



$\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -sets and $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -sets

Research Article

O.Ravi^{1*}, K.Kalpana² and S.Tharmar³

1 Department of Mathematics, P. M. Thevar College, Usilampatti, Madurai District, Tamil Nadu, India.

2 Department of Mathematics, P. M. Thevar College, Usilampatti, Madurai District, Tamil Nadu, India.

3 Department of Mathematics, R. V. S College of Engineering and Technology, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.

Abstract: We define \wedge_m -sets and \vee_m -sets in minimal spaces and discuss their properties. Also define $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -sets and $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -sets in ideal minimal spaces and discuss their properties. At the end of the paper, we characterize m - T_1 -spaces using these new sets.

MSC: 54C10, 54C05, 54A05, 54A10.

Keywords: m - \mathcal{I}_g -closed set, $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set, $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set, m - T_1 -space.

© JS Publication.

1. Introduction

Ozbakir and Yildirim [6] introduced m - \mathcal{I}_g -closed sets in ideal minimal spaces and discussed their properties. In this paper, in Section 3, we define \wedge_m -sets and \vee_m -sets in minimal spaces and discuss their properties. In Section 4, we define $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -sets and $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -sets in ideal minimal spaces and discuss their properties. In Section 5, we characterize m - T_1 -spaces using these new sets.

2. Preliminaries

Definition 2.1 ([3]). A subfamily $m_X \subset \wp(X)$ is said to be a minimal structure on X if $\emptyset, X \in m_X$. The pair (X, m_X) is called a minimal space (or an m -space). A subset A of X is said to be m -open if $A \in m_X$. The complement of an m -open set is called m -closed set. We set $m\text{-int}(A) = \cup\{U : U \subset A, U \in m_X\}$ and $m\text{-cl}(A) = \cap\{F : A \subset F, X - F \in m_X\}$.

Lemma 2.2 ([3]). Let X be a nonempty set and m_X a minimal structure on X . For subsets A and B of X , the following properties hold:

$$(1) \quad m\text{-cl}(X - A) = X - m\text{-int}(A) \text{ and } m\text{-int}(X - A) = X - m\text{-cl}(A),$$

* E-mail: siingam@yahoo.com

- (2) If $X-A \in m_X$, then $m-cl(A)=A$ and if $A \in m_X$, then $m-int(A)=A$,
- (3) $m-cl(\emptyset)=\emptyset$, $m-cl(X)=X$, $m-int(\emptyset)=\emptyset$ and $m-int(X)=X$,
- (4) If $A \subset B$, then $m-cl(A) \subset m-cl(B)$ and $m-int(A) \subset m-int(B)$,
- (5) $A \subset m-cl(A)$ and $m-int(A) \subset A$,
- (6) $m-cl(m-cl(A))=m-cl(A)$ and $m-int(m-int(A))=m-int(A)$.

A minimal space (X, m_X) has the property $[\mathcal{U}]$ if "the arbitrary union of m -open sets is m -open" [6]. (X, m_X) has the property $[\mathcal{I}]$ if "the any finite intersection of m -open sets is m -open". [6].

Lemma 2.3 ([6]). *Let X be a nonempty set and m_X a minimal structure on X satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$. For a subset A of X , the following properties hold:*

- (1) $A \in m_X$ if and only if $m-int(A)=A$,
- (2) A is m -closed if and only if $m-cl(A)=A$,
- (3) $m-int(A) \in m_X$ and $m-cl(A)$ is m -closed.

An ideal \mathcal{I} on a minimal space (X, m_X) is a non-empty collection of subsets of X which satisfies the following conditions.

- (1) $A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $B \subset A$ imply $B \in \mathcal{I}$ and
- (2) $A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $B \in \mathcal{I}$ imply $A \cup B \in \mathcal{I}$.

Definition 2.4 ([6]). *Let (X, m_X) be a minimal space with an ideal \mathcal{I} on X and $(.)_m^*$ be a set operator from $\wp(X)$ to $\wp(X)$. For a subset $A \subset X$, $A_m^*(\mathcal{I}, m_X) = \{x \in X : U_m \cap A \notin \mathcal{I} \text{ for every } U_m \in \mu_m(x)\}$ where $\mu_m(x) = \{U_m \in m_X : x \in U_m\}$ is called the minimal local function of A with respect to \mathcal{I} and m_X . We will simply write A_m^* for $A_m^*(\mathcal{I}, m_X)$.*

