
BOLLETTINO UNIONE MATEMATICA ITALIANA

ZBIGNIEW DUSZYŃSKI

A Note on \mathcal{R} -Maps

Bollettino dell'Unione Matematica Italiana, Serie 8, Vol. 10-B
(2007), n.3, p. 697–706.

Unione Matematica Italiana

http://www.bdim.eu/item?id=BUMI_2007_8_10B_3_697_0

L'utilizzo e la stampa di questo documento digitale è consentito liberamente per motivi di ricerca e studio. Non è consentito l'utilizzo dello stesso per motivi commerciali. Tutte le copie di questo documento devono riportare questo avvertimento.

*Articolo digitalizzato nel quadro del programma
bdim (Biblioteca Digitale Italiana di Matematica)
SIMAI & UMI*

<http://www.bdim.eu/>

A Note on \mathcal{R} -Maps.

ZBIGNIEW DUSZYŃSKI

Sunto. – *Viene studiata la ricchezza della classe delle \mathcal{R} -mappe [3]. Vengono anche indicate numerose conseguenze per la teoria degli spazi quasi- \mathcal{H} -chiusi (vedi Lemma 5).*

Summary. – *Richness of the class of \mathcal{R} -maps [3] is investigated. Several consequences for the theory of quasi- \mathcal{H} -closed spaces are indicated.*

1. – Introduction.

In 1973, Carnahan [3] has introduced the notion of \mathcal{R} -maps. Mappings of stronger forms of continuity among \mathcal{R} -maps were studied by Noiri, see for instance [25]. In this paper, some well-known weak types of continuity with additional conditions, concerning respective forms of generalized openness or extremal disconnectedness imposed on the range space, are localized within the class of \mathcal{R} -maps. In the application section we show, among others, that members of the above mentioned subclasses of \mathcal{R} -maps preserve well-known conditions of near compactness, \mathcal{S} -closedness, and quasi- \mathcal{H} -closedness, simultaneously.

2. – Preliminaries.

No separation axioms for topological spaces (denoted with (X, τ) , (Y, σ) , etc.) are assumed. For a subset S of (X, τ) , the closure and the interior of S have standard denotation: $\text{cl}(S)$ (or $\text{cl}_\tau(S)$) and $\text{int}(S)$ (or $\text{int}_\tau(S)$), respectively. The S is said to be *a-open* [17] (resp. *semi-open* [14]; *semi-closed* [4]; *preopen* [15]; *preclosed* [1]; *regular open*; *regular closed*) in (X, τ) , if $S \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(\text{int}(S)))$ (resp. $S \subset \text{cl}(\text{int}(S))$; $\text{int}(\text{cl}(S)) \subset S$; $S \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(S))$; $\text{cl}(\text{int}(S)) \subset S$; $S = \text{int}(\text{cl}(S))$; $S = \text{cl}(\text{int}(S))$). The collection of all semi-open (resp. preopen, preclosed, regular open, regular closed) subsets of (X, τ) is denoted by $\text{SO}(X, \tau)$ (resp. $\text{PO}(X, \tau)$, $\text{PC}(X, \tau)$, $\text{RO}(X, \tau)$, $\text{RC}(X, \tau)$). The

collection of all a -open subsets of (X, τ) forms a topology on X [17], different than the original one in general. The intersection of all semi-closed subsets of (X, τ) containing $S \subset X$ is called the *semi-closure* [4] of S and is denoted with $\text{scl}(S)$.

A mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is said to be *a-continuous* [22, 16] (resp. *semi-continuous* [14] (briefly *s.c.*; *almost continuous* in the sense of Husain (equiv. precontinuous) [10, 15] (briefly *a.c.H.*); *almost continuous* in the sense of S&S [34] (*a.c.S.*); *irresolute* [5]; an \mathcal{R} -map [3]), if $f^{-1}(V)$ is a -open in (X, τ) (resp. $f^{-1}(V) \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$; $f^{-1}(V) \in \text{PO}(X, \tau)$; $f^{-1}(V) \in \tau$; $f^{-1}(V) \in \text{SO}(X, \tau)$; $f^{-1}(V) \in \text{RO}(X, \tau)$) for every $V \in \sigma$ (resp. $V \in \sigma$; $V \in \sigma$; $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$ [34, Theorem 2.2(b), see Definition 2.1]; $V \in \text{SO}(Y, \sigma)$; $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$). Clearly, f is an \mathcal{R} -map if $f^{-1}(V) \in \text{RC}(X, \tau)$ for any $V \in \text{RC}(Y, \sigma)$.

