then, each  $F_n$  is a closed compact subset of  $(X, \tau)$  since it is a closed subset of the Hausdorff compact subspace  $K$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{F} = \{F_n : n \in D\}$  is a filter base, and clearly,  $\bigcap \mathcal{F} = \{x_0\}$ . However, there is no  $F_n$  contained in  $U$ . This contradiction shows that, for any compact subset  $K$  of  $(X, \tau)$ ,  $K \cap (X - U)$  is closed in  $K$ ; thus,  $K \cap U$  is open in  $K$ . Since  $(X, \tau)$  is a  $k$ -space, it follows that  $U$  is open in  $(X, \tau)$ . Therefore,  $\tau_{\text{CK}} \subseteq \tau$ , implying  $\tau = \tau_{\text{CK}}$ .  $\square$

Since every locally compact Hausdorff space is a  $k$ -space, we have the following.

**Corollary 2.5.** *Every Hausdorff locally compact space is CK-filter defined.*

A space  $X$  is called a *sequential space* if a subset  $A$  is closed if and only if for any sequence  $\{x_i\}$  in  $A$ ,  $A$  contains all limits of  $\{x_i\}$ . Sequential spaces are precisely the quotient spaces of metric spaces [5, 6]. Every sequential Hausdorff space is a  $k$ -space [3, Theorem 3.3.20].

**Corollary 2.6.** *Every Hausdorff sequential space is CK-filter defined. In particular, every first countable Hausdorff space is CK-filter defined.*

At this time, we still do not have an example of a CK-filter defined Hausdorff space which is not a  $k$ -space.

We now show that, for any CK-filter defined space  $X$ ,  $(\text{CK}(X), \supseteq)$  is a bounded complete dcpo model of  $X$ .

**Lemma 2.7.** *For any Hausdorff space  $(X, \tau)$ ,  $\text{CK}(X, \tau) = \text{CK}(X, \tau_{\text{CK}})$ .*

*Proof.* First, note that every compact Hausdorff space is locally compact, and thus, CK-filter defined. Also, in a Hausdorff space, every compact set is closed.

Since  $\tau_{\text{CK}}$  is finer than  $\tau$ , if  $A \in \text{CK}(X, \tau_{\text{CK}})$ , then  $A$  is a compact subset of  $(X, \tau)$ . However,  $(X, \tau)$  is Hausdorff; thus,  $A$  is also closed in  $(X, \tau)$ . Hence,  $A \in \text{CK}(X, \tau)$ .

Now, let

$$F \in \text{CK}(X, \tau)$$

and

$$\{U_i : i \in I\} \subseteq \tau_{\text{CK}}$$

be an open cover of  $F$ . Then,

$$F = \bigcup \{F \cap U_i : i \in I\}.$$

The subspace  $F$  of  $(X, \tau)$  is compact Hausdorff; thus, it is CK-filter defined. It is easily seen that each  $F \cap U_i$  is a CK-open set of the space  $F$  (if  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \text{CK}(F)$  is a filter base such that  $\bigcap \mathcal{D} = \{x\} \subseteq F \cap U_i$ , then  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \text{CK}(X, \tau)$  and  $\bigcap \mathcal{D} = \{x\} \subseteq U_i$ ). Therefore, each  $F \cap U_i$  is an open set of  $F$  since  $F$  is CK-filter defined, that is,

$$F \cap U_i = F \cap V_i$$

for some  $V_i \in \tau$ . Then,

$$F \subseteq \bigcup \{V_i : i \in I\}.$$

As  $F \in \text{CK}(X, \tau)$  is compact, there exist  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n$  such that

$$F \subseteq \bigcup \{V_{i_k} : k = 1, 2, \dots, n\},$$

which then implies

$$F \subseteq \bigcup \{U_{i_k} : k = 1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Hence,  $F$  is a compact set of  $(X, \tau_{\text{CK}})$ . In addition, as  $F$  is closed in  $(X, \tau)$  it is also closed in  $(X, \tau_{\text{CK}})$ ; thus,  $F \in \text{CK}(X, \tau_{\text{CK}})$ .

