

Assume all spaces are locally compact.

**Proposition 1.** *The following are all equivalent winning conditions for  $Con_{O,P}(X^*, \infty)$ :*

- *The points chosen by  $P$  converge to  $\infty$ .*
- *All compact subsets of  $X$  contain finitely many points chosen by  $P$ .*
- *No compact subset of  $X$  contains infinite points chosen by  $P$ .*

*The following are all equivalent winning conditions for  $Clus_{O,P}(X^*, \infty)$ :*

- *The points chosen by  $P$  cluster about  $\infty$ .*
- *All compact subsets of  $X$  miss infinitely many points chosen by  $P$ .*
- *No compact subset of  $X$  contains cofinite points chosen by  $P$ .*

**Proposition 2.** *The winning condition for  $Con_{O,P}(X^*, \infty)$  is equivalent to the winning condition of  $LF_{K,P}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* First, suppose that the points chosen by  $P$  have a limit point  $l$ , the contradiction of  $LF_{K,P}(X^*)$ 's winning condition. Every open set about  $l$  contains infinitely many points, including a compact neighborhood of  $l$ . This contradicts the winning condition of  $Con_{O,P}(X^*, \infty)$ .

Then, suppose that there was a compact subset of  $X$  containing infinite points chosen by  $P$ , the contradiction of  $Con_{O,P}(X^*, \infty)$ 's winning condition. Every infinite subset of a compact set has a limit point, contradicting  $LF_{K,P}(X^*)$ 's winning condition.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** *The following are all equivalent.*

- *$X$  is metacompact.*
- *$O \uparrow_{tact} Con_{O,P}(X^*, \infty)$ .*
- *$O \uparrow_{tact} Clus_{O,P}(X^*, \infty)$ .*

*Proof.* Gruenhage has shown  $X$  is metacompact  $\Rightarrow K \uparrow_{tact} LF_{K,P}(X)$  (which is equivalent to  $O \uparrow_{tact} Con_{O,P}(X^*, \infty)$ ), and obviously  $O \uparrow_{tact} Con_{O,P}(X^*, \infty) \Rightarrow O \uparrow_{tact} Clus_{O,P}(X^*, \infty)$ . We proceed by modifying Gruenhage's proof that  $K \uparrow_{tact} LF_{K,P}(X)$  implies  $X$  is metacompact to show  $O \uparrow_{tact} Clus_{O,P}(X^*, \infty)$  does also.

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a cover of  $X$ , and refine it to open  $F_\sigma$  sets with compact closures. Let  $K : X^* \rightarrow K[X]$  be the complement of a winning clustering strategy for  $O$  such that  $K(x)$  is a compact neighborhood of  $x$  for all  $x \in X$ .

Let  $A(x) = \{p : x \notin K(p)\}$ .

For each  $x$ , we claim  $x$  is not even a limit point of  $A(x)$ . To see this, suppose there was such an  $x$ , and choose any compact neighborhood  $N$  of  $x$ . If  $x$  was a limit of  $A(x)$ , then  $N \cap A(x) \neq \emptyset$ . We choose  $x_0 \in N \cap A(x)$ , and note  $x \notin K(x_0)$  since  $x_0 \in A(x)$ .

This makes  $N \setminus K(x_0)$  a neighborhood of  $x$ , which must then intersect  $A(x)$ . We may then pick an  $x_1$  in  $N \cap A(x) \setminus K(x_0)$ . By continuing this process inductively we find  $x_n$  in  $N \cap A(x) \setminus \bigcup_{0 \leq i < n} K(x_i)$ . Since the  $x_n$  are all in the compact set  $N$ , the winning condition for  $Clus_{O,P}(X^*, \infty)$  is not met for the play  $\langle x_0, X^* \setminus K(x_0), x_1, X^* \setminus K(x_1), \dots \rangle$ , contradicting the fact that  $K$  is the complement of a winning strategy.

Let  $K'(x) = \text{Int}(K(x) \setminus A(x))$ . We note that  $x \in K'(x)$  since  $x$  was not a limit point or member of  $A(x)$ . So for each  $K$  let  $\{K'(x) : x \in K\}$  be an open cover, and take a finite subset  $F(K) \subset K$  which yields the subcover  $\{K'(x) : x \in F(K)\}$ .