It is known that f is a -continuous if and only if f is *s.c.* and *a.c.H.* [24, Theorem 3.2]. Also, *irresolutness* \Rightarrow *s.c.* and \mathcal{R} -mapness \Rightarrow *a.c.S.*, but the converses are false in general, see [31, Example 1] and [25, p. 249] respectively. In [7] the author shows that both \mathcal{R} -mapness&continuity and \mathcal{R} -mapness&*a-continuity* are couples of independent notions.

A mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is said to be *almost open* in the sense of S&S [34] (briefly *a.o.S.*), if $f(U) \in \sigma$ for every $U \in \text{RO}(X, \tau)$. A space (X, τ) is called *extremally disconnected (e.d.)* if $\text{cl}(S) \in \tau$ for every $S \in \tau$.

3. – \mathcal{R} -mappings.

In 1972 Noiri has given the following result.

THEOREM 1. [18, Lemma 1]. – *If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is a.o.S. and a.c.S., then it is an \mathcal{R} -map.*

An $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is said to be *weakly a-continuous* [26] (resp. *weakly continuous* [13]) (briefly *w.a.c.* and *w.c.* respectively), if $\text{cl}_{\tau^a}(f^{-1}(V)) \subset f^{-1}(\text{cl}_{\sigma}(V))$ [26, Lemma 2.2(d)] (resp. $f^{-1}(V) \subset \text{int}(f^{-1}(\text{cl}(V)))$) for every $V \in \sigma$.

The following implications are known:

$$\text{continuity} \Rightarrow \text{a.c.S.} \Rightarrow \text{w.c.} \Rightarrow \text{w.a.c.}$$

None of these allows the reverse (see respectively [34, Examples 2.1&2.3], [26, Example 5.4].

THEOREM 2. – *If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is a.o.S., w.a.c., and a.c.H., then it is an \mathcal{R} -map.*

PROOF. – Let $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$. We shall show only that $\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V))) \subset f^{-1}(V)$. By [1, Theorem 1.5(c)] we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))) &= \text{int}(f(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))))) \\ &\subset \text{int}(f(\text{cl}_{\tau^a}(f^{-1}(V)))) \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(V)) = V. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, f is an \mathcal{R} -map. □

We have $a\text{-continuity} \Rightarrow w.c.$ (see [16, Diagram p. 214] or [26, Lemma 5.2]) and $a\text{-continuity} \Rightarrow a.c.H.$ (see [16, Diagram p. 214] or [24, Theorem 3.2]). By [24, Example 3.10] one may easily see that there exists a $w.a.c.$ and $a.c.H.$ mapping which is not $a.c.S.$

THEOREM 3. – *Let (X, τ) be arbitrary and (Y, σ) be e.d. If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is $w.a.c.$ and $a.c.H.$ then it is an \mathcal{R} -map.*

PROOF. – Let $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$. We show that $\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V))) \subset f^{-1}(V)$. With [26, Lemma 2.2(c)], [1, Theorem 1.5(d)], and [33, Theorem 6(3)] we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))) &\subset f(\text{cl}(\text{int}_{\tau^a}(f^{-1}(\text{cl}(V)))))) \subset f(\text{cl}(\text{int}(f^{-1}(\text{cl}(V)))))) \\ &\subset \text{cl}(f(\text{int}(f^{-1}(\text{cl}(V)))))) \subset \text{cl}(V) = V. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, f is an \mathcal{R} -map. □

The example below and [26, Example 5.6] show that $w.a.c.$ and $a.c.H.$ are independent of each other, even if the range space is e.d.

EXAMPLE 1. – Let $X = \{a, b\}$, $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \{b\}\}$, $\sigma = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}\}$. The identity mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \sigma)$ is $w.c.$ and not $a.c.H.$

COROLLARY 1. – *Let a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be $w.c.$ and $a.c.H.$ If*

- f is $a.o.S.$ or
- (Y, σ) is e.d.,

then f is an \mathcal{R} -map.

Recall that $w.c.$ and $a.c.H.$ are independent notions too (see [26, Remark 5.8(2)] or consider Example 1 and [26, Example 5.6] for the e.d. range spaces).

