

**Definition 1.**  $X$  is **Menger** if for all open covers  $\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \dots$  there exist finite subcollections  $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n$  such that  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{F}_n$  is a cover of  $X$ .

**Proposition 2.**  $\sigma\text{-compact} \Rightarrow \text{Menger} \Rightarrow \text{Lindelof}$

**Definition 3.** In the two-player game  $\text{Cov}_{C,F}(X)$  player  $C$  chooses open covers  $\mathcal{U}_n$  of  $X$ , followed by player  $F$  choosing a finite subcollection  $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n$ .  $F$  wins if  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{F}_n$  is a cover of  $X$ .

**Theorem 4.**  $X$  is Menger if and only if  $C \nVdash \text{Cov}_{C,F}(X)$ .

*Proof.* Result due to (???)

First, suppose  $X$  wasn't Menger. Then there would exist open covers  $\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \dots$  of  $X$  such that for any choice of finite subcollections  $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n$ ,  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{F}_n$  isn't a cover of  $X$ . Thus  $C \uparrow_{\text{pre}} \text{Cov}_{C,F}(X) \Rightarrow S \nVdash \text{Cov}_{C,F}(X)$ .

The other direction is based upon Gruenhage's topological game presentation. Assume  $X$  is Menger, and consider a strategy for  $C$  in  $\text{Cov}_{C,F}(X)$ .

Since  $X$  is Lindelof, we can assume  $C$  plays only countable covers of  $X$ . Then, since  $F$  is choosing finite subsets, we may assume  $F$  chooses some initial segment of the countable cover. In turn, we can assume  $C$  plays an increasing open cover  $\{U_0, U_1, \dots\}$  where  $U_n \subseteq U_{n+1}$ . And in that case, it's sufficient to assume  $F$  simply chooses a singleton subset of each cover. And finally, since choices made by  $F$  are already covered, we can assume that every open set in a cover played by  $C$  covers the sets chosen by  $F$  previously.

As a result, we have the following figure of a tree of plays which I need to draw:

(Insert figure here.)

Note that for  $a, b \in \omega^{<\omega}$  and  $m \leq n$ , we know:

- (a)  $U_{a \smallfrown m} \subseteq U_{a \smallfrown n}$   
(for example,  $U_{1627} \subseteq U_{1629}$  - increasing the final digit yields supersets)
- (b)  $U_a \subseteq U_{a \smallfrown b}$   
(for example,  $U_{1627} \subseteq U_{162789}$  - appending any sequence to the end yields supersets)
- (c)  $U_{a \smallfrown m} \subseteq U_{a \smallfrown n} \subseteq U_{a \smallfrown n \smallfrown b} \subseteq U_{a \smallfrown n \smallfrown b \smallfrown m}$   
(for example:  $U_{1627} \subseteq U_{1629283287}$  - injecting a subsequence with initial number larger than the original's final number, prior to the final number, yields supersets)

We may observe that if  $F$  can find an  $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$  such that  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} U_{f \upharpoonright (n+1)} = X$ , she can use  $\{U_{f \upharpoonright 0}\}, \{U_{f \upharpoonright 1}\}, \dots$  to counter  $C$ 's strategy.

Let  $V_k^n = \bigcap_{a \in \omega^{\leq n}} U_{a \smallfrown k}$ . We claim that (1)  $V_k^n$  is open, (2)  $\mathcal{V}^n = \{V_0^n, V_1^n, \dots\}$  is increasing, and (3)  $\mathcal{V}^n$  is a cover. Proofs:

1. Since due to (c) for each  $b \in \omega^{\leq n} \setminus k^{\leq n}$ , there is an  $a \in k^{\leq n}$  with  $U_{a \smallfrown k} \subseteq U_{b \smallfrown k}$ :

$$V_k^n = \bigcap_{a \in \omega^{\leq n}} U_{a \smallfrown k} = \bigcap_{a \in k^{\leq n}} U_{a \smallfrown k} \cap \bigcap_{b \in \omega^{\leq n} \setminus k^{\leq n}} U_{b \smallfrown k} = \bigcap_{a \in k^{\leq n}} U_{a \smallfrown k}$$

making  $V_k^n$  a finite intersection of open sets.