Definition 2.5 ([6]). *Let (X, m_X) be a minimal space with an ideal \mathcal{I} on X . The set operator $m-cl^*$ is called a minimal \star -closure and is defined as $m-cl^*(A) = A \cup A_m^*$ for $A \subset X$. We will denote by $m_x^*(\mathcal{I}, m_X)$ the minimal structure generated by $m-cl^*$, that is, $m_x^*(\mathcal{I}, m_X) = \{U \subset X : m-cl^*(X-U) = X-U\}$. $m_x^*(\mathcal{I}, m_X)$ is called \star -minimal structure which is finer than m_X . The elements of $m_x^*(\mathcal{I}, m_X)$ are called $m\star$ -open and the complement of an $m\star$ -open set is called $m\star$ -closed. The interior of a subset A in $(X, m_x^*(\mathcal{I}, m_X))$ is denoted by $m-int^*(A)$.*

If \mathcal{I} is an ideal on (X, m_X) , then (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is called an ideal minimal space or ideal m -space.

Lemma 2.6 ([6], Theorem 2.1). *Let (X, m_X) be a minimal space with $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'$ ideals on X and A, B be subsets of X . Then*

- (1) $A \subset B \Rightarrow A_m^* \subset B_m^*$,
- (2) $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{I}' \Rightarrow A_m^*(\mathcal{I}') \subset A_m^*(\mathcal{I})$,
- (3) $A_m^* = m-cl(A_m^*) \subset m-cl(A)$,
- (4) $A_m^* \cup B_m^* \subset (A \cup B)_m^*$,

(5) $(A_m^*)_m \subset A_m^*$.

Proposition 2.7 ([6]). *The set operator $m-cl^*$ satisfies the following conditions:*

- (1) $A \subset m-cl^*(A)$,
- (2) $m-cl^*(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ and $m-cl^*(X) = X$,
- (3) If $A \subset B$, then $m-cl^*(A) \subset m-cl^*(B)$,
- (4) $m-cl^*(A) \cup m-cl^*(B) \subset m-cl^*(A \cup B)$.

Definition 2.8 ([6]). *A subset A of an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is $m\star$ -closed (resp. $m\star$ -dense in itself, $m\star$ -perfect) if $A_m^* \subset A$ (resp. $A \subset A_m^*$, $A_m^* = A$).*

Definition 2.9 ([6]). *A subset A of an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is $m\mathcal{I}$ -generalized closed (briefly, $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed) if $A_m^* \subset U$ whenever $A \subset U$ and U is m -open. A subset A of an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is said to be $m\mathcal{I}$ -generalized open (briefly, $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -open) if $X - A$ is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed.*

Lemma 2.10 ([6]). *If (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is an ideal minimal space and $A \subset X$, then A is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed if and only if $m-cl^*(A) \subset U$ whenever $A \subset U$ and U is m -open in X .*

Definition 2.11 ([6]). *A minimal space (X, m_X) is said to be $m-T_1$ if for any pair of distinct points x, y of X , there exist an m -open set containing x but not y and an m -open set containing y but not x .*

Lemma 2.12 ([6]). *Let (X, m_X) be a minimal space satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$. Then (X, m_X) is $m-T_1$ if and only if for each point $x \in X$, the singleton $\{x\}$ is m -closed.*

Lemma 2.13 ([6]). *Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$ and $A \subset X$. If (X, m_X) is an $m-T_1$ space, then A is $m\star$ -closed if and only if A is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed.*

Lemma 2.14 ([5]). *Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space and $A \subset X$. If A is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed then $A_m^* - A$ contains no nonempty m -closed set.*

3. \wedge_m -sets and \vee_m -sets

Definition 3.1. *Let A be a subset of a minimal space (X, m_X) . We define subsets A_m^\wedge and A_m^\vee as follows:*

- (1) $A_m^\wedge = \cap \{U : A \subset U \text{ and } U \text{ is } m\text{-open}\}$.
- (2) $A_m^\vee = \cup \{F : F \subset A \text{ and } F \text{ is } m\text{-closed}\}$.

Lemma 3.2. *For subsets A, B and $A_i, i \in \Delta$, of a minimal space (X, m_X) the following properties hold:*

- (1) $A \subset A_m^\wedge$.
- (2) $A \subset B \Rightarrow A_m^\wedge \subset B_m^\wedge$.
- (3) $(A_m^\wedge)_m^\wedge = A_m^\wedge$.

(4) If A is m -open then $A=A_m^\wedge$.

(5) $\cup\{(A_i)_m^\wedge : i \in \Delta\} \subset (\cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\})_m^\wedge$.

(6) $(\cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\})_m^\wedge \subset \cap\{(A_i)_m^\wedge : i \in \Delta\}$.

(7) $(X - A)_m^\wedge = X - A_m^\vee$.

Proof. (1), (2), (4), (6) and (7) are immediate consequences of Definition 3.1.