In all, this shows that  $\text{CK}(X, \tau) = \text{CK}(X, \tau_{\text{CK}})$ . □

**Corollary 2.8.** *For any Hausdorff space  $(X, \tau)$ , the space  $(X, \tau_{\text{CK}})$  is Hausdorff and CK-filter defined.*

*Proof.* That  $(X, \tau_{\text{CK}})$  is Hausdorff follows from the fact that  $\tau_{\text{CK}}$  is finer than  $\tau$ .

Let  $U$  be a CK-open set of  $(X, \tau_{CK})$ . We must show that  $U \in \tau_{CK}$ . Let  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq CK(X, \tau)$  be a filter base such that

$$\bigcap \mathcal{D} = \{x\} \subseteq U.$$

Then,  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq CK(X, \tau_{CK})$  by Lemma 2.7. As  $U$  is a CK-open set of  $(X, \tau_{CK})$ , there is a  $V \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $V \subseteq U$ . Hence,  $U \in \tau_{CK}$ .  $\square$

A subset  $U$  of a topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is called CK\*-open if, for any filter base  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq CK(X)$ ,

$$\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subseteq U \implies F \subseteq U \text{ for some } F \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Every open set of  $X$  is CK\*-open, and every CK\*-open set is CK-open.

The intersection of two CK\*-open sets is clearly a CK\*-open set. However, it seems impossible to show that, in general, the union of two CK\*-open sets is CK\*-open. Thus, it is unlikely that all CK\*-open sets form a topology if no further condition is imposed.

**Lemma 2.9.** *A subset of a Hausdorff space is CK-open if and only if it is CK\*-open.*

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a Hausdorff space. We only need prove that every CK-open set of  $X$  is CK\*-open.

Let  $U$  be a CK-open set of  $X$  and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq CK(X)$  a filter base such that  $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subseteq U$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that there is an  $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $F \subseteq F_0$  holds for all  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . The subspace  $F_0$  of  $X$  is Hausdorff and compact; therefore, it is CK-filter defined.

It is easy to verify that, if  $A$  is a closed set and  $U$  is a CK-open set, then  $U \cap A$  is a CK-open subset of the subspace  $A$ . Now,  $U \cap F_0$  is a CK-open set of the (Hausdorff compact) subspace  $F_0$ ; thus, it is open. Therefore, it is a CK\*-open set of  $F_0$ . Now,

$$\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subseteq U \cap F_0,$$

and each member of  $\mathcal{F}$  is a closed compact subset of  $F_0$ . Thus, there is an  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $F \subseteq U \cap F_0 \subseteq U$ . In all, this shows that  $U$  is CK\*-open.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a  $T_1$  topological space. Consider the following statements:*

- (1)  $X$  is CK-filter defined.
- (2) The mapping

$$\eta_X : X \longrightarrow \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X))$$

*is a homeomorphism.*

- (3) Every CK\*-open set is an open set of  $X$ .

*Then (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3). If  $X$  is Hausdorff, then the above three statements are equivalent.*

*Proof.*

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). Assume that  $(X, \tau)$  is CK-filter defined. For any  $U \in \tau$ , we claim that the following set is a Scott open set of the dcpo  $(\text{CK}(X), \supseteq)$ :

$$\{A \in \text{CK}(X) : A \subseteq U\}.$$

In order to see this, let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a directed subset of  $\text{CK}(X)$  and

$$\bigvee_{\text{CK}(X)} \mathcal{E} = \bigcap \mathcal{E} \subseteq U.$$

Choose one  $A_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ , and let  $\widehat{\mathcal{E}} = \{B \in \mathcal{E} : B \subseteq A_0\}$ . Then,  $\bigcap \widehat{\mathcal{E}} = \bigcap \mathcal{E} \subseteq U$ . Further,

$$\bigcup \{B^c : B \in \widehat{\mathcal{E}}\} \supseteq U^c \supseteq A_0 \cap U^c;$$

