



**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING SCIENCES & RESEARCH
TECHNOLOGY**

Minimal rp -open Sets and Maximal rp -open Sets

Sellamuthu.M.^{*1} S. Balasubramanian²

^{*1,2}Department of Mathematics, Government Arts College(A), Karur, Tamilnadu, India

sellamuthum@rediffmail.com

Abstract

The object of the present paper is to study the notions of minimal rp -open set and maximal rp -open set and their basic properties are studied.

Keywords: rp -open set, minimal rp -open set and maximal rp -open set.

Introduction

Nakaoka and Oda have introduced minimal open sets and maximal open sets, which are subclasses of open sets. A. Vadivel and K. Vairamanickam introduced minimal $rg\alpha$ -open sets and maximal $rg\alpha$ -open sets in topological spaces. S. Balasubramanian and P.A.S. Vyjayanthi introduced minimal v -open sets and maximal v -open sets; minimal v -closed sets and maximal v -closed sets in topological spaces. Inspired with these developments we further study a new type of open sets namely minimal rp -open sets and maximal rp -open sets.

Throughout the paper a space X means a topological space (X, τ) . The class of rp -open sets is denoted by $RPO(X)$. For any subset A of X its complement, interior, closure, rp -interior, rp -closure are denoted respectively by the symbols A^c , A° , A^- , $rp(A)^\circ$ and $rp(A)^-$.

Preliminaries

Definition 1: A proper nonempty

- (i) open subset U of X is said to be a **minimal open set** if any open set contained in U is ϕ or U .
- (ii) semi-open subset U of X is said to be a **minimal semi-open set** if any semi-open set contained in U is ϕ or U .
- (iii) pre-open subset U of X is said to be a **minimal pre-open set** if any pre-open set contained in U is ϕ or U .
- (iv) v -open subset U of X is said to be a **minimal v -open set** if any v -open set contained in U is ϕ or U .
- (v) $rg\alpha$ -open subset U of X is said to be a **minimal $rg\alpha$ -open set** if any $rg\alpha$ -open set contained in U is ϕ or U .

Definition 2: A proper nonempty

- (i) open subset U of X is said to be a **maximal open set** if any open set containing U is X or U .
- (ii) semi-open subset U of X is said to be a **maximal semi-open set** if any semi-open set containing U is X or U .
- (iii) pre-open subset U of X is said to be a **maximal pre-open set** if any pre-open set containing U is X or U .
- (iv) v -open subset U of X is said to be a **maximal v -open set** if any v -open set containing U is X or U .
- (v) $rg\alpha$ -open subset U of X is said to be a **maximal $rg\alpha$ -open set** if any $rg\alpha$ -open set containing U is X or U .

Minimal rp -open Sets and Maximal rp -open Sets

Definition 1: A proper nonempty rp -open subset U of X is said to be a **minimal rp -open set** if any rp -open set contained in U is ϕ or U .

Remark 1: Minimal open set and minimal rp -open set are not same:

Example 1: Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$; $\tau = \{\phi, \{a, c\}, X\}$. $\{a, c\}$ is Minimal open but not Minimal rp -open; $\{a\}$ and $\{c\}$ are Minimal rp -open but not Minimal open.

Remark 2: From the above example and known results we have the following implications

Theorem 1: (i) Let U be a minimal rp -open set and W be a rp -open set. Then $U \cap W = \phi$ or $U \subset W$.

(ii) Let U and V be minimal rp -open sets. Then $U \cap V = \phi$ or $U = V$.

Proof: (i) Let U be a minimal rp -open set and W be a rp -open set. If $U \cap W = \phi$, then there is nothing to prove. If $U \cap W \neq \phi$. Then $U \cap W \subset U$. Since U is a minimal rp -open set, we have $U \cap W = U$. Therefore $U \subset W$.

(ii) Let U and V be minimal rp -open sets. If $U \cap V \neq \phi$, then $U \subset V$ and $V \subset U$ by (i). Therefore $U = V$.

Theorem 2: Let U be a minimal rp -open set. If $x \in U$, then $U \subset W$ for any regular open neighborhood W of x .

Proof: Let U be a minimal rp -open set and x be an element of U . Suppose \exists a regular open neighborhood W of x such that $U \not\subset W$. Then $U \cap W$ is a rp -open set such that $U \cap W \subset U$ and $U \cap W \neq \phi$. Since U is a minimal rp -open set, we have $U \cap W = U$. That is $U \subset W$, which is a contradiction for $U \not\subset W$. Therefore $U \subset W$ for any regular open neighborhood W of x .

Theorem 3: Let U be a minimal rp -open set. If $x \in U$, then $U \subset W$ for some rp -open set W containing x .