(3) From (1) and (2) we have $A_m^\wedge \subset (A_m^\wedge)_m^\wedge$. If $x \notin A_m^\wedge$, then there exists an m -open set U such that $A \subset U$ and $x \notin U$. Hence $A_m^\wedge \subset U$ by Definition 3.1 and so $x \notin (A_m^\wedge)_m^\wedge$. Thus $(A_m^\wedge)_m^\wedge \subset A_m^\wedge$. Hence $(A_m^\wedge)_m^\wedge = A_m^\wedge$.

(5) Let $A = \cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$. By (2) we have $\cup\{(A_i)_m^\wedge : i \in \Delta\} \subset A_m^\wedge = (\cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\})_m^\wedge$. \square

Remark 3.3. In Lemma 3.2, the equality in (5) and (6) does not hold as can be seen by the following example.

Example 3.4. Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$ and $m_X = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}\}$. Take $A = \{a\}$ and $B = \{b\}$, then $A_m^\wedge \cup B_m^\wedge = \{a\} \cup \{b\} = \{a, b\}$ and $(A \cup B)_m^\wedge = X$. Hence $A_m^\wedge \cup B_m^\wedge = \{a, b\} \subsetneq X = (A \cup B)_m^\wedge$. Also take $C = \{a, b\}$ and $D = \{b, c\}$, then $C_m^\wedge \cap D_m^\wedge = X$ and $(C \cap D)_m^\wedge = \{b\}$. Hence $(C \cap D)_m^\wedge = \{b\} \subsetneq X = C_m^\wedge \cap D_m^\wedge$.

Proposition 3.5. Let (X, m_X) be a minimal space satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$ and $A_i, i \in \Delta$ be subsets of X . Then $\cup\{(A_i)_m^\wedge : i \in \Delta\} = (\cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\})_m^\wedge$.

Proof. Let $A = \cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$. If $x \notin \cup\{(A_i)_m^\wedge : i \in \Delta\}$ then for each $i \in \Delta$, there exists an m -open set U_i such that $A_i \subset U_i$ and $x \notin U_i$. If $U = \cup\{U_i : i \in \Delta\}$ then U is m -open set by property $[\mathcal{U}]$ with $A \subset U$ and $x \notin U$. Therefore $x \notin A_m^\wedge$. Hence $(\cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\})_m^\wedge \subset \cup\{(A_i)_m^\wedge : i \in \Delta\}$. \square

Lemma 3.6. For subsets A, B and $A_i, i \in \Delta$, of a minimal space (X, m_X) the following properties hold:

(1) $A_m^\vee \subset A$.

(2) $A \subset B \Rightarrow A_m^\vee \subset B_m^\vee$.

(3) $(A_m^\vee)_m^\vee = A_m^\vee$.

(4) If A is m -closed then $A = A_m^\vee$.

(5) $(\cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\})_m^\vee \subset \cap\{(A_i)_m^\vee : i \in \Delta\}$.

(6) $\cup\{(A_i)_m^\vee : i \in \Delta\} \subset (\cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\})_m^\vee$.

Proof. (1), (2), (4) and (6) are immediate consequences of Definition 3.1.

(3) From (1) and (2) we have $(A_m^\vee)_m^\vee \subset A_m^\vee$. If $x \in A_m^\vee$ then for some m -closed set $F \subset A$, $x \in F$. Then $F \subset A_m^\vee$ by Definition 3.1. Since F is m -closed, again by Definition 3.1, $x \in (A_m^\vee)_m^\vee$.

(5) Let $A = \cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$. By (2) we have $(\cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\})_m^\vee \subset \cap\{(A_i)_m^\vee : i \in \Delta\}$. \square

Remark 3.7. In Lemma 3.6, the equality in (5) and (6) does not hold as can be seen by the following example.

Example 3.8. In Example 3.4, take $A=\{a, c\}$ and $B=\{b, c\}$, then $A_m^\vee \cap B_m^\vee = \{a, c\} \cap \{b, c\} = \{c\}$ and $(A \cap B)_m^\vee = \emptyset$. Hence $(A \cap B)_m^\vee = \emptyset \subsetneq \{c\} = A_m^\vee \cap B_m^\vee$. Also take $C=\{a\}$ and $D=\{c\}$, then $C_m^\vee \cup D_m^\vee = \emptyset$ and $(C \cup D)_m^\vee = \{a, c\}$. Hence $C_m^\vee \cup D_m^\vee = \emptyset \subsetneq \{a, c\} = (C \cup D)_m^\vee$.

Proposition 3.9. Let (X, m_X) be a minimal space satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$ and $A_i, i \in \Delta$ be subsets of X . Then $(\cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\})_m^\vee = \cap\{(A_i)_m^\vee : i \in \Delta\}$.

