# A Characterization of $G_{\delta}$ Graphs

By

## Tadashi Tanaka

(Received September 30, 1971)

#### § 1. Introduction

Let f be a mapping on X into Y where X and Y are topological spaces. The graph G of f is said to be  $G_{\delta}$  provided G is a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $X \times Y$ . F. Burton Jones and E. S. Thomas, Jr [1], [2] obtained some results on connected  $G_{\delta}$  graphs which are interesting to the study of almost continuous mappings.

We first, in this paper, give a necessary and sufficient condition in order that the graph of mapping be a  $G_{\delta}$  graph. Next we show by means of an example that the converse of a result in [1] is not true.

Notations. Let A be a set in X. Let denote by  $A^{(1)}$  the derived set of A, that is the set of all accumulation points of A, by  $A^{(2)}$  the derived set of  $A^{(1)}, \dots,$  by  $A^{(n)}$  the derived set of  $A^{(n-1)}(n=1, 2, \dots)$ . Here we note that the sequence  $\{A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, \dots\}$  is decreasing.

Let f be a mapping on X into Y and let  $Z \subset X$ . Then  $f \mid Z$  denotes the mapping which, for  $x \in Z$ , assigns f(x) to x.

Most of terms can be extracted from Kuratowski's Topology [3].

#### $\S 2$ . The characterization theorem

Theorem. Let f be a mapping on X into Y where X and Y are metrizable topological spaces. Let N denote the set of all points x of X such that f is discontinuous at x. Then the condition that there exists a positive integer n for which the graph of  $f|N^{(n)}$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $X \times Y$  is necessary and sufficient in order that f have a  $G_{\delta}$  graph.

The following lemmas are useful in proving this theorem.

LEMMA 1. If  $G_i$  (i=1, 2, ..., n) are  $G_\delta$  sets in X, then the union  $\bigvee_{i=1}^n G_i$  is a  $G_\delta$  set in X.

It is well-known that Lemma 1 is true. On the other hand, the union of an arbitrary number of  $G_{\delta}$  sets is not necessarily a  $G_{\delta}$  set, but the next result is true.

Lemma 2. Let T be an arbitrary index set. If  $G_t = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} G_{ti}(t \in T)$  where  $G_{ti}$  are open sets in X and  $G_{t1} \cap G_{s1} = \phi$  for every pair of indexes  $t \neq s$  in T, then the union  $\bigcup_{t \in T} G_t$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set in X.

PROOF. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the sequences  $\{G_{t1}, G_{t2}, \dots\}$  are decreasing. This and the condition in the lemma imply that if  $t \neq s$ , then for every pair  $i, j, G_{ti} \cap G_{sj} \subset G_{t1} \cap G_{s1} = \phi$  and hence  $G_{ti} \cap G_{sj} = \phi$ .

To prove this lemma, it is sufficient to show that  $\bigcup_{t \in T} G_t = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} (\bigcup_{t \in T} G_{ti})$ . Let  $p \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} (\bigcup_{t \in T} G_{ti})$ . Then for each i there is an integer t(p, i) such that  $p \in G_{t(p, i)i}$ . By the preceding fact, t(p, i) is independent on i. Let  $t_p$  denote t(p, i). Then we have

$$p \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} G_{t_p i} \subset \bigcup_{t \in T} G_t$$
 and hence  $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} (\bigcup_{t \in T} G_{t i}) \subset \bigcup_{t \in T} G_t$ .

On the other hand, we have

$$G_t = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} G_{ti} \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} (\bigcup_{t \in T} G_{ti})$$
 and hence  $\bigcup_{t \in T} G_t \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} (\bigcup_{t \in T} G_{ti})$ .

Thus we have  $\bigcup_{t \in T} G_t = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} (\bigcup_{t \in T} G_{ti})$ , which completes the proof.

Lemma 3. Let f, X, Y and N be as in Theorem. Then the graph of  $f|(X-\bar{N})$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $X\times Y$ .

PROOF. Let G denote the graph of  $f|(X-\bar{N})$ . Since  $f|(X-\bar{N})$  is continuous by the definition of N, it follows that  $\bar{G} \cap \{(X-\bar{N}) \times Y\} = G$  where  $\bar{G}$  is the closure of G in  $X \times Y$ . Since in a metric space each closed set is a  $G_{\delta}$  set, it follows that  $\bar{G} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} G_i$  where  $G_i$  are open in  $X \times Y$ . Hence we have

$$G = ( \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} G_i ) \cap \{ (X - \bar{N}) \times Y \} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} [G_i \cap \{ (X - \bar{N}) \times Y \}].$$

Thus the graph of  $f|(X-\bar{N})$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $X\times Y$ .

