UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

A note on coherence of dcpos

Jia, Xiaodong; Jung, Achim; Li, Qingguo

DOI:
10.1016/j.topol.2016.06.011

License:
Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):
Jia, X, Jung, A & Li, Q 2016, 'A note on coherence of dcpos', *Topology and its Applications*, vol. 209, pp. 235-238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.topol.2016.06.011

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

General rights
Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

• Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
• Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
• User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
• Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy
While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Download date: 16. Jan. 2021

A note on coherence of dcpos ☆

Xiaodong Jia[a,*], Achim Jung[a], Qingguo Li[b]

[a] *School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom*
[b] *College of Mathematics and Econometrics, Hunan University, Changsha, Hunan, 410082, China*

Abstract

In this note, we prove that a well-filtered dcpo L is coherent in its Scott topology if and only if for every $x, y \in L$, $\uparrow x \cap \uparrow y$ is compact in the Scott topology. We use this result to prove that a well-filtered dcpo L is Lawson-compact if and only if it is patch-compact if and only if L is finitely generated and $\uparrow x \cap \uparrow y$ is compact in the Scott topology for every $x, y \in L$.

Keywords: coherence, well-filtered dcpo, Lawson compactness, patch topology
2000 MSC: 54B20, 06B35, 06F30

1. Introduction

In this paper, we investigate the *coherence* with respect to the Scott topology on directed-complete partial ordered sets (*dcpo*'s for short). Coherence, which states that the intersection of any two compact saturated sets is again compact, is an important property in domain theory [1, 3]. For instance, coherence is equivalent to Lawson compactness on pointed continuous domains [5]. This equivalence enabled the second author to characterise the Lawson compactness of continuous domains by the so-called "property M", and use this element-level characterization to classify the category of continuous domains with respect to the cartesian closedness [5, 6].

In [9, 8], the equivalence between coherence and Lawson compactness was generalised to quasicontinuous domains. In Chapter 3 of [3], one even sees that on finitely generated quasicontinuous domains the compactness of $\uparrow x \cap \uparrow y$ for any $x, y \in L$, which seems much weaker than what coherence requires, already implies the Lawson compactness of L. In this note, we greatly generalize this result to *well-filtered* dcpos. Indeed, since every quasicontinuous domain is locally finitary compact and sober (see for example, [4]), our proof drops the locally finitary compact property and only uses well-filteredness, which is even strictly weaker than sobriety [7].

2. Preliminaries

We refer to [1, 3] for the standard definitions and notations of order theory and domain theory, and to [4] for topology.

☆Supported by a Royal Society-Newton Mobility Grant and the National Natural Science Foundation of China.
*Corresponding author.
Email addresses: jia.xiaodong@yahoo.com (Xiaodong Jia), A.Jung@cs.bham.ac.uk (Achim Jung)

A topological space is called *well-filtered* if, whenever an open set U contains a filtered intersection $\bigcap_{i\in I} Q_i$ of compact saturated subsets, then U contains Q_i for some $i \in I$. Any sober space is well-filtered (see [3, Theorem II-1.21]). We take *coherence* of a topological space to mean that the intersection of any two compact saturated subsets is compact. A *stably compact* space is a topological space which is compact, locally compact, well-filtered and coherent. We call a dcpo L well-filtered (respectively, compact, sober, coherent, locally compact, stably compact) if L with its Scott topology $\sigma(L)$ is a well-filtered (respectively, compact, sober, coherent, locally compact, stably compact) space. Without further reference, we always equip L with the Scott topology $\sigma(L)$. Finally, a dcpo L is said to be *core-compact* if its Scott topology $\sigma(L)$ is a continuous lattice in the inclusion order.

For a topological space X, we denote the set of all compact saturated sets of X by $\mathcal{Q}(X)$. We consider the *upper Vietoris topology* v on $\mathcal{Q}(X)$, generated by the sets

$$\Box U = \{K \in \mathcal{Q}(X) \mid K \subseteq U\},$$

where U ranges over the open subsets of X. We use $\mathcal{Q}_v(X)$ to denote the resulting topological space. For a dcpo L, we use $\mathcal{Q}_v(L)$ to denote $\mathcal{Q}_v((L, \sigma(L)))$.

