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Approximation Simply Characterized
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Abstract

We provide a method for checking if a given auxiliary relation on a poset is the approximation relation on a domain.

*Keywords:* (continuous) domain, way-below relation, lower semicontinuous function

# Motivation

If (*P,* ±) is a partial order, then the *approximation* (called also the *way-below* relation) is defined for *x, y* ∈ *P* as *x* *y* if and only of for any directed subset *D* of *P* , if *y* ± ↑*D*, then *x* ± *d* for some *d* ∈ *D* ( ↑*D* denotes the supremum of *D*). The goal of this short paper is to give a simple method of recognizing the approximation relation in various concrete partial orders. Our results can be seen as a direct generalizations of these in [[2](#_bookmark2)] as much as we carry the proofs not only in the powerset lattice but in more general partial orders. It is often the case that approximation is characterized in terms of some interpolating family of elements, for example: if *X* is a set, then *A* *B* in the powerset P(*X*) iff *A* ⊆ *F* ⊆ *B* for some finite subset *F* of *X*. In this case finite subsets of *X* form the interpolating family and, moreover, they are a *basis* of P(*X*). (A subset *B* of a poset *P* is a basis of *P* if and only if every *x* ∈ *P* arises as the directed supremum of the set ↓*x* ∩ *B*,
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where ↓*x* = {*y* ∈ *P* | *y* *x*}.) In most cases, however, the interpolating family cannot serve as a basis, since its elements are of different type than the elements of the poset under investigation. For instance, if *X* is a locally compact topological space, then *x* *y* in the lattice of open sets O(*X*) if

and only if there is a compact subset *q* of *X* such that *x* ⊆ *q* ⊆ *y*. Our main results, in Section 2, allow to recognize when it is the case that existence of an auxiliary interpolating family characterizes the approximation relation. We claim that the methods proposed in this paper can simplify the task of proving that certain posets are domains. In Section 3 we give various examples supporting our claim.

We assume basic familiarity with the theory of domains. (A *domain* is a poset which has a basis in the sense defined above.) Our main reference to the subject is [[1](#_bookmark3)] and we adhere to the notation and terminology used in the book.

# Main results

In the paper *P* will denote a poset, *H, T* ⊆ *P* will be nonempty with *H* closed under directed suprema, and ≺ will be a binary relation on *P* satisfying:

* 1. ≺ refines ±,
  2. *a* ± *b* ≺ *c* ± *d* implies *a* ≺ *d*, for all *a, b, c, d* ∈ *P* ,
  3. for all *t* ∈ *T* , *h* ∈ *H*, *t* ≺ *h* implies *t* ≺ *h*' ≺ *t*' ≺ *h* for some *t*' ∈ *T* and

*h*' ∈ *H*.

Note that ≺ must be transitive by (i) and (ii). We will often call the property

(iii) “interpolation”.

Theorem 2.1 *Axioms* (1)-(2)*:*

1. *h* = ↑{*t* ∈ *T* | *t* ≺ *h*}*,*
2. *t* ≺ ↑{*hi* ∈ *H* | *i* ∈ *I*} *implies t* ≺ *hj for some j* ∈ *I*

*are equivalent to* (a)-(b)*:*

* 1. *h* = ↑{*h*' ∈ *H* | *h*' *H h*} *(i.e. H is a domain in the relative order),*
  2. *h* *H h*' *iff h* ≺ *t* ≺ *h*' *for some t* ∈ *T .*

Proof. Assume (1)-(2). For (b), suppose that *h* ≺ *t* ≺ *h*' for some *t* ∈ *T* and *h*' ± ↑*hi*, *i* ∈ *I*. By (iii), *t* ≺ ↑*hi* and thus *t* ≺ *hj* by (3), which implies *h* ≺ *hj*. This proves *h* *H h*'. Conversely, assume *h*1 *H h*2. By (1), *h*2 =

↑{*t* ∈ *T* | *t* ≺ *h*2}. By interpolation, *h*2 = ↑{*h* ∈ *H* | ∃*t* ∈ *T* (*h* ≺ *t* ≺ *h*2)}.

By assumption, *h*1 ± *h* ≺ *t* ≺ *h*2 for some *h* ∈ *H* and *t* ∈ *T* , which by (ii)

gives *h*1 ≺ *t* ≺ *h*2, as required. Note that (a) follows immediately from (1)

and (b).

Conversely, assume (a)-(b). Part (1) is clear (use interpolation). To see (2), suppose *t* ≺ ↑*hi*. Since *H* is closed under directed suprema, we can use interpolation to get *t* ≺ *h*' ≺ *t*' ≺ ↑*hi*. Hence *h*' *H* ↑*hi*, by (b). Therefore, there exists *j* ∈ *I* such that *t* ≺ *h*' ± *hj*. By (ii), *t* ≺ *hj* and (2) is now proved.

