

## The dimension of products of complete separable metric spaces

by

John Kulesza (Fairfax)

**Abstract.** For each  $n \in \omega$ , a complete, separable, totally disconnected metric space  $X_n$  is described satisfying  $\dim(X_n) = n$  and  $\dim(X_n^\omega) = n$ . The space  $X_n$  can be chosen to be a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  homeomorphic to its own square.

**0. Introduction.** It is well known that if  $A$  and  $B$  are separable, metrizable spaces with positive dimension, then

$$\dim(A \times B) > \max\{\dim(A), \dim(B)\},$$

provided either  $A$  or  $B$  is compact. In 1967, in [AK], Anderson and Keisler proved:

**THEOREM.** *For each  $n \in \omega$  there is a separable, metrizable subspace  $Y_n$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  satisfying  $\dim(Y_n) = \dim(Y_n^\omega) = n$ .*

It follows from above that an example as in this theorem cannot be compact for  $n > 0$ . In this paper, we improve on the Anderson and Keisler result by showing:

**THEOREM 1.** *For each  $n \in \omega$  there is a completely metrizable, totally disconnected subspace  $X_n$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  satisfying  $\dim(X_n) = \dim(X_n^\omega) = n$ .*

In fact  $X_n^\omega$  can be shown to embed in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ ; hence the example can additionally be made homeomorphic to its square.

Examples for  $n = 0$  and  $n = 1$  are well known; for  $n = 0$  the Cantor set suffices while for  $n = 1$  the set of irrational points in  $I_2$  will do.

The examples provided will actually be graphs of functions from a Cantor set into an  $n$ -cube. Dimension theory techniques of Rubin, Schori, and Walsh [RSW], as noticed by R. Pol in [P] will easily give  $n$  dimensional complete graphs. We choose the graphs carefully so that the products will not have greater dimension than the original graphs.

In Section 2 a direct proof of Theorem 1 is given, while Sections 3 and 4 are intended to isolate and generalize the techniques used in the proof of Theorem 1.

AMS (MOS) Subject Classification: 54E50, 54F45, 54G20.

Key words: Complete space, dimension, product space.

In Section 5 an example is presented which shows that some of the care used in getting the spaces for Theorem 1 is necessary.

The author gratefully acknowledges the referee's valuable comments.

**1. Preliminaries.** Let  $R$  denote the real numbers, let  $I$  denote the closed interval  $[0, 1]$ , and let  $C$  denote the usual Cantor set in  $I$ . If  $X$  is a set then  $X^n = \{f: f \text{ is a function, } \text{domain}(f) = n, \text{ and } \text{image}(f) \subseteq X\}$ . We identify  $f \in X^n$  with the ordered  $n$ -tuple  $(f(0), f(1), \dots, f(n-1))$ , and let  $f|_m$  denote the restriction of  $f$  to  $m$ . For  $x, y \in R^n$ ,  $x \geq_1 y$  if  $x$  is greater than or equal to  $y$  in the lexicographic ordering on  $R^n$ . If  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is a function then  $\text{Gr}(f)$  denotes the graph of  $f$ ; the topology on  $\text{Gr}(f)$  is the subspace topology where  $\text{Gr}(f) \subseteq X \times Y$ . A topological space is totally disconnected if each point is the intersection of all of the simultaneously closed and open subsets containing it. If  $X$  is a topological space, and  $G$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint compact subsets of  $X$  whose union is  $X$ , then  $G$  is an upper semicontinuous (usc) decomposition of  $X$  if and only if for each closed subset  $C$  in  $X$ ,  $\bigcup \{g \in G: g \cap C \neq \emptyset\}$  is closed in  $X$ .

**2. Proof of Theorem 1.** In [RSW], for each  $n \in \omega$  a compact subset  $W_n$  of  $C \times I^n \subseteq I^{n+1}$  is described where  $W_n$  projects onto  $C$ , and any subset of  $W_n$  which projects onto  $C$  has dimension  $n$ . For each  $c \in C$ , let  $p_c$  denote the least element of  $\{[c] \times I^n\} \cap W_n$  in the lexicographic ordering, and let  $X_n = \{p_c: c \in C\}$ . Then  $X_n$  is the graph of a function  $f: C \rightarrow I^n$ , where  $p_c = (c, f(c))$ , and  $\dim(X_n) = n$ . The referee has pointed out that  $X_n$  is essentially the set in the example on pages 80 and 81 of [L]. In fact, in [L] it is shown that such a metric spaces is complete; completeness will also follow from our Theorem 3.

