Applications of almost compatible functions for limited information strategies in infinite length games

BEST 2015 - San Francisco State University

Steven Clontz
http://stevenclontz.com

Auburn, AL

June 16, 2016

Definition

A topological space X is Menger if for every sequence $\langle \mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \ldots \rangle$ of open covers of X there exists a sequence $\langle F_0, F_1, \ldots \rangle$ such that F_n is covered by some finite subcollection of $\mathcal{U}_n$ and $X = \bigcup_{n<\omega} F_n$.



Proposition

X is σ-relatively-compact $\Rightarrow$ X is Menger $\Rightarrow$ X is Lindelöf.

Definition

A topological space X is Menger if for every sequence $\langle \mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \ldots \rangle$ of open covers of X there exists a sequence $\langle F_0, F_1, \ldots \rangle$ such that F_n is covered by some finite subcollection of $\mathcal{U}_n$ and $X = \bigcup_{n<\omega} F_n$.



Proposition

X is σ-relatively-compact $\Rightarrow$ X is Menger $\Rightarrow$ X is Lindelöf.

Game

Let $Men_{C,F}(X)$ denote the *Menger game* with players $\mathscr{C}$, $\mathscr{F}$.



$\mathscr{F}$ wins the game if $X = \bigcup_{n<\omega} F_n$, and $\mathscr{C}$ wins otherwise.

Theorem (Hurewicz 1926 [1])

X is Menger if and only if $\mathscr{C} \not\uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$.

Theorem (Telgarsky 1984 [5], Scheepers 1995 [4])

Let X be metrizable. $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if X is σ-compact.

Theorem (Fremlin, Miller 1988 [2])

There are ZFC examples of non-σ-compact subsets of the real line which are Menger.

Theorem (Hurewicz 1926 [1])

X is Menger if and only if $\mathscr{C} \not\uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$.

Theorem (Telgarsky 1984 [5], Scheepers 1995 [4])

Let X be metrizable. $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if X is σ-compact.

Theorem (Fremlin, Miller 1988 [2])

There are ZFC examples of non-σ-compact subsets of the real line which are Menger.

Theorem (Hurewicz 1926 [1])

X is Menger if and only if $\mathscr{C} \not\uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$.

Theorem (Telgarsky 1984 [5], Scheepers 1995 [4])

Let X be metrizable. $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if X is σ-compact.

Theorem (Fremlin, Miller 1988 [2])

There are ZFC examples of non-σ-compact subsets of the real line which are Menger.

Assume κ is an uncountable cardinal.

Example

Let $\kappa^\dagger = \kappa \cup \{\infty\}$, with κ discrete and neighborhoods of ∞ being co-countable. Then $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^\dagger\right)$ but $\kappa^\dagger$ is not σ-compact.

Definition

A *perfect information strategy* uses full information of the previous moves of the opponent. ($\mathscr{A} \uparrow G$)

Definition

A *k-tactical strategy* only uses the last k previous moves of the opponent. ($\mathscr{A} \underset{k\text{-tact}}{\uparrow} G$)

Definition

A *k-Markov strategy* only uses the last k previous moves of the opponent and the round number. ($\mathscr{A} \underset{k\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} G$)

If omitted, assume $k = 1$.

Definition

A *perfect information strategy* uses full information of the previous moves of the opponent. ($\mathscr{A} \uparrow G$)

Definition

A *k-tactical strategy* only uses the last k previous moves of the opponent. ($\mathscr{A} \underset{k\text{-tact}}{\uparrow} G$)

Definition

A *k-Markov strategy* only uses the last k previous moves of the opponent and the round number. ($\mathscr{A} \underset{k\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} G$)

If omitted, assume $k = 1$.

Definition

A *perfect information strategy* uses full information of the previous moves of the opponent. ($\mathscr{A} \uparrow G$)

Definition

A *k-tactical strategy* only uses the last k previous moves of the opponent. ($\mathscr{A} \underset{k\text{-tact}}{\uparrow} G$)

Definition

A *k-Markov strategy* only uses the last k previous moves of the opponent and the round number. ($\mathscr{A} \underset{k\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} G$)

If omitted, assume $k = 1$.

Definition

A *perfect information strategy* uses full information of the previous moves of the opponent. ($\mathscr{A} \uparrow G$)

Definition

A *k-tactical strategy* only uses the last k previous moves of the opponent. ($\mathscr{A} \underset{k\text{-tact}}{\uparrow} G$)

Definition

A *k-Markov strategy* only uses the last k previous moves of the opponent and the round number. ($\mathscr{A} \underset{k\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} G$)

If omitted, assume $k = 1$.