When *H* is a domain, denote by *H*ˆ (the Lawson dual of *H*).

the domain of Scott-open filters on *H*

Theorem 2.2 *Assume that H is a domain in the relative order from P and that T is closed under ﬁltered inﬁma. If we have for all h* ∈ *H, t* ∈ *T :*

1. *h* > *ti implies h* > *tj for some j* ∈ *I,*
2. *h*1*, h*2*,* > *t implies h*1*, h*2 ± *h* > *t for some h* ∈ *H,*
3. *t* = {*h* ∈ *H* | *h* > *t*}*.*

↓

*then:*

1. *H*ˆ *is isomorphic to T , the inverse isomorphism being*

*T* e *t* '→ {*h* ∈ *H* | *h* > *t*} ∈ *H*ˆ *,*

1. *T*ˆ *is isomorphic to H, the inverse isomorphism being*

*H* e *h* '→ {*t* ∈ *T* | *t* ≺ *h*} ∈ *T*ˆ*,*

1. *T is a domain in the dual to the relative order from P with the way-below characterized as follows: t* *T t*' *iff t*' ≺ *h* ≺ *t for some h* ∈ *H.*

Proof. For (c), let *F* ∈ *H*ˆ

and *h* ∈ *F* (*F* is nonempty as a filter). Consider

*GF* := {*t* ∈ *T* | *h*1 > *t* > *h*2 for *h*1*, h*2 ∈ *F* }. Since *F* is Scott-open in a domain *H*, there exists *h*' ∈ *F* with *h*' *H h*. Thus by (b), *h*' ≺ *t* ≺ *h* for some *t* ∈ *T* , which proves that *GF* is nonempty. Now, if *hi* ∈ *F* , *i* = 1*,* 2, then *hi* *H h*3 > *t* > *h*4 for some *t* ∈ *T* and *hj* ∈ *F* , *j* = 3*,* 4. This implies that *GF* is filtered and hence has an infimum, call it *tF* . Therefore, *h* > *tF* by -roundness of *F* and (b). We have proved that *h* ∈ *F* implies *h* > *tF* . To show the reverse implication, assume *h*' > *tF* for *h*' ∈ *F* . By (3), we have *h*' > *t* for some *t* ∈ *GF* . Therefore, *h*' > *t* > *h*2 for some *h*2 ∈ *H* by definition of *GF* . But this proves that *h*' ∈ *F* , as *F* is upper. We have shown that *h* ∈ *F*

iff *h* > *tF* . We conclude that the map *H*ˆ e *F* '→ *tF* injective. Clearly, it is

also monotone. To see surjectivity, fix *t* ∈ *T* and pick some filtered collection

{*ti*}*,i* ∈ *I* with infimum *t* (it is possible by (4),(5) and interpolation). Let

*Ft* := {*h* ∈ *H* | *h* > *t*}. Surely, *Ft* /= ∅ by (5). Fix a particular *h* ∈ *Ft*. Hence

*h* >

↓

*ti* and by (3), *h* > *tj* for some *j* ∈ *I*. Let {*hk*}*,k* ∈ *K* be the directed

subset of *H*-approximants of *h*. Since *h* =

↑*hk*, by (2) we have *hk* > *tj* for

some *k* ∈ *K*. Therefore, *t* =

↓ *ti* ± *tj* ≺ *hk*. That is, *hk* ∈ *Ft*, which proves

that *Ft* is Scott-open. Clearly, it is also upper. Next, if *h*1*, h*2 in *Ft*, then by

(4) and interpolation, there is some *h*3 ∈ *Ft* with *h*1*, h*2 > *h*3. We have shown that *Ft* is a filter, and hence the mapping is surjective. To see that the inverse mapping is well-defined, it remains to demonstrate that the filter *Ft* is defined in a unique way, that is, that different *t*’s give rise to distinct *Ft*’s. But this

is clear from the uniqueness of infima. Therefore, *H*ˆ is isomorphic to *T* . Part

(d) is now easy as it follows from Lawson-duality that *T*ˆ

=∼ *H*ˆ

=∼ *H*. The

isomorphism *H* ∼= *H*ˆ

is concretely given as *H* e *h* '→ {*F* ∈ *H*ˆ

| *h* ∈ *F* } ∈ *H*ˆ *.*

Using the equivalence *h* ∈ *Ft* iff *h* > *t* proved above, we can restate the isomorphism above as *H* e *h* '→ {*t* ∈ *T* | *t* ≺ *h*} ∈ *T*ˆ*.* Lastly, for (e), note that *T* is a domain, because it is isomorphic to *H*ˆ , which is a domain since *H* is. Suppose now that *t, t*' ∈ *T* with *t* *t*'. This is however equivalent to *Ft* *Ft*'

in *H*ˆ . By Theorem II-1.17 of [[1](#_bookmark3)], the last assertion is in turn equivalent to

*Ft* ⊆ ↑*h* for some *h* ∈ *Ft*' (that is, *t* ± *h* > *t*'). Using interpolation, this implies (and is implied) by *t* > *h* > *t*', as required.

