

JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS AND APPLICATIONS **154**, 558–571 (1991)

# Many Continuous Functions Have Many Proper Local Extrema

ANGELO BELLA

*Department of Mathematics, University of Catania,  
viale A. Doria 6, 95125 Catania, Italy*

JANUSZ J. CHARATONIK

*Institute of Mathematics, University of Wrocław,  
Pl. Grunwaldzki 2/4, 50-384 Wrocław, Poland*

AND

ALFONSO VILLANI

*Department of Mathematics, University of Messina,  
ctr. Papardo, Salita Sperone 31, 98010 S. Agata, Messina, Italy*

*Submitted by R. P. Boas*

*Received March 3, 1989*

Given a topological space  $X$ , let  $M(X)$  (resp.  $m(X)$ ) denote the set of all continuous real functions on  $X$  whose set of proper local maximum (resp. minimum) points is dense in  $X$ . We identify some classes of spaces  $X$  for which  $M(X)$  is a dense subset of  $C(X)$  endowed with the majorant topology. In particular,  $M(X) \cap m(X)$  is dense in  $C(X)$  with the majorant topology whenever  $X$  has a  $\sigma$ -discrete  $\pi$ -base and a dense subset whose points are  $G_\delta$ -sets.

Also we show that  $M(X) \cap m(X)$  is residual in  $C(X)$  endowed with the topology of uniform convergence, provided that  $X$  has a  $\sigma$ -discrete  $\pi$ -base consisting of completely metrizable subspaces. This is true, in particular, for all completely metrizable spaces. © 1991 Academic Press, Inc.

## INTRODUCTION

Let  $X$  be a topological space. Given a function  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we say that a point  $x \in X$  is a proper local maximum (resp. minimum) point for  $f$  provided that there exists a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $x$  such that  $f(y) < f(x)$  (resp.  $f(y) > f(x)$ ) for every  $y \in U \setminus \{x\}$ . We denote by  $M(f)$  (resp.  $m(f)$ ) the set of all proper local maximum (resp. minimum) points for  $f$ . Of

course  $M(f) \cap m(f)$  consists of all the isolated points of  $X$ ; also it is obvious that if  $f$  is a continuous function, then  $\{x\}$  is a  $G_\delta$ -set in  $X$  for every  $x \in M(f) \cup m(f)$  (these easy remarks will explain the reason of some assumptions in the statements of Section 1).

Let  $C(X)$  be the set of all continuous real functions on  $X$ . Also let  $M(X)$  (resp.  $m(X)$ ) denote the subset of  $C(X)$  consisting of all functions  $f$  for which  $M(f)$  (resp.  $m(f)$ ) is a dense set in  $X$ . As the title suggests, the purpose of this paper is to show that if the space  $X$  satisfies some suitable assumptions, then  $M(X)$ , or even  $M(X) \cap m(X)$ , is (in a sense to be specified) a rather numerous subset of  $C(X)$  with respect to some natural topology for  $C(X)$ .

To make clear the last point, there are two topologies that will be considered for  $C(X)$ , namely, the majorant topology, i.e., that topology in which basic neighborhoods of  $f \in C(X)$  are the sets

$$\{g \in C(X) : |g(x) - f(x)| < \varepsilon(x) \text{ for every } x \in X\}$$

with  $\varepsilon \in C(X)$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  everywhere in  $X$ , and the topology of uniform convergence, i.e., the topology induced by the metric  $\rho$  of uniform convergence on  $X$ :

$$\rho(f, g) = \min\{1, \sup\{|f(x) - g(x)| : x \in X\}\}$$

for every  $f, g \in C(X)$  (recall that with this metric  $C(X)$  is a complete metric space). Of course the majorant topology is stronger than that of uniform convergence; moreover, the two topologies coincide if and only if the space  $X$  is pseudocompact (according to the definition given in [6, p. 126]).

Coming back to the subject of the paper, there are some recent results along the above indicated direction which have been obtained by A. Villani [5], who proved that  $M(X)$  is a dense subset of  $C(X)$  endowed with the majorant topology whenever the space  $X$  is metrizable, and by V. Drobot and M. Morayne [1], who showed that for  $X = [0, 1]$ , the set  $M(X)$  is a residual Borel subset of  $C(X)$ ; as a matter of fact, the argument given in [1] is easily realized to work with minor changes for any separable locally compact metrizable space, if the topology of uniform convergence is considered for  $C(X)$ . By the way, we recall here that a very strong result, implying that  $M([0, 1]) \cap m([0, 1])$  is nonempty, is due to Z. Zalcwasser [7], who proved that for any two disjoint countable sets  $A, B \subset [0, 1]$  there exists a differentiable function  $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $M(f) = A$ ,  $m(f) = B$ . We refer the reader also to [3] for a short proof of the result by Zalcwasser, to [4] for a nice elementary proof that  $M(\mathbb{R})$  is nonempty, and to the literature cited in [1] for further references.

In this paper the above quoted results, namely those from [5, 1], are extended to more general classes of topological spaces. More precisely,

in Section 1 we consider the density of  $M(X)$ , or  $M(X) \cap m(X)$ , in  $C(X)$  endowed with the majorant topology, and show, among other things, that  $M(X) \cap m(X)$  is dense in  $C(X)$  provided that  $X$  is a completely regular space which has a  $\sigma$ -discrete  $\pi$ -base and a dense subset whose points are  $G_\delta$ -sets in  $X$ . In Section 2 we consider the residuality of  $M(X)$  in  $C(X)$  endowed with the topology of uniform convergence. A simplified statement of our main result is that  $M(X)$  (and hence  $M(X) \cap m(X)$ ) is a residual set in  $C(X)$  whenever  $X$  has a  $\sigma$ -discrete  $\pi$ -base consisting of completely metrizable subspaces. This is true in particular for all completely metrizable spaces.

