

2.7 Coverings

Now we'll get to say 'compact' instead of 'sequentially compact.'

Let M be a metric space, and let \mathcal{U} be a collection of open subsets in M . Suppose $A \subseteq M$.

If $\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U \supseteq A$, then \mathcal{U} is an open cover of A . [We can write $\bigcup \mathcal{U}$]

Ex: $\mathcal{U} = \{(-n, n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an open cover of \mathbb{R}

$\mathcal{U} = \{(\frac{1}{n}, 1 - \frac{1}{n}) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an open cover of $(0, 1)$

(but not of $[0, 1]$)

$\mathcal{U} = \{\mathbb{R}\}$ is an open cover of \mathbb{R}

Suppose $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, i.e. for all $V \in \mathcal{V}$, $V \in \mathcal{U}$. If \mathcal{V} is an open cover of A , then it is a subcover of \mathcal{U} , or we can say that \mathcal{U} has a subcover \mathcal{V} .

Def: Let M be a metric space. The set $A \subseteq M$ is compact if every open cover of A has a finite subcover [covering compact].

To get an intuitive feel for this definition, it helps to start with some examples of sets which are not compact.

- Ex:
- \mathbb{R} is not compact, since the open cover $\{(-n, n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has no finite subcover.
 - $(0, 1)$ is not compact, since $\{(\frac{1}{n}, 1 - \frac{1}{n})\}$ has no finite subcover.
 - \mathbb{N}_{disc} is not compact, since $\{n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has no finite subcover.

But why is $[0, 1]$ compact? It's not immediately obvious;
the following will help:

Thm: In a metric space M , $A \subseteq M$ is (covering) compact iff it is sequentially compact.

Proof: (\Rightarrow) Suppose A is covering compact but not sequentially compact.

Then there is some sequence $(p_n) \in A$ that has no convergent subsequences. Then for every $a \in A$, a is not the limit of any subsequence of (p_n) . So we can find an $\varepsilon_a > 0$ such that $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid p_n \in B(a, \varepsilon_a)\}$ is finite.

Let $\mathcal{U} = \{B(a, \varepsilon_a) \mid a \in A\}$. Then \mathcal{U} is an open cover of A , so it has a finite subcover $\mathcal{V} = \{B(a_1, \varepsilon_1), \dots, B(a_k, \varepsilon_k)\}$.

For each $i = 1, \dots, k$, we have $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid p_n \in B(a_i, \varepsilon_i)\}$ is finite.

Then $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid p_n \in \bigcup_{i=1}^k B(a_i, \varepsilon_i)\}$ is finite. But $\bigcup_{i=1}^k B(a_i, \varepsilon_i) \supseteq A \ni (p_n)$,

so this is a contradiction. The sequence must have a convergent subsequence, i.e. A must be sequentially compact.

The other direction will be the most involved proof we've done so far.

Lemma: (Lebesgue Numbers): Suppose M is sequentially compact, and let \mathcal{U} be an open cover of M . Then there is some $\lambda > 0$ such that: $\forall x \in M, \exists U \in \mathcal{U}$ with $B(x, \lambda) \subseteq U$.

Proof: Suppose otherwise, that is, suppose \mathcal{U} is an open cover without a positive Lebesgue number.

Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find an $a_n \in M$ such that $B(a_n, \frac{1}{n})$ is not contained in any $U \in \mathcal{U}$.

Since M is sequentially compact, the sequence (a_n) has a convergent subsequence, (a_{n_k}) , with $a_{n_k} \rightarrow p \in M$.

Since \mathcal{U} is a cover, there is some $U \in \mathcal{U}$ with $p \in U$.

Since \mathcal{U} is an open cover, U contains an open ball $B(p, \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$.

There is some $K_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $k \geq K_1 \Rightarrow d(a_{n_k}, p) < \epsilon/2$. There is also some $K_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $k \geq K_2 \Rightarrow \frac{1}{n_k} < \epsilon/2$. Thus if $k \geq \max\{K_1, K_2\}$,

$$B(a_{n_k}, \frac{1}{n_k}) \subseteq B(p, \epsilon) \subseteq U.$$

But this is a contradiction to our assumption; such an open cover cannot exist. \square

(\Leftarrow): Suppose A is sequentially compact, and let \mathcal{U} be any open cover of A . Let λ be a Lebesgue number for \mathcal{U} .