PROOF of THEOREM. To prove the sufficiency, suppose that there exists a positive integer n such that the graph of  $f|N^{(n)}$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $X \times Y$ .

First, since by Lemma 3, the graph  $f|(X-\bar{N})$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $X\times Y$ , then by Lemma 1 it is sufficient to show that the graph of  $f|\bar{N}$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $X\times Y$ .

Now  $\bar{N}$  is the union of the derived set  $N^{(1)}$  and the set  $N_1$  of all isolated points of N. Since each point of  $N_1$  is isolated, so is each point of the graph of  $f|N_1$ . Therefore there exists a family  $\mathbf{F}$  of open sets in  $X \times Y$  such that every element of  $\mathbf{F}$  contains just one point of the graph of  $f|N_1$  and any two elements of  $\mathbf{F}$  are mutually separated. Moreover, each point of the graph of  $f|N_1$  is a  $G_\delta$  set in  $X \times Y$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2 the graph of  $f|N_1$  is a  $G_\delta$  set in  $X \times Y$ . Hence by Lemma 1, it is sufficient to show that the graph of  $f|N^{(1)}$  is a  $G_\delta$  set in  $X \times Y$ .

Next, since  $N^{(1)}$  is closed,  $N^{(1)}$  is the union of  $N^{(2)}$  and the set  $N_2$  of all isolated points of  $N^{(1)}$ . Then, by the same method as in the case of  $f|N_1$  we can prove that the graph of  $f|N_2$  is a  $G_\delta$  set in  $X\times Y$ . Hence by Lemma 1, it is sufficient to show that the graph of  $f|N^{(2)}$  is a  $G_\delta$  set in  $X\times Y$ .

After the *n*-th step of the above argument, it is sufficient to show that a graph of  $f|N^{(n)}$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $X \times Y$ . This is the hypothesis. Thus the sufficiency is proved.

To prove the necessity, suppose that the graph of f is an intersection  $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} G_i$  of open sets  $G_i$  in  $X \times Y$ . Let n be a positive integer. Since  $N^{(n)}$  is closed in X, it follows that  $N^{(n)} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} H_i$  where  $H_i$  are open sets in X. Then we have

the graph of 
$$f|N^{(n)} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \{G_i \cap (H_i \times Y)\}$$
, and hence

the graph of  $f|N^{(n)}$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $X\times Y$ . Thus Theorem is completel proved.

COROLLARY. Let f, X, Y and N be as in Theorem. Then if there exists a positive integer n such that  $N^{(n)} = \phi$ , then f has a  $G_{\delta}$  graph.

PROOF. We may assume that n is the smallest integer such that  $N^{(n)} = \phi$ . Then every point of  $N^{(n-1)}$  is isolated, and hence the graph of  $f|N^{(n-1)}$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $X \times Y$ . Therefore, by Theorem f has a  $G_{\delta}$  graph.

### §3. The example

In this section, let f be a function on I into I where I is the unit interval and let G be the graph of f. F. B. Jones and E. S. Thomas, Jr. have proved the following fact:

If G is a connected  $G_{\delta}$  graph, then G is nowhere dense in  $I^2$ .

In the following, we give an example to show that a connected and now-here dense graph G is not necessarily a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $I^2$ .

Lemma 4. Let  $S=M_1 \cup M_2$  be a decomposition of a complete metric space S into  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  such that both  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are dense in S and  $M_1$  is countable. Then any  $G_{\delta}$  set containing  $M_1$  contains uncountable points of  $M_2$ .

PROOF. The countable set  $M_1$  is not a  $G_\delta$  set. For suppose, on the contrary, that  $M_1$  is a  $G_\delta$  set. Then the complement  $M_2$  of  $M_1$  is a  $F_\sigma$  set. Hence let  $M_2 = \bigvee_{i=1}^\infty F_i$  where  $F_i$  are closed sets. Let  $\mathbf{F}$  be the family consisting of all  $F_i$  and all points of  $M_1$ . Then  $\mathbf{F}$  is a countable family of closed sets, and the union of elements of  $\mathbf{F}$  is S. Since by the hyopthesis, S is a complete metric space, then by Baire theorem, some element of  $\mathbf{F}$  contains an open set in S. This contradicts to the hypothesis that  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are dense in S. Therefore,  $M_1$  is not a  $G_\delta$  set.