In [7] the author has defined \mathbf{p} - $a.c.H.$ mappings: an $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is \mathbf{p} - $a.c.H.$ if $f(\text{cl}_{\tau}(U)) \subset \text{cl}_{\sigma}(f(U))$ for every set $U \in \text{PO}(X, \tau)$. By [33, Theorem 6(3)] we have $\mathbf{p}\text{-}a.c.H. \Rightarrow a.c.H.$, but the converse may fail [7]. In 1983, Mashhour et al.

showed that a -continuity \Rightarrow \mathfrak{p} -a.c.H. [16, Corollary 1.1(i)]. The equivalence a -continuity \Leftrightarrow s.c. and \mathfrak{p} -a.c.H. is due to the author [7]. We do not know if there is an example of \mathfrak{p} -a.c.H. mapping which is not a -continuous.

THEOREM 4. – *If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is \mathfrak{p} -a.c.H. and the range space (Y, σ) is e.d., then f is an \mathcal{R} -map.*

PROOF. – Let $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$. Obviously, we have $f^{-1}(V) \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))$. On the other hand, by the assumption

$$f(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))) \subset f(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V))) \subset \text{cl}(V) = V.$$

Hence f is an \mathcal{R} -map. □

COROLLARY 2. – *If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is a -continuous and (Y, σ) is e.d., then f is an \mathcal{R} -map.*

An $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is said to be *weakly open* [32] if $f(U) \subset \text{int}_\sigma(f(\text{cl}_\tau(U)))$ for every $U \in \tau$. We have: a.o.S. \Rightarrow weak openness [21, Lemma 1.4], but the converse is not true in general [21, Example 1.5]. If (X, τ) is e.d., then these notions become equivalent.

THEOREM 5. – *If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is weakly open \mathfrak{p} -a.c.H., then it is an \mathcal{R} -map.*

PROOF. – Take a $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$. Weak openness of f implies

$$\begin{aligned} f(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))) &\subset \text{int}(f(\text{cl}(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V))))) \\ &\subset \text{int}(f(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))) \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(V)) = V. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, f is an \mathcal{R} -map. □

COROLLARY 3. – *If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is weakly open and a -continuous then it is an \mathcal{R} -map.*

REMARK 1. – (a). For an a.o.S. and a -continuous mapping, Theorem 5 is a consequence of Theorem 2.

(b). To throw more light on Theorem 1 it is worth to recall that a -continuity and a.c.S. are independent of each other [24, Examples 3.9&3.10].

LEMMA 1. [5, Theorem 1.5]. – *A mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is irresolute if and only if $f(\text{scl}(A)) \subset \text{scl}(f(A))$ for any $A \subset X$.*

THEOREM 6. – *If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is irresolute and a.c.H., then it is an \mathcal{R} -map.*

PROOF. – Let $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$. With [12, Proposition 2.7(a)] we get $f(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))) \subset f(\text{scl}(f^{-1}(V)))$, because $f^{-1}(V) \in \text{PO}(X, \tau)$. From Lemma 1 we infer that

$$f(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))) \subset \text{scl}(V) = \text{int}(\text{cl}(V)) = V.$$

Thus, f is an \mathcal{R} -map. □

In [7] we justify independence of irresolutness and a.c.H.

An $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is said to be *weakly quasi continuous* [28] (briefly *w.q.c.*) if $f^{-1}(V) \subset \text{cl}(\text{int}(f^{-1}(\text{cl}(V))))$ for every $V \in \sigma$ [26, Lemma 5.3].

One has *irresolutness* \Rightarrow *w.q.c.* but by [26, Example 5.5] the reverse does not hold.

THEOREM 7. – *If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is weakly open, w.q.c., and a.c.H., then it is an \mathcal{R} -map.*

PROOF. – Let $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$. By hypothesis we can calculate as follows

$$\begin{aligned} f(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))) &\subset \text{int}(f(\text{cl}(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))))) \subset \text{int}(f(\text{cl}(\text{int}(f^{-1}(\text{cl}(V)))))) \\ &\subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(f(f^{-1}(\text{cl}(V)))))) \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(V)) = V. \end{aligned}$$

It means f is an \mathcal{R} -map. □

[26, Examples 5.5&5.6] show the independence of w.q.c. and a.c.H.

REMARK 2. – What concerns Theorem 2, it is worth to recall that *w.a.c.* \Rightarrow *w.q.c.* and that the converse is not true [26, p. 489].

A mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is said to be *almost open in the sense of Wilansky* [38] (briefly *a.o.W.*), if $f^{-1}(\text{cl}_\sigma(V)) \subset \text{cl}_\tau(f^{-1}(V))$ for every $V \in \sigma$. It is known that f is a.o.W. if and only if $f(U) \in \text{PO}(Y, \sigma)$ for every $U \in \tau$ [33, Theorem 11] (and hence, a.o.W. coincides with preopenness [15]). Recall that both *a.o.W.&weak openness* and *a.o.W.&a.o.S.* are pairs of independent notions [21, p. 315].