Considering such strategies allows us to factor out Scheepers's proof characterizing σ-compact metrizable spaces with the Menger game.

Lemma

$\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if X is σ-relatively-compact.

Lemma

Let X be second-countable. $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if $\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$

The result then follows as metrizable $+$ Lindelöf $\Leftrightarrow$ regular $+$ second countable.

Considering such strategies allows us to factor out Scheepers's proof characterizing σ-compact metrizable spaces with the Menger game.

Lemma

$\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if X is σ-relatively-compact.

Lemma

Let X be second-countable. $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if $\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$

The result then follows as metrizable $+$ Lindelöf $\Leftrightarrow$ regular $+$ second countable.

Considering such strategies allows us to factor out Scheepers's proof characterizing σ-compact metrizable spaces with the Menger game.

Lemma

$\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ *if and only if* X *is* σ*-relatively-compact.*

Lemma

Let X *be second-countable.* $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$ *if and only if* $\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$

The result then follows as metrizable + Lindelöf $\Leftrightarrow$ regular + second countable.

Considering such strategies allows us to factor out Scheepers's proof characterizing σ-compact metrizable spaces with the Menger game.

Lemma

$\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if X is σ-relatively-compact.

Lemma

Let X be second-countable. $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if $\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$

The result then follows as metrizable + Lindelöf $\Leftrightarrow$ regular + second countable.

Example

$\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(\kappa^\dagger)$, but $\mathscr{F} \underset{\text{mark}}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(\kappa^\dagger)$.

Proposition

$\mathscr{F} \underset{(k+2)\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ *if and only if* $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$.

Example

$\mathscr{F} \underset{\text{2-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(\omega_1^\dagger)$

What about for $\kappa > \omega_1$? As we'll see, this question may not be answerable in *ZFC*.

Example

$\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^{\dagger}\right)$, but $\mathscr{F} \underset{\text{mark}}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^{\dagger}\right)$.

Proposition

$\mathscr{F} \underset{(k+2)\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$.

Example

$\mathscr{F} \underset{\text{2-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}\left(\omega_1^{\dagger}\right)$

What about for $\kappa > \omega_1$? As we'll see, this question may not be answerable in *ZFC*.

Example

$\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^\dagger\right)$, but $\mathscr{F} \underset{\text{mark}}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^\dagger\right)$.

Proposition

$\mathscr{F} \underset{(k+2)\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$.

Example

$\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}\left(\omega_1^\dagger\right)$

What about for $\kappa > \omega_1$? As we'll see, this question may not be answerable in *ZFC*.

Example

$\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^\dagger\right)$, but $\mathscr{F} \underset{\text{mark}}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^\dagger\right)$.

Proposition

$\mathscr{F} \underset{(k+2)\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ if and only if $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$.

Example

$\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}\left(\omega_1^\dagger\right)$

What about for $\kappa > \omega_1$? As we'll see, this question may not be answerable in *ZFC*.

The game $Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^\dagger\right)$ essentially involves choosing countable and finite subsets of κ, such as in this game due to Scheepers [3]:

Game

Let $Sch_{C,F}^{\cup,\subset}(\kappa)$ denote Scheepers's *strict countable-finite game* in which each round $\mathscr{C}$ chooses $C_n \in [\kappa]^{\leq\omega}$ such that $C_n \supsetneq \bigcup_{i<n} C_i$, followed by $\mathscr{F}$ choosing $F_n \in [C_n]^{<\omega}$. $\mathscr{F}$ wins if $\bigcup_{n<\omega} F_n = \bigcup_{n<\omega} C_n$, and $\mathscr{C}$ wins otherwise.

$Sch^{\cup,\subseteq}_{C,F}(\kappa)$ is more restrictive than the Menger game, but this is easily remedied.

Game

Let $Sch^{\cap}_{C,F}(\kappa)$ denote the *intersection countable-finite game* in which each round $\mathscr{C}$ chooses $C_n \in [\kappa]^{\leq\omega}$, followed by $\mathscr{F}$ choosing $F_n \in [C_n]^{<\omega}$.
$\mathscr{F}$ wins if $\bigcup_{n<\omega} F_n \supseteq \bigcap_{n<\omega} C_n$, and $\mathscr{C}$ wins otherwise.

Theorem

$\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cap}_{C,F}(\kappa)$ if and only if $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(\kappa^{\dagger})$.

$Sch^{\cup,\subseteq}_{C,F}(\kappa)$ is more restrictive than the Menger game, but this is easily remedied.