thus, the directed family  $\{B^c : B \in \widehat{\mathcal{E}}\}$  is an open cover of the compact set  $A_0 \cap U^c$ . There is a  $B \in \widehat{\mathcal{E}}$  such that  $A_0 \cap U^c \subseteq B^c$ , which implies  $B \subseteq U \cup A_0^c$ . However,  $B \subseteq A_0$ ; hence  $B \subseteq U$ . Since the set  $\{A \in \text{CK}(X) : A \subseteq U\}$  is clearly an upper set of  $(\text{CK}(X), \supseteq)$ , it is thus a Scott open set of  $(\text{CK}(X), \supseteq)$ . Furthermore,

$$\eta_X(U) = \{\{x\} : x \in U\} = \{A \in \text{CK}(X) : A \subseteq U\} \bigcap \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)),$$

which is an open set of  $\text{Max}(\text{CK}(X))$ . Thus,  $\eta_X$  is an open mapping.

Now, let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a Scott open set in  $\text{CK}(X)$ . We prove that  $\eta_X^{-1}(\mathcal{U} \cap \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)))$  is open in  $(X, \tau)$ . By assumption (1), we only need verify that  $\eta_X^{-1}(\mathcal{U} \cap \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)))$  is a CK-open set of  $(X, \tau)$ . Assume

that  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \text{CK}(X)$  is a filter base such that

$$\bigcap \mathcal{F} = \{x\} \subseteq \eta_X^{-1}(\mathcal{U} \cap \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X))).$$

Then,  $\mathcal{F}$  is a directed subset of  $\text{CK}(X)$  and

$$\bigvee_{\text{CK}(X)} \mathcal{F} = \{x\} = \eta_X(x) \in \mathcal{U}$$

since  $x \in \eta_X^{-1}(\mathcal{U} \cap \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)))$ . Since  $\mathcal{U}$  is Scott open, there is a  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $F \in \mathcal{U}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{U}$  is an upper set of  $(\text{CK}(X), \supseteq)$ ; thus, for any  $y \in F$ , it holds that  $\{y\} \in \mathcal{U}$ . Therefore,

$$\eta_X(F) = \{\{y\} : y \in F\} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \cap \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)).$$

It follows that  $F \subseteq \eta_X^{-1}(\mathcal{U} \cap \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)))$ , showing that  $\eta_X^{-1}(\mathcal{U} \cap \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)))$  is CK-open in  $(X, \tau)$ . Therefore,  $\eta_X$  is continuous. Since  $\eta_X$  is also clearly bijective, it is a homeomorphism.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3). Let  $U \subseteq X$  be a CK\*-open set. By the definition of CK\*-open sets, it follows that the set  $\widehat{U} = \{A \in \text{CK}(X) : A \subseteq U\}$  is a Scott open set of  $(\text{CK}(X), \supseteq)$ ; thus,

$$\eta_X^{-1}(\text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)) \cap \widehat{U}) = U$$

must be an open set of  $(X, \tau)$ . Thus, (3) is proved.

Now assume that  $(X, \tau)$  is Hausdorff and every CK\*-open set is open in  $(X, \tau)$ . From Lemma 2.9, every CK-open set of  $(X, \tau)$  is CK\*-open, so every CK-open set of  $(X, \tau)$  is open, showing that  $X$  is CK-filter defined. Hence, (3) implies (1); therefore, all three statements are equivalent.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.11.** *For any Hausdorff space  $(X, \tau)$ ,  $\text{Max}(\text{CK}(X))$  is homeomorphic to  $(X, \tau_{\text{CK}})$ .*

*Proof.* We prove that the mapping

$$g : (X, \tau_{\text{CK}}) \longrightarrow \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X))$$

is a homeomorphism, where  $g(x) = \{x\}$ ,  $x \in X$ .

