

R-CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS

CH. KONSTADILAKI-SAVVOPOULOU and D. JANKOVIĆ

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand

(Received May 8, 1989 and in revised form July 27, 1989)

ABSTRACT. A strong form of continuity of functions between topological spaces is introduced and studied. It is shown that in many known results, especially closed graph theorems, functions under consideration are R-continuous. Several results in the literature concerning strong continuity properties are generalized and/or improved.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES. R-continuity, continuity, closed graph property, rim compactness.
1980 AMS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODE. 54C10, 54D10.

1. INTRODUCTION.

The purpose of this paper is to introduce a strong form of continuity of functions between topological spaces and study its properties. We call this new class of functions, R-continuous functions, because it is closely related to the class of regular topological spaces and is instrumental in discussing preservation of regularity under mappings. Since R-continuous functions into T_1 spaces have closed graphs it is not surprising that in many familiar closed graph theorems considered, functions are R-continuous. For instance, a well known result that closed graph functions into compact spaces are continuous is strengthened by showing that they are actually R-continuous. It is also observed that R-continuous functions are encountered in various standard settings. Among others, we show that continuous functions from locally compact Hausdorff spaces into Hausdorff spaces are R-continuous. We also establish numerous basic results about R-continuity as well as obtain several improvements of known results.

2. PRELIMINARIES.

By $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is meant an arbitrary function between topological spaces. For a subset A of a space X , clA , $int A$, and BdA denote the closure, interior and boundary of A in X , respectively. Recall that A is regular open if $A = int clA$. The family of regular open sets in X is a base for a topology on X , denoted by τ_g . For $A \subset X$, the θ -closure (Veličko [1]) of A in X is $cl_\theta A = \{x \in X: clU \cap A \neq \emptyset, \text{ for each open } U \subset X \text{ with } x \in U\}$. A is θ -closed if $A = cl_\theta A$ and θ -open sets in X are complements of θ -closed sets. For a space (X, τ) , the space (X, τ_θ) is the set X with the topology τ_θ of θ -open sets. It is clear that $\tau_\theta \subset \tau_3 \subset \tau$ and that a space is regular if and only if $\tau = \tau_\theta$. Recall now that a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is strongly θ -continuous (Noiri [2]) (resp. θ -continuous (Fomin [3]), weakly continuous (Levine [4])) if for each $x \in X$ and each open set V containing $f(x)$, there exists an open set U containing x such that $f(clU) \subset V$ (resp. $f(clU) \subset clV$,

$f(U) \subset c\ell V$). Note that $f:(X, \tau) \rightarrow Y$ is strongly θ -continuous if and only if $f:(X, \tau_\theta) \rightarrow Y$ is continuous. It is known that strong θ -continuity \implies continuity \implies θ -continuity \implies weak continuity and that none of these implications is reversible. However, if the domain of a continuous function is regular then the function is strongly θ -continuous and if the range of a weakly continuous function is regular then the function is strongly θ -continuous. If \mathfrak{F} is a filter base on a space X we denote by $\text{ad } \mathfrak{F}$ the adherence of \mathfrak{F} , that is $\bigcap \{c\ell F: F \in \mathfrak{F}\}$ and by $c\ell \mathfrak{F}$ the filter base $\{c\ell F: F \in \mathfrak{F}\}$. \mathbb{R} stands for the set of real numbers.

3. BASIC PROPERTIES OF R-CONTINUITY.

DEFINITION 3.1. A function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is R-continuous at $x \in X$ if for each open set V containing $f(x)$, there exists an open set U containing x such that $c\ell f(U) \subset V$.

A function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is R-continuous if it is R-continuous at each $x \in X$. Note that a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is R-continuous if open sets U and V in Definition 3.1 are replaced by a basic open set and a subbasic open set, respectively. Also, it is clear that R-continuous functions are continuous. Moreover, R-continuity implies strong θ -continuity, while the converse is not true in general. We will first characterize R-continuity and then provide some examples to distinguish between continuity, strong θ -continuity and R-continuity.

THEOREM 3.1. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a function. Then the following are equivalent.