Proof. Let $A = \cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$. If $x \in \cap\{(A_i)_m^\vee : i \in \Delta\}$, then for each $i \in \Delta$, there exists a m -closed set F_i such that $F_i \subset A_i$ and $x \in F_i$. If $F = \cap\{F_i : i \in \Delta\}$ then F is m -closed by property $[\mathcal{U}]$ with $F \subset A$ and $x \in F$. Therefore $x \in A_m^\vee$. Hence $\cap\{(A_i)_m^\vee : i \in \Delta\} \subset (\cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\})_m^\vee$. \square

Definition 3.10. A subset A of a minimal space (X, m_X) is said to be a

(1) \wedge_m -set if $A = A_m^\wedge$.

(2) \vee_m -set if $A = A_m^\vee$.

Remark 3.11. \emptyset and X are \wedge_m -sets and \vee_m -sets.

Theorem 3.12. Let (X, m_X) be a minimal space satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$. Then the following hold.

(1) Arbitrary union of \wedge_m -sets is a \wedge_m -set.

(2) Arbitrary intersection of \vee_m -sets is a \vee_m -set.

Proof.

(1) Let $\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$ be a family of \wedge_m -sets. If $A = \cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$, then by Proposition 3.5, $A_m^\wedge = \cup\{(A_i)_m^\wedge : i \in \Delta\} = \cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\} = A$. Hence A is a \wedge_m -set.

(2) Let $\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$ be a family of \vee_m -sets. If $A = \cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$, then by Proposition 3.9, $A_m^\vee = \cap\{(A_i)_m^\vee : i \in \Delta\} = \cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\} = A$. Hence A is a \vee_m -set. \square

Remark 3.13. In Theorem 3.12, we cannot drop the property $[\mathcal{U}]$. It is shown in the following example.

Example 3.14. In Example 3.4, $\{a\}$ and $\{b\}$ are \wedge_m -sets but their union is not \wedge_m -set. Also, $\{a, c\}$ and $\{b, c\}$ are \vee_m -sets but their intersection is not \vee_m -set.

Theorem 3.15. Let (X, m_X) be a minimal space. Then the following hold.

(1) Arbitrary intersection of \wedge_m -sets is a \wedge_m -set.

(2) Arbitrary union of \vee_m -sets is a \vee_m -set.

Proof.

(1) Let $\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$ be a family of \wedge_m -sets. If $A = \cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$, then by Lemma 3.2, $A_m^\wedge \subset \cap\{(A_i)_m^\wedge : i \in \Delta\} = \cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\} = A$. Again by Lemma 3.2, $A \subset A_m^\wedge$. Hence A is a \wedge_m -set.

(2) Let $\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$ be a family of \vee_m -sets. If $A = \cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\}$, then by Lemma 3.6, $A_m^\vee \supset \cup\{(A_i)_m^\vee : i \in \Delta\} = \cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\} = A$.
Again by Lemma 3.6, $A_m^\vee \subset A$. Hence A is a \vee_m -set.

□

4. Generalized \wedge_m -sets and \vee_m -sets in Ideal Minimal Spaces

Definition 4.1. A subset A of an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is said to be

(1) $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set if $A_m^\wedge \subset F$ whenever $A \subset F$ and F is m^\star -closed.

(2) $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set if $X - A$ is an $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set.

Proposition 4.2. Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space. Then the following hold:

(1) Every \wedge_m -set is an $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set but not conversely.

(2) Every \vee_m -set is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set but not conversely.

Example 4.3. Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$, $m_X = \{\emptyset, X, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}\}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \{\emptyset\}$. Then $\{a, c\}$ is $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set but not \wedge_m -set and $\{b\}$ is $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set but not \vee_m -set.

Proposition 4.4. Every m -open set is $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set but not conversely.

Proof. Let $A \subset F$ and F is m^\star -closed. If A is m -open, then $A_m^\wedge = A \subset F$. Hence A is $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set. □

Example 4.5. In Example 4.3, $\{b\}$ is $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set but not m -open set.

Theorem 4.6. A subset A of an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set if and only if $U \subset A_m^\vee$ whenever $U \subset A$ and U is m^\star -open.

Proof. Suppose that $A \subset X$ is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set and U is an m^\star -open set such that $U \subset A$. Then $X - A \subset X - U$ and $X - U$ is m^\star -closed. Since $X - A$ is an $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set, we have $(X - A)_m^\wedge \subset X - U$ and so $X - A_m^\vee \subset X - U$, by Lemma 3.2. Therefore, $U \subset A_m^\vee$. Conversely, assume that $U \subset A_m^\vee$ whenever $U \subset A$ and U is m^\star -open. Suppose $X - A \subset F$ and F is m^\star -closed. Then, $X - F \subset A$ and $X - F$ is m^\star -open. Therefore, $X - F \subset A_m^\vee$ and so $X - A_m^\vee \subset F$. By Lemma 3.2, we have $(X - A)_m^\wedge \subset F$. Hence $X - A$ is an $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set and so A is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set. □

Theorem 4.7. Let A be an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set in an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) . Then for every m^\star -closed set F such that $A_m^\vee \cup (X - A) \subset F$, $F = X$ holds.