2. We show  $V_k^0 \subseteq V_{k+1}^0$ :

$$V_k^0 = U_k \subseteq U_{k+1} = V_{k+1}^0$$

and then assume  $V_k^n \subseteq V_{k+1}^n$ :

$$V_k^{n+1} = \bigcap_{a \in \omega^{\leq n+1}} U_{a \smallfrown k} = V_k^n \cap \bigcap_{a \in \omega^{n+1}} U_{a \smallfrown k} \subseteq V_{k+1}^n \cap \bigcap_{a \in \omega^{n+1}} U_{a \smallfrown (k+1)} = V_{k+1}^{n+1}$$

3. We easily see that  $\mathcal{V}^0 = \{U_0, U_1, \dots\}$  is a cover, and then assume  $\mathcal{V}^n$  is a cover.

Let  $x \in X$  and pick  $l < \omega$  such that  $x \in V_l^n$ . For  $a \in l^{n+1}$  choose  $l_a$  such that  $x \in U_{a \smallfrown l_a}$ , giving

$$x \in \bigcap_{a \in l^{n+1}} U_{a \smallfrown l_a}$$

We will assume  $k > l, l_a$  for all  $a \in l^{\leq n+1}$ .

For any  $a \in k^{n+1} \setminus l^{n+1}$  note that  $a = b \smallfrown c$  where  $b \in l^{\leq n}$  and  $c$  begins with a number  $l$  or greater:

$$V_l^n \subseteq U_{b \smallfrown l} \subseteq U_{b \smallfrown c} \subseteq U_{b \smallfrown c \smallfrown l_a} = U_{a \smallfrown l_a}$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} x &\in V_l^n \cap \left( \bigcap_{a \in l^{n+1}} U_{a \smallfrown l_a} \right) \\ &= V_l^n \cap \left( \bigcap_{a \in k^{n+1} \setminus l^{n+1}} U_{a \smallfrown l_a} \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{a \in l^{n+1}} U_{a \smallfrown l_a} \right) \\ &= V_l^n \cap \left( \bigcap_{a \in k^{n+1}} U_{a \smallfrown l_a} \right) \\ &\subseteq V_k^n \cap \left( \bigcap_{a \in k^{n+1}} U_{a \smallfrown k} \right) \\ &= V_k^{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, apply Menger to  $\mathcal{V}^n$ , resulting in the cover  $\{V_{f(0)}^0, V_{f(1)}^1, \dots\}$ , noting

$$X = \bigcup_{n < \omega} V_{f(n)}^n \subseteq \bigcup_{n < \omega} U_{(f \upharpoonright n) \cap f(n)} = \bigcup_{n < \omega} U_{f \upharpoonright (n+1)}$$

□

**Proposition 5.**  *$X$  is compact if and only if  $F \uparrow_{tact} Cov_{C,F}(X)$*

*Proof.* Assume  $X$  is compact. For each open cover played by  $C$ , pick the finite subcover.

Assume  $F$  has a winning tactical strategy. For any open cover, have  $C$  play only it during the entire game.  $F$ 's only choice must be a finite subcover. □

**Proposition 6.** *If  $X$  is  $\sigma$ -compact then  $F \uparrow_{mark} Cov_{C,F}(X)$*

*Proof.* Let  $X = \bigcup_{n < \omega} X_n$  for compact  $X_n$ . On round  $n$ ,  $F$  picks the finite subcover of  $C$ 's open cover of  $X_n$ . □

Due to Telgarski in “On Games of Topsoe”:

**Theorem 7.** *For metrizable  $X$ ,  $X$  is  $\sigma$ -compact if and only if  $F \uparrow Cov_{C,F}(X)$ .*

In a question I posed to G, he answered:

**Lemma 8.** *For all functions  $\tau : \omega_1 \times \omega \rightarrow [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ , there exists a sequence  $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots < \omega_1$  such that  $\{\tau(\alpha_n, n) : n < \omega\}$  is not a cover for  $\{\beta : \forall n < \omega (\beta < \alpha_n)\}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $P_n = \{\beta : \beta < \alpha \Rightarrow \beta \in \tau(\alpha, n)\}$ . Observe that each  $P_n$  is finite; else there is some  $\alpha$  larger than every member of some countably infinite  $P_n^* \subseteq P_n$  such that  $P_n^* \subseteq \tau(\alpha, n)$ .

Choose  $\beta \notin \bigcup_{n < \omega} P_n$ . Then for each  $n < \omega$ , pick  $\alpha_n > \beta$  such that  $\beta \notin \tau(\alpha_n, n)$ . □

Note that the one-point Lindelöfication of discrete  $\omega_1, \omega_1^\dagger$ , is not  $\sigma$ -compact. With the above lemma, we may see that:

**Example 9.**  *$F \uparrow Cov_{C,F}(\omega_1^\dagger)$  but  $F \not\uparrow_{mark} Cov_{C,F}(\omega_1^\dagger)$ .*

*Proof.* First, we see  $F$  has a simple perfect information strategy: in response to the initial cover of  $\omega_1^\dagger$ ,  $F$  chooses a co-countable neighborhood of  $\infty$ . On successive turns she may pick a single set from  $C$ 's covers to cover the countable remainder.