- (a) f is R-continuous.
- (b) For every filter base \mathfrak{F} on X , if \mathfrak{F} converges to $x \in X$ then $c\ell f(\mathfrak{F})$ converges to $f(x)$.
- (c) For every $x \in X$ and for every open set V containing $f(x)$ there exists an open set U containing x such that $c\ell f(c\ell U) \subset V$.
- (d) For every $x \in X$ and for every closed set F in Y with $f(x) \in F$, there exist open sets U and V such that $x \in U, F \subset V$ and $f(c\ell U) \cap V = \emptyset$.
- (e) For every $x \in X$ and for every closed set F in Y with $f(x) \in F$, there exist open sets U and V such that $x \in U, F \subset V$ and $f(U) \cap V = \emptyset$.

PROOF. We prove only (a) \implies (b), (b) \implies (c) and (e) \implies (a) since (c) \implies (d) and (d) \implies (e) are obvious.

(a) \implies (b). Let $x \in X$, let \mathfrak{F} be a filter base on X converging to x and let V be an open set in Y containing $f(x)$. Since f is R-continuous, there exists an open set U containing x such that $c\ell f(U) \subset V$. Since \mathfrak{F} converges to x there is an $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that $F \subset U$. Hence $c\ell f(F) \subset c\ell f(U) \subset V$ and so, the filter $c\ell f(\mathfrak{F})$ converges to $f(x)$.

(b) \implies (c). Let $x \in X$ and let V be an open set in Y containing $f(x)$. The family $\mathfrak{F} = \{U_x: U_x \text{ is an open in } X \text{ containing } x\}$ is a filter base converging to x . By hypothesis $c\ell f(\mathfrak{F}) = \{c\ell f(U_x): U_x \text{ is an open set in } X \text{ containing } x\}$ converges to $f(x)$. So, there exists an open set U_x containing x such that $c\ell f(U_x) \subset V$. This implies that f is R-continuous and consequently $f(c\ell U_x) \subset c\ell f(U_x)$. So, $c\ell f(c\ell U_x) \subset V$.

(e) \implies (a). Let $x \in X$ and let V be an open set in Y containing $f(x)$. Then $Y - V$ is closed in Y and $f(x) \notin Y - V$. Put $F = Y - V$. By hypothesis, there exist open sets U and W such that $x \in U, F \subset W$ and $f(U) \cap W = \emptyset$ and so, $f(U) \subset Y - W$. Therefore, $c\ell f(U) \subset c\ell f(Y - W) = Y - W \subset V$ and hence f is R-continuous.

The following example given in MacDonald and Willard [5] shows that quotient mappings from regular spaces onto Hausdorff spaces are not necessarily R-continuous. Note that the function in this example is strongly θ -continuous and has a closed graph.

EXAMPLE 3.1. Let $X = X_1 \cup X_2$, where

$$X_1 = \{(0,0)\} \cup \{(0, \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n^m}) : n = 1, 2, \dots; m = 2, 3, \dots\}$$

and

$$X_2 = \{(1, \frac{1}{n}) : n = 1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{(1, \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n^m}) : n = 1, 2, \dots; m = 2, 3, \dots\}$$

and X is considered as a subspace of the plane. By identifying the points $(0, \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n^m})$ and $(1, \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n^m})$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$, and $m = 2, 3, \dots$, we obtain an open quotient map onto a non-regular Hausdorff space. The range of the surjection is not regular, since the closed set $\{(1, \frac{1}{n}) : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ and the point $(0,0)$ cannot be separated by open sets. As a consequence of our Theorem 6.1 we have that the range of an R-continuous open surjection is regular. Therefore, the quotient map is not R-continuous, while being strongly θ -continuous.

It is clear that a continuous function into a regular space is R-continuous. This observation slightly generalizes Theorem 8 of Long and Herrington [6]. Furthermore, the following characterization of regular spaces is readily established.

PROPOSITION 3.1. Let Y be a space. Then the following are equivalent.

- (a) Y is regular.
- (b) The identity function $i: Y \rightarrow Y$ is R-continuous (resp. strongly θ -continuous).
- (c) For every space X every continuous function from X into Y is R-continuous (resp. strongly θ -continuous).

To offer another sufficient condition for R-continuity we need the concept of subweak closedness of functions. A function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be subweakly closed (Jankovič and Rose [7]) if there exists a base \mathfrak{B} for the topology on X such that $clf(U) \subset f(clU)$ for every $U \in \mathfrak{B}$. The importance of this notion lies in the fact that the projections from the product of spaces onto the co-ordinate spaces are subweakly closed.