Proof. Let A be an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set in an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) . Suppose F is m^\star -closed set such that $A_m^\vee \cup (X - A) \subset F$. Then $X - F \subset (X - A_m^\vee) \cap A$. Since A is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set and the m^\star -open set $X - F \subset A$, by Theorem 4.6, $X - F \subset A_m^\vee$. Already, we have $X - F \subset X - A_m^\vee$ and so $X - F = \emptyset$ which implies that $F = X$. □

Corollary 4.8. Let A be an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set in an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) . Then $A_m^\vee \cup (X - A)$ is m^\star -closed if and only if A is a \vee_m -set.

Proof. Let A be an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set. Suppose $A_m^\vee \cup (X-A)$ is $m\star$ -closed. Then by Theorem 4.7, $A_m^\vee \cup (X-A) = X$ and so $A \subset A_m^\vee$. By Lemma 3.6, we have $A_m^\vee \subset A$. Hence A is a \vee_m -set.

Conversely, suppose A is a \vee_m -set. Then $A_m^\vee \cup (X-A) = A \cup (X-A) = X$, which is $m\star$ -closed. □

Theorem 4.9. *Let A be a subset of an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) satisfying property $[\mathcal{I}]$ such that A_m^\vee is a $m\star$ -closed set. If $F=X$, whenever F is $m\star$ -closed and $A_m^\vee \cup (X-A) \subset F$, then A is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set.*

Proof. Let U be an $m\star$ -open set such that $U \subset A$. Since A_m^\vee is $m\star$ -closed, $A_m^\vee \cup (X-U)$ is $m\star$ -closed. By hypothesis, $A_m^\vee \cup (X-U) = X$. This implies that $U \subset A_m^\vee$. Hence A is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set. □

Theorem 4.10. *Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space. Then each singleton set in X is either $m\star$ -open or an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set.*

Proof. Suppose $\{x\}$ is not $m\star$ -open. Then, $X - \{x\}$ is not $m\star$ -closed. So the only $m\star$ -closed set containing $X - \{x\}$ is X . Therefore, $(X - \{x\})_m^\wedge \subset X$ and so $X - \{x\}$ is an $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set. Hence $\{x\}$ is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set. □

The set of all $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -sets is denoted by $D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee$ and the set of all $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -sets is denoted by $D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$.

Definition 4.11. *Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space and $A \subset X$. Then $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A) = \cap\{U : A \subset U \text{ and } U \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge\}$ and $m-int_{\mathcal{I}}^\vee(A) = \cup\{F : F \subset A \text{ and } F \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee\}$.*

Theorem 4.12. *Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$ and $A_i, i \in \Delta$ be subsets of X . Then the following hold.*

(1) *If $A_i \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ for all $i \in \Delta$, then $\cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\} \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$.*

(2) *If $A_i \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee$ for all $i \in \Delta$, then $\cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\} \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee$.*

Proof.

(1) Let $A_i \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ for all $i \in \Delta$. Suppose $\cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\} \subset F$ and F is $m\star$ -closed. Then $A_i \subset F$ for all $i \in \Delta$. So $A_i^\wedge \subset F$ for all $i \in \Delta$. Therefore, $\cup\{(A_i)_m^\wedge : i \in \Delta\} \subset F$. By Proposition 3.5, $(\cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\})_m^\wedge = \cup\{(A_i)_m^\wedge : i \in \Delta\} \subset F$. So $\cup\{A_i : i \in \Delta\} \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$.

(2) Let $A_i \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee$ for all $i \in \Delta$. Then, $X - A_i \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ for all $i \in \Delta$. So, by (1), $\cup\{X - A_i : i \in \Delta\} \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$. $X - \cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\} \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ and so $\cap\{A_i : i \in \Delta\} \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee$. □

Remark 4.13. *In Theorem 4.12, we cannot drop the property $[\mathcal{U}]$. It is shown in the following example.*

Example 4.14. *Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$, $m_X = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}\}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$. Then $D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}\}$, take $A = \{a\} \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ and $B = \{b\} \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ but their union $A \cup B = \{a, b\} \notin D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$. Also, $D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee = \{\emptyset, X, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}\}$, take $A = \{a, c\} \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee$ and $B = \{b, c\} \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee$ but their intersection $A \cap B = \{c\} \notin D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee$.*

Theorem 4.15. *Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$ and $A, B \subset X$. Then $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ is a kuratowski closure operator on X .*

Proof.