We want to show that  $\dim(X_n^\omega) = n$ ; it suffices to show  $\dim(X_n^m) = n$  for all  $m$ . For maximal simplicity we do the case  $m = 2$ ; for larger  $m$  the proof is analogous. We actually show  $X_n^2$  embeds in  $C \times R^n$ , and the result is immediate. Consider the function  $h: X_n^2 \rightarrow C \times C \times R^n$  given by

$$h((c_1, f(c_1)), (c_2, f(c_2))) = (c_1, c_2, f(c_1) + f(c_2)).$$

If  $h$  is an injective homeomorphism we are done because  $C \times C$  is homeomorphic to  $C$ . To show that  $h$  is a homeomorphism we need only show its inverse is continuous because  $h$  is obviously injective and continuous. Supposing the inverse is not continuous, we have  $(c_i, d_i, f(c_i) + f(d_i)) \rightarrow (c, d, f(c) + f(d))$  but  $(c_i, f(c_i)) \rightarrow (c, r)$  and  $(d_i, f(d_i)) \rightarrow (d, s)$  where not both  $r = f(c)$  and  $s = f(d)$ , for some sequence  $\{(c_i, d_i, f(c_i) + f(d_i))\}$ . Since  $W_n$  is compact, by the choice of  $f$ , it follows that  $r \geq_1 f(c)$  and  $s \geq_1 f(d)$ , with at least one of the inequalities being strict. But then  $r + s >_1 f(c) + f(d)$ , and this implies that  $(c_i, d_i, f(c_i) + f(d_i)) \rightarrow (c, d, r + s)$ , violating the original choice. ■

**Remark.** It will also follow from Theorem 2 that  $X_n^m$  embeds in  $R^{n+1}$ . In fact it can be shown that  $X_n^\omega$  embeds in  $R^{n+1}$ . For  $i \in \omega$ , let  $f_i: C \rightarrow I^n$  be defined by

$f_i(x) = f(x)/2^i$ , where  $f$  is as in Theorem 1. Then  $\text{Gr}(f_i)$  is homeomorphic to  $\text{Gr}(f)$ , which is homeomorphic to  $X_n$  and so  $\prod \text{Gr}(f_i)$  is homeomorphic to  $X_n^\omega$ . The function  $p: \prod \text{Gr}(f_i) \rightarrow C^\omega \times R^n$  defined by

$$p((c_0, f(c_0)), (c_1, f(c_1)), \dots) = ((c_0, c_1, \dots), f_0(c_0) + f_1(c_1) + \dots)$$

is a homeomorphism. But  $C^\omega$  is homeomorphic to  $C$ , hence  $X_n^\omega$  embeds in  $C \times R^n$ .

**3. Bounding the dimension of products of graphs.** We start by characterizing graphs for which a particular function will be a homeomorphism.

**DEFINITION 1.** Let  $f: X \rightarrow R^n$ , and  $g: Y \rightarrow R^n$  be functions. The pair  $\langle f, g \rangle$  is said to be *properly spread* if the conditions that  $(x, u) \in \text{cl}(\text{Gr}(f))$ ,  $(y, v) \in \text{cl}(\text{Gr}(g))$  and  $u + v = f(x) + g(y)$ , imply that  $u = f(x)$  and  $v = g(y)$ .

**LEMMA 1.** If  $X$  and  $Y$  are metrizable,  $f: X \rightarrow R^n$  and  $g: Y \rightarrow R^n$  are bounded functions, then the function  $e: \text{Gr}(f) \times \text{Gr}(g) \rightarrow X \times Y \times R^n$  defined by

$$e((x, f(x)), (y, g(y))) = (x, y, f(x) + g(y))$$

is an injective homeomorphism if and only if  $\langle f, g \rangle$  is properly spread.