PROPOSITION 3.2. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is strongly θ -continuous and subweakly closed, then f is R-continuous.

PROOF. Since f is subweakly closed, there exists a base \mathfrak{B} for the topology on X such that $clf(U) \subset f(clU)$, for every $U \in \mathfrak{B}$. The strong θ -continuity of f gives that for every $x \in X$ and every open V containing $f(x)$ there exists $U \in \mathfrak{B}$ such that $f(clU) \subset V$. The result follows by combining the previous two facts.

To see that the converse of the Proposition 3.2. does not hold, consider the identity function $i: (\mathbf{R}, \tau) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}, \sigma)$, where τ is the usual topology on \mathbf{R} and σ is the indiscrete topology of \mathbf{R} .

THEOREM 3.2. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is continuous, X is locally compact Hausdorff, and Y is Hausdorff, then f is R-continuous.

PROOF. Since X is regular and f is continuous, f is strongly θ -continuous. The local compactness of X implies that there is a base \mathfrak{B} for the topology on X consisting of open sets with compact closures. Let $U \in \mathfrak{B}$. Since f is continuous, $f(clU)$ is compact in Y and hence closed because Y is Hausdorff. Therefore, f is subweakly closed and so, by Proposition 3.2, f is R-continuous.

Notice that the space X in Example 3.1 is not locally compact.

In the light of Proposition 3.1 it is reasonable to expect that our strong form of continuity will produce a weak form of regularity on the range of a function. Recall that a space X is R_0 (Davis

[8]), if for every open set U in X and every $x \in U$, $cl\{x\} \subset U$. It is known that regular spaces are R_0 while the converse is not true and that a space is T_1 if and only if it is R_0 and T_0 .

PROPOSITION 3.3. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is an R -continuous surjection, then Y is R_0 .

PROOF. Let $y \in Y$ and let V be an open set containing y . There exists an $x \in X$ such that $y = f(x)$. Since f is R -continuous, there is an open set U containing x such that $clf(U) \subset V$. This implies $cl\{y\} \subset V$ and hence Y is R_0 .

The previous result enables us to construct in a simple way examples of strongly θ -continuous and hence continuous functions which are not R -continuous. The following example is in that sense instructive.

EXAMPLE 3.2. Let τ be the discrete topology on \mathbf{R} and σ the left ray topology on \mathbf{R} . The identity function $i: (\mathbf{R}, \tau) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}, \sigma)$ is strongly θ -continuous but not \mathbf{R} -continuous, since (\mathbf{R}, σ) is not R_0 .

Next we state several basic properties of R -continuous functions without proofs since the proofs are similar to those in the case of continuous functions.

PROPOSITION 3.4.

- (a) If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is continuous (resp. R -continuous) and $g: Y \rightarrow Z$ is R -continuous, then the composition $gof: X \rightarrow Z$ is R -continuous.
- (b) If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is R -continuous and $g: Y \rightarrow Z$ is continuous and closed, then the composition $gof: X \rightarrow Z$ is R -continuous.
- (c) Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ and $g: Y \rightarrow Z$ be functions. If the composition $gof: X \rightarrow Z$ is R -continuous and f is an open surjection, then g is R -continuous.
- (d) If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is an R -continuous function and $A \subset X$, then the restriction $f/A: A \rightarrow B$ is R -continuous, for any B with $f(A) \subset B \subset Y$.
- (e) If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a function such that $f_i = f/U_i: U_i \rightarrow Y$ is R -continuous for every $i \in I$, where $\{U_i: i \in I\}$ is an open cover of X , then f is R -continuous.
- (f) If each $X_i \neq \phi$, then the product function $\Pi f_i: \Pi X_i \rightarrow \Pi Y_i$ is R -continuous iff each $f_i: X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ is R -continuous.

4. R -CONTINUITY AND CLOSED GRAPH PROPERTY.

Since the class of R -continuous functions into T_1 spaces is properly contained in the class of functions with closed graphs, a natural question arises. Under what conditions are closed graph functions R -continuous? In answering this question we will strengthen some known closed graph theorems. But first we will show that a function possessing a strong continuity property will also possess some strong form of closed graph property if its range satisfies a certain, usually weak, separation axiom.