THEOREM 8. – *If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is a.o.W. and p-a.c.H., then it is an \mathcal{R} -map.*

PROOF. – Let $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$. With [33, Theorem 11] we get
 $f(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(\text{cl}(V)))))) \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(f(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(\text{cl}(V)))))) \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(f(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V))))))$.
 But f is \mathbf{p} -a.c.H., whence $f(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(V)))) \subset \text{int}(\text{cl}(V)) = V$. Thus, f is an \mathcal{R} -map. \square

REMARK 3. – The reader is advised to compare Theorem 8 with Theorem 5.

COROLLARY 4. – *If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is a.o.W. and a -continuous then it must be an \mathcal{R} -map (see Corollary 3).*

The next lemma is obvious, hence the proof is omitted.

LEMMA 2. – *$f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is an \mathcal{R} -map if and only if $\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(\text{int}(\text{cl}(A)))))) = f^{-1}(\text{int}(\text{cl}(A)))$ for every $A \subset Y$.*

LEMMA 3. [19, Theorem 1(2)]. – *A mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is s.c. if and only if $\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(B))) \subset f^{-1}(\text{cl}(B))$ for every subset $B \subset Y$.*

A mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is said to be *contra-precontinuous* [11] if $f^{-1}(V) \in \text{PC}(X, \tau)$ for every $V \in \sigma$.

THEOREM 9. – *Let (Y, σ) be e.d. If a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is s.c. and contra-precontinuous then it is an \mathcal{R} -map.*

PROOF. – Let $V \in \text{RO}(Y, \sigma)$. By hypothesis we have $f^{-1}(\text{cl}(V)) = \text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}(\text{cl}(V))))$. Put $V = \text{int}(\text{cl}(A))$ for an $A \subset Y$ and apply Lemma 2. \square

REMARK 4. – Since in an e.d. space (Y, σ) ,

$$\text{RO}(Y, \sigma) = \text{RC}(Y, \sigma),$$

Theorem 9 can be obtained by the following observation:

a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is s.c. and contra-precontinuous if and only if $f^{-1}(V) \in \text{RC}(X, \tau)$ for every $V \in \sigma$ (i.e., iff f is RC-continuous [6]) [11, Theorem 3.9].

We complete our investigation with considering the notion of θ -continuity. An $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is said to be θ -continuous [8] if for every $x \in X$ and $V \in \sigma$ with $f(x) \in V$ there exists a $U \in \tau$ such that $x \in U$ and $f(\text{cl}_\tau(U)) \subset \text{cl}_\sigma(V)$. In [34, 9] it was shown that $a.c.S. \Rightarrow \theta$ -continuity $\Rightarrow w.c.$, but none of these implications is reversible. Notice that also: a -continuity $\Rightarrow \theta$ -continuity [16].

Straight from the respective definitions one obtains the following.

REMARK 5. – Let a mapping $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be weakly open or a.o.W. If it is θ -continuous, then it is a.c.S.

Thus for the a.o.S. case, Theorem 1 can be reformulated as follows: *a.o.S. together with θ -continuity imply \mathcal{R} -mapness.* It is worth to notice that in the a.o.S. case, Remark 5 can be proved using [23, Theorem 2.1].

4. – Applications.

In this section some corollaries following from what obtained above are presented.

THEOREM 10. – *Let an $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be surjective and $g: (Y, \sigma) \rightarrow (Z, \gamma)$ be arbitrary. If the composition $g \circ f$ is a.o.S., the function f and the space (Y, σ) fulfil one of the assumptions of Theorems 2-9 or Corollaries 1-4, then g is a.o.S.*

PROOF. – The proofs are similar to that of [18, Theorem 2(a)] and thus omitted. \square