Theorem 4: Let U be a minimal rp -open set. Then $U = \bigcap \{W : W \in RPO(X, x)\}$ for any element x of U .

Proof: By theorem[3.3] and U is rp -open set containing x , we have $U \subset \bigcap \{W : W \in RPO(X, x)\} \subset U$.

Theorem 5: Let U be a nonempty rp -open set. Then the following three conditions are equivalent.

(i) U is a minimal rp -open set

(ii) $U \subset rp(S)^-$ for any nonempty subset S of U

(iii) $rp(U)^- = rp(S)^-$ for any nonempty subset S of U .

Proof: (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Let $x \in U$; U be minimal rp -open set and $S(\neq \phi) \subset U$. By theorem[3.3], for any rp -open set W containing x , $S \subset U \subset W \Rightarrow S \subset W$. Now $S = S \cap U \subset S \cap W$. Since $S \neq \phi$, $S \cap W \neq \phi$. Since W is any rp -open set containing x , by theorem[5.03], $x \in rp(S)^-$. That is $x \in U \Rightarrow x \in rp(S)^- \Rightarrow U \subset rp(S)^-$ for any nonempty subset S of U .

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) Let S be a nonempty subset of U . That is $S \subset U \Rightarrow rp(S)^- \subset rp(U)^- \rightarrow (1)$. Again from (ii) $U \subset rp(S)^-$ for any $S(\neq \phi) \subset U \Rightarrow rp(U)^- \subset rp(rp(S)^-)^- = rp(S)^-$. That is $rp(U)^- \subset rp(S)^- \rightarrow (2)$. From (1) and (2), we have $rp(U)^- = rp(S)^-$ for any nonempty subset S of U .

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) From (3) we have $rp(U)^- = rp(S)^-$ for any nonempty subset S of U . Suppose U is not a minimal rp -open set. Then \exists a nonempty rp -open set V such that $V \subset U$ and $V \neq U$. Now \exists an element a in U such that $a \notin V \Rightarrow a \in V^c$. That is $rp(\{a\})^- \subset rp(V^c)^- = V^c$, as V^c is rp -closed set in X . It follows that $rp(\{a\})^- \neq rp(U)^-$. This is a contradiction for $rp(\{a\})^- = rp(U)^-$ for any $\{a\}(\neq \phi) \subset U$. Therefore U is a minimal rp -open set.

Theorem 6: Let $V \neq \phi$ be a finite rp -open set. Then \exists at least one (finite) minimal rp -open set U such that $U \subset V$.

Proof: Let V be a nonempty finite rp -open set. If V is a minimal rp -open set, we may set $U = V$. If V is not a minimal rp -open set, then \exists (finite) rp -open set V_1 such that $\phi \neq V_1 \subset V$. If V_1 is a minimal rp -open set, we may set $U = V_1$. If V_1 is not a minimal rp -open set, then \exists (finite) rp -open set V_2 such that $\phi \neq V_2 \subset V_1$. Continuing this process, we have a sequence of rp -open sets $V \supset V_1 \supset V_2 \supset V_3 \supset \dots \supset V_k \supset \dots$. Since V is a finite set, this process repeats only finitely. Then finally we get a minimal rp -open set $U = V_n$ for some positive integer n .

[A topological space X is said to be locally finite space if each of its elements is contained in a finite open set.]

Corollary 1: Let X be a locally finite space and $V \neq \phi$ be an rp -open set. Then \exists at least one (finite) minimal rp -open set U such that $U \subset V$.

Proof: Let X be a locally finite space and V be a nonempty rp -open set. Let x in V . Since X is locally finite space, we have a finite open set V_x such that x in V_x . Then $V \cap V_x$ is a finite rp -open set. By Theorem 3.6 \exists at least one (finite) minimal rp -open set U such that $U \subset V \cap V_x$. That is $U \subset V \cap V_x \subset V$. Hence \exists at least one (finite) minimal rp -open set U such that $U \subset V$.

Corollary 2: Let V be a finite minimal open set. Then \exists at least one (finite) minimal rp -open set U such that $U \subset V$.

Proof: Let V be a finite minimal open set. Then V is a nonempty finite rp -open set. By Theorem 3.6, \exists at least one (finite) minimal rp -open set U such that $U \subset V$.

Theorem 7: Let U ; U_λ be minimal rp -open sets for any element $\lambda \in \Gamma$. If $U \subset \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Gamma} U_\lambda$, then \exists an element $\lambda \in \Gamma$ such that $U = U_\lambda$.

Proof: Let $U \subset \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Gamma} U_\lambda$. Then $U \cap (\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Gamma} U_\lambda) = U$. That is $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Gamma} (U \cap U_\lambda) = U$. Also by theorem[3.1] (ii), $U \cap U_\lambda = \phi$ or $U = U_\lambda$ for any $\lambda \in \Gamma$. It follows that \exists an element $\lambda \in \Gamma$ such that $U = U_\lambda$.