**Proof.** Obviously  $e$  is continuous and injective. The function  $e^{-1}$  is continuous if and only if, whenever  $(x_i, y_i, f(x_i) + g(y_i)) \rightarrow (x, y, f(x) + g(y))$  it follows that  $(x_i, f(x_i)) \rightarrow (x, f(x))$  and  $(y_i, g(y_i)) \rightarrow (y, g(y))$ , which is true if and only if  $\langle f, g \rangle$  is properly spread. ■

In general, if  $f$  and  $g$  are continuous or  $n = 1$  and  $f$  and  $g$  are both lower (or upper) semicontinuous, then  $e$  will be a homeomorphism. We proceed to generalize semicontinuity in a way which allows for the application of Lemma 1, and obviously includes functions like the  $f$  used in Theorem 1.

**DEFINITION 2.** If  $X$  is a topological space, and  $f: X \rightarrow R^n$  is a function, then  $f$  is *n lower semicontinuous* ( $n$ -lsc) provided, if  $p = (x, r) \in \{x\} \times R^n$  is a limit point of  $\text{Gr}(f)$  (in  $X \times R^n$ ), then  $r \geq_1 f(x)$ .

One can define  $n$  upper semicontinuity analogously and get all of our results. We stay with  $n$  lower semicontinuity.

**LEMMA 2.** If  $X$  and  $Y$  are metrizable spaces and  $f: X \rightarrow R^n$ ,  $g: Y \rightarrow R^n$  are  $n$ -lsc, then  $\langle f, g \rangle$  is properly spread.

**Proof.** Suppose  $(x, u) \in \text{cl}(\text{Gr}(f))$ ,  $(y, v) \in \text{cl}(\text{Gr}(g))$  and  $u + v = f(x) + g(y)$ . By the  $n$ -lsc condition,  $u \geq_1 f(x)$  and  $v \geq_1 g(y)$ , so  $u + v \geq_1 f(x) + g(y)$ , with equality holding exactly when  $u = f(x)$  and  $v = g(y)$ . Thus  $\langle f, g \rangle$  is properly spread. ■

**LEMMA 3.** If  $X$  and  $Y$  are metrizable spaces,  $f: X \rightarrow R^n$  and  $g: Y \rightarrow R^n$  are bounded  $n$ -lsc functions, then  $h: X \times Y \rightarrow R^n$  defined by  $h(x, y) = f(x) + g(y)$  is a bounded  $n$ -lsc function.

**Proof.** Obviously  $h$  is bounded. Suppose  $(x, y, r) \in X \times Y \times R^n$  is a limit point of  $\text{Gr}(h)$ . Then there are  $r_x$  and  $r_y$  with  $(x, r_x) \in \text{cl}(\text{Gr}(f))$  and  $(y, r_y) \in \text{cl}(\text{Gr}(g))$

and  $r_x + r_y = r$ . Since the functions are  $n$ -lsc  $r_x \geq_i f(x)$  and  $r_y \geq_i g(y)$ , so  $r \geq_i f(x) + g(y) = h(x, y)$ . ■

Combining Lemmas 1, 2 and 3:

**THEOREM 2.** *If  $X$  and  $Y$  are metrizable  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $g: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  are bounded and  $n$ -lsc, then  $\text{Gr}(f) \times \text{Gr}(g)$  is homeomorphic to  $\text{Gr}(h)$  where  $h: X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is defined by  $h(x, y) = f(x) + g(y)$ , and  $h$  is  $n$ -lsc.*

Immediately we get:

**COROLLARY 1.** *For  $X, Y$  metrizable, and  $f, g$   $n$ -lsc functions as in Theorem 2,  $\dim(\text{Gr}(f) \times \text{Gr}(g)) \leq \dim(X) + \dim(Y) + n$ .*

**Proof.** By Theorem 2,  $\text{Gr}(X) \times \text{Gr}(Y)$  is homeomorphic to  $\text{Gr}(h)$  which is a subset of  $X \times Y \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . ■

**COROLLARY 2.** *If  $X$  is a strongly zero dimensional metrizable space and  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is bounded and  $n$ -lsc, then  $\dim(\text{Gr}(f)^\omega) \leq n$ .*

**Proof.** We only need to show  $\dim(\text{Gr}(f)^k) \leq n$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . But this is obvious using Theorem 2 and induction. ■

In the same way one proves the following.