It is worth recalling here, for the reader's convenience, that a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of nonempty open subsets of a space  $X$  is said to be a  $\pi$ -base for  $X$  provided that every nonempty open set  $A \subset X$  contains some  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ .

Throughout the paper, regular, completely regular and normal spaces need not be Hausdorff.

## 1. SOME DENSITY RESULTS

As announced before, this section is devoted to establishing some sufficient conditions for a topological space  $X$  in order that  $M(X)$  be a dense subset of  $C(X)$  endowed with the majorant topology.

To simplify our exposition, it is convenient to set down formally the following definition.

**DEFINITION.** A nonempty subset  $D$  of a space  $X$  is said to be *strongly discrete* provided that there exists a discrete family  $\{V_s : s \in D\}$  of open subsets of  $X$  such that  $s \in V_s$  for every  $s \in D$ . Also the empty set is considered to be strongly discrete, just by convention.

A set  $S \subset X$  is said to be  $\sigma$ -*strongly discrete* if  $S$  is a countable union of strongly discrete sets.

Of course, a strongly discrete set  $D$  is also discrete; i.e.,  $D$  is a discrete space with the relative topology, provided that  $D$  is nonempty. Also, in a  $T_1$ -space every strongly discrete set is closed. Conversely, if the space  $X$  is normal and collectionwise Hausdorff (i.e., for every nonempty discrete set  $\mathcal{A} \subset X$  there is a family  $\{W_t : t \in \mathcal{A}\}$  of pairwise disjoint open sets with  $t \in W_t$  for each  $t \in \mathcal{A}$ ), then every closed discrete set is strongly discrete. To see this, assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a nonempty closed discrete set and take a family  $\{W_t : t \in \mathcal{A}\}$  as before. Also, using normality, take an open set  $V$  with  $\mathcal{A} \subset V \subset \bar{V} \subseteq \bigcup \{W_t : t \in \mathcal{A}\}$ . Then  $t \in V \cap W_t$  for every  $t \in \mathcal{A}$ , and it is easy to check that  $\{V \cap W_t : t \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is a discrete family.

The following lemma will be applied repeatedly in the proof of forthcoming Theorem 1.

LEMMA. Let  $X$  be a completely regular space. Let  $D \subset X$  be a nonempty strongly discrete set such that every singleton  $\{s\}$ , with  $s \in D$ , is a  $G_\delta$ -set in  $X$ . Also, let  $H \subset X$  be a closed set disjoint from  $D$ .

Then, for every  $\varphi, \eta \in C(X)$  with  $\eta > 0$  everywhere in  $X$ , there exist  $\psi \in C(X)$  and  $\{B_s : s \in D\}$ , a discrete family of closed sets, disjoint from  $H$ , with  $s \in \text{Int}(B_s)$  for every  $s \in D$ , such that:

- (i)  $\varphi \leq \psi < \varphi + \eta$  everywhere in  $X$ ,
- (ii)  $\psi = \varphi$  in  $X \setminus \bigcup \{B_s : s \in D\}$ ,
- (iii)  $\psi(x) < \psi(s)$  for every  $s \in D$  and  $x \in B_s \setminus \{s\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\vartheta$  be a fixed number with  $0 < \vartheta < 1$  and, for each  $s \in D$ , let  $\lambda_s = \vartheta\eta(s)$ .

As the space  $X$  is regular and the set  $D$  is strongly discrete, it is possible to find, for each  $s \in D$ , a closed neighbourhood  $B_s$  of  $s$ , disjoint from  $H$ , in such a way that  $\{B_s : s \in D\}$  is a discrete family. Of course, it can be also assumed that  $\varphi(B_s) \subset ]-\infty, \varphi(s) + \lambda_s/2]$  for every  $s \in D$ .

Let, for every  $s \in D$ ,  $h_s : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a continuous function such that  $h_s^{-1}(1) = \{s\}$  and  $h_s(X \setminus \text{Int}(B_s)) = \{0\}$ . The existence of such a function is proved in a standard way as follows. Since  $\{s\}$  is a  $G_\delta$ -set in  $X$  there exists  $\{A_n\}$ , a decreasing sequence of open sets, with  $A_n \subset \text{Int}(B_s)$  for all  $n$ , such that  $\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty A_n = \{s\}$ . Since  $X$  is a completely regular space there is, for each  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , a continuous function  $g_n : X \rightarrow [0, 2^{-n}]$  such that  $g_n(s) = 2^{-n}$  and  $g_n(X \setminus A_n) = \{0\}$ . Then, letting  $h_s = \sum_{n=1}^\infty g_n$ , we obtain a continuous function with the desired features.

Now, for each  $s \in D$ , let  $\gamma_s \in C(X)$  be defined by

$$\gamma_s(x) = [1 - h_s(x)] \varphi(x) + h_s(x)[\varphi(s) + \lambda_s]$$

for every  $x \in X$ . We have  $\gamma_s(s) = \varphi(s) + \lambda_s$ . Also, if  $x \in B_s \setminus \{s\}$  then  $\gamma_s(x) < \gamma_s(s)$ ; indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_s(x) &\leq [1 - h_s(x)][\varphi(s) + \lambda_s/2] + h_s(x)[\varphi(s) + \lambda_s] \\ &= \varphi(s) + \lambda_s/2 + h_s(x)\lambda_s/2 < \varphi(s) + \lambda_s = \gamma_s(s). \end{aligned}$$

As the family  $\{B_s : s \in D\}$  is discrete and for each  $s \in D$  we have  $\gamma_s = \varphi$  in  $X \setminus \text{Int}(B_s)$ , then the function  $\gamma : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(x) &= \varphi(x) && \text{if } x \in X \setminus \bigcup_{s \in D} B_s, \\ \gamma(x) &= \gamma_s(x) && \text{if } x \in B_s, s \in D, \end{aligned}$$

is continuous. Also, it is apparent that  $\gamma$  satisfies conditions (ii) and (iii).