Game

Let $Sch^{\cap}_{C,F}(\kappa)$ denote the *intersection countable-finite game* in which each round $\mathscr{C}$ chooses $C_n \in [\kappa]^{\leq\omega}$, followed by $\mathscr{F}$ choosing $F_n \in [C_n]^{<\omega}$.
$\mathscr{F}$ wins if $\bigcup_{n<\omega} F_n \supseteq \bigcap_{n<\omega} C_n$, and $\mathscr{C}$ wins otherwise.

Theorem

$\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cap}_{C,F}(\kappa)$ if and only if $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(\kappa^{\dagger})$.

Perhaps this game is too dissimilar to the original. One may prefer to investigate either of these variants as well:

Game

Let $Sch_{C,F}^{\cup,\subseteq}(\kappa)$ denote the *nonstrict countable-finite game* in which each round $\mathscr{C}$ chooses $C_n \in [\kappa]^{\leq\omega}$ such that $C_n \supseteq \bigcup_{i<n} C_i$, followed by $\mathscr{F}$ choosing $F_n \in [C_n]^{<\omega}$.
$\mathscr{F}$ wins if $\bigcup_{n<\omega} F_n \supseteq \bigcup_{n<\omega} C_n$, and $\mathscr{C}$ wins otherwise.

Game

Let $Sch_{C,F}^{1,\subseteq}(\kappa)$ denote the *initial countable-finite game* in which each round $\mathscr{C}$ chooses $C_n \in [\kappa]^{\leq\omega}$ such that $C_n \supseteq \bigcup_{i<n} C_i$, followed by $\mathscr{F}$ choosing $F_n \in [C_n]^{<\omega}$.
$\mathscr{F}$ wins if $\bigcup_{n<\omega} F_n \supseteq C_0$, and $\mathscr{C}$ wins otherwise.

Perhaps this game is too dissimilar to the original. One may prefer to investigate either of these variants as well:

Game

Let $Sch^{\cup,\subseteq}_{C,F}(\kappa)$ denote the *nonstrict countable-finite game* in which each round $\mathscr{C}$ chooses $C_n \in [\kappa]^{\leq\omega}$ such that $C_n \supseteq \bigcup_{i<n} C_i$, followed by $\mathscr{F}$ choosing $F_n \in [C_n]^{<\omega}$.
$\mathscr{F}$ wins if $\bigcup_{n<\omega} F_n \supseteq \bigcup_{n<\omega} C_n$, and $\mathscr{C}$ wins otherwise.

Game

Let $Sch^{1,\subseteq}_{C,F}(\kappa)$ denote the *initial countable-finite game* in which each round $\mathscr{C}$ chooses $C_n \in [\kappa]^{\leq\omega}$ such that $C_n \supseteq \bigcup_{i<n} C_i$, followed by $\mathscr{F}$ choosing $F_n \in [C_n]^{<\omega}$.
$\mathscr{F}$ wins if $\bigcup_{n<\omega} F_n \supseteq C_0$, and $\mathscr{C}$ wins otherwise.

Theorem

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^\dagger\right) \arrow[rr, leftrightarrow] \arrow[d] & & \mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cap}_{C,F}\left(\kappa\right) \arrow[d] \\
\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Sch^{1,\subseteq}_{C,F}\left(\kappa\right) \arrow[rr, leftrightarrow] & & \mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cup,\subseteq}_{C,F}\left(\kappa\right) \\
& \mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}tact}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cup,\subset}_{C,F}\left(\kappa\right) \arrow[ul] \arrow[ur] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Observe that there is no direct implication connecting $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^\dagger\right)$ and $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-tact}}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cup,\subset}_{C,F}\left(\kappa\right)$.

Theorem

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^{\dagger}\right) \arrow[rr, leftrightarrow] \arrow[d] & & \mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cap}_{C,F}\left(\kappa\right) \arrow[d] \\
\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Sch^{1,\subseteq}_{C,F}\left(\kappa\right) \arrow[rr, leftrightarrow] & & \mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cup,\subseteq}_{C,F}\left(\kappa\right) \\
& \mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}tact}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cup,\subseteq}_{C,F}\left(\kappa\right) \arrow[ul] \arrow[ur] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Observe that there is no direct implication connecting $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^{\dagger}\right)$ and $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-tact}}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cup,\subseteq}_{C,F}\left(\kappa\right)$.

The following was introduced by Scheepers to study k-tactics in his original countable-finite game.

Definition

For two functions f, g we say f is *almost compatible* with g ($f \|^* g$) if $|\{x \in \mathrm{dom}(f) \cap \mathrm{dom}(g) : f(x) \neq g(x)\}| < \omega$.