For any open set  $E$  of  $\text{Max}(\text{CK}(X))$ , there is a Scott open set  $\widehat{E}$  of  $\text{CK}(X)$  such that  $E = \{\{y\} : \{y\} \in \widehat{E}\}$ . Then,  $g^{-1}(E) = \{y : \{y\} \in \widehat{E}\}$

is a CK-open set of  $X$ . As a matter of fact, let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \text{CK}(X)$  be a filter base such that

$$\bigcap \mathcal{F} = \{y\} \subseteq g^{-1}(E).$$

Then,

$$\bigvee_{\text{CK}(X)} \mathcal{F} \in \widehat{E}.$$

Thus, there is an  $F \in \mathcal{F} \cap \widehat{E}$ . Again, since  $\widehat{E}$  is an upper set of  $(\text{CK}(X), \supseteq)$  we have that  $\{y\} \in \widehat{E}$  holds for any  $y \in F$ , which implies  $g(F) \subseteq E$ . Thus,  $F \subseteq g^{-1}(E)$ . Hence,  $g^{-1}(E)$  is an open set of  $(X, \tau_{\text{CK}})$ ; therefore,  $g$  is continuous.

Now, let  $U \in \tau_{\text{CK}}$ . From Lemma 2.9,  $U$  is a  $\text{CK}^*$ -open set of  $X$ . We can verify that

$$H = \{A \in \text{CK}(X) : A \subseteq U\}$$

is a Scott open set of  $\text{CK}(X)$  and

$$H \cap \text{Max}(\text{CK}(X)) = g(U).$$

Thus,  $g$  is also an open mapping, and therefore, a homeomorphism.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.12.**

- (1) For any Hausdorff space  $X$ ,  $\text{Max}(\text{CK}(X))$  is CK-filter defined.
- (2) A Hausdorff space  $X$  is CK-filter defined if and only if it is homeomorphic to  $\text{Max}(\text{CK}(Y))$  for some Hausdorff space  $Y$ .

By the implication of (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) in Theorem 2.10, we deduce the main positive result in this paper on spaces that have a bounded complete depo model.

**Theorem 2.13.** *Every CK-filter defined  $T_1$  space has a bounded complete depo model.*

**Corollary 2.14.** *Every Hausdorff  $k$ -space has a bounded complete depo model.*

Another possible bounded complete depo model of a space  $X$  formed by some subsets is the set  $\text{CKC}(X)$  of all nonempty closed compact and connected subsets of  $X$ . With respect to the reverse inclusion order,  $\text{CKC}(X)$  is a bounded complete depo, and the maximal points are the

singletons. For the real line  $\mathbb{R}$  with the Euclidean topology,  $\text{CKC}(\mathbb{R})$  is the set of all closed intervals and it is indeed a dcpo model of  $\mathbb{R}$  (see [7, Example V-6.3]).

The next theorem can be proved using a similar method as for locally compact Hausdorff spaces.

**Proposition 2.15.** *If  $X$  is a locally compact and locally connected  $T_1$  space, then  $(\text{CKC}(X), \supseteq)$  is a bounded complete dcpo model of  $X$ .*

**3. Conclusions and remarks for further work.** In this paper, we introduced and studied CK-filter defined spaces and used this to characterize the Hausdorff spaces whose nonempty compact subsets form a dcpo model. One of the main results is that every Hausdorff  $k$ -space has a bounded complete dcpo model.

The following are some related problems and tasks for further study on this topic.

(1) Example 1.1 shows that not every  $T_1$  space has a bounded complete dcpo model. We do not know, at this moment, whether assuming a stronger separation axiom will guarantee the existence of such a dcpo model. In particular, we are interested in knowing whether every Hausdorff space has a bounded complete dcpo model.

(2) From Theorem 2.4, if a space is a Hausdorff  $k$ -space, it is CK-filter defined. We do not know whether the converse conclusion for Hausdorff spaces are true. We conjecture it is not true.

(3) It is well known that the category of all Hausdorff  $k$ -spaces is Cartesian closed. Now, the category of Hausdorff  $k$ -spaces is a subcategory of Hausdorff CK-filtered spaces, and they seem very close to each other. We wonder whether the category of all Hausdorff CK-filter defined space also owns some closure properties. For example, one problem is: is the product of two Hausdorff CK-filter defined spaces CK-filter defined?