- (1) Since $\emptyset_m^\wedge = \emptyset$, $\emptyset \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ and so $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(\emptyset) = \emptyset$.
- (2) From the definition of $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A)$, it is clear that $A \subset m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A)$.
- (3) We have $\{U : A \cup B \subset U, U \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge\} \subset \{U : A \subset U, U \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge\}$. So $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A) \subset m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A \cup B)$. Similarly, $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(B) \subset m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A \cup B)$. Therefore, $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A) \cup m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(B) \subset m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A \cup B)$. On the other hand, if $x \notin m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A) \cup m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(B)$, then $x \notin m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A)$. So there exists $U_1 \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ such that $A \subset U_1$ but $x \notin U_1$. Similarly, there exists $U_2 \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ such that $B \subset U_2$ but $x \notin U_2$. Let $U = U_1 \cup U_2$. Then, by Theorem 4.12, $U \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ such that $A \cup B \subset U$ but $x \notin U$. So $x \notin m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A \cup B)$. Therefore, $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A \cup B) \subset m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A) \cup m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(B)$ which implies that $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A \cup B) = m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A) \cup m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(B)$.
- (4) Now $\{U : A \subset U, U \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge\} = \{U : m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A) \subset U, U \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge\}$ by the definition of $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ operator and so $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A) = m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A))$. Hence $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$ is a kuratowski closure operator. □

Remark 4.16. In Theorem 4.15, we cannot drop the property $[\mathcal{U}]$. It is shown in the following example.

Example 4.17. In Example 4.14, take $A = \{a\}$ and $B = \{b\}$. Then $m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A) \cup m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(B) = \{a\} \cup \{b\} = \{a, b\} \subsetneq m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A \cup B) = X$.

Theorem 4.18. Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space. Then $X - m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A) = m-int_{\mathcal{I}}^\vee(X - A)$ for every subset A of X .

Proof. $X - m-cl_{\mathcal{I}}^\wedge(A) = X - \cap \{U : A \subset U, U \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge\} = \cup \{X - U : X - U \subset X - A, X - U \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee\} = m-int_{\mathcal{I}}^\vee(X - A)$. □

Theorem 4.19. Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$. Then every singleton subset of X is an $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set if and only if $G = G_m^\vee$ holds for every $m\star$ -open set G .

Proof. Suppose every singleton subset of X is an $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set. Let G be an $m\star$ -open set and $y \in X - G$. Since $\{y\}$ is $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set, $\{y\}_m^\wedge \subset X - G$. Therefore, $\cup \{\{y\}_m^\wedge : y \in X - G\} \subset X - G$. By Proposition 3.5, $(\cup \{\{y\} : y \in X - G\})_m^\wedge = \cup \{\{y\}_m^\wedge : y \in X - G\} \subset X - G$ and so $(X - G)_m^\wedge \subset X - G$. Therefore, $(X - G)_m^\wedge = X - G$. Since $X - G_m^\vee = (X - G)_m^\wedge = X - G$ and so $G = G_m^\vee$.

Conversely, let $x \in X$ and F be a $m\star$ -closed set containing x . Since $X - F$ is $m\star$ -open, $X - F = (X - F)_m^\vee = X - F_m^\wedge$ and so $F = F_m^\wedge$. Therefore, $\{x\}_m^\wedge \subset F_m^\wedge = F$. Hence $\{x\}$ is an $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set. □

Theorem 4.20. Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$. Then the following are equivalent.

(1) Every $m\star$ -open set is a \vee_m -set,

(2) $D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee = \emptyset(X)$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) By Theorem 4.19, every singleton subset of X is an $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set. If any subset A of X is written as a union of singleton sets, then by Theorem 4.12(1), A is an $\mathcal{I}.\wedge_m$ -set and so every subset of X is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set. Therefore, $D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee = \emptyset(X)$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Let A be an $m\star$ -open set. By hypothesis, A is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set and so by Lemma 3.2(1) and Theorem 4.6, A is a \vee_m -set. □

Theorem 4.21. A subset A of an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is an $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed set if and only if $m-cl^*(A) \subset A_m^\wedge$.

Proof. Suppose that $A \subset X$ is an $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed set. Let $x \in m\text{-cl}^*(A)$. Suppose $x \notin A_m^\wedge$. Then there exists an m -open set U containing A such that $x \notin U$. Since A is an $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed set, $A \subset U$ and U is m -open implies that $m\text{-cl}^*(A) \subset U$ and so $x \in m\text{-cl}^*(A)$, a contradiction. Therefore, $m\text{-cl}^*(A) \subset A_m^\wedge$.