Theorem 8: Let U ; U_λ be minimal rp -open sets for any $\lambda \in \Gamma$. If $U = U_\lambda$ for any $\lambda \in \Gamma$, then $(\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Gamma} U_\lambda) \cap U = \phi$.

Proof: Assume $(\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Gamma} U_\lambda) \cap U \neq \phi$. That is $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Gamma} (U_\lambda \cap U) \neq \phi$. Then \exists an element $\lambda \in \Gamma$ such that $U \cap U_\lambda \neq \phi$. By theorem 3.1(ii), we have $U = U_\lambda$, which contradicts the fact that $U \neq U_\lambda$ for any $\lambda \in \Gamma$. Hence $(\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Gamma} U_\lambda) \cap U = \phi$.

We now introduce maximal rp -open sets in topological spaces as follows.

Definition 2: A proper nonempty rp -open $U \subset X$ is said to be **maximal rp -open set** if any rp -open set containing U is either X or U .

Remark 3: Maximal open set and maximal rp -open set are not same.

Example 2: In Example 1, $\{a, c\}$ is Maximal open but not Maximal rp -open; $\{a, b\}$ and $\{b, c\}$ are Maximal rp -open but not Maximal open.

Remark 4: From the known results and by the above example we have the following implications:

Theorem 9: A proper nonempty subset F of X is maximal rp -open set iff $X-F$ is a minimal rp -closed set.

Proof: Let F be a maximal rp -open set. Suppose $X-F$ is not a minimal rp -open set. Then \exists rp -open set $U \neq X-F$ such that $\phi \neq U \subset X-F$. That is $F \subset X-U$ and $X-U$ is a rp -open set which is a contradiction for F is a minimal rp -closed set.

Conversely let $X-F$ be a minimal rp -open set. Suppose F is not a maximal rp -open set. Then \exists rp -open set $E \neq F$ such that $F \subset E \neq X$. That is $\phi \neq X-E \subset X-F$ and $X-E$ is a rp -open set which is a contradiction for $X-F$ is a minimal rp -closed set. Therefore F is a maximal rp -open set.

Theorem 10: (i) Let F be a maximal rp -open set and W be a rp -open set. Then $F \cup W = X$ or $W \subset F$.

(ii) Let F and S be maximal rp -open sets. Then $F \cup S = X$ or $F = S$.

Proof: (i) Let F be a maximal rp -open set and W be a rp -open set. If $F \cup W = X$, then there is nothing to prove. Suppose $F \cup W \neq X$. Then $F \subset F \cup W$. Therefore $F \cup W = F \Rightarrow W \subset F$.

(ii) Let F and S be maximal rp -open sets. If $F \cup S \neq X$, then we have $F \subset S$ and $S \subset F$ by (i). Therefore $F = S$.

Theorem 11: Let F be a maximal rp -open set. If x is an element of F , then for any rp -open set S containing x , $F \cup S = X$ or $S \subset F$.

Proof: Let F be a maximal rp -open set and x is an element of F . Suppose \exists rp -open set S containing x such that $F \cup S \neq X$. Then $F \subset F \cup S$ and $F \cup S$ is a rp -open set, as the finite union of rp -open sets is a rp -open set. Since F is a rp -open set, we have $F \cup S = F$. Therefore $S \subset F$.

Theorem 12: Let $F_\alpha, F_\beta, F_\delta$ be maximal rp -open sets such that $F_\alpha \neq F_\beta$. If $F_\alpha \cap F_\beta \subset F_\delta$, then either $F_\alpha = F_\delta$ or $F_\beta = F_\delta$.

Proof: Given that $F_\alpha \cap F_\beta \subset F_\delta$. If $F_\alpha = F_\delta$ then there is nothing to prove.

If $F_\alpha \neq F_\delta$ then we have to prove $F_\beta = F_\delta$. Now $F_\beta \cap F_\delta = F_\beta \cap (F_\delta \cap X) = F_\beta \cap (F_\delta \cap (F_\alpha \cup F_\beta))$ (by thm. 3.10 (ii)) = $F_\beta \cap ((F_\delta \cap F_\alpha) \cup (F_\delta \cap F_\beta)) = (F_\beta \cap F_\delta \cap F_\alpha) \cup (F_\beta \cap F_\delta \cap F_\beta)$
 $= (F_\alpha \cap F_\beta) \cup (F_\delta \cap F_\beta)$ (by $F_\alpha \cap F_\beta \subset F_\delta$) = $(F_\alpha \cup F_\delta) \cap F_\beta = X \cap F_\beta$ (Since F_α and F_δ are maximal rp -open sets by theorem[3.10](ii), $F_\alpha \cup F_\delta = X$) = F_β . That is $F_\beta \cap F_\delta = F_\beta \Rightarrow F_\beta \subset F_\delta$. Since F_β and F_δ are maximal rp -open sets, we have $F_\beta = F_\delta$. Therefore $F_\beta = F_\delta$.