Now, suppose that  $\sigma(\mathcal{U}, n)$  was a winning Markov strategy and aim for a contradiction. Consider the covers

$$\mathcal{U}(\alpha) = \{[\alpha, \omega_1) \cup \{\infty\}\} \cup \{\{\beta\} : \beta < \alpha\}$$

and define  $\tau(\alpha, n)$  to be the union of singletons chosen by  $\sigma(\mathcal{U}(\alpha), n)$ .

Using the sequence  $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots < \omega_1$  from the previous lemma, we consider the play  $\mathcal{U}(\alpha_0), \mathcal{U}(\alpha_1), \dots$ .

As  $\sigma$  was a winning strategy,  $\{\sigma(\mathcal{U}(\alpha_n), n) : n < \omega\}$  must cover  $\omega_1^\dagger$ , and thus  $\{\tau(\alpha_n, n) : n < \omega\}$  must cover  $\{\beta : \forall n < \omega (\beta < \alpha_n)\}$ , contradiction.  $\square$

We require a lemma.

**Lemma 10.** *There exist injective functions  $f_\alpha : \alpha \rightarrow \omega$  such that if  $\alpha < \beta$ , then*

$$f_\beta \upharpoonright \alpha =^* f_\alpha$$

*that is,  $f_\beta \upharpoonright \alpha$  and  $f_\alpha$  agree on all but finitely many ordinals.*

**Example 11.**  $F \upharpoonright_{2\text{-mark}} \text{Cov}_{C,F}(\omega_1^\dagger)$

*Proof.* Using the functions  $f_\alpha$  from the previous lemma, let

$$\tau(\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}, n+1) = f_{\alpha_n}^{-1}([0, n]) \cup \{\beta < \alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1} : f_{\alpha_n}(\beta) \neq f_{\alpha_{n+1}}(\beta)\}$$

For any sequence  $\alpha_n$ , suppose that  $\beta < \alpha_n$  for all  $n$ , and  $\beta$  is not covered by

$$\{\tau(\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}, n+1) : n < \omega\}$$

Then we see first that  $f_{\alpha_n}(\beta) = f_{\alpha_{n+1}}(\beta)$  for all  $n$ . However,  $f_n(\beta) > n$  for all  $n$  as well, which is a contradiction.

Finally, for each open cover  $\mathcal{U}$ , assign arbitrary  $\alpha(\mathcal{U})$ ,  $U(\mathcal{U})$  such that  $[\alpha(\mathcal{U}), \omega_1) \cup \{\infty\}$  is a subset of  $U(\mathcal{U}) \in \mathcal{U}$ . Then a 2-Markov strategy  $\sigma(\mathcal{U}_n, \mathcal{U}_{n+1}, n+1)$  which chooses  $U(\mathcal{U}_n)$  and covers the finite set  $\tau(\alpha(\mathcal{U}_n), \alpha(\mathcal{U}_{n+1}), n+1)$  is a winning strategy for  $F$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $\sigma(\mathcal{U}, n)$  be a winning Markov strategy for  $F$  in  $\text{Cov}_{C,F}(X)$ , and  $\mathfrak{C}$  collect all open covers of  $X$ . Then for*

$$C_n = \bigcap_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{C}} \overline{\bigcup \sigma(\mathcal{U}, n)}$$

and

$$D_n = \bigcap_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{C}} \bigcup \sigma(\mathcal{U}, n)$$

*it follows that  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} C_n = \bigcup_{n < \omega} D_n = X$ .*

*Proof.* Observe  $D_n \subseteq C_n$ . Suppose that  $x \notin D_n = \bigcap_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{C}} \bigcup \sigma(\mathcal{U}, n)$  for any  $n < \omega$ . Then for each  $n$ , pick  $\mathcal{U}_n \in \mathfrak{C}$  such that  $x \notin \bigcup \sigma(\mathcal{U}_n, n)$ . Then  $\sigma$  does not defeat the play  $\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \dots$  since the  $\sigma(\mathcal{U}_n, n)$  do not cover  $x$ , contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem 13.** *For regular spaces  $X$ ,  $F \uparrow_{\text{mark}} \text{Cov}_{C,F}(X)$  if and only if  $X$  is  $\sigma$ -compact.*

*Proof.* The reverse implication has already been shown. To complete the proof, we look to Scheepers for inspiration.

Let  $\sigma(\mathcal{U}, n)$  be a winning Markov strategy for  $F$  in  $\text{Cov}_{C,F}(X)$ . Let  $\mathfrak{C}$  collect all open covers of  $X$ . Define

$$C_n = \bigcap_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{C}} \overline{\bigcup \sigma(\mathcal{U}, n)}$$

as in the previous lemma. Note that  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} C_n = X$ , and we will show each  $C_n$  is compact as it is  $H$ -closed.