Recall that a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ has a θ -closed graph (resp. θ -closed graph with respect to X) (Hamlett and Herrington [9]) if for every $(x, y) \notin G(f)$ ($G(f)$ denotes the graph of f), there exist open sets U and V containing x and y , respectively, such that $(clU \times clV) \cap G(f) = \phi$ (resp. $(clU \times V) \cap G(f) = \phi$), or equivalently, $f(clU) \cap clV = \phi$ (resp. $f(clU) \cap V = \phi$). Note that $f: X \rightarrow Y$ has a θ -closed graph if and only if $G(f) = cl_\theta G(f)$.

Our first result is a variation of the well known and useful fact that continuous functions into Hausdorff spaces have closed graphs (actually, θ -closed graphs with respect to the domains).

THEOREM 4.1. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is an R -continuous (resp. strongly θ -continuous) function and Y is T_1 (resp. Hausdorff), then f has a θ -closed graph with respect to X (resp. θ -closed graph).

PROOF. The first part of the result follows from the facts that R-continuous functions into T_1 spaces have closed graphs and that continuous functions with closed graphs have θ -closed graphs with respect to the domains. To show the second part, let $x \in X$, $y \in Y$ and $y \neq f(x)$. Since Y is Hausdorff, there exist open sets V and W such that $f(x) \in V$, $y \in W$ and $V \cap c\ell W = \phi$. The strong θ -continuity of f implies that there exists an open set U containing x such that $f(c\ell U) \subset V$. Therefore, $f(c\ell U) \cap c\ell W = \phi$ and f has a θ -closed graph.

The parenthetical part of Theorem 4.1 improves Theorem 12 of (Long and Herrington [6]) where it was shown that a strongly θ -continuous function into a Hausdorff space has a θ -closed graph with respect to the domain. We remark that another improvement of this result can be obtained by replacing the hypothesis of strong θ -continuity with θ -continuity.

Note that the function considered in Example 3.1 has a θ -closed graph but is not R-continuous. Therefore, the converse of the first part of Theorem 4.1 does not hold. Our next example shows that there is a function with a θ -closed graph into a Hausdorff space which is not strongly θ -continuous.

EXAMPLE 4.1. Let τ be the usual topology of \mathbf{R} and σ be the topology $\{U - A: U \in \tau \text{ and } A \subset \{\frac{1}{n}: n = 1, 2, \dots\}\}$ on \mathbf{R} . Clearly, $\tau \subset \sigma$ and (\mathbf{R}, σ) is an Urysohn space. The identity function $i: (\mathbf{R}, \tau) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}, \sigma)$ has a θ -closed graph, but is not strongly θ -continuous since $\sigma_\theta = \sigma_3 = \tau$ and i is not continuous.

By Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 3.3 it easily follows that R-continuous functions onto T_0 spaces have θ -closed graphs with respect to the domains.

The proof of the next proposition is straight forward and hence is omitted.

PROPOSITION 4.1. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is an injection with a θ -closed graph with respect to X , then X is Hausdorff.

Combining Proposition 4.1 and the first part of Theorem 4.1 we may get a sufficient condition for the domain of a function to be Hausdorff. But, it is not difficult to see that a strongly θ -continuous injection into a T_0 space has a Hausdorff domain. This observation improves Theorem 4 of [6] and also implies the known fact that T_0 regular spaces are T_3 .

We now turn our attention to the closed graph theorems. The following closed graph theorem was established independently by Rose [10] and Noiri [11]: every closed graph weakly continuous function into a rim-compact space is continuous. This result was generalized in (Janković [12]). We will show that a closed graph weakly continuous function into a rim-compact space has a strong continuity property, namely, it is R-continuous. Actually our result states that closed graph continuous functions into rim-compact spaces are R-continuous. As an immediate consequence we will obtain a strengthening of the well-known theorem that functions with closed graphs into compact spaces are continuous. Recall that a space is called rim-compact, if its topology has an open basis of sets whose boundaries are compact.

THEOREM 4.2. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a weakly continuous function with a closed graph and Y is rim-compact, then f is R-continuous.

