

ON THE COMMUTATIVITY OF THE BOUNDARY AND INTERIOR OPERATORS IN A TOPOLOGICAL SPACE.—N. Levine [2] discovered that, in a topological space, the interior and closure operators will commute if and only if the set on which they operate is the symmetric difference of a set that is both open and closed and a set that is nowhere dense. The intent of this paper is to characterize those sets for which the interior and boundary operators will commute.

The following notation will be used:

- cA —closure of A
- CA —complement of A
- $\text{Int } A$ —interior of A
- BA —boundary of A
- $A \nabla B$ —symmetric difference of A and B

Lemma 1: $\{X, T\}$ is a topological space and A and E subsets of X , then $\text{Int}(A \cap E) = \text{Int } A \cap \text{Int } E$.

Lemma 2: If $\{X, T\}$ is a topological space, A and E are subsets of X , and A is open and E is dense, then $c(A \cap E) = cA \cap cE = cA$. This is an exercise on p. 57 in Kelley's book (1955).

Lemma 3: If $\{X, T\}$ is a topological space and A is a subset of X , then $\text{Int } BA \cap B \text{Int } A = \emptyset$.

Proof: $\text{Int } BA \cap B \text{Int } A = \text{Int}(cA \cap cCA) \cap c \text{Int } A \cap c \text{Int } A = \text{Int } cA \cap \text{Int } cCA \cap c \text{Int } A \cap c \text{Int } A = \text{Int } cA \cap c \text{Int } A \cap c \text{Int } A \cap c \text{Int } A = \emptyset$.

Lemma 4: If $\{X, T\}$ is a topological space and A is a subset of X , then $\text{Int } BA = B \text{Int } A$ if and only if $\text{Int } cA = c \text{Int } A = \text{Int } A$.

Proof: Necessity. Suppose $\text{Int } BA = B \text{Int } A$. Then these sets must both be empty in order to be equal since by lemma 2 they have nothing in common. Thus

$$(1) \text{Int } BA = \text{Int } cA \cap c \text{Int } A = \emptyset \text{ and}$$

$$(2) B \text{Int } A = c \text{Int } A \cap cCA = \emptyset$$

Equations 1 and 2 imply $\text{Int } cA \subset c \text{Int } A$ and $c \text{Int } A \subset cCA = \text{Int } A$ respectively. Since $\text{Int } A \subset \text{Int } cA$, it follows that $\text{Int } A = \text{Int } cA = c \text{Int } A$.

Sufficiency. Suppose $\text{Int } cA = c \text{Int } A = \text{Int } A$. This implies that $B \text{Int } A = \emptyset$ and $\text{Int } BA = \emptyset$, and thus the two sets are equal.

Theorem: If $\{X, T\}$ is a topological space and A is a subset of X , then $\text{Int } BA = B \text{Int } A$ if and only if $A = E \cup P$, where E is open and closed, P is nowhere dense, and $E \cap P = \emptyset$.

Proof: Using lemma 4, the proof reduces to showing that $\text{Int } cA = c \text{Int } A = \text{Int } A$ if and only if $A = E \cup P$, where E is open and closed, P is nowhere dense, and $E \cap P = \emptyset$.

Necessity. Suppose $\text{Int } cA = c \text{Int } A = \text{Int } A$. By Levine's theorem (Levine, 1961), it follows that if $\text{Int } cA = c \text{Int } A$, then $A = E \nabla P$ where E is open and closed and P is nowhere dense. Thus it is left to establish what further conditions the second equality places on E and P . In Levine's proof, $E = c \text{Int } A$. Thus $E = \text{Int } A$ (i.e. $E = \text{Int}(E \nabla P)$). $\text{Int}(E \nabla P) = Cc[(E \cap CP) \cup (CE \cap P)] = Cc[(CE \cap CP) \cup (P \cap E)] = C[c(CE \cap CP) \cup c(P \cap E)]$. By lemma 2 and the fact that CP is dense it follows that $C[c(CE \cap CP) \cup c(P \cap E)] = CcCE \cap Cc(P \cap E) = E \cap Cc(P \cap E)$. Therefore, $E = E \cap Cc(P \cap E)$ which implies $P \cap E = \emptyset$.

Sufficiency. Suppose $A = E \cup P$, E is open and closed, P is nowhere dense, and $E \cap P = \emptyset$. By Levine's theorem, $c \text{Int } A = \text{Int } cA$. $\text{Int } A = \text{Int}(E \cup P) = Cc(CE \cap CP) = CcCE = E$. Thus $\text{Int } A$ is closed and it follows that $C \text{Int } A = \text{Int } cA = \text{Int } A$.—

DAVID H. STALEY, *Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.*

REFERENCES

- Kelley, J. L. *General Topology*, Van Nostrand, New York, 1955.
- Levine, N. On the commutativity of the closure and interior operators in topological spaces, *American Mathematics Monthly* 68 (1961), 474-477.