Definition

$S(\kappa)$ states that there exist functions $f_A : A \to \omega$ for each $A \in [\kappa]^{\leq\omega}$ such that $|\{\alpha \in A : f_A(\alpha) \leq n\}| < \omega$ for all $n < \omega$ and $f_A \|^* f_B$ for all $A, B \in [\kappa]^\omega$.

The following was introduced by Scheepers to study k-tactics in his original countable-finite game.

Definition

For two functions f, g we say f is *almost compatible* with g ($f\|^* g$) if $|\{x \in \mathrm{dom}(f) \cap \mathrm{dom}(g) : f(x) \neq g(x)\}| < \omega$.

Definition

$S(\kappa)$ states that there exist functions $f_A : A \to \omega$ for each $A \in [\kappa]^{\leq\omega}$ such that $|\{\alpha \in A : f_A(\alpha) \leq n\}| < \omega$ for all $n < \omega$ and $f_A\|^* f_B$ for all $A, B \in [\kappa]^\omega$.

The following was introduced by Scheepers to study k-tactics in his original countable-finite game.

Definition

For two functions f, g we say f is *almost compatible* with g ($f \|^* g$) if $|\{x \in \mathrm{dom}(f) \cap \mathrm{dom}(g) : f(x) \neq g(x)\}| < \omega$.

Definition

$S(\kappa)$ states that there exist functions $f_A : A \to \omega$ for each $A \in [\kappa]^{\leq\omega}$ such that $|\{\alpha \in A : f_A(\alpha) \leq n\}| < \omega$ for all $n < \omega$ and $f_A \|^* f_B$ for all $A, B \in [\kappa]^\omega$.

Proposition

$S(\omega_1)$.

Proposition

$\kappa > \mathfrak{c}$ implies $\neg S(\kappa)$.

Theorem

For any cardinal κ, ZFC $+ S(\kappa)$ is consistent.

Proposition

$S(\omega_1)$.

Proposition

$\kappa > \mathfrak{c}$ implies $\neg S(\kappa)$.

Theorem

For any cardinal κ, ZFC $+ S(\kappa)$ is consistent.

Proposition

$S(\omega_1)$.

Proposition

$\kappa > \mathfrak{c}$ implies $\neg S(\kappa)$.

Theorem

For any cardinal κ, ZFC $+$ $S(\kappa)$ is consistent.

Let $\mathfrak{z}$ be the supremum of cardinals κ where $S(\kappa)$.

Question

$S(\mathfrak{z})$?

Question

What is the relationship of $\mathfrak{z}$ to other small cardinals such as $\mathfrak{t}$, $\mathfrak{b}$, $\mathfrak{d}$, etc.?

Let $\mathfrak{z}$ be the supremum of cardinals κ where $S(\kappa)$.

Question

$S(\mathfrak{z})$?

Question

What is the relationship of $\mathfrak{z}$ to other small cardinals such as $\mathfrak{t}$, $\mathfrak{b}$, $\mathfrak{d}$, etc.?

Let $\mathfrak{z}$ be the supremum of cardinals κ where $S(\kappa)$.

Question

$S(\mathfrak{z})$?

Question

What is the relationship of $\mathfrak{z}$ to other small cardinals such as $\mathfrak{t}$, $\mathfrak{b}$, $\mathfrak{d}$, etc.?

Theorem

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
 & \mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^{\dagger}\right) \arrow[d] \arrow[rr, leftrightarrow] & & \mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cap}_{C,F}(\kappa) \arrow[d] \\
S(\kappa) \arrow[ur] \arrow[r] \arrow[drr] & \mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Sch^{1,\subseteq}_{C,F}(\kappa) \arrow[rr, leftrightarrow] & & \mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cup,\subseteq}_{C,F}(\kappa) \\
 & & \mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}tact}{\uparrow} Sch^{\cup,\subset}_{C,F}(\kappa) \arrow[ul] \arrow[ur] &
\end{tikzcd}
$$

Question

Should all the arrows be two-sided?