Let $a_1 \in A$ and $U_1 \in \mathcal{U}$ s.t. $B(a_1, \lambda) \subseteq U_1$.

If $A \subseteq U_1$ we are done; if not we choose $a_2 \in A - U_1$ and find some $U_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ with $B(a_2, \lambda) \subseteq U_2$.

Now if $A \subseteq (U_1 \cup U_2)$ we are done; if not we can continue in this way with $a_3 \in A - (U_1 \cup U_2)$ and so on.

In fact, if this process ever terminates, then we have proved the result. So suppose it doesn't.

Then we can construct a sequence (a_n) ; this sequence must have a convergent subsequence (a_{n_k}) with $a_{n_k} \rightarrow p \in A$.

There is some $K \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $k \geq K \Rightarrow d(a_{n_k}, p) < \lambda$ so that $p \in U_{n_k}$.

If $\lambda > K$, we know that $a_{n_\ell} \in A \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^K U_{n_i}$; in particular, this would mean that $a_{n_\ell} \notin U_{n_k}$.

But this is a contradiction; if this were true then (a_{n_k}) would not converge to p . We cannot build such a sequence, and so eventually the process must terminate. Thus there is a finite subcover $\{U_1, \dots, U_m\}$ as required. \square

Recall: $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is compact iff it is closed & bounded.

If $A \subseteq M$ is compact it is closed & bounded.

This leaves the door ajar; we can sneak in something that is closed & bounded but not compact [e.g. \mathbb{N}_{disc}]. How to shut that door?

Def: $A \subseteq M$ is totally bounded if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the open cover of A by balls of radius ε has a finite subcover.

Q: Is totally bounded weaker or stronger than being bounded?

A: LTS (presentation)

The following result seems almost obvious; total boundedness is basically "compactness for ε -balls." It's not surprising that it extends to "just plain compactness."

Thm: Let M be a complete metric space. Then $A \subseteq M$ is compact iff it is closed & totally bounded.

Proof: (\Rightarrow) If A is compact, then it is closed by a previous result.

Now $\{B(x, \varepsilon) \mid x \in A\}$ is an open cover of A for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and by compactness it has a finite subcover.
 $\therefore A$ is totally bounded.

(\Leftarrow): If A is closed & totally bounded, then for each $\varepsilon_k = \frac{1}{k}$

there is a finite open cover \mathcal{U}_k of balls of radius $\frac{1}{k}$, e.g.:

$$\mathcal{U}_1 = \{B(q_{11}, 1), \dots, B(q_{1m}, 1)\} \text{ covers } A \text{ for some } q_{11}, \dots, q_{1m}.$$

Let $(a_n) \in A$ be any sequence. Then it must visit one of the open balls infinitely often; wolog say $B(q_{11}, 1)$.

Set $A_1 = B(q_{11}, 1)$, and choose $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $a_{n_1} \in A_1$.

Now, A_1 is itself totally bounded. Thus it has a finite cover:

$$\{B(q_{21}, \frac{1}{2}), \dots, B(q_{2m_2}, \frac{1}{2})\}. \text{ The sequence } (a_n) \text{ must visit}$$

one of these balls, wolog $A_2 = B(q_{21}, \frac{1}{2})$, infinitely many times. Thus we can choose $n_2 > n_1$ s.t. $a_{n_2} \in A_2$.

Continuing in this way, we can construct a subsequence $(a_{n_k}) \in (a_n)$ such that $a_{n_k} \in A_k = A_{k-1} \cap B(p_k, \frac{1}{k})$ for a specific sequence of points (p_k) .

Claim: (a_{n_k}) is Cauchy. Proof: Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$

so that $\frac{2}{N} < \varepsilon$. Then for $k, l \geq N$ we have:

$$d(a_{n_k}, a_{n_l}) \leq \text{diam}(A_N) = \frac{2}{N} < \varepsilon$$

Since M is complete, (a_{n_k}) converges in M . Since A is

closed, it converges in A . Thus A is sequentially compact.

And now we know that this just means compact. \square