Moreover, we have  $\gamma \geq \varphi$  everywhere in  $X$ . To see this, note that if  $x \in B_s$ , for some  $s \in D$ , then

$$\gamma(s) = \gamma_s(x) = \varphi(x) + [\varphi(s) + \lambda_s - \varphi(x)] h_s(x) \geq \varphi(x).$$

At this point, to obtain the function  $\psi$  that we are looking for, it is enough to put  $\psi = \min\{\gamma, \varphi + \vartheta\eta\}$ . Then conditions (i) and (ii) are obviously satisfied. To check (iii) note that for every  $s \in D$  we have

$$\gamma(s) = \varphi(s) + \lambda_s < \varphi(s) + \vartheta\eta(s),$$

so that  $\psi(s) = \gamma(s)$ ; hence, for every  $x \in B_s \setminus \{s\}$  we have

$$\psi(x) \leq \gamma(x) < \gamma(s) = \psi(s). \quad \blacksquare$$

Now, we come to prove Theorem 1 below, the main result of this section. This theorem extends [5, Theorem 1] in two directions. First, a more general class of spaces is considered here (it should be observed that in a metrizable space every discrete set is a countable union of closed discrete sets, hence it is  $\sigma$ -strongly discrete according to the remark before the lemma; it follows that in a metrizable space a set is  $\sigma$ -discrete if and only if it is  $\sigma$ -strongly discrete). Secondly, it is possible here to prescribe for the approximating function  $g$  both maximum and minimum points simultaneously.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $X$  be a completely regular topological space. Let  $S, T \subset X$  be two  $\sigma$ -strongly discrete disjoint sets such that each singleton  $\{s\}$ , with  $s \in S \cup T$ , is a  $G_\delta$ -set in  $X$ .*

*Then, for every  $f, \varepsilon \in C(X)$ , with  $\varepsilon > 0$  everywhere in  $X$ , there exists  $g \in C(X)$  such that:*

- (j)  $|g - f| < \varepsilon$  everywhere in  $X$ ,
- (jj)  $S \subset M(g), T \subset m(g)$ .

*Also, if  $K \subset X$  is any closed set disjoint from  $S \cup T$ , it is possible for  $g$  to satisfy*

- (jjj)  $g|_K = f|_K$ .

*Proof.* As the case  $S \cup T = \emptyset$  is trivial, we can assume without loss of generality that  $S$  is nonempty. Then we have

$$S = D_0 \cup D_2 \cup D_4 \cup \dots, \quad T = D_1 \cup D_3 \cup D_5 \cup \dots,$$

where  $D_0, D_1, D_2, \dots$  are pairwise disjoint strongly discrete sets and  $D_0 \neq \emptyset$ . We set  $E_n = \bigcup_{k=0}^n D_k$  for every  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , and  $E_{-1} = \emptyset$ . Also, let  $f_{-1} = f$ .

We will show by induction that there exist  $\{f_n: n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , a sequence in  $C(X)$ , and  $\{B_s: s \in S \cup T\}$ , a family of closed subsets of  $X$ , with

$s \in \text{Int}(B_s)$  for every  $s \in S \cup T$ , such that the following conditions are satisfied for every  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ :

(1)<sub>n</sub> if  $D_n \neq \emptyset$  then  $\{B_s : s \in D_n\}$  is a discrete family,

(2)<sub>n</sub>  $(\cup\{B_s : s \in D_n\}) \cap (K \cup E_{n-1}) = \emptyset$ ,

(here, of course, the convention  $\cup\{B_s : s \in D_n\} = \emptyset$  whenever  $D_n = \emptyset$  is observed; similar warnings will be omitted in the sequel),

(3)<sub>n</sub>  $(-1)^n f_{n-1} \leq (-1)^n f_n < (-1)^n f_{n-1} + \varepsilon/2^{n+1}$  everywhere in  $X$ ,

(4)<sub>n</sub>  $f_n = f_{n-1}$  in  $X \setminus \cup\{B_s : s \in D_n\}$ ,

(5)<sub>n</sub>  $(-1)^k f_n(x) < (-1)^k f_n(s)$  whenever  $k \leq n$ ,  $s \in D_k$ , and  $x \in B_s \setminus \{s\}$ ,

(6)<sub>n</sub> if  $B_u \cap B_v \neq \emptyset$  for some  $v \in D_n$  and  $u \in E_{n-1}$ , then  $v \in B_u$ .

To prove this, we first note that applying the lemma with  $D = D_0$ ,  $H = K$ ,  $\varphi = f_{-1}$ , and  $\eta = \varepsilon/2$ , we obtain the existence of  $f_0 \in C(X)$  and  $\{B_s : s \in D_0\}$ , a family of closed subsets of  $X$ , with  $s \in \text{Int}(B_s)$  for every  $s \in D_0$ , such that conditions (1)<sub>0</sub>–(6)<sub>0</sub> are satisfied.

Next, let us assume that functions  $f_0, \dots, f_n$  and closed sets  $B_s, s \in E_n$ , have been found such that conditions (1)<sub>k</sub>–(6)<sub>k</sub> are satisfied for  $k = 0, \dots, n$ , and construct  $f_{n+1}$  and  $B_s, s \in D_{n+1}$ , such that (1)<sub>n+1</sub>–(6)<sub>n+1</sub> hold.

