

In this paper we investigate an open question posed to us by Gruenhage:

**Question 1.** *Let  $P$  be the subspace of the Sorgenfrey line containing only irrational numbers. Does there exist a base  $\mathcal{B}$  for  $P$  such that for every  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  which is also a base for  $X$ , there exists a locally finite subcover  $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ ?*

We begin by tackling a simpler (solved) problem:

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $R$  be the Sorgenfrey line, the set of real numbers with the topology generated by the base  $\mathcal{B} = \{[a, b) : a < b\}$  (where  $[a, b) = \{x : a \leq x < b\}$ ).*

*For every  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  which is also a base for  $R$ , there exists a pairwise disjoint subcover  $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  (and thus a locally finite subcover).*

*Proof.* We begin by letting  $b_{n,0} = n$  for each  $n < \omega$ , and if  $b_{n,\alpha}$  is defined for some ordinal  $\alpha < \omega_1$  and  $b_{n,\alpha} < n + 1$ , we define its successor  $b_{n,\alpha+1}$  as follows:

- $b_{n,\alpha} < b_{n,\alpha+1} \leq n + 1$
- $[b_{n,\alpha}, b_{n,\alpha+1}) \in \mathcal{C}$

(This is possible as  $\mathcal{C}$  is a base, and there must be some element of  $\mathcal{C}$  which contains  $b_{n,\alpha}$  and is a subset of  $[b_{n,\alpha}, n + 1)$ .)

(If  $b_{n,\alpha} = n + 1$ , then let  $b_{n,\alpha+1} = n + 1$  as well.) Finally, if  $\alpha < \omega_1$  is a limit ordinal, let  $b_{n,\alpha} = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \alpha} b_{n,\beta}$ .

Let  $C_{n,\alpha} = [b_{n,\alpha}, b_{n,\alpha+1})$ . We claim  $\mathcal{C}' = \{C_{n,\alpha} : n < \omega, \alpha < \omega_1\}$  is a pairwise disjoint cover of  $R$ . Pairwise disjoint is evident by definition. To see that it is a cover, suppose it wasn't and missed some  $x \in [n, n + 1)$ . Then we have an uncountable increasing sequence of numbers  $\{b_{n,\alpha} : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ , which contradicts the countable chain condition on the real line.  $\square$

This idea can actually be generalized for any dense subspace, but it takes some machinery:

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $P$  be a dense subspace of the Sorgenfrey line with the induced topology, which has the base  $\mathcal{B} = \{[a, b) : a < b, a \in P\}$ .*

*For every  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  which is also a base for  $P$ , there exists a pairwise disjoint subcover  $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  (and thus a locally finite subcover).*

*Proof.* It suffices to show for  $[0, 1) \cap P$ . We begin by constructing a collection of functions  $S \subseteq \omega^{\omega_1}$  and numbers  $c_s, d_s, c_{s \smallfrown \langle -1 \rangle}$  defined by those functions as follows:

- Let  $S_0 = \{\emptyset\}$ . Let  $d_\emptyset = 0$  and  $c_{\langle -1 \rangle} = 1$ .
- Suppose  $S_\alpha$  has been defined, as well as  $d_s \leq c_{s \smallfrown \langle -1 \rangle}$  for each  $s \in S_\alpha$ . For  $s \in S_\alpha$ , consider the following:
  - If  $d_s = c_{s \smallfrown \langle -1 \rangle}$ , do nothing.
  - If  $d_s < c_{s \smallfrown \langle -1 \rangle}$  and  $d_s \in P$ , let  $S_{\alpha+1}$  contain  $s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle$  and define  $c_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle}, d_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle}, c_{s \smallfrown \langle 0, -1 \rangle}$  such that

$$d_s = c_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle} < d_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle} \leq c_{s \smallfrown \langle 0, -1 \rangle} = c_{s \smallfrown \langle -1 \rangle}$$

where  $[c_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle}, d_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle}) \in \mathcal{C}$ .

- If  $d_s < c_{s \smallfrown \langle -1 \rangle}$  and  $d_s \notin P$ , let  $S_{\alpha+1}$  contain  $s \smallfrown \langle n \rangle$  for all  $n < \omega$  and define  $c_{s \smallfrown \langle n \rangle}, d_{s \smallfrown \langle n \rangle}, c_{s \smallfrown \langle n, -1 \rangle}$  for all  $n < \omega$  such that

$$d_s < \dots \leq c_{s \smallfrown \langle 2, -1 \rangle} = c_{s \smallfrown \langle 1 \rangle} < d_{s \smallfrown \langle 1 \rangle} \leq c_{s \smallfrown \langle 1, -1 \rangle} = c_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle} < d_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle} \leq c_{s \smallfrown \langle 0, -1 \rangle} = c_{s \smallfrown \langle -1 \rangle}$$

where  $[c_{s \smallfrown \langle n \rangle}, d_{s \smallfrown \langle n \rangle}) \in \mathcal{C}$  for all  $n < \omega$  and  $c_{s \smallfrown \langle n \rangle} \rightarrow d_s$ .

- Suppose  $\alpha$  is a limit ordinal and  $S_\beta$  has been defined for all  $\beta < \alpha$ . If  $s \in \omega^\alpha$  and  $t \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} S_\beta$  for all  $t < s$ , let  $S_\alpha$  contain  $s$  and define  $d_s = \lim_{t < s} d_t$  and  $c_{s \smallfrown \langle -1 \rangle} = \lim_{t < s} c_{t \smallfrown \langle -1 \rangle}$ .
- Let  $S = \bigcup_{n < \omega} S_\alpha$ .

Let  $S = \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} S_\alpha$ . By construction,  $\mathcal{C}' = \{[c_s, d_s) : s \in S\}$  is a disjoint subcollection of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We claim it also must cover  $[0, 1) \cap P$ .

Suppose not:  $x \in [0, 1) \cap P$  is not contained in  $[c_s, d_s)$  for any  $s \in S$ . Note that  $d_\emptyset < x$  (or else  $x \in [c_\emptyset, d_\emptyset)$ ). Assume  $n_\beta < \omega$  is defined for all  $\beta < \alpha$ , and consider  $s \in \omega^\alpha$  where  $s(\beta) = n_\beta$ . If  $d_s < x$ , we claim there is a minimal  $n_\alpha < \omega$  where  $d_{s \smallfrown \langle n_\alpha \rangle} < x$ .

- This possible when  $d_s \notin P$  since  $d_{s \smallfrown \langle n \rangle} \rightarrow d_s$ .
- This is also possible when  $d_s \in P$  since  $[c_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle}, d_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle})$  does not contain  $x$ , and thus  $d_s = c_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle} < d_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle} \leq x$ . If  $d_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle} = x$  then  $d_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle} \in P$  and  $[d_{s \smallfrown \langle 0 \rangle}, d_{s \smallfrown \langle 0, 0 \rangle}) = [c_{s \smallfrown \langle 0, 0 \rangle}, d_{s \smallfrown \langle 0, 0 \rangle})$  contains  $x$ , which is a contradiction.

Finally, we notice that by defining  $f \in \omega_1^\omega$  such that  $f(\alpha) = n_\alpha$ , then  $d_{f \restriction \alpha}$  is an increasing uncountable sequence defined for all  $\alpha < \omega_1$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$