Next let D be any  $G_{\delta}$  set containing  $M_1$  and let  $D = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} D_i$  where  $D_i$  are open sets. Suppose that D contains at most countable points  $\{a_1, a_2, \ldots\}$  of  $M_2$ . Then it follows that

 $M_1 = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} (D_i - a_i)$ , and hence  $M_1$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set, contradicting to the preceding result. Thus Lemma 4 is proved.

Lemma 5. Let A be a totally disconnected and dense in itself subset of I. Then the graph is connected provided f satisfies the condition as follows:

If C is any component of I-A, then the graph of  $f|\bar{C}$  is connected and meets both  $I \times \{0\}$  and  $I \times \{1\}$ .

PROOF. Suppose, on the contrary, that G is not connected. Let  $G = G_1 \cup G_2$  be a separation of G. Let  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  be the projections of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  into the domain I of f, respectively. Then without loss of generality, there exist a sequence  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$  of points in  $I_1$  and a point b of  $I_2$  such that  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$  converges to b. Moreover, we may assume that any point of  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$  is not in A. For when  $a_n$  is in A, then  $a_n$  can be replaced by the following point. Let  $U_n$  be an  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of the point  $(a_n, f(a_n))$  such that  $U_n \cap G_2 = \phi$  and  $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{n}$ . Then by hypothesis, the projection of  $U_n$  into the domain of f contains at least one component f of f of f and the graph of f of f is a point desired.

Now if some component D of I-A contains an infinite number of points of  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ , then we have  $b \in \overline{D}$ . Hence the point (b, f(b)) belongs to  $G_1$  which contains the graph of  $f|\overline{D}$ , contradicting to  $(b, f(b)) \in G_2$ . On the other hand, if every component of I-A contains at most a finite number of points

of  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ , then to each n we assign a point  $P_n$  of the intersection of  $I \times \{f(b)\}$  and the graph of f on the component of I - A containing  $a_n$ . Then the sequence  $\{P_1, P_2, \dots\}$  is in  $G_1$  and converges to (b, f(b)), contradicting to  $(b, f(b)) \in G_2$ . Thus Lemma 5 is proved.

EXAMPLE. Let K be the Cantor ternary set in I and let  $\{(r_i, s_i) | i = 1, 2, \dots\}$  be the family of pairwise disjoint open intervals whose union is I - K. For each n, let  $B_n$  be an arc in  $[r_n, s_n] \times I$  such that the following conditions hold:

- (1) The points  $(r_n, 0)$  and  $(s_n, 0)$  are the end points of  $B_n$ .
- (2) For each x in  $[r_n, s_n]$ ,  $B_n \cap (\{x\} \times I)$  is a point.
- (3)  $B_n$  meets  $I \times \{1\}$ .

Let  $H=K-\bigvee_{i=1}^{\infty} [r_i, s_i]$  and consider the set G defined as follows:

$$G = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \cup \{(x, 1) \mid x \in H\}.$$

Then the set of all discontinuous points of the function defined by G is the set K. Here we note that K is a totally disconnected and dense in itself subset of I, and that both H and K-H are dense in K and K-H is countable.

Hence by Lemma 5 G is a connected graph, and by the theorem, p. 142, of  $\lceil 3 \rceil G$  is nowhere dense.

On the other hand, by Lemma 4 any  $G_{\delta}$  set containing the graph of f|K contains uncountable points of  $H \times \{0\}$ , and hence G is not a  $G_{\delta}$  set in  $I^2$ . Thus by Theorem in  $\S 2$ , G is not a  $G_{\delta}$  graph.

Faculty of Engineering Tokushima University

#### References

- [1] F. Burton Jones and E. S. Thomas, Jr., Connected  $G_{\delta}$  graphs, Duke Math. J. 33 (1966), 341-346.
- [2] E. S. Thomas, Jr., Some characterizations of functions of Baire class 1, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 17 (1966), 456-461.
- [3] K. Kuratowski, Topology I, Academic Press, New York, 1966.