PROOF. In order to shorten the proof we assume that f is continuous. Let \mathfrak{F} be a filter base on X converging to x and let V be a basic open set such that $f(x) \in V$ and $\text{Bd}(V)$ compact. Assume that $\text{Bd}(V) \neq \phi$. Otherwise the proof is complete. Since $f(\mathfrak{F})$ converges to $f(x)$, there exists a $F^* \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that $f(F^*) \subset V$. Let $\mathfrak{F}^* = \{F^* \cap F: F \in \mathfrak{F}\}$. Clearly, \mathfrak{F} converges to x , $f(\mathfrak{F}^*)$ converges to $f(x)$ and $c\ell f(F) \subset c\ell V$ for every $F \in \mathfrak{F}^*$. In order to establish that $c\ell f(\mathfrak{F})$ converges to $f(x)$ it is enough to show that $c\ell f(\mathfrak{F}^*)$ converges to $f(x)$. Suppose that this is not the case.

Then $clf(F) \cap (Y - V) \neq \phi$ for every $F \in \mathfrak{F}^*$, since $clf(F) \subset clV$, $clf(F) \cap Bd(V) \neq \phi$. The compactness of $Bd(V)$ implies there is a $y \in adclf(\mathfrak{F}^*) \cap Bd(V)$. This gives $y \in adf(\mathfrak{F}^*) \cap Bd(V)$. Since \mathfrak{F}^* converges to x and f has a closed graph, $y = f(x)$. So, $f(x) \in Bd(V)$. This contradiction establishes that $clf(\mathfrak{F})$ converges to $f(x)$. By Theorem 2.2, f is R-continuous.

In [7] it was observed that closed graph functions into compact spaces are strongly θ -continuous. By Theorem 4.2 we have an improvement of this result.

COROLLARY 4.1. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a function with a closed graph and Y is compact, then f is R-continuous.

In [6], Long and Herrington established that a θ -continuous function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ with a θ -closed graph with respect to X into the rim-compact space Y is strongly θ -continuous. [Theorem 10] and also, that a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ with a θ -closed graph with respect to X into compact space Y is strongly θ -continuous [Theorem 11]. Our Theorem 4.2 and Corollary 4.1 considerably improve their results.

Combining Theorem 4.1. and Corollary 4.1, we obtain the following characterization of R-continuous functions into T_1 compact spaces.

COROLLARY 4.2. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a function and let Y be a T_1 compact space. Then f is R-continuous if and only if f has a closed graph.

Theorem 9 of [6] and our Theorem 4.1 give a similar characterization of strong θ -continuity.

COROLLARY 4.3. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a function and let Y be a minimal Hausdorff space. Then f is strongly θ -continuous if and only if f has a θ -closed graph.

We close this section by pointing out that a closed graph function from a first countable space into a countably compact space is R-continuous. This result strengthens Theorem I.1.11 in [9].

5. FURTHER PROPERTIES OF R-CONTINUOUS AND STRONGLY θ -CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS.

It is a well known fact that if continuous functions f and g which map, into a Hausdorff space, agree on a dense subset of the domain, then they coincide. In this section we obtain similar results for R-continuous and strongly θ -continuous functions.

THEOREM 5.1. If $f: X \rightarrow Z$ is a function with a θ -closed graph with respect to X and $g: Y \rightarrow Z$ is a strongly θ -continuous function, then the set $\{(x, y) \in X \times Y: f(x) = g(y)\}$ is θ -closed.

PROOF. Let $A = \{(x, y) \in X \times Y: f(x) = g(y)\}$ and let $(x, y) \in A$. Then $f(x) = g(y)$ and $(x, g(y)) \in (X \times Z) - G(f)$. Since f has a θ -closed graph with respect to X , there exists open sets U and W containing x and $g(y)$, respectively, such that $f(clU) \cap W = \phi$. The strong θ -continuity of g implies that there is an open set V containing y such that $g(clV) \subset W$. Therefore $f(clU) \cap g(clV) = \phi$. We claim that $(clU \times clV) \cap A = \phi$ and hence $A = cl_g A$. Suppose that there is $a(x, y) \in (clU \times clV) \cap A$. Then $f(x) = g(y)$, $f(x) \in f(clU)$ and $g(y) \in g(clV)$ implying $f(clU) \cap g(clV) \neq \phi$. This contradiction establishes the proof.

By analyzing the proof of Theorem 5.1, it is easy to see that there are numerous variations of Theorem 4.1. The most important one is certainly the following: if $f: X \rightarrow Z$ has a closed graph and $g: Y \rightarrow Z$ is continuous, then the set $\{(x, y) \in X \times Y: f(x) = g(y)\}$ is closed. Other possibilities are left to the reader.

We now cite some results that follow from the previously established results or may be obtained in similar manner.