(4) In [9], Hofmann and Lawson introduced  $q$ -spaces and proved that every Hausdorff  $k$ -space is a  $q$ -space. One of the characteristics of sober  $q$ -spaces was given in terms of collections of quasicompact saturated subsets of the space [9, Proposition 2.9]. It would be desirable to find more links between CK-filter defined spaces and  $q$ -spaces.

**Acknowledgments.** We are very grateful to the anonymous referee for carefully checking the original draft and giving us many helpful suggestions for improvements. In particular, the referee suggested we consider whether every Hausdorff  $k$ -space is CK-filter defined, which encouraged us to prove Theorem 2.4.

## REFERENCES

1. M. Ali-Akbaria, B. Honarib and M. Pourmahdiana, *Any  $T_1$  space has a continuous poset model*, Topol. Appl. **156** (2009), 2240–2245.
2. A. Edalat and R. Heckmann, *A computational model for metric spaces*, Theor. Comp. Sci. **193** (1998), 53–73.
3. R. Engelking, *General topology*, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
4. M. Ern e, *Algebraic models for  $T_1$ -spaces*, Topol. Appl. **158** (2011), 945–962.
5. S.P. Franklin, *Spaces in which sequences suffice*, Fund. Math. **57** (1965), 107–115.
6. ———, *Spaces in which sequences suffice*, II, Fund. Math. **61** (1967), 51–56.
7. G. Gierz, K.H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, et al., *Continuous lattices and domains*, Volume 93, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
8. J. Goubault-Larrecq, *Non-Hausdorff topology and domain theory: Selected topics in point-set topology*, Volume 22, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.
9. K.H. Hofmann and J.D. Lawson, *On the order-theoretical foundation of a theory of quasicompactly generated spaces without separation axiom*, J. Australian Math. Soc. **36** (1984), 194–212.
10. R. Kopperman, A. K unzi and P. Waszkiewicz, *Bounded complete models of topological spaces*, Topol. Appl. **139** (2004), 285–297.
11. J.D. Lawson, *Spaces of maximal points*, Math. Struct. Comp. Sci. **7** (1997), 543–555.
12. ———, *Computation on metric spaces via domain theory*, Topol. Appl. **85** (1998), 247–263.
13. L. Liang and K. Klause, *Order environment of topological spaces*, Acta Math. Sinica **20** (2004), 943–948.
14. K. Martin, *Ideal models of spaces*, Theor. Comp. Sci. **305** (2003), 277–297.
15. ———, *Domain theoretic models of topological spaces*, Electr. Notes Theor. Comp. Sci. **13** (1998), 173–181.
16. ———, *Nonclassical techniques for models of computation*, Topol. Proc. **24** (1999), 375–405.
17. ———, *The regular spaces with countably based models*, Theor. Comp. Sci. **305** (2003), 299–310.
18. D.S. Scott, *Continuous lattices*, in *Toposes, algebraic geometry and logic*, Lect. Notes Math. **274**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972.

19. P. Waszkiewicz, *How do domains model topologies?*, Electr. Notes Theor. Comp. Sci. **83** (2004).
20. K. Weihrauch and U. Schreiber, *Embedding metric spaces into cpo's*, Theor. Comp. Sci. **16** (1981), 5–24.
21. X. Xi and D. Zhao, *Well-filtered spaces and their dcpo models*, Math. Struct. Comp. Sci. **27** (2017), 507–515.
22. D. Zhao, *Poset models of topological spaces*, in Proc. Inter. Conf. Quant. Logic Quantification of Software, Global-Link Publisher, 2009.
23. D. Zhao and X. Xi, *Dcpo models of  $T_1$  topological spaces*, Math. Proc. Cambr. Philos. Soc. **164** (2018), 125–134.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SINGAPORE, NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY, MATHEMATICS AND MATHEMATICS EDUCATION, 1 NANYANG WALK, SINGAPORE 637616

**Email address:** [dongsheng.zhao@nie.edu.sg](mailto:dongsheng.zhao@nie.edu.sg)

JIANGSU NORMAL UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, JIANGSU, CHINA

**Email address:** [littlebrook@jsnu.edu.cn](mailto:littlebrook@jsnu.edu.cn)