3. Main results

Lemma 3.1. *Let L be a well-filtered dcpo. Then L is coherent if and only if $\uparrow x \cap \uparrow y$ is compact for all $x, y \in L$.*

Proof. If L is coherent, it is obvious that $\uparrow x \cap \uparrow y$ is compact for all $x, y \in L$, since $\uparrow x, \uparrow y$ are compact saturated.

For the reverse, suppose $\uparrow x \cap \uparrow y$ is compact for all $x, y \in L$. We proceed to prove that for any compact saturated sets $A, B \subseteq L$, $A \cap B$ is compact in L. To this end, fix some element $a \in L$; we define a function f from L to $\mathcal{Q}_v(L)$ by sending an element x to the compact saturated set $\uparrow x \cap \uparrow a$. We claim that f is continuous. Indeed, for every Scott open subset $U \subseteq L$, $f^{-1}(\Box U) = \{x \mid \uparrow x \cap \uparrow a \subseteq U\}$ is obviously an upper set. Let $D \subseteq L$ be a directed subset with $\sup D \in f^{-1}(\Box U)$, then one has $\uparrow(\sup D) \cap \uparrow a \subseteq U$, that is, $\bigcap_{d\in D}(\uparrow d \cap \uparrow a) \subseteq U$. Note that L is well-filtered and $\{\uparrow d \cap \uparrow a \mid d \in D\}$ is a filtered family of compact saturated sets by assumption, so we have some $d \in D$ such that $\uparrow d \cap \uparrow a \subseteq U$, i. e., $d \in f^{-1}(\Box U)$. Hence f is continuous.

Since f is continuous, for the given compact saturated subset $A \subseteq L$, $f(A) = \{\uparrow x \cap \uparrow a \mid x \in A\}$ is a compact subset of $\mathcal{Q}_v(L)$. We now claim that the union of $f(A)$, which is just $A \cap \uparrow a$, is compact in L. Indeed, for any compact subset $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{Q}_v(L)$, let $\{U_\alpha\}$ be a directed family of open sets of L covering $\bigcup \mathcal{C}$. By compactness, every element K of $\mathcal{C}$ is already covered by one U_α; in other words, $K \in \Box U_\alpha$. It follows that $\{\Box U_\alpha\}$ is a directed family covering $\mathcal{C}$, and now the compactness of $\mathcal{C}$ tells us that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \Box U_\alpha$ for some α. Hence $\bigcup \mathcal{C} \subseteq U_\alpha$ for this α. (This argument is similar to the one employed by Andrea Schalk in [10, Chapter 7] for showing that $\bigcup \colon \mathcal{Q}_v(\mathcal{Q}_v(X)) \to \mathcal{Q}_v(X)$ is well-defined.)

Now for such A the above argument enables us to define another function g from L to $\mathcal{Q}_v(L)$ as: $g(x) = \uparrow x \cap A$ for every $x \in L$. A similar deduction shows that g is continuous. So for the compact saturated subset B of L, $g(B)$ is compact in $\mathcal{Q}_v(L)$, and again the union of $g(B)$, which is $A \cap B$, is compact in L. So L is coherent. $\Box$

Corollary 3.2. *Every well-filtered complete lattice L is coherent.*

Proof. For every $x, y \in L$ the intersection of $\uparrow x$ and $\uparrow y$, which is $\uparrow(x \vee y)$, is always compact, so the statement follows from Lemma 3.1. □

The following fact about core-compact complete lattices is essentially due to G. Gierz and K.H. Hofmann [2]; we collect it here as a corollary to the previous result.

Corollary 3.3. *For a complete lattice L, the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *L is core-compact, i. e., $\sigma(L)$ is a continuous lattice;*
2. *$(L, \sigma(L))$ is stably compact.*

Proof. The only interesting part is that *1* implies *2*. Suppose L is a complete lattice and $\sigma(L)$ is continuous, then $(L, \sigma(L))$ is a locally compact sober space by [3, PropositionVII-4.1]. Since sober spaces are well-filtered, L is coherent by Corollary 3.2. Finally, L is obviously compact in its Scott topology since it has a least element. □

We now come to a characterization of the compactness of Lawson and patch topologies on L. Recall that the patch topology on L arises by taking all Scott closed sets together with all compact saturated sets as a subbasis for the closed sets; whereas the (coarser) Lawson topology is generated by the Scott closed subsets and principal upper sets $\uparrow x$. The following theorem is a generalization of [3, Theorem III-5.8] which is stated for quasicontinuous domains.