# Corollaries

In the sequel, we will refer to numbering of properties and names of sets as used in Theorems [2.1](#_bookmark0) and [2.2](#_bookmark1).

Example 3.1 Setting *P* = (P(*X*)*,* ⊆) for any set *X*, *H* = P(*X*), *T* =

P*fin*(*X*) and ≺=⊆, we get by Theorem [2.1](#_bookmark0) that

*A* *B* iff ∃*F* ∈ P*fin*(*X*)*. A* ⊆ *F* ⊆ *B,*

for all *A, B* ∈ P(*X*).

Example 3.2 Let *P* = (*D,* ±) be a domain. Let *H* = *D*, ≺= and *T* be a basis of *D*. Then Theorem [2.1](#_bookmark0) amounts to a statement that *B* is dense in the way-below relation. On the other hand, if we choose *T* to be a subset dense in the way-below relation, then the Theorem gives that *T* is a basis for *D*.

Example 3.3 Let *H* be the collection of nonempty open sets of a topological space *X*, which is *T*0, locally compact, well-filtered (see Theorem II-1.21 of [[1](#_bookmark3)] for the definition) and such that the intersection of two nonempty compact saturated sets is compact. Let *P* = (P(*X*)*,* ⊆), ≺=⊆ and let *T* be the collec- tion of all nonempty compact saturated sets. Then (i)-(ii), (2) are trivial; (iii) and (1) follow from local compactness. Theorem [2.1](#_bookmark0) implies that (O(*X*)*,* ⊆)

is a continuous lattice with the way-below: *O*1 *O*2 iff *O*1 ⊆ *C* ⊆ *O*2 for some compact saturated subset *C* of *X*. Now, (3) is exactly well-filteredness;

(5) holds because the intersection of saturated compacta is compact and again by well-filteredness of *X*. Theorem [2.2](#_bookmark1) then implies that *T* is a domain with *C*1 *C*2 iff *C*2 ⊆ *O* ⊆ *C*1 for some *O* ∈ *H* and, more importantly, that *T* is isomorphic to the domain of Scott-open filters on O(*X*). The latter state- ment is nothing but the Hofmann-Mislove Theorem for locally compact sober spaces.

Example 3.4 Let *P* be the poset of all nonempty, convex, compact subsets of R*n* ordered by the inverse inclusion. Set *H* = *P* , ≺=⊇ and *T* ⊆ *H* be the collection of all polyhedra with rational coordinates. Then the hypothesis of Theorem [2.1](#_bookmark0) is satisfied and hence *P* is a domain with the way-below relation *K* *L* iff *L* ⊆ *R* ⊆ *K* for some polyhedron *R* ∈ *T* . In particular, we conclude that the set of all compact intervals with rational endpoints is a basis in IR.

Example 3.5 This result appears in [[1](#_bookmark3)] as a part of Proposition I-1.22.1. Let

*X* be a compact Hausdorff space. By LSC(*X,* R∗) we denote the complete lattice of all lower semicontinuous functions of type *X* → R∗, where R∗ is the extended real line. For any function *f* : *X* → R∗, its upper graph is a set *Gf* = {(*x, r*) ∈ *X* × R∗ | *r < f* (*x*)}. Note that it is an open subset of *X* × R∗ iff *f* ∈ LSC(*X,* R∗). Let *P* = (P(*X* × R∗)*,* ⊆), choose *H* to be the collection of upper graphs of functions from LSC(*X,* R∗) and let *T* be the family of all closures of elements of *H*. Take ≺=⊆. Properties (i)-(ii) are trivial.

Note that the three posets: LSC(*X,* R∗), graphs of lower semicontinuous maps under inclusion, and open subsets of *X* × R∗ with R∗-components of the form [−∞*, r*) for *r* ∈ R∗, are all isomorphic. Therefore, (iii) can be easily deduced from normality of *X* × R∗. Part (2) follows from compactness of *X* × R∗. Part (1) is a consequence of both normality and compactness of the space. By Theorem [2.1](#_bookmark0), we can then conclude that LSC(*X,* R∗) is a continuous lattice with *f* *g* iff cl(*Gf* ) ⊆ *Gg*.
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