Theorem 13: Let F_α, F_β and F_δ be different maximal rp -open sets to each other. Then $(F_\alpha \cap F_\beta) \not\subset (F_\alpha \cap F_\delta)$.

Proof: Let $(F_\alpha \cap F_\beta) \subset (F_\alpha \cap F_\delta) \Rightarrow (F_\alpha \cap F_\beta) \cup (F_\delta \cap F_\beta) \subset (F_\alpha \cap F_\delta) \cup (F_\delta \cap F_\beta) \Rightarrow (F_\alpha \cup F_\delta) \cap F_\beta \subset F_\delta \cap (F_\alpha \cup F_\beta)$. Since by theorem 3.10(ii), $F_\alpha \cup F_\delta = X$ and $F_\alpha \cup F_\beta = X \Rightarrow X \cap F_\beta \subset F_\delta \cap X \Rightarrow F_\beta \subset F_\delta$. From the definition of maximal rp -open set it follows that $F_\beta = F_\delta$, which is a contradiction to the fact that F_α, F_β and F_δ are different to each other. Therefore $(F_\alpha \cap F_\beta) \not\subset (F_\alpha \cap F_\delta)$.

Theorem 14: Let F be a maximal rp -open set and x be an element of F . Then $F = \cup \{ S : S \text{ is a } rp\text{-open set containing } x \text{ such that } F \cup S \neq X \}$.

Proof: By theorem 3.12 and fact that F is a rp -open set containing x , we have $F \subset \cup \{ S : S \text{ is a } rp\text{-open set containing } x \text{ such that } F \cup S \neq X \} - F$. Therefore we have the result.

Theorem 15: If $F \neq \phi$ is proper cofinite rp -open set. Then \exists (cofinite) maximal rp -open set E such that $F \subset E$.

Proof: If F is maximal rp -open set, we may set $E = F$. If F is not a maximal rp -open set, then \exists (cofinite) rp -open set F_1 such that $F \subset F_1 \neq X$. If F_1 is a maximal rp -open set, we may set $E = F_1$. If F_1 is not a maximal rp -open set, then \exists a (cofinite) rp -open set F_2 such that $F \subset F_1 \subset F_2 \neq X$. Continuing this process, we have a sequence of rp -open, $F \subset F_1 \subset F_2 \subset \dots \subset F_k \subset \dots$. Since F is a cofinite set, this process repeats only finitely. Then, finally we get a maximal rp -open set $E = E_n$ for some positive integer n .

Theorem 16: Let F be a maximal rp -open set. If $x \in X-F$. Then $X-F \subset E$ for any rp -open set E containing x .

Proof: Let F be a maximal rp -open set and x in $X-F$. $E \not\subset F$ for any rp -open set E containing x . Then $E \cup F = X$ by theorem 3.10(ii). Therefore $X-F \subset E$.

Conclusion

In this paper we introduced the concept of minimal rp -open and maximal rp -open sets, studied their basic properties.

References

- [1] S.Balasubramanian, and Sandhya.C., Minimal gs-open sets and maximal gs-closed sets – Asian Journal of Current

Engineering and Maths1: 2 March - April (2012) 34 – 38.

- [2] S.Balasubramanian, K.A.Venkatesh, and C.Sandhya, Minimal pg-open sets and maximal pg-closed sets– Inter. J. Math. Archive, Vol 3, No.3 (2012)1246 – 1253.
 [3] S.Balasubramanian, Minimal g-open sets – Asian Journal of current Engineering and Maths, 1: 3 May - June (2012) 69–73.

- [4] S.Balasubramanian, and Ch.Chaithanya, Minimal α_g -open sets – Aryabhata Journal of Mathematics and Informatics, Vol.4, No.1, Jan-June(2012)83 – 94.
- [5] S.Balasubramanian, K.A.Venkaresh, and C.Sandhya, Minimal spg-open sets and maximal spg-closed sets – AJCEM (In Press)
- [6] F. Nakaoka and N. Oda, Some Properties of Maximal Open Sets, Int. J. Math. Sci. 21,(2003)1331-1340.
- [7] F. Nakaoka and N. Oda, Some Applications of Minimal Open Sets, Int. J. Math. Sci. 27-8, (2001), 471-476.
- [8] F. Nakaoka and N. Oda, On Minimal Closed Sets, Proceeding of Topological spaces Theory and its Applications, 5(2003), 19-21.