Theorem 3.4. *Let L be a well-filtered dcpo. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *L is patch-compact, i. e., L is compact in the patch topology;*
2. *L is Lawson-compact;*
3. *L is compact and $\uparrow x \cap \uparrow y$ is compact for every $x, y \in L$;*
4. *L is finitely generated and $\uparrow x \cap \uparrow y$ is compact for every $x, y \in L$;*
5. *L is finitely generated and coherent.*

Proof. (*1*⇒*2*): That *1* implies *2* is true for all dcpos since the patch topology is finer than the Lawson topology.
(*2*⇒*3*): It is obvious that L is compact since the Lawson topology is finer than the Scott topology. For every $x, y \in L$, $\uparrow x \cap \uparrow y$ is Lawson closed; therefore it is Lawson-compact, thus Scott compact.
(*3*⇒*4*): Since L is compact, by the Hausdorff Maximality Principle, every element is above some minimal element of L. Denote the set of all minimal elements of L by M; M must be finite. Otherwise, the family $\{M \backslash F \mid F \subseteq_{\text{fin}} M\}$ is a filtered set of non-empty Scott closed sets with an empty intersection, which contradicts compactness.
(*4*⇒*5*): This is from Lemma 3.1.
(*5*⇒*1*): This is a straightforward consequence of [3, Lemma VI-6.5][1]. □

4. Acknowledgments

We thank the anonymous referee for improving the presentation of the paper.

[1]This lemma works for sober dcpos in [3]. However, one can find that its proof only uses well-filteredness.

References

[1] S. Abramsky and A. Jung. Domain theory. In S. Abramsky, D. M. Gabbay, and T. S. E. Maibaum, editors, *Semantic Structures*, volume 3 of *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science*, pages 1–168. Clarendon Press, 1994.

[2] G. Gierz and K. H. Hofmann. On complete lattices L for which $O(L)$ is continuous – A lattice theoretical characterisation of CS. Available at `http://www.mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de/~keimel/SCS/scs34.pdf`, August 1977.

[3] G. Gierz, K. H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J. D. Lawson, M. Mislove, and D. S. Scott. *Continuous Lattices and Domains*, volume 93 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[4] J. Goubault-Larrecq. *Non-Hausdorff Topology and Domain Theory*, volume 22 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

[5] A. Jung. *Cartesian Closed Categories of Domains*, volume 66 of *CWI Tracts*. Centrum voor Wiskunde en Informatica, Amsterdam, 1989. 107 pp.

[6] A. Jung. The classification of continuous domains. In *Proceedings, Fifth Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 35–40. IEEE Computer Society Press, 1990.

[7] Hui Kou. Uk-admitting dcpo's need not be sober. In K. Keimel, G.-Q. Zhang, Y.-M. Liu, and Y.-X. Chen, editors, *Domain and Processes*, volume 1 of *Semantic Structures in Computation*, pages 41–50. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.

[8] Hui Kou, Ying-Ming Liu, and Mao-Kang Luo. On meet-continuous dcpos. In G. Zhang, J. Lawson, Y. Liu, and M. Luo, editors, *Domain Theory, Logic and Computation*, volume 3 of *Semantic Structures in Computation*, pages 117–135. Springer Netherlands, 2003.

[9] J. Lawson. The upper interval topology, Property M, and compactness. In Abbas Edalat, Achim Jung, Klaus Keimel, and Marta Kwiatkowska, editors, *Comprox III, Third Workshop on Computation and Approximation*, volume 13 of *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 158–172. Elsevier Science Publishers, 1998.

[10] A. Schalk. *Algebras for Generalized Power Constructions*. Doctoral thesis, Technische Hochschule Darmstadt, 1993. 166 pp.