Enumerate  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ . We define  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  for  $\alpha < \lambda$  to fulfill the following:

- $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  is countable
- $\{U_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \subseteq \bigcup_{\beta \leq \alpha} \mathcal{U}_\beta$
- If

$$N_\alpha = \left( \bigcup \mathcal{U}_\alpha \right) \setminus \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \left( \bigcup \mathcal{U}_\beta \right)$$

(that is,  $N_\alpha$  contains the points covered by  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  and not covered by a previous  $\mathcal{U}_\beta$ )

then there exists a countable  $S_\alpha \subseteq N_\alpha$  where

$$N_\alpha \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in S_\alpha} K'(x) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in S_\alpha} K(x) \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{U}_\alpha$$

To start, let  $\mathcal{U}_0$  and  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  for every limit  $\alpha$  be the empty set. For the successor ordinal  $\alpha + 1$ , let  $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha+1,0} = \{U_\alpha\}$  and  $S_{\alpha+1,0} = \emptyset$ . Then let  $O_{\alpha+1} = \bigcup_{\beta \leq \alpha} \bigcup \mathcal{U}_\beta$ , the points covered by previous  $\mathcal{U}_\beta$ .

We then define

$$S_{\alpha+1,n+1} = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha+1,n}} F(Cl(U) \setminus O_{\alpha+1})$$

and let  $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha+1,n+1} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  be a finite cover of  $\bigcup_{x \in S_{\alpha+1,n+1}} K(x)$ . Note that  $S_{\alpha,n}$  and  $U_{\alpha,n}$  are finite at every step  $n$ , so we may define  $S_\alpha = \bigcup_{n < \omega} S_{\alpha,n}$  and  $U_\alpha = \bigcup_{n < \omega} U_{\alpha,n}$ .

Such  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  may be seen to fulfill the above requirements.

Let  $W_\alpha = \bigcup_{x \in S_\alpha} K'(x)$ . Note  $W_\alpha$  contains everything in  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  not covered by lower  $\mathcal{U}_\beta$ .

We now show the collection of  $W_\alpha$  is point-finite. Suppose it wasn't: if  $x \in W_{\alpha_n}$  for  $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \dots$ , then for each  $n$  choose some  $x_n \in S_{\alpha_n}$  where  $x \in K'(x_n)$ .

FINISH THIS

□

**Example 4.** Let  $X$  be a zero-dimensional, compact  $L$ -space (hereditarily Lindeloff and non-separable). It is a fact that there exists a point-countable collection  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$  of clopen sets in  $X$ , and it is also true that any point-finite subcollection of  $\mathcal{U}$  is countable.

Let  $C = \{c_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$  be any uncountable subset of the Cantor space  $2^\omega$ . Let  $X_s = X \times \{s\}$  for each  $s \in 2^{<\omega}$ , and  $U_{\alpha,s} = U_\alpha \times \{s\}$ .

Finally, let

$$\mathbb{X} = C \cup \bigcup_{s \in 2^{<\omega}} X_s$$

be a tree of  $2^{<\omega}$  copies of  $X$ , and where

$$c_\alpha \cup \bigcup_{n < \omega} U_{\alpha, x_\alpha \upharpoonright n}$$

is an open set about each  $c_\alpha$ .

**Definition 5.** Let  $S \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$  and  $m < \omega$ . Define

$$K_S = \bigcup_{\alpha \in S} \left( c_\alpha \cup \left( \bigcup_{s < c_\alpha} U_{\alpha,s} \right) \right)$$

$$A = \{z \frown \langle 1 \rangle : z \in 1^{<\omega}\}$$

$$K_S^* = K_S \setminus \bigcup_{s \in A} X_s$$

and

$$L_m = \bigcup_{s \in 2^{<m}} X_s$$

and observe that every compact set is dominated by  $K_S^* \cup L_m$  for some  $S, m$ . Intuitively,  $K_S^*$  collects the branches of  $U_\alpha$  converging up to  $c_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in S$  while avoiding copies  $X_s$  of  $X$  for each  $s$  in an antichain  $A$ , and  $L_m$  collects the copies  $X_s$  of  $X$  with  $|s| < m$  at the base of the tree.

**Proposition 6.** Without loss of generality,  $P$  always plays points in  $\bigcup_{s \in 2^{<\omega}} X_s$ .

**Proposition 7.**  $K \upharpoonright LF_{K,P}(\mathbb{X})$ .

*Proof.* In response to a point  $\langle x, s \rangle$ ,  $K$  observes that there are only countably many  $\alpha$  such that  $U_\alpha \times \{s\}$  contains  $\langle x, s \rangle$  (by point-countability of  $X$ ). Enumerate these as  $\alpha_n$ .  $K$  makes a promise that during round  $m$ ,  $K$  will forbid some superset of  $K_{\{\alpha_n : n \leq m\}}$ . Finally,  $K$  also always forbids a superset of  $L_{|s|+1}$ .