Decompose  $D_{n+1}$  as  $D_{n+1} = D'_{n+1} \cup D''_{n+1}$ , with  $D'_{n+1} = D_{n+1} \setminus \cup\{B_t : t \in E_n\}$  and  $D''_{n+1} = D_{n+1} \setminus D'_{n+1}$ .

If  $D'_{n+1} = \emptyset$  we introduce the function  $h$  by setting  $h = f_n$ .

If  $D'_{n+1} \neq \emptyset$  we apply the lemma with  $D = D'_{n+1}$ ,  $H = K \cup (\cup\{B_t : t \in E_n\})$  (this is a closed set by assumptions (1)<sub>k</sub>,  $k = 0, \dots, n$ ),  $\varphi = (-1)^{n+1} f_n$  and  $\eta = \varepsilon/2^{n+3}$ . Then there exist  $h \in C(X)$  and, for each  $s \in D'_{n+1}$ ,  $B_s$ , a closed neighbourhood of  $s$ , such that (replacing  $h$  with  $-h$  if  $n + 1$  is an odd integer):

(a)  $\{B_s : s \in D'_{n+1}\}$  is a discrete family,

(b)  $(\cup\{B_s : s \in D'_{n+1}\}) \cap (K \cup (\cup\{B_t : t \in E_n\})) = \emptyset$ ,

(c)  $(-1)^{n+1} f_n \leq (-1)^{n+1} h < (-1)^{n+1} f_n + \varepsilon/2^{n+3}$  everywhere in  $X$ ,

(d)  $h = f_n$  in  $X \setminus \cup\{B_s : s \in D'_{n+1}\}$ ,

(e)  $(-1)^{n+1} h(x) < (-1)^{n+1} h(s)$  for every  $s \in D'_{n+1}$  and  $x \in B_s \setminus \{s\}$ .

Now, consider  $D''_{n+1}$ . If  $D''_{n+1} = \emptyset$ , then closed sets  $B_s$ , for  $s \in D_{n+1}$ , have already been constructed; moreover, letting  $f_{n+1} = h$ , it is clear, by (a)–(e) and (5)<sub>n</sub>, that conditions (1)<sub>n+1</sub>–(6)<sub>n+1</sub> are fulfilled.

Hence, suppose that  $D''_{n+1} \neq \emptyset$  and let  $\{U_s : s \in D''_{n+1}\}$  be any discrete family of open sets with  $s \in U_s$  for every  $s \in D''_{n+1}$ .

For each  $s \in D''_{n+1}$  denote by  $\Delta_s$  the set of all points  $t \in E_n$  such that  $s \in B_t$ . By conditions (1)<sub>k</sub>,  $k = 0, \dots, n$ , the set  $\Delta_s$  is finite. Let  $\tau_s =$

$\min\{|f_n(t) - f_n(s)| : t \in \Delta_s\}$ ; by condition (5)<sub>n</sub>,  $\tau_s$  is a positive number. Also, let  $C_s$  denote the union of all sets  $B_t$  with  $t \in (E_n \setminus \Delta_s) \cup D'_{n+1}$ ; by conditions (1)<sub>k</sub>,  $k = 0, \dots, n$ , and also (a) if  $D'_{n+1} \neq \emptyset$ ,  $C_s$  is a closed set; moreover, using condition (b) if  $D'_{n+1} \neq \emptyset$ , we have that  $s \notin C_s$ . Then, applying the lemma again with  $D = \{s\}$ ,  $H = K \cup C_s \cup \Delta_s \cup (X \setminus U_s)$  (note that each  $\{t\}$ ,  $t \in \Delta_s$ , is a closed set since it is a  $G_\delta$ -set and the space  $X$  is regular),  $\varphi = h$  and  $\eta = \eta_s = \min\{\varepsilon/2^{n+3}, \tau_s\}$ , we obtain a function  $h_s \in C(X)$  and a closed neighbourhood  $B_s$  of  $s$  such that (replacing  $h_s$  with  $-h_s$  if necessary):

- ( $\beta$ )<sub>s</sub>  $B_s \subset U_s \setminus (K \cup C_s \cup \Delta_s)$ ,
- ( $\gamma$ )<sub>s</sub>  $(-1)^{n+1} h \leq (-1)^{n+1} h_s < (-1)^{n+1} h + \eta$ , everywhere in  $X$ ,
- ( $\delta$ )<sub>s</sub>  $h_s = h$  in  $X \setminus B_s$ ,
- ( $\varepsilon$ )<sub>s</sub>  $(-1)^{n+1} h_s(x) < (-1)^{n+1} h_s(s)$  for every  $x \in B_s \setminus \{s\}$ .

Do this for each  $s \in D''_{n+1}$ . Then closed sets  $B_s$ ,  $s \in D''_{n+1}$ , have been constructed. Moreover, having in mind conditions ( $\beta$ )<sub>s</sub>,  $s \in D''_{n+1}$ , the discreteness of  $\{U_s : s \in D''_{n+1}\}$ , and also conditions (a)–(b) if  $D'_{n+1} \neq \emptyset$ , it is easy to check the validity of (1)<sub>n+1</sub>, (2)<sub>n+1</sub>, and (6)<sub>n+1</sub>.

Let  $f_{n+1} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{n+1}(x) &= h(x) && \text{if } x \in X \setminus \bigcup\{B_s : s \in D'_{n+1}\}, \\ f_{n+1}(x) &= h_s(x) && \text{if } x \in B_s, s \in D''_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

By conditions (1)<sub>n+1</sub> and ( $\delta$ )<sub>s</sub>,  $s \in D''_{n+1}$ , the function  $f_{n+1}$  is well defined and continuous. Also, using conditions ( $\gamma$ )<sub>s</sub>,  $s \in D''_{n+1}$ , and as usual (c) and (d) if  $D'_{n+1} \neq \emptyset$ , it is easy to check that (3)<sub>n+1</sub> and (4)<sub>n+1</sub> are fulfilled.