Theorem

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
 & \mathscr{F} \uparrow_{\text{2-mark}} Men_{C,F}\left(\kappa^\dagger\right) \arrow[d] \arrow[rr, leftrightarrow] & & \mathscr{F} \uparrow_{\text{2-mark}} Sch^{\cap}_{C,F}(\kappa) \arrow[d] \\
S(\kappa) \arrow[ur] \arrow[r] \arrow[drr] & \mathscr{F} \uparrow_{\text{2-mark}} Sch^{1,\subseteq}_{C,F}(\kappa) \arrow[rr, leftrightarrow] & & \mathscr{F} \uparrow_{\text{2-mark}} Sch^{\cup,\subseteq}_{C,F}(\kappa) \\
 & & \mathscr{F} \uparrow_{\text{2-tact}} Sch^{\cup,\subset}_{C,F}(\kappa) \arrow[ul] \arrow[ur] &
\end{tikzcd}
$$

Question

Should all the arrows be two-sided?

Definition

A space X is *robustly Menger* if there exist functions $r_{\mathcal{V}} : X \to \omega$ for each open cover $\mathcal{V}$ of X such that for all open covers $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ and numbers $n < \omega$, the following sets are finitely coverable by $\mathcal{V}$:

$$c(\mathcal{V}, n) = \{x \in X : r_{\mathcal{V}}(x) \leq n\}$$

$$p(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, n+1) = \{x \in X : n < r_{\mathcal{U}}(x) < r_{\mathcal{V}}(x)\}$$

Theorem

$\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ implies X is robustly Menger implies $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$.

Theorem

$S(\kappa)$ implies $\kappa^\dagger$ is robustly Menger.

Question

Does $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ imply X is robustly Menger?

Theorem

$\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ implies X is robustly Menger implies $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$.

Theorem

$S(\kappa)$ implies $\kappa^\dagger$ is robustly Menger.

Question

Does $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ imply X is robustly Menger?

Theorem

$\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ implies X is robustly Menger implies $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-}mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$.

Theorem

$S(\kappa)$ implies $\kappa^\dagger$ is robustly Menger.

Question

Does $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$ imply X is robustly Menger?

Example

Let $R_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be the real line with the basis generated by open intervals with or without the rationals removed.

Theorem

$R_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is second countable and $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(R_{\mathbb{Q}})$.

Corollary

$\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(R_{\mathbb{Q}})$, even though it isn't σ-compact.

Example

Let $R_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be the real line with the basis generated by open intervals with or without the rationals removed.

Theorem

$R_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is second countable and $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(R_{\mathbb{Q}})$.

Corollary

$\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(R_{\mathbb{Q}})$, even though it isn't σ-compact.

Example

Let R_ω be the real line with the basis generated by open intervals with any countable set removed.

Theorem

$\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(R_\omega)$, but $\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(R_\omega)$.

Theorem

$S(\mathfrak{c})$ *implies* R_ω *is robustly Menger.*

Question

Does there exist a space such that $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$ but X is not robustly Menger or $\mathscr{F} \underset{\text{2-mark}}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$?

Example

Let R_ω be the real line with the basis generated by open intervals with any countable set removed.

Theorem

$\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(R_\omega)$, *but* $\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(R_\omega)$.

Theorem

$S(\mathfrak{c})$ *implies* R_ω *is robustly Menger.*

Question

Does there exist a space such that $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$ but X is not robustly Menger or $\mathscr{F} \underset{\text{2-mark}}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$?

Example

Let R_ω be the real line with the basis generated by open intervals with any countable set removed.

Theorem

$\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(R_\omega)$, but $\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(R_\omega)$.

Theorem

$S(\mathfrak{c})$ implies R_ω is robustly Menger.

Question

Does there exist a space such that $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$ but X is not robustly Menger or $\mathscr{F} \underset{2\text{-mark}}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$?

Example

Let R_ω be the real line with the basis generated by open intervals with any countable set removed.

Theorem

$\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(R_\omega)$, but $\mathscr{F} \underset{mark}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(R_\omega)$.

Theorem

$S(\mathfrak{c})$ implies R_ω is robustly Menger.

Question

Does there exist a space such that $\mathscr{F} \uparrow Men_{C,F}(X)$ but X is not robustly Menger or $\mathscr{F} \underset{\text{2-mark}}{\not\uparrow} Men_{C,F}(X)$?

Witold Hurewicz.
Über eine Verallgemeinerung des Borelschen Theorems.
Math. Z., 24(1):401–421, 1926.

Arnold W. Miller and David H. Fremlin.
On some properties of Hurewicz, Menger, and Rothberger.
Fund. Math., 129(1):17–33, 1988.

Marion Scheepers.
Concerning *n*-tactics in the countable-finite game.
J. Symbolic Logic, 56(3):786–794, 1991.

Marion Scheepers.
A direct proof of a theorem of Telgársky.
Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 123(11):3483–3485, 1995.

Rastislav Telgársky.
On games of Topsøe.
Math. Scand., 54(1):170–176, 1984.

Questions?