Suppose  $P$ 's moves clustered at some point. Since  $K$  forbade  $L_{|s|+1}$  during each round, that point must be  $c_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha$ .  $P$ 's play then must have included a subsequence of points  $\langle x_0, s_0 \rangle, \langle x_1, s_1 \rangle, \langle x_2, s_2 \rangle \dots$  such that  $x_n \in U_\alpha$  and  $s_n \leq s_{n+1} \leq c_\alpha$ . However, in response to  $\langle x_0, s_0 \rangle$ ,  $K$  made a promise to eventually forbid a superset of  $K_{\{\alpha\}}$ , making every  $\langle x_n, t_n \rangle$  illegal after that round.  $\square$

**Theorem 8.**  $K \not\uparrow_{tact} LF_{K,P}(\mathbb{X})$ .

*Proof.* (Vanished somewhere during my editing... looking for it now!)  $\square$

**Theorem 9.**  $K \not\uparrow_{2-tact} LF_{K,P}(\mathbb{X})$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\sigma(\langle x, s \rangle, \langle y, t \rangle)$  was a winning 2-tactical strategy. We may define  $S(x, y, n)$  and  $m(x, y, n)$  such that for each  $(x, y)$ ,

$$\bigcup_{s, t \in 2^{\leq n}} \sigma(\langle x, s \rangle, \langle y, t \rangle) \subseteq K_{S(x, y, n)}^* \cup L_{m(x, y, n)}$$

Select an arbitrary point  $x' \in X$ . We define a tactical strategy

$$\tau(x, s) = K_{S(x, x', m(x, x', |s|)+1)}^* \cup L_{m(x, x', m(x, x', |s|)+1)}$$

We complete the proof by showing  $\tau$  is a winning tactical strategy (a contradiction).

Suppose

$$\langle x_0, s_0 \rangle, \langle x_1, s_1 \rangle, \langle x_2, s_2 \rangle, \dots$$

successfully countered  $\tau$  by clustering at  $c \in C$  (the strategy trivially prevents clustering elsewhere). Let  $z_n = \langle 0, \dots, 0 \rangle$  with  $n$  zeros. We claim

$$\langle x_0, s_0 \rangle, \langle x', z_{m(x_0, x_0, |s_0|)} \wedge \langle 1 \rangle \rangle, \langle x_1, s_1 \rangle, \langle x', z_{m(x_1, x', |s_1|)} \wedge \langle 1 \rangle \rangle, \langle x_2, s_2 \rangle, \langle x', z_{m(x_2, x', |s_2|)} \wedge \langle 1 \rangle \rangle, \dots$$

is a successful counter to  $\sigma$ .

Obviously it also clusters at  $c$ , so we need only show that it is a legal counter to  $\sigma$ . Note that

$$\sigma(\langle x', z_{m(x_i, x', |s_i|)} \wedge \langle 1 \rangle \rangle, \langle x_{i+1}, s_{i+1} \rangle) \subseteq \sigma(\langle x_{i+1}, s_{i+1} \rangle, \langle x', z_{m(x_{i+1}, x', |s_{i+1}|)} \wedge \langle 1 \rangle \rangle)$$

since the only difference in input is a higher copy of  $x' \in X$ .

Suppose  $\langle x_i, s_i \rangle$  was an illegal move. Then for some  $j < i$ , that move was forbidden by

$$\sigma(\langle x_j, s_j \rangle, \langle x', z_{m(x_j, x', |s_j|)} \frown \langle 1 \rangle \rangle)$$

$$\subseteq K_{S(x_j, x', m(x_j, x', |s_j|)+1)}^* \cup L_{m(x_j, x', m(x_j, x', |s_j|)+1)} = \tau(x_j, s_j)$$

which is a contradiction as it was a legal move against  $\tau$ .

Finally, consider  $\langle x', z_{m(x_i, x', |s_i|)} \frown \langle 1 \rangle \rangle$ . Since the length of  $z_{m(x_i, x', |s_i|)} \frown \langle 1 \rangle$  is longer than  $m(x_i, x', |s_i|)$ , it's not forbidden by any  $L_m$  played by  $K$ . And since  $z_{m(x_i, x', |s_i|)} \frown \langle 1 \rangle$  is on the antichain  $A$  avoided by the  $K_S^*$ s, it could never have been forbidden at all.  $\square$

**Proposition 10.** *The above proof can be adapted to prove  $K \not\Upsilon_{k-tact} LF_{K,P}(\mathbb{X})$ .*