COROLLARY 5.1. If $f: X \rightarrow Z$ is R-continuous (resp. θ -continuous) $g: Y \rightarrow Z$ is strongly θ -continuous, and Z is T_1 (resp. Hausdorff) then the set $\{(x, y) \in X \times Y: f(x) = g(y)\}$ is θ -closed.

THEOREM 5.2. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ has a θ -closed graph with respect to X (resp. θ -closed graph) and $g: X \rightarrow Y$ is strongly θ -continuous (resp. θ -continuous) then the set $\{x \in X: f(x) = g(x)\}$ is θ -closed.

The second part of the next corollary improves Theorem 2 of [6].

COROLLARY 5.2. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is R-continuous (strongly θ -continuous) and $g: X \rightarrow Y$ is strongly θ -continuous (θ -continuous) and Y is T_1 (Hausdorff), then $\{x \in X: f(x) = g(x)\}$ is θ -closed.

COROLLARY 5.3. If $f, g: X \rightarrow Y$ are R-continuous (resp. strongly θ -continuous) functions which agree on a θ -dense subset A of X (i.e. $cl_\theta A = X$) and Y is T_1 (resp. Hausdorff), then $f = g$.

6. PRESERVATION OF REGULARITY.

As we have mentioned in the introduction one of the reasons for introducing the concept of R-continuity is its intrinsic relationship with the regularity separation axiom. As observed in Willard [13], very strong conditions must be imposed on a surjection so that it preserves regularity. Chaber [14] established that T_3 is preserved by continuous closed open surjections. We obtain this result by use of R-continuity. First, we need to recall that a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is almost-open [15] if $f(U) \subset \text{int } cl f(U)$ for every (basic) open set U in X . Open functions are almost open while the converse is not true even in the presence of R-continuity as the following example shows.

EXAMPLE 6.1. Let τ be the usual topology on \mathbf{R} and σ be the simple extension of τ by the set of rationals \mathbf{Q} i.e. $\sigma = \{(U \cap \mathbf{Q}) \cup V: U, V \in \tau\}$. The identity function $i: (X, \sigma) \rightarrow (X, \tau)$ is R-continuous and almost open but not open.

THEOREM 6.1. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is an R-continuous almost-open surjection, then Y is regular.

PROOF. Let $y \in Y$ and let V be an open set containing y . There exists an $x \in X$ such that $y = f(x)$ and since f is R-continuous there is an open set U containing x such that $cl f(U) \subset V$. The almost openness of f gives $f(U) \subset \text{int } cl f(U)$ and consequently, $y \in f(U) \subset W \subset cl W \subset V$, where $W = \text{int } cl f(U)$. Hence, Y is regular.

COROLLARY 6.1. Regularity is preserved under continuous open subweakly closed surjections.

PROOF. Since X is regular and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is continuous, f is strongly θ -continuous. By Proposition 3.2 it follows that f is R-continuous and by Theorem 6.1 that Y is regular.

REMARK 6.1. We point out that replacing the hypothesis open in Corollary 6.1 with almost-open does not strengthen the result, since almost open subweakly closed functions from regular spaces are open. Moreover, if $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a subweakly closed function from a regular space X such that $f(U) \subset \text{int } cl f(cl U)$ for every open U in X , then f is open. Let us agree to call a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ almost weakly open if $f(U) \subset \text{int } cl f(cl U)$ for every (basic) open set U in X . Clearly, almost-open \implies almost-weakly-open and almost-weakly-open functions from regular spaces are almost open. Also, the class of almost-open functions is properly contained in the class of almost-weakly-open functions. To see this recall first that a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly-open (Rose [16]) if $f(U) \subset \text{int } f(cl U)$ for every (basic) open set U in X . It was shown in [16] that weak openness and almost openness are independent. Since weak openness obviously implies almost weak openness, we conclude that almost weak openness is a common generalization of both weak openness and almost openness. Now, it is clear that replacing "open" in Corollary 6.1 with "weak open" also does not strengthen the result. The proofs of previous observations are left to the reader.

COROLLARY 6.2. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a continuous open closed surjection and X is T_3 , then Y is T_3 .

PROOF. Note that T_1 is preserved by closed surjections and apply Corollary 6.1.