Conversely, suppose $m\text{-cl}^*(A) \subset A_m^\wedge$. If $A \subset U$ and U is m -open, then $A_m^\wedge \subset U_m^\wedge = U$ and so $m\text{-cl}^*(A) \subset A_m^\wedge \subset U$. Therefore, A is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed. \square

Corollary 4.22. *A subset A of an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -open if and only if $A_m^\vee \subset m\text{-int}^*(A)$.*

Proof. $A \subset X$ is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -open if and only if $X-A$ is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed if and only if $m\text{-cl}^*(X-A) \subset (X-A)_m^\wedge$ if and only if $X-m\text{-int}^*(A) \subset X-A_m^\vee$ if and only if $A_m^\vee \subset m\text{-int}^*(A)$. \square

Theorem 4.23. *If A is an $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -open set in an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) , then $U=X$ whenever U is m -open and $m\text{-int}^*(A) \cup (X-A) \subset U$.*

Proof. Assume that A is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -open in X . Let U be an m -open set in X such that $m\text{-int}^*(A) \cup (X-A) \subset U$, then $X-U \subset X-(m\text{-int}^*(A) \cup (X-A)) = (X-m\text{-int}^*(A)) \cap A = m\text{-cl}^*(X-A) - (X-A)$. Since $X-A$ is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed, then by Lemma 2.14, $(X-A)_m^* - (X-A)$ contains no nonempty m -closed set. But $m\text{-cl}^*(X-A) - (X-A) = (X-A)_m^* - (X-A)$ and so $m\text{-cl}^*(X-A) - (X-A)$ contains no nonempty m -closed set. Since $X-U$ is m -closed, then $X-U = \emptyset$ and so $U=X$. \square

Corollary 4.24. *A \wedge_m -set A in an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed if and only if A is $m\star$ -closed.*

Proof. Let A be a \wedge_m -set. If A is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed, then by Theorem 4.21, $m\text{-cl}^*(A) \subset A_m^\wedge$ and so $m\text{-cl}^*(A) \subset A$ which implies that A is $m\star$ -closed.

Conversely, it is clear, since every $m\star$ -closed set is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed. \square

Corollary 4.25. *An m -open set A in an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed if and only if A is $m\star$ -closed.*

Proof. The proof follows from the fact that every m -open set is a \wedge_m -set. \square

Theorem 4.26. *Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space and $A \subset X$. If A_m^\wedge is an $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed set, then A is an $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed set.*

Proof. Let A_m^\wedge be $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed set. By Theorem 4.21, $m\text{-cl}^*(A_m^\wedge) \subset (A_m^\wedge)_m^\wedge = A_m^\wedge$. Since $A \subset A_m^\wedge$ and so $m\text{-cl}^*(A) \subset m\text{-cl}^*(A_m^\wedge) \subset A_m^\wedge$. Again, by Theorem 4.21, A is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed. \square

Remark 4.27. *The converse of Theorem 4.26 need not be true as shown by the following example.*

Example 4.28. *In Example 4.3, $A=\{a\}$ is $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed set but A_m^\wedge is not $m\mathcal{I}_g$ -closed set.*

5. Characterizations of $m\text{-T}_1$ -spaces

Definition 5.1. *Let (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) be an ideal minimal space and $A \subset X$. Then m_X^\wedge is defined as follows: $m_X^\wedge = \{A \subset X : m\text{-cl}_X^\wedge(X-A) = X-A\}$. m_X^\wedge is called \wedge -minimal structure on X generated by $m\text{-cl}_X^\wedge$. Each element of m_X^\wedge is called m_X^\wedge -open and the complement of an m_X^\wedge -open set is called m_X^\wedge -closed. We observe that m_X^\wedge is always finer than $D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee$ and m_X^c is always finer than $D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\wedge$.*

Theorem 5.2. *In an ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$, the following are equivalent.*

- (1) (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is a m - T_1 -space,
- (2) Every $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set is a \vee_m -set,
- (3) Every m_X^\wedge -open set is a \vee_m -set.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose there exists an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set A which is not \vee_m -set. Then $A_m^\vee \subsetneq A$. Therefore, there exists an element $x \in A$ such that $x \notin A_m^\vee$. Then, $\{x\}$ is not m -closed, the definition of A_m^\vee , a contradiction to Lemma 2.12. This proves (2).