Let us show that also (5)<sub>n+1</sub> is satisfied. This will conclude the inductive argument.

Let  $k \leq n + 1$ ,  $s \in D_k$ , and  $x \in B_s \setminus \{s\}$ . If  $k = n + 1$ , then the inequality  $(-1)^{n+1} f_{n+1}(x) < (-1)^{n+1} f_{n+1}(s)$  follows from (e) if  $s \in D'_{n+1}$ , or from ( $\varepsilon$ )<sub>s</sub> if  $s \in D''_{n+1}$ . If  $k \leq n$  and  $x \notin \bigcup\{B_t : t \in D_{n+1}\}$ , then, using conditions (4)<sub>n+1</sub>, (5)<sub>n+1</sub>, and (2)<sub>n+1</sub>, we have

$$(-1)^k f_{n+1}(x) = (-1)^k f_n(x) < (-1)^k f_n(s) = (-1)^k f_{n+1}(s).$$

Finally, let us consider the case  $k \leq n$  and  $x \in B_t$  for some  $t \in D_{n+1}$ . By condition (6)<sub>n+1</sub> we have  $t \in B_s$ , hence  $t \in D''_{n+1}$  and  $s \in \Delta_t$ . We distinguish two subcases according to whether  $(-1)^k = (-1)^{n+1}$  or  $(-1)^k = (-1)^n$ . In the first case we have

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^k f_{n+1}(x) &= (-1)^{n+1} h_t(x) \leq && \text{(by } (\varepsilon)_t) \\ (-1)^{n+1} h_t(t) &< && \text{(by } (\gamma)_t) \\ (-1)^{n+1} h(t) + \eta_t &\leq (-1)^{n+1} h(t) + |f_n(t) - f_n(s)| = \end{aligned}$$

(using (d) if  $D'_{n+1} \neq \emptyset$ )

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{n+1} f_n(t) + |f_n(t) - f_n(s)| &= \\ (-1)^k f_n(t) + |(-1)^k f_n(t) - (-1)^k f_n(s)| &= \quad (\text{by } (5)_n) \\ (-1)^k f_n(s) &= \quad (\text{by } (2)_{n+1} \text{ and } (4)_{n+1}) \\ (-1)^k f_{n+1}(s). & \end{aligned}$$

If  $(-1)^k = (-1)^n$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^k f_{n+1}(x) &= (-1)^n h_i(x) \leq \quad (\text{by } (\gamma)_i) \\ (-1)^n h(x) &= \quad (\text{using (d) if } D'_{n+1} \neq \emptyset) \\ (-1)^k f_n(x) &< \quad (\text{by } (5)_n) \\ (-1)^k f_n(s) &= \quad (\text{by } (2)_{n+1} \text{ and } (4)_{n+1}) \\ (-1)^k f_{n+1}(s). & \end{aligned}$$

At this point we are in a position to define the function  $g$  that we are looking for. Let

$$g = f_{-1} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (f_n - f_{n-1}).$$

By conditions  $(3)_n$ ,  $n=0, 1, 2, \dots$ , the function  $g$  is well defined, continuous, and satisfies

$$|g - f| = |g - f_{-1}| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |f_n - f_{n-1}| < \varepsilon$$

everywhere in  $X$ , that is condition (j). Moreover, by conditions  $(2)_n$  and  $(4)_n$ ,  $n=0, 1, 2, \dots$ , it is clear that also (jjj) is satisfied.

Let us check (jj). We will show that  $(-1)^k g(x) < (-1)^k g(s)$  whenever  $s \in D_k$  and  $x \in B_s \setminus \{s\}$ . Of course, this implies (jj).

Since  $g = \lim_n f_n$  and owing to conditions  $(2)_n$  and  $(4)_n$ ,  $n=k+1, k+2, \dots$ , we have  $f_k(s) = f_{k+1}(s) = \dots = g(s)$ . Denote by  $L$  the set of all integers  $n=0, 1, 2, \dots$  such that  $(-1)^n = (-1)^k$  and  $x \in \bigcup \{B_t : t \in D_n\}$ . If  $L$  is a finite set, then, letting  $v = \max L$ , by conditions  $(2)_n$ ,  $(4)_n$ , and  $(3)_n$ ,  $n=v+1, v+2, \dots$ , we have  $(-1)^k f_{n-1}(x) \geq (-1)^k f_n(x)$  for all  $n \geq v$ , hence by  $(5)_v$ ,

$$(-1)^k g(x) \leq (-1)^k f_v(x) < (-1)^k f_v(s) = (-1)^k g(s).$$

If the set  $L$  is infinite, then fix any  $m \in L$  with  $m > k$  and denote by  $t$  the



element of  $D_m$  for which  $x \in B_t$ . By  $(6)_m$  we have  $t \in B_s$  and so, by conditions  $(5)_n$ ,  $n = m, m + 1, \dots$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^k f_n(x) &= (-1)^m f_n(x) \leq (-1)^m f_n(t) \\ &= (-1)^k f_n(t) < (-1)^k f_n(s) \end{aligned}$$

for every  $n \geq m$ . But, as above for  $s$ , we also have  $f_m(t) = f_{m+1}(t) = \dots = g(t)$ . It follows  $(-1)^k g(x) \leq (-1)^k g(t) < (-1)^k g(s)$ . This accomplishes the proof. ■

Now, we present some consequences of Theorem 1.

Henceforth, given a space  $X$ , we will denote by  $X'$  the derived set of  $X$ .