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be an open cover of  $C_n$ , and  $\mathcal{V}$  be a cover of  $X \setminus C_n$  by open sets whose closures are disjoint from  $C_n$  (possible by regularity).

Since  $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V}$  covers  $X$ ,  $\overline{\bigcup \sigma(\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V}, n)} \supseteq C_n$ . Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{F} = \sigma(\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V}, n) \setminus \mathcal{V}$ , then  $\overline{\bigcup \mathcal{F}} \supseteq C_n$  (the closures of sets in  $\mathcal{V}$  missed  $C_n$ ). Thus  $\mathcal{F}$  witnesses that  $C_n$  is  $H$ -closed.  $\square$

**Example 14.** *Let  $R$  be given the topology from example 63 from Counterexamples in Topology, the topology generated by open intervals with countable sets removed. This space is non-regular, non- $\sigma$ -compact, and Lindelöf. It is also Menger as  $F \uparrow \text{Cov}_{C,F}(R)$ , but  $F \not\uparrow_{\text{mark}} \text{Cov}_{C,F}(R)$ .*

*Proof.* From Counterexamples: The irrationals are open, but contain no closed neighborhood, showing non-regular. Compact subsets are exactly finite subsets, showing non- $\sigma$ -compact.

Take open covers  $\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \dots$ . Define  $\sigma(\mathcal{U}_0, \dots, \mathcal{U}_{2n})$  to be a finite subcover of  $[-n, n] \setminus C_n$  for some countable  $C_n = \{c_{n,0}, c_{n,1}, \dots\}$ . For  $\sigma(\mathcal{U}_0, \dots, \mathcal{U}_{2n+1})$ , use any subcover of  $\{c_{i,j} : i, j < n\}$ . It is easily seen that  $\sigma$  is a winning perfect information strategy.

There cannot be a winning Markov strategy  $\sigma(\mathcal{U}, n)$ , however. Define

$$D_n = \bigcap_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{C}} \bigcup \sigma(\mathcal{U}, n)$$

where  $\mathfrak{C}$  is the collection of open covers of  $R$ . For any  $x_0, x_1, \dots \in R$ , we may define the open cover  $\mathcal{U} = \{R \setminus \{x_i : i \neq n\} : n < \omega\}$ , and observe that  $\bigcup \sigma(\mathcal{U}, n) \supseteq D_n$  cannot contain every  $x_i$ . Thus  $D_n$  is finite, but since the previous lemma requires  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} D_n = R$  if  $\sigma$  is a winning strategy, there exists a counter to  $\sigma$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 15.** *For any topological space  $X$  and all  $k \geq 2$ ,  $F \uparrow_{k\text{-mark}} \text{Cov}_{C,F}(X)$  if and only if  $F \uparrow_{2\text{-mark}} \text{Cov}_{C,F}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $\sigma(\mathcal{U}_0, \dots, \mathcal{U}_{k-1}, n)$  is a winning  $k$ -Markov strategy. Define the 2-Markov strategy  $\tau(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, n)$  so that it contains  $\sigma(\mathcal{W}_0, \dots, \mathcal{W}_{k-1}, m)$  for the following conditions on  $(\mathcal{W}_0, \dots, \mathcal{W}_{k-1}, m)$ :

- Each  $\mathcal{W}_i \in \{\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}\}$
- $m \leq (n+1)k$ ; in particular, for  $i < k$ ,

$$\sigma(\mathcal{W}_0, \dots, \mathcal{W}_{k-1}, (n+1)k + i) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, n+1)$$

Considering an arbitrary play  $\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \dots$  by  $C$  versus  $\tau$ , we note that  $\sigma$  defeats the play

$$\underbrace{\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_0, \dots, \mathcal{U}_0}_k, \underbrace{\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_1}_k \dots$$

So we have that

$$\bigcup_{i < k, n < \omega} \sigma(\underbrace{\mathcal{U}_n, \dots, \mathcal{U}_n}_{k-i-1}, \underbrace{\mathcal{U}_{n+1}, \dots, \mathcal{U}_{n+1}}_{i+1}, (n+1)k + i)$$

is a cover for  $X$ , and as

$$\sigma(\underbrace{\mathcal{U}_n, \dots, \mathcal{U}_n}_{k-i-1}, \underbrace{\mathcal{U}_{n+1}, \dots, \mathcal{U}_{n+1}}_{i+1}, (n+1)k + i) \subseteq \tau(\mathcal{U}_n, \mathcal{U}_{n+1}, n+1)$$

$\tau$  defeats the play  $\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \dots$  □

The question remains:

**Question 16.** *In general, does  $F \uparrow_{\text{mark}} \text{Cov}_{C,F}(X)$  imply  $X$  is  $\sigma$ -compact?*