We remark that Corollary 6.2 improves Theorem 14.6 in [13]. Also, it may be noted that the well-known result that each factor of a non-empty regular (T_1) product space is regular (T_1) follows from Corollary 6.1 (since the projections are continuous, open, subweakly closed surjections). That the product of regular (T_1) spaces is regular (T_1) follows from Proposition 3.4 (f) by setting $X_i = Y_i$, letting f_i be the identity function on X_i , and then using the equivalence of (a) and (b) from Proposition 3.1.

REFERENCES

1. VELIČKO, N.V., H-Closed Topological Spaces, Mat.Sb 70 (1966), 98-112.
2. NOIRI, T., On δ -continuous Functions, J. Korean Math. Soc. 16 (1980), 161-166.
3. FOMIN, S., Extensions of Topological Spaces, Ann. of Math. 44 (1943), 471-480.
4. LEVINE, N., A Decomposition of Continuity in Topological Spaces, Amer.Math. Monthly 68 (1961), 44-46.
5. MACDONALD, S. and WILLARD, S., Domains of Paracompactness and Regularity, Can. J. Math. XXIV(6) (1972), 1079-1085.
6. LONG, P.E. and HERRINGTON, L.L., Strongly θ -continuous Functions, J.Korean Math. Soc. 18 (1981), 21-28.
7. JANKOVIĆ, D.S. and ROSE, D., Weakly Closed Functions, submitted.
8. DAVIS, A.S., Indexed Systems of Neighborhoods for General Topological Spaces, Amer. Math. Monthly 68 (1961), 886-893.
9. HAMLET, T.R. and HERRINGTON, L.L., The Closed Graph and P-Closed Graph Properties in General Topology, Contemporary Mathematics, Vol. 3, American Mathematical Society, 1981.
10. ROSE, D.A., On Levine's Deomposition of Continuity, Canad. Math. Bull. 21 (1978), 477-481.
11. NOIRI, T., Weak Continuity and Closed Graphs, Cas. Pest. Mat. 101 (1976), 379-382.
12. JANKOVIČ, D.S., θ -Regular Spaces, Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci. 8(3), (1985), 615-619.
13. WILLARD, S., General Topology, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Masds. 1970.
14. CHABER, J., Remarks an Open-closed Mappings, Fund. Math. LXXIV (1972), 197-208.
15. WILANSKY, A., Topics in Functional Analysis, Lecture Notes in Math Vol. 45, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1967.
16. ROSE, D.A., Weak Openness and Almost Opeeness, Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci. 7 (1984), 35-40.

Special Issue on Nonlinear Vibrations, Stability Analysis and Control

Call for Papers

Important advances in mathematics, physics, biology, and engineering science have shown the importance of the analysis of instabilities and strongly coupled dynamical behavior. New investigation tools enable us to better understand the dynamical behavior of more complex structures. However, the increasing interest in mechanical structures with extreme performances has propelled the scientific community toward the search for solution of hard problems exhibiting strong nonlinearities. As a consequence, there is an increasing demand both for nonlinear structural components and for advanced multidisciplinary and multiscale mathematical models and methods. In dealing with the phenomena involving a great number of coupled oscillators, the classical linear dynamic methods have to be replaced by new specific mathematical tools.

This special issue aims to assess the current state of nonlinear structural models in vibration analysis, to review and improve the already known methods for analysis of nonlinear and oscillating systems at a macroscopic scale, and to highlight also some of the new techniques which have been applied to complex structures.

We are looking for original high-quality research papers on topics of interest related to specific mathematical models and methods for nonlinear and strongly coupled (correlated) oscillating systems and for distributed-parameter structures that include but are not limited to the following main topics:

- Vibration analysis of distributed-parameter and multi-body systems, parametric models
- Global methods, wavelet methods, and fractal analysis for spatially and temporally coupled oscillators
- Nonlinear time series methods for dynamic systems
- Control of nonlinear vibrations and bifurcations, control of chaos in vibrating systems. Transient chaos. Chaotic oscillators. Bifurcations
- Micro- and nanovibrating structural systems

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/mpe/guidelines.html>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking Sys-

tem at <http://mts.hindawi.com/> according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	January 1, 2010
First Round of Reviews	April 1, 2010
Publication Date	July 1, 2010

Lead Guest Editor

Carlo Cattani, University of Salerno, Via Ponte Don Melillo, 84084 Fisciano (SA), Italy; ccattani@unisa.it