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $X$  be a completely regular space.*

*If there exists a  $\sigma$ -strongly discrete set  $F$  which is a dense subset of  $\text{Int}(X')$  and such that  $\{x\}$  is a  $G_\delta$ -set in  $X$  for every  $x \in F$ , then both  $M(X)$  and  $m(X)$  are dense in  $C(X)$  endowed with the majorant topology.*

*If there exist two disjoint  $\sigma$ -strongly discrete sets  $F, G$ , both dense subsets of  $\text{Int}(X')$ , such that  $\{x\}$  is a  $G_\delta$ -set in  $X$  for every  $x \in F \cup G$ , then  $M(X) \cap m(X)$  is dense in  $C(X)$  endowed with the majorant topology.*

*Proof.* If a set  $F$  exists, then we apply Theorem 1 with  $S = F$ ,  $T = \emptyset$  and  $f, \varepsilon$  any two functions in  $C(X)$ , with  $\varepsilon > 0$  everywhere in  $X$ . The corresponding function  $g$  belongs to  $M(X)$ . Indeed, we have  $M(g) \supseteq F \cup (X \setminus X')$  and the last set is dense in  $X$ . This proves the density of  $M(X)$ . To prove that also  $m(X)$  is dense, it is enough to interchange the roles of  $F$  and  $\emptyset$ , or to use the obvious remark that (regardless of which of two topologies is considered for  $C(X)$ ) there exists a homeomorphism of  $C(X)$  onto itself, namely  $f \rightarrow -f$ , which takes  $M(X)$  onto  $m(X)$ .

If two sets  $F, G$  exist, then we apply Theorem 1 again with  $S = F$ ,  $T = G$ . ■

Theorem 2 yields in particular the following

**COROLLARY 1.** *Let  $X$  be a completely regular space.*

*If  $\text{Int}(X')$  has a countable dense subset whose points are  $G_\delta$ -sets in  $X$ , then both  $M(X)$  and  $m(X)$  are dense in  $C(X)$  endowed with the majorant topology.*

*If  $\text{Int}(X')$  has two disjoint countable dense subsets whose points are  $G_\delta$ -sets in  $X$ , then  $M(X) \cap m(X)$  is dense in  $C(X)$  endowed with the majorant topology.*

*Proof.* Observe that any countable set is  $\sigma$ -strongly discrete. ■

Finally, we prove

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $X$  be a completely regular space with a  $\sigma$ -strongly discrete  $\pi$ -base and with a dense subset whose points are  $G_\delta$ -sets in  $X$ . Then  $M(X) \cap m(X)$  is dense in  $C(X)$  endowed with the majorant topology.*

*Proof.* Of course, we can assume that  $\text{Int}(X') \neq \emptyset$ , for if  $\text{Int}(X') = \emptyset$ , then it is obvious that  $M(X) = m(X) = C(X)$ .

Let  $Y$  be a dense subset of  $X$  such that  $\{y\}$  is a  $G_\delta$ -set in  $X$  for every  $y \in Y$ . By the regularity of  $X$ , each singleton  $\{y\}$ , with  $y \in Y$ , is also a closed set, and consequently every nonempty open subset of  $\text{Int}(X')$  meets  $Y$  in infinitely many points.

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a discrete  $\pi$ -base for  $X$ . Then  $\mathcal{V} = \{V \in \mathcal{U} : V \subset \text{Int}(X')\}$  is a  $\pi$ -base for the subspace  $\text{Int}(X')$ ; also we have  $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{V}_n$ , where each  $\mathcal{V}_n$  is a discrete family in  $X$ .

We will construct by induction  $\{F_n : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$  and  $\{G_n : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ , two sequences of pairwise disjoint subsets of  $Y \cap \text{Int}(X')$ , with  $(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty F_n) \cap (\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty G_n) = \emptyset$ , such that, for every  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , both  $F_n$  and  $G_n$  are contained in  $\bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}_n\}$  and meet each  $V \in \mathcal{V}_n$  in one point. Then the theorem will follow from Theorem 2 taking  $F = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty F_n$  and  $G = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty G_n$ .

To perform the construction, we first choose, for every  $V \in \mathcal{V}_1$ , two distinct points  $x_V, y_V$  in  $Y \cap V$ , and put  $F_1 = \{x_V : V \in \mathcal{V}_1\}$ ,  $G_1 = \{y_V : V \in \mathcal{V}_1\}$ .

Next, let us assume that pairwise disjoint subsets  $F_1, \dots, F_n, G_1, \dots, G_n$  of  $Y \cap \text{Int}(X')$  have been found such that, for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , both  $F_i$  and  $G_i$  are contained in  $\bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}_i\}$  and meet each  $V \in \mathcal{V}_i$  in one point, and construct  $F_{n+1}, G_{n+1}$ .

Owing to the discreteness of  $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_n$ , for each  $V \in \mathcal{V}_{n+1}$  there is a nonempty open set  $\Omega \subset V$  which meets  $F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_n \cup G_1 \cup \dots \cup G_n$  in finitely many points. Hence, by the initial remark, two distinct points  $x_V, y_V$  can be chosen in  $(Y \cap V) \setminus (F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_n \cup G_1 \cup \dots \cup G_n)$  for every  $V \in \mathcal{V}_{n+1}$ . At this point, to complete the inductive step, it is enough to take  $F_{n+1} = \{x_V : V \in \mathcal{V}_{n+1}\}$ , and  $G_{n+1} = \{y_V : V \in \mathcal{V}_{n+1}\}$ . ■

*Remark.* By the above proof it is clear that in Theorem 3 the assumption that  $X$  has a  $\sigma$ -discrete  $\pi$ -base and a dense subset whose points are  $G_\delta$ -sets in  $X$  can be weakened as follows: if  $\text{Int}(X') \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\text{Int}(X')$ , with the relative topology, has a  $\pi$ -base which is  $\sigma$ -discrete in  $X$  and a dense subset whose points are  $G_\delta$ -sets.