**COROLLARY 3.** *If  $\{X_i: i \in \omega\}$  is a collection of strongly zero dimensional metrizable spaces, and for each  $i \in \omega$ ,  $f_i: X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $n$ -lsc, then  $\dim(\prod \text{Gr}(f_i)) \leq n$ .*

**4. Getting completeness.** In the example of Theorem 1 the use of the lexicographic ordering was twofold. First, it enabled the use of the homeomorphism technique of Section 3, by giving  $n$ -lsc functions. The main goal of this section is to show its other use, which is to guarantee completeness; this is the content of Theorem 3 which is quite general and interesting in its own right. Apparently the use of the lexicographic ordering in selection theorems is quite old. (See [BS] for an example.) Also, other people know of Theorem 3; we include a proof because we do not know of a reference and because it can be used to show the spaces  $X_n$  from Theorem 1 are complete.

We start with some notation and a preliminary lemma.

If  $X \subseteq \mathbb{I}^n$  is a compact set, and  $G$  is a usc decomposition of  $X$ , then for each  $g \in G$  let  $I(g)$  denote the least element of  $g$  in the lexicographic ordering on  $\mathbb{I}^n$ . Then for  $0 \leq m \leq n$ , let  $g(m) = \{x \in g: x|_m = I(g)|_m\}$ , and let  $G_m = \{g(m): g \in G\}$ . Then  $G_n = \{I(g): g \in G\}$ .

**LEMMA 4.** *For  $X, G$  as above,  $G_m$  is a usc decomposition of  $\cup G_m$ .*

**Proof.** Fix  $m$ . Suppose  $K$  is a closed subset of  $\cup G_m$ , and  $x \in g(m)$  is a limit point of  $H = \cup \{g \in G_m: g \cap K \neq \emptyset\}$ . Then for each  $t \in \omega$ , there exists  $x_t \in g_t(m)$  with  $x_t \rightarrow x$ , and each  $g_t(m) \subseteq H$ . Now  $x_t|_m \rightarrow x|_m$ . There are also  $y_t \in g_t(m) \cap K$ , and  $y_t|_m = x_t|_m$ . By the usc property of  $G$ , any limit point of  $\{y_t\}$  is in  $g$ , and there must be such a point; call it  $y$ . Now it follows that  $y \in K \cap g(m)$ , so  $g(m) \subseteq H$ . ■

**THEOREM 3.** *For  $X$  and  $G$  as above, for each  $m$  with  $0 \leq m \leq n$ ,  $\cup G_m$  is a  $G_\delta$  subset of  $\mathbb{I}^n$ . In particular  $\{I(g): g \in G\}$  is completely metrizable.*

**Proof.** Obviously  $G_0$  is  $G_\delta$ . Suppose  $\cup G_m$  is  $G_\delta$ . We show that  $\cup G_{m+1}$  is. For each  $i \in \omega$  and  $0 \leq j < 2^i$  let  $J_{ij} = \{x \in \mathbb{I}^n: x(m) \in [j/2^i, (j+1)/2^i]\}$ , and let  $J_i = \{J_{ij}: 0 \leq j < 2^i\}$ . We consider  $J_i$  as ordered by the second subscript. We have:

(1)  $J_i$  is a closed subset of  $\mathbb{I}^n$ ,

(2) If  $x, y$  are both in  $J_{ij}$ , then  $|x(m) - y(m)| \leq 1/2^i$ , and

(3) For each  $g \in G$ ,  $g(m+1) \subseteq J_{ij}$  where  $J_{ij}$  is the least element of  $J_i$  intersecting  $g(m)$ .

For each  $i \in \omega$  and  $0 \leq j < 2^i$  let  $K_{ij} = (J_{ij} \cap (\cup G_m)) \setminus W_{ij}$  where  $W_{ij} = \cup \{g(m): g(m) \cap J_{ir} \neq \emptyset \text{ for some } r < j\}$ . Then:

(4)  $K_{ij}$  is a  $G_\delta$  set,

(5) If  $K_{ij} \cap g \neq \emptyset$ , then  $g(m+1) \subseteq K_{ij}$ , and

(6) For each  $i \in \omega$  there is a  $K_{ij}$  which intersects  $g$ .

The only one at all tricky to verify is (4). By Lemma 4,  $W_{ij}$  is a closed subset of  $\cup G_m$ . But  $J_{ij}$  is closed,  $\cup G_m$  is  $G_\delta$  by hypothesis, so (4) holds.