A space (X, τ) is called *quasi- \mathcal{H} -closed* [29] (resp. *nearly compact* [35]; *\mathcal{S} -closed* [36]), briefly: \mathcal{QHC} (resp. \mathcal{NC} ; \mathcal{SC}), if for every cover $\mathcal{F} = \{V_a : a \in \nabla\} \subset \tau$ (resp. $\mathcal{F} \subset \tau$; $\mathcal{F} \subset \text{SO}(X, \tau)$) there exists a finite subset $\nabla_0 \subset \nabla$ such that $X = \bigcup_{a \in \nabla_0} \text{cl}(V_a)$ (resp. $X = \bigcup_{a \in \nabla_0} \text{int}(\text{cl}(V_a))$; $X = \bigcup_{a \in \nabla_0} \text{cl}(V_a)$). The first name for \mathcal{QHC} spaces was *almost-compact* spaces [30]. It is known that $\mathcal{NC} \Rightarrow \mathcal{QHC}$ and $\mathcal{SC} \Rightarrow \mathcal{QHC}$, but the converses fail, see [35, Section 1, p. 702] and [20, Remark 1.5] respectively. For e.d. spaces we have $\mathcal{NC} \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{SC} \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{QHC}$ (compare [2, Corollary 1]).

LEMMA 4. – *A space (X, τ) is \mathcal{NC} [35, Theorem 2.1(c)] (resp. \mathcal{SC} [2, Theorem 2]) if and only if every regular open (resp. regular closed) cover of X allows a finite subcover.*

By Lemma 4 and [27, Lemma 3.9] we obtain what follows.

LEMMA 5. – *Let a surjective $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be an \mathcal{R} -map and the space (X, τ) be \mathcal{NC} (resp. \mathcal{SC} ; \mathcal{QHC}). Then (Y, σ) is \mathcal{NC} (resp. \mathcal{SC} ; \mathcal{QHC}).*

THEOREM 11. – *Assume $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is a surjection. Let it be*

- ([35, Theorem 3.1] for the \mathcal{NC} case) a.o.S. and a.c.S. (see Remark 5), or
- a.o.S., w.a.c., and a.c.H. or

- weakly open and \mathfrak{p} -a.c.H., or
- irresolute and a.c.H., or
- weakly open, w.q.c., and a.c.H., or
- a.o.W. and \mathfrak{p} -a.c.H.

If (X, τ) is \mathcal{NC} (resp. \mathcal{SC} ; \mathcal{QHC}) then (Y, σ) is \mathcal{NC} (resp. \mathcal{SC} ; \mathcal{QHC}).

PROOF. – These follow at once from Lemma 5 and Theorems 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 respectively. \square

REMARK 6. – Since continuity implies α -continuity and these notions do not coincide [22], the 6th case of Theorem 11 is an extension to [20, Theorem 2.2].

Recall that an irresolute (resp. θ -continuous) surjection preserves the \mathcal{SC} [37, Theorem 3.5] (resp. \mathcal{QHC} [27, Lemma 3.9]) property. Obviously, by [27, Lemma 3.9] an a.c.S. surjection preserves the \mathcal{QHC} property [37, Theorem 3.3].

THEOREM 12. – Let a space (Y, σ) be e.d. and let a surjection $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ fulfil the following:

- f is w.a.c., and a.c.H. or
- f is \mathfrak{p} -a.c.H., or
- f is s.c. and contra-precontinuous.

If (X, τ) is \mathcal{NC} or \mathcal{SC} or \mathcal{QHC} , then (Y, σ) is \mathcal{QHC} ($= \mathcal{NC} = \mathcal{SC}$).

PROOF. – Lemma 5 and Theorems 3, 4, 9 respectively.

It must be reminded that Thompson [37, Theorem 3.2] proved, in fact, that for every s.c. surjection, if the domain space is \mathcal{SC} then the range space is \mathcal{QHC} .

REFERENCES

- [1] D. ANDRIJEVIĆ, *Semi-preopen sets*, Mat. Vesnik, **38** (1986), 24-32.
- [2] D. E. CAMERON, *Properties of \mathcal{S} -closed spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **72** (1978), 581-586.
- [3] D. A. CARNAHAN, *Some properties related to compactness in topological spaces*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Arkansas, 1973.
- [4] C. G. CROSSLEY - S. K. HILDEBRAND, *Semi-closure*, Texas J. Sci., **22**(2-3) (1971), 99-112.
- [5] C. G. CROSSLEY - S. K. HILDEBRAND, *Semi-topological properties*, Fundamenta Mathematicae, **74** (1972), 233-254.
- [6] J. DONTCHEV - T. NOIRI, *Contra-semicontinuous functions*, Math. Pannonica, **10**(2) (1999), 159-168.