## 2. A CATEGORY RESULT

In this section we are concerned with the residuality of  $M(X)$  in  $C(X)$  endowed with the topology of uniform convergence. Since  $C(X)$  with the metric  $\rho$  of uniform convergence is a complete metric space, it is obvious

that in this case residuality implies density. Also, by a previous remark (see the proof of Theorem 2), it is apparent that  $M(X)$  is residual if and only if  $m(X)$  is; hence  $M(X)$  residual implies that also  $M(X) \cap m(X)$  is residual.

**THEOREM 4.** *Let  $X$  be a topological space for which the following condition is satisfied: if  $\text{Int}(X') \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\text{Int}(X')$  with the relative topology has a  $\pi$ -base  $\mathcal{U}$  which consists of completely metrizable subspaces and which moreover is a  $\sigma$ -discrete family in  $X$ .*

*Then  $M(X) \cap m(X)$  is a residual set in  $C(X)$  endowed with the topology of uniform convergence.*

*Proof.* Of course we can assume that  $\text{Int}(X') \neq \emptyset$ . Also, by the above remark, it is enough to prove that  $M(X)$  is residual.

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be as in the statement and, for each  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ , let  $d_U$  be a complete compatible metric on  $U$ ; we will denote by  $\delta_U(V)$  the diameter of a set  $V \subset U$  with respect to this metric. Also, let  $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_n$ , where every  $\mathcal{U}_n$  is a discrete family in  $X$ .

For every  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $\mathbb{V}_n$  be the set of all families  $\mathcal{V}$  of the form  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_U : U \in \mathcal{U}_n\}$ , where  $V_U$  is a nonempty open subset of  $U$  for each  $U \in \mathcal{U}_n$ . Also, for every  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $\mathbb{W}_{n,k}$  be the set of all  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{V}_n$ , with  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_U : U \in \mathcal{U}_n\}$ , such that  $\delta_U(V_U) \leq 1/k$  for each  $U \in \mathcal{U}_n$ .

Now, for every  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{V}_n$ , with  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_U : U \in \mathcal{U}_n\}$ , let  $A_n(\mathcal{V})$  be the set of all functions  $f \in C(X)$  with the property: there exists  $\sigma > 0$  such that  $\sup f(U) \geq \sup f(U \setminus V_U) + \sigma$  for every  $U \in \mathcal{U}_n$  (here the convention  $\sup \emptyset = -\infty$  is observed). We have that  $A_n(\mathcal{V})$  is an open subset of  $C(X)$ . To check this, let  $\tilde{f}$  be any function in  $A_n(\mathcal{V})$ , so that there is a  $\bar{\sigma} > 0$  such that  $\sup \tilde{f}(U) \geq \sup \tilde{f}(U \setminus V_U) + \bar{\sigma}$  for every  $U \in \mathcal{U}_n$ . We claim that the open ball of  $C(X)$  centered at  $\tilde{f}$  and with radius  $r = \min\{\bar{\sigma}/2, 1\}$  is contained in  $A_n(\mathcal{V})$ . Indeed, from  $\rho(f, \tilde{f}) < r \leq 1$ , it follows, for every  $Y \subset X$ ,

$$\sup f(Y) \geq \sup \tilde{f}(Y) - \rho(f, \tilde{f}) \geq \sup f(Y) - 2\rho(f, \tilde{f}),$$

and hence, for every  $U \in \mathcal{U}_n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup f(U) &\geq \sup \tilde{f}(U) - \rho(f, \tilde{f}) \geq \sup \tilde{f}(U \setminus V_U) + \bar{\sigma} - \rho(f, \tilde{f}) \\ &\geq \sup f(U \setminus V_U) + \bar{\sigma} - 2\rho(f, \tilde{f}), \end{aligned}$$

whence  $f \in A_n(\mathcal{V})$  since  $\bar{\sigma} - 2\rho(f, \tilde{f}) > \bar{\sigma} - 2r \geq 0$ .

Next, for every  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , let

$$B_{n,k} = U\{A_n(\mathcal{V}) : \mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{W}_{n,k}\}.$$

We will prove that the open set  $B_{n,k}$  is dense in  $C(X)$ . To this aim, given

$f \in C(X)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we will construct a family  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} \in \mathbb{W}_{n,k}$  and a function  $g \in A_n(\tilde{\mathcal{V}})$  such that  $\rho(g, f) \leq \varepsilon$ . Consider the family  $\mathcal{U}'_n = \{U \in \mathcal{U}_n : \sup f(U) < +\infty\}$ . If  $\mathcal{U}'_n = \emptyset$ , then  $f \in A_n(\mathcal{V})$  for every  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{V}_n$ , hence we can take  $g = f$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$  any family in  $\mathbb{W}_{n,k}$ . If  $\mathcal{U}'_n \neq \emptyset$  we proceed as follows. Let, for each  $U \in \mathcal{U}'_n$ , a point  $x_U$  and an open set  $W_U$  be fixed such that

$$x_U \in W_U, \overline{W_U} \subset U, \quad \delta_U(W_U) \leq 1/k$$

and

$$\sup f(U) < f(x_U) + \varepsilon/2;$$

also, let  $\varphi_U : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function such that

$$\begin{aligned} (*) \quad & f \leq \varphi_U \leq f + \varepsilon \quad \text{everywhere in } U, \\ (**) \quad & \varphi_U = f \quad \text{in } U \setminus W_U, \end{aligned}$$

and  $\varphi_U(x_U) = f(x_U) + \varepsilon$ . Then, owing to the discreteness of  $\mathcal{U}'_n$ , to condition (\*\*\*) and to the fact that  $\overline{W_U} \subset U$ , the function  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , defined by