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose that (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is not a m - T_1 -space. Then by Lemma 2.13 there exists an m - \mathcal{I}_g -closed set A which is not $m\star$ -closed. So, there exists an element $x \in X$ such that $x \in m\text{-cl}^*(A)$ but $x \notin A$. By Theorem 4.10, $\{x\}$ is either $m\star$ -open or an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set. When $\{x\}$ is $m\star$ -open, $\{x\} \cap A = \emptyset$, $m\text{-cl}^*(A) \subset m\text{-cl}^*(X - \{x\}) = X - \{x\}$ which is a contradiction to the fact that $x \in m\text{-cl}^*(A)$. When $\{x\}$ is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set, by our assumption, $\{x\}$ is a \vee_m -set and hence $\{x\}$ is m -closed. Therefore, $A \subset X - \{x\}$ and $X - \{x\}$ is m -open. Since A is m - \mathcal{I}_g -closed, $m\text{-cl}^*(A) \subset X - \{x\}$. This is also a contradiction to the fact that $x \in m\text{-cl}^*(A)$. Therefore, every m - \mathcal{I}_g -closed set is $m\star$ -closed and hence (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is a m - T_1 -space.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Suppose that every $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set is a \vee_m -set. Then, a subset F is a $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set if and only if F is a \vee_m -set. Let $A \in m_X^\wedge$. Then $A = m\text{-int}_{\mathcal{I}}^\vee(A) = \cup\{F : F \subset A \text{ and } F \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee\} = \cup\{F : F \subset A \text{ and } F \text{ is a } \vee_m\text{-set}\}$. Now $A_m^\vee = (m\text{-int}_{\mathcal{I}}^\vee(A))_m^\vee = (\cup\{F : F \subset A \text{ and } F = F_m^\vee\})_m^\vee \supset \cup\{F_m^\vee : F \subset A \text{ and } F = F_m^\vee\} = \cup\{F : F \subset A \text{ and } F = F_m^\vee\} = \cup\{F : F \subset A \text{ and } F \in D_{m\mathcal{I}}^\vee\} = m\text{-int}_{\mathcal{I}}^\vee(A) = A$. Always $A_m^\vee \subset A$ and so $A_m^\vee = A$. Hence A is a \vee_m -set.

(3) \Rightarrow (2) Let A be an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set. Then, by definition of $m\text{-int}_{\mathcal{I}}^\vee(A)$, $m\text{-int}_{\mathcal{I}}^\vee(A) = A$ and so $A \in m_X^\wedge$. By (3), A is a \vee_m -set. \square

Corollary 5.3. *An ideal minimal space (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) satisfying property $[\mathcal{U}]$ is a m - T_1 -space if and only if every singleton set is either $m\star$ -open or m -closed.*

Proof. Assume that (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is a m - T_1 -space. Let $x \in X$. Suppose $\{x\}$ is not $m\star$ -open. By Theorem 4.10, it is an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set. Since X is a m - T_1 -space, by Theorem 5.2(2), $\{x\}$ is a \vee_m -set and hence is m -closed.

Conversely, suppose (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is not a m - T_1 -space. Then, there exists an $\mathcal{I}.\vee_m$ -set A which is not a \vee_m -set, by Theorem 5.2(2). So there exists an element $x \in A$ such that $x \notin A_m^\vee$. If $\{x\}$ is m -closed, then A_m^\vee contains the m -closed set $\{x\}$, which is not possible. If $\{x\}$ is $m\star$ -open, then the $m\star$ -closed set $X - \{x\}$ contains $A_m^\vee \cup (X - A)$. By Theorem 4.7, $X - \{x\} = X$, which is not possible. So $\{x\}$ is neither $m\star$ -open nor m -closed, which is contradiction to our assumption. Therefore, (X, m_X, \mathcal{I}) is a m - T_1 -space. \square

References

- [1] M.Ganster, S.Jafari and T.Noiri, *On pre- \wedge -sets and pre- \vee -sets*, Acta Math. Hungar., 95(4)(2002), 337-343.
- [2] H.Maki, J.Umehara and K.Yamamura, *Characterizations of $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -spaces using generalized \vee -sets*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math., 19(7)(1988), 634-640.
- [3] H.Maki, *On generalizing semi-open and preopen sets, Report for Meeting on Topological Spaces Theory and its Applications*, Yatsushiro College of Technology, (1996), 13-18.
- [4] M.Navaneethakrishnan and D.Sivaraaj, *\mathcal{I}_g -closed sets and $T_{\mathcal{I}}$ -spaces*, Journal of Advanced Research in Pure Mathematics, 1(2)(2009), 41-49.

- [5] O.Ravi, S.Tharmar and S.Ganesan, *Some locally closed sets in ideal minimal spaces*, International Journal of Advances in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 1(1)(2011), 89-105.
- [6] O.B.Ozbakir and E.D.Yildirim, *On some closed sets in ideal minimal spaces*, Acta Math. Hungar., 125(3)(2009), 227-235.