

THE PATCH FRAME AND ITS RELATIONS WITH SEPARATION IN POINT-FREE TOPOLOGY

ABSTRACT.

1. INTRODUCTION

Aquí va la introducción.

2. PRELIMINARIES

3. HAUSDORFF PROPERTIES IMPLIES PATCH TRIVIALITY

Gadgets:

A the base frame

Its point space $S = \text{pt}(A)$.

The compact saturated sets of S ,

$$Q(S).$$

The preframe of open filters of A ,

$$A^\wedge.$$

The preframe of open filters of $\Omega(S)$.

$$\Omega(S)^\wedge.$$

First we recall that every open filter $F \in A^\wedge$ has three faces, that is, determines (and its determine) by :

- The compact saturated $Q \in QS$.
- $\nabla \in \Omega(S)^\wedge$.
- The compact quotient $A \rightarrow A_F$.
- The fitted nucleus v_F .

Hoffman-Mislove can be rephrase:

There is a bijection between compact quotients of A and compact saturated sets of S

Definition 3.1. A frame has KC if every compact quotient of A is a closed one. In other words every compact sublocale is close.

Denote by \mathcal{Hrm} the subcategory of \mathcal{Frm} of Hausdorff frames in the sense of Johnstone and Shu.

The block structure on a frame is an important problem and its related with some separation properties of frames.

Proposition 3.2. *For every $A \in \mathcal{Hrm}$ the interval corresponding to the block determined by a open filter $F \in A^\wedge$ is trivial, that is,*

$$[v_F, w_F] = \{*\}$$

Proof. We know that for all $F \in A^\wedge$ the following holds: $v_F \leq w_F$. As a contradiction, suppose that exists $F \in A^\wedge$ such that $w_F \not\leq v_F$, that is, exists $a \in A$ such that $w_F(a) \not\leq v_F(a)$.

Note that $w_F(a) \neq 1$, otherwise

$$1 = w_F(a) = \bigwedge \{p \in M \mid a \leq p\} \leq p$$

and this is a contradiction because $p \neq 1$.

Then $1 \neq w_F(a) \not\leq v_F(a)$ and for the property **(H)**, exists $u \in A$ such that

$$(1) \quad u \not\leq w_F(a) \quad \text{y} \quad \neg u \not\leq v_F(a)$$

Note that $0 \leq a$, then $w_F(0) \leq w_F(a)$ and $v_F(0) \leq v_F(a)$ - Thus, for **1** we have that

$$(2) \quad i) u \not\leq w_F(0) \quad \text{y} \quad ii) \neg u \not\leq v_F(0).$$

For **2-(i)** is true that $u \not\leq \bigwedge M$, in particular, $u \not\leq p$ for all $p \in M$. Therefore, $\neg u \leq p$ and $\neg u \leq w_F(0)$. If **2-(ii)** is true, then $u \notin F$, in otherwise

$$u \in F \Rightarrow v_u \leq f \Rightarrow v_u(0) = \neg u \leq f(0)$$

and this is a contradiction. Thus, for the Birkhoff's separation lemma, exists a completely prime filter G such that $u \notin G \supseteq F$. We take

$$q = \bigvee \{y \in A \mid y \notin G\}$$

the point corresponding to G . Thus, $u \notin G$, $u \leq q$. If $q \notin F$, then exists $m \in M$ such that $q \leq m$. Since q is maximum, $q = m$ or $m = 1$, but $m \neq 1$ ($1 \in F$ and $M = A \setminus F$), then $m = q \in M$. Hence $u \not\leq q$ and this is a contradiction. Therefore $v_F = w_F$. \square

Proposition 3.3. *Every Hausdorff frame A (in the sense of Johnstone and Shou) is tidy, that is, A is patch trivial.*

Proof. \square

REFERENCES