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) &= f(x) & \text{if } x \notin \bigcup \{U : U \in \mathcal{U}'_n\}, \\ g(x) &= \varphi_U(x) & \text{if } x \in U, U \in \mathcal{U}'_n, \end{aligned}$$

is easily seen to be continuous. Also, by (\*), we have  $\rho(g, f) \leq \varepsilon$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} = \{\tilde{V}_U : U \in \mathcal{U}'_n\}$  be any family in  $\mathbb{W}_{n,k}$  such that  $\tilde{V}_U = W_U$  for every  $U \in \mathcal{U}'_n$ . Then we have  $g \in A_n(\tilde{\mathcal{V}})$ . Indeed, we claim that

$$\sup g(U) \geq \sup g(U \setminus \tilde{V}_U) + \varepsilon/2$$

for every  $U \in \mathcal{U}'_n$ . This is obvious if  $U \notin \mathcal{U}'_n$ , for in this case  $\sup g(U) = \sup f(U) = +\infty$ . If  $U \in \mathcal{U}'_n$ , then the above claim follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \sup g(U) &\geq g(x_U) = f(x_U) + \varepsilon \\ &\geq \sup f(U) + \varepsilon/2 \geq \sup f(U \setminus \tilde{V}_U) + \varepsilon/2 \\ &\geq \sup g(U \setminus \tilde{V}_U) + \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, to complete the proof, we show that  $M(X)$  contains a dense  $G_\delta$ -set in  $C(X)$ , namely  $\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty B_{n,k}$ .

Let  $f \in \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty B_{n,k}$ . We have to show that if  $\Omega \subset X$  is open and nonempty, then  $\Omega \cap M(f) \neq \emptyset$ . This is obvious if  $\Omega \cap X' \neq \emptyset$ . So, let  $\Omega \subset X'$ , hence  $\Omega \subset \text{Int}(X')$ , and, replacing  $\Omega$  with a nonempty open subset if necessary, let the condition  $\sup f(\Omega) < +\infty$  be satisfied. As  $\mathcal{U}$  is a  $\pi$ -base for  $\text{Int}(X')$ , there exist an integer  $n^*$  and a set  $U^* \in \mathcal{U}_{n^*}$  such that  $U^* \subset \Omega$ . As the function  $f$  is in  $\bigcap_{k=1}^\infty B_{n^*,k}$ , then for every  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , there is a

nonempty open set  $V_k \subset U^*$  such that  $\delta_{U^*}(V_k) \leq 1/k$  and  $\sup f(U^*) \geq \sup f(U^* \setminus V_k)$ . The family  $\{V_k: k=1, 2, \dots\}$  has the finite intersection property because, for every  $k=1, 2, \dots$ , the inequalities

$$\sup f(U^*) > \sup f(U^* \setminus V_i), \quad i=1, \dots, k,$$

imply

$$\begin{aligned} \sup f(U^*) &> \sup f\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k (U^* \setminus V_i)\right) \\ &= \sup f\left(U^* \setminus \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k V_i\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

hence  $\bigcap_{i=1}^k V_i$  cannot be empty. Since  $(U^*, d_{U^*})$  is a complete metric space, then, by a version of the Cantor theorem [2, p. 337, Theorem 4.3.10],  $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} (U^* \cap \overline{V_k})$  is nonempty. Let  $p$  be a point in  $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} (U^* \cap \overline{V_k})$ . We will prove that  $p \in M(f)$  and this will conclude the proof.

We first note that  $f(p) = \sup f(U^*)$ . This is proved by contradiction as follows. Assume that a point  $q \in U^*$  exists such that  $f(q) > f(p)$ , and let  $W$  be an open neighborhood of  $p$ ,  $W \subset U^*$ , such that  $f(q) > f(y)$  for every  $y \in W$ . Since  $\delta_{U^*}(V_k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $p \in \overline{V_k}$ , we have that, for  $k$  large enough,  $V_k \subset W$ , hence  $\sup f(V_k) \leq f(q)$ , whence the contradiction  $\sup f(U^*) = \sup f(U^* \setminus V_k)$ .

Next, we show that  $f(p) > f(x)$  for every  $x \in U^* \setminus \{p\}$ . Indeed, if  $x \neq p$ , then  $x \notin V_k$  if  $k$  is large enough, and so

$$f(p) = \sup f(U^*) > \sup f(U^* \setminus V_k) \geq f(x). \quad \blacksquare$$

It is worth pointing out explicitly the following particular case of Theorem 4.

**COROLLARY 2.** *Let  $X$  be a completely metrizable space. Then  $M(X) \cap m(X)$  is a residual set in  $C(X)$  endowed with the topology of uniform convergence.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a  $\sigma$ -discrete base for  $X$  and, if  $\text{Int}(X') \neq \emptyset$ , let  $\mathcal{U} = \{B \cap \text{Int}(X'): B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ . Then the assumptions of Theorem 4 are satisfied.  $\blacksquare$

#### REFERENCES

1. V. DROBOT AND M. MORAYNE, Continuous functions with a dense set of proper local maxima, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **92** (1985), 209–211.
2. R. ENGELKING, "General Topology," PWN, Warsaw, 1977.

3. V. KELAR, On strict local extrema of differentiable functions, *Real. Anal. Exchange* **6**, No. 2 (1980–1981), 242–244.
4. E. E. POSEY AND J. E. VAUGHAN, Functions with a proper local maximum in each interval, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **90** (1983), 281–282.
5. A. VILLANI, Functions with a dense set of proper local maximum points, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **94** (1985), 353–359.
6. S. WILLARD, “General Topology,” Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1970.
7. Z. ZALCWASSER, Sur le fonctions de Kopcke, *Prace Mat. Fiz.* **35** (1927–1928), 57–99.