Let  $K_i = \cup \{K_{ij}: 0 \leq j < 2^i\}$ ; clearly  $K_i$  is  $G_\delta$ . Thus  $\cap K_i$  is also a  $G_\delta$ . By (2), (5), and (6),  $\cup G_{m+1} = \cap K_i$ . ■

Observe that Theorem 3 remains true with  $n$  replaced by  $\omega$ . Thus Theorem 3 gives a way of finding  $G_\delta$  sections for mappings on compact metric spaces; simply embed the domain in the Hilbert cube and choose the least element in each point inverse.

**5. A false conjecture.** One might guess that whenever  $f: C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a function  $\dim(\text{Gr}(f)^\omega) \leq n$ . We provide a counterexample as follows. Let  $X_2$  be as in Theorem 1, and let  $f$  be the function which  $X_2$  is the graph of. Define, for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $f_i: C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $f_0(c) = x_0$  and  $f_1(c) = x_1$  where  $f(c) = (x_0, x_1)$ . Let  $M$  be the free union of  $\text{Gr}(f_0)$  and  $\text{Gr}(f_1)$ . Clearly  $M$  is homeomorphic to the graph of a function from  $C$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and so  $\dim(M) \leq 1$ , but  $M^2$  contains a copy of  $\text{Gr}(f)$  (along the diagonal), hence has dimension 2.

**6. Questions.** The following questions present themselves.

(1) Is there a (complete) separable metric space  $M$  such that  $\dim(M) < \dim(M^\omega) < \infty$ ?

(2) The examples of this paper give, to some extent, high dimensional analogues of the irrational points in  $I_2$ . In order to make the analogue more complete, can these examples be made homogeneous?

#### References

- [AK] R. D. Anderson and J. E. Keisler, *An Example in Dimension Theory*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 18 (1967), 709-713.  
 [BS] D. Bertsekas and S. Shreve, *Stochastic Optimal Control*, Academic Press, New York 1978.

- [L] A. Lelek, *Dimension Inequalities for Unions and Mappings of Separable Metric Spaces*, Colloq. 23 (1971), 69–91.
- [P] R. Pol, *A Weakly Infinite Dimensional Compactum Which is not Countable Dimensional*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 82 (1981), 634–636.
- [RSW] L. Rubin, R. Schori and J. Walsh, *New Dimension Theory Techniques for Constructing Infinite Dimensional Examples*, Gen. Top. Appl. 10 (1979), 93–102.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES  
 GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY  
 Fairfax, Virginia  
 U.S.A.

*Received 25 July 1988;*  
*in revised form 8 February 1989*

## An approximate analog of a theorem of Khintchine

by

Chris Freiling and Dan Rinne (San Bernardino, California)

**Abstract** The following theorem is established: If  $f$  is a real valued measurable function on the reals, then  $f$  has a finite approximate derivative almost everywhere on the set where the upper approximate symmetric derivative is less than infinity. This theorem is the approximate analog of a theorem of A. Khintchine.

In 1927, Khintchine [2] proved the following:

**THEOREM.** *If  $f$  is a real valued measurable function on the reals, then  $f$  has a finite ordinary derivative almost everywhere on the set where the upper symmetric derivative is less than infinity.*

In this paper we prove:

**THEOREM 1.** *If  $f$  is a real valued measurable function on the reals, then  $f$  has a finite approximate derivative almost everywhere on the set where the upper approximate symmetric derivative is less than infinity.*

An earlier proof of Theorem 1 (Russo and Valenti [6]) makes the oversight of assuming that not density zero implies positive density. This theorem will almost immediately give a Denjoy–Young–Saks Theorem for the approximate symmetric derivative.

In [1], Belna, Evans, and Humke constructed an additive subgroup,  $G$ , of the reals so that both the set  $G$  and its complement contain an element from every perfect set, and thus both have inner measure zero. The characteristic function of the set  $G$ , therefore, has symmetric derivative zero at every point in  $G$ , while the ordinary derivative does not exist at any point in  $G$ , showing that the assumption of measurability cannot be dropped in Khintchine's Theorem. Their example, however, leaves open the possibility that a non-measurable version of Khintchine's Theorem might be true if "almost everywhere" were replaced by "except on a set of inner measure zero." This improvement has been established by the following result of Uher [9]:

**THEOREM.** *If a function  $f$  has a finite upper symmetric derivative on a measurable set  $E$ , then  $f$  is almost everywhere differentiable on  $E$ .*