- [7] Z. DUSZYŃSKI, *On p -open mappings*, Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Roumanie Tome 49 (97), No. 3, 2006, 223-238.
- [8] S. V. FOMIN, *Extensions of topological spaces*, Ann. of Math., 44 (1943), 471-480; first in Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 32 (1941), 114.
- [9] HONG OH KIM, *Notes on C -compact spaces and functionally compact spaces*, Kyungpook Math. J., 10(1) (1970), 75-79.
- [10] T. HUSAIN, *Almost continuous mappings*, Prace Mat., 10 (1966), 1-7.
- [11] S. JAFARI - T. NOIRI, *On contra-precontinuous functions*, Bul. Malaysian Math. Sci. Soc., 25 (2002), 115-128.
- [12] D. S. JANKOVIĆ, *A note on mappings of extremally disconnected spaces*, Acta Math. Hungar., 46(1-2) (1985), 83-92.
- [13] N. LEVINE, *A decomposition of continuity in topological spaces*, Amer. Math. Monthly, 68 (1961), 44-46.
- [14] N. LEVINE, *Semi-open sets and semi-continuity in topological spaces*, Amer. Math. Monthly, 70 (1963), 36-41.
- [15] A. S. MASHHOUR - M. E. ABD EL-MONSEF - S. N. EL-DEEB, *On precontinuous and weak precontinuous mappings*, Proc. Math. and Phys. Soc. Egypt, 53 (1982), 47-53.
- [16] A. S. MASHHOUR - I. A. HASANEIN - S. N. EL-DEEB, *a -continuous and a -open mappings*, Acta Math. Hungar., 41(3-4) (1983), 213-218.
- [17] O. NJÁSTAD, *On some classes of nearly open sets*, Pacific J. Math., 15 (1965), 961-970.
- [18] T. NOIRI, *On almost open mappings*, Mem. Miyakanojo Tech. Coll., 7 (1972), 167-171.
- [19] T. NOIRI, *A note on semi-continuous mappings*, Lincei-Rend. Sc. fis. mat. e nat., 55 (1973), 400-403.
- [20] T. NOIRI, *On S -closed spaces*, Ann. Soc. Sci. Bruxelles, 91 (1977), 189-194.
- [21] T. NOIRI, *Semi-continuity and weak-continuity*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, 31(106) (1981), 314-321.
- [22] T. NOIRI, *A function which preserves connected spaces*, Čas. pěst. mat., 107 (1982), 393-396.
- [23] T. NOIRI, *Almost-open functions*, Indian J. Math., 25(1) (1983), 73-79.
- [24] T. NOIRI, *On a -continuous functions*, Čas. pěst. mat., 109 (1984), 118-126.
- [25] T. NOIRI, *Super-continuity and some strong forms of continuity*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math., 15(3) (1984), 241-250.
- [26] T. NOIRI, *Weakly a -continuous functions*, Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci., 10 (1987), 483-490.
- [27] T. NOIRI, *A note on F -closed spaces*, Kyungpook Math. J., 31(2) (1991), 269-273.
- [28] V. POPA - C. STAN, *On a decomposition of quasi-continuity in topological spaces*, Stud. Cerc. Mat., 25 (1973), 41-43. (in Romanian)
- [29] J. PORTER - J. THOMAS, *On \mathcal{H} -closed and minimal Hausdorff spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 138 (1969), 159-170.
- [30] A. RAMANATHAN, *Maximal-Hausdorff spaces*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci., 26 (1947), 31-42.
- [31] I. L. REILLY - M. K. VAMANAMURTHY, *Connectedness and strong semi-continuity*, Čas. pěst. mat., 109 (1984), 261-265.
- [32] D. A. ROSE, *Weak openness and almost openness*, Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci., 7(1) (1984), 35-40.
- [33] D. A. ROSE, *Weak continuity and almost continuity*, Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci., 7(2) (1984), 311-318.
- [34] M. K. SINGAL - ASHA RANI SINGAL, *Almost-continuous mappings*, Yokohama Math. J., 16 (1968), 63-73.
- [35] M. K. SINGAL - ASHA MATHUR, *On nearly-compact spaces*, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital., 2(4) (1969), 702-710.

- [36] T. THOMPSON, *S-closed spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **60** (1976), 335-338.
- [37] T. THOMPSON, *Semicontinuous and irresolute images of S-closed spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **66**(2) (1977), 359-362.
- [38] A. WILANSKY, *Topics in functional analysis*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 45, Springer-Verlag 1967.

Casimirus the Great University,
Institute of Mathematics, Pl. Weyssenhoffa 11, 85-072 Bydgoszcz, Poland

Pervenuta in Redazione
il 18 maggio 2006