Guest Editors

Alexander P. Seyranian, Moscow State Lomonosov University, Michurinsky pr. 1, 119192 Moscow, Russia; seyran@imec.msu.ru

Irena Trendafilova, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Strathclyde, 75 Montrose Street, Glasgow G1 1XJ, UK; irina.trendafilova@strath.ac.uk

Special Issue on Space Dynamics

Call for Papers

Space dynamics is a very general title that can accommodate a long list of activities. This kind of research started with the study of the motion of the stars and the planets back to the origin of astronomy, and nowadays it has a large list of topics. It is possible to make a division in two main categories: astronomy and astrodynamics. By astronomy, we can relate topics that deal with the motion of the planets, natural satellites, comets, and so forth. Many important topics of research nowadays are related to those subjects. By astrodynamics, we mean topics related to spaceflight dynamics.

It means topics where a satellite, a rocket, or any kind of man-made object is travelling in space governed by the gravitational forces of celestial bodies and/or forces generated by propulsion systems that are available in those objects. Many topics are related to orbit determination, propagation, and orbital maneuvers related to those spacecrafts. Several other topics that are related to this subject are numerical methods, nonlinear dynamics, chaos, and control.

The main objective of this Special Issue is to publish topics that are under study in one of those lines. The idea is to get the most recent researches and published them in a very short time, so we can give a step in order to help scientists and engineers that work in this field to be aware of actual research. All the published papers have to be peer reviewed, but in a fast and accurate way so that the topics are not outdated by the large speed that the information flows nowadays.

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/mpe/guidelines.html>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/> according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	July 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	October 1, 2009
Publication Date	December 1, 2009

Lead Guest Editor

Antonio F. Bertachini A. Prado, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE), São José dos Campos, 12227-010 São Paulo, Brazil; prado@dem.inpe.br

Guest Editors

Maria Cecilia Zanardi, São Paulo State University (UNESP), Guaratinguetá, 12516-410 São Paulo, Brazil; cecilia@feg.unesp.br

Tadashi Yokoyama, Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP), Rio Claro, 13506-900 São Paulo, Brazil; tadashi@rc.unesp.br

Silvia Maria Giuliatti Winter, São Paulo State University (UNESP), Guaratinguetá, 12516-410 São Paulo, Brazil; silvia@feg.unesp.br

Special Issue on Decision Support for Intermodal Transport

Call for Papers

Intermodal transport refers to the movement of goods in a single loading unit which uses successive various modes of transport (road, rail, water) without handling the goods during mode transfers. Intermodal transport has become an important policy issue, mainly because it is considered to be one of the means to lower the congestion caused by single-mode road transport and to be more environmentally friendly than the single-mode road transport. Both considerations have been followed by an increase in attention toward intermodal freight transportation research.

Various intermodal freight transport decision problems are in demand of mathematical models of supporting them. As the intermodal transport system is more complex than a single-mode system, this fact offers interesting and challenging opportunities to modelers in applied mathematics. This special issue aims to fill in some gaps in the research agenda of decision-making in intermodal transport.

The mathematical models may be of the optimization type or of the evaluation type to gain an insight in intermodal operations. The mathematical models aim to support decisions on the strategic, tactical, and operational levels. The decision-makers belong to the various players in the intermodal transport world, namely, drayage operators, terminal operators, network operators, or intermodal operators.

Topics of relevance to this type of decision-making both in time horizon as in terms of operators are:

- Intermodal terminal design
- Infrastructure network configuration
- Location of terminals
- Cooperation between drayage companies
- Allocation of shippers/receivers to a terminal
- Pricing strategies
- Capacity levels of equipment and labour
- Operational routines and lay-out structure
- Redistribution of load units, railcars, barges, and so forth
- Scheduling of trips or jobs
- Allocation of capacity to jobs
- Loading orders
- Selection of routing and service

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jamds/guidelines.html>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/>, according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	June 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	September 1, 2009
Publication Date	December 1, 2009

Lead Guest Editor

Gerrit K. Janssens, Transportation Research Institute (IMOB), Hasselt University, Agoralaan, Building D, 3590 Diepenbeek (Hasselt), Belgium; Gerrit.Janssens@uhasselt.be

Guest Editor

Cathy Macharis, Department of Mathematics, Operational Research, Statistics and Information for Systems (MOSI), Transport and Logistics Research Group, Management School, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussel, Belgium; Cathy.Macharis@vub.ac.be