



## Some characterizations of $\beta$ -paracompactness in ideal topological space

E. D. Yıldırım<sup>1</sup>, O. B. Özbakır<sup>2,\*</sup> and A.Ç. Güler<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Letters, Yaşar University, İzmir, Turkey*

<sup>2</sup> *Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Ege University, İzmir, Turkey*

---

**Abstract.** In this paper, we introduce  $\beta$ -paracompactness with respect to an ideal ( $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompactness) as a weak form of  $\beta$ -paracompactness and  $I$ -paracompactness. We give some relations between this concept and some other types of paracompactness, and also we study some of its fundamental properties.

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classifications:** 54D20, 54A05, 54C10, 54G05

**Key Words and Phrases:**  $\beta$ -paracompact, ideal,  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact,  $\sigma$ - $\beta$ -locally finite

---

### 1. Introduction

Paracompactness is one of the important concepts of general topology. In literature, different kinds of generalized paracompactness such as  $S$ -paracompactness [5],  $P_3$ -paracompactness [6] and  $\beta$ -paracompactness [11] are studied.

The concept of  $I$ -paracompactness as generalization of paracompactness was given by Zahid [24]. Furthermore, this concept was studied by Hamlet et al. [13] and Sathiyasundari and Renukadevi [22]. Recently,  $S$ -paracompactness with respect to an ideal which is weaker form of  $I$ -paracompactness was studied by J. Sanabria et al. [21].

Here, we introduce  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompactness and we compare this concept with the other types of paracompactness. Then, we give counterexamples showing that the opposite directions of Proposition 1 and 2 do not hold. Furthermore, adding some conditions, we find that the reverse directions may happen to be true. Besides, we investigate some of its essential properties. Finally, we examine  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompactness under some functions.

---

\*Corresponding author.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29020/nybg.ejpam.v12i2.3394>

Email addresses: [esra.dalan@yasar.edu.tr](mailto:esra.dalan@yasar.edu.tr) (E. D. Yıldırım),

[oya.ozbakir@ege.edu.tr](mailto:oya.ozbakir@ege.edu.tr) (O. B. Özbakır), [aysegul.caksu.guler@ege.edu.tr](mailto:aysegul.caksu.guler@ege.edu.tr) (A.Ç. Güler)

## 2. Preliminaries

Throughout this work,  $(X, \tau)$  denotes a topological space on which no separation axioms are assumed unless clearly indicated. If  $A$  is a subset of  $(X, \tau)$ , then the closure of  $A$  and the interior of  $A$  will be denoted by  $cl(A)$  and  $int(A)$ , respectively. Also, the class of all subsets of  $X$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . A subset  $A$  of  $(X, \tau)$  is said to be semi-open [16] if there exists  $U \in \tau$  such that  $U \subseteq A \subseteq cl(U)$ . This is equivalent to say that  $A \subseteq cl(int(A))$ . Also,  $A$  is said to be  $\beta$ -open [1] (preopen [18]) if  $A \subseteq cl(int(cl(A)))(A \subseteq int(cl(A)))$ . The concept of  $\beta$ -open sets is equal to that of semi-preopen sets in [7]. The family of all semi-open (resp.  $\beta$ -open and preopen) sets of  $(X, \tau)$  is denoted by  $SO(X, \tau)$  (resp.  $\beta O(X, \tau)$  and  $PO(X, \tau)$ ). The complement of a semi-open (resp.  $\beta$ -open and preopen) set is said to be semi-closed [10] (resp.  $\beta$ -closed [1, 7] and preclosed [18]). The semi-closure [10] (resp.  $\beta$ -closure [3, 7] and preclosure[18]) of  $A$ , denoted by  $scl(A)$  (resp.  $\beta cl(A)$  and  $pcl(A)$ ), is the intersection of all semi-closed (resp.  $\beta$ -closed and preclosed) sets containing  $A$ . Note that,  $\beta cl(A)$  is  $\beta$ -closed [3, 7].

**Lemma 1.** [3, 7] *For a subset  $A$  of a topological space  $(X, \tau)$ , the following conditions hold:*

- (i)  $x \in \beta cl(A)$  if and only if  $A \cap U \neq \emptyset$  for every  $U \in \beta O(X, \tau)$  containing  $x$ ,
- (ii)  $A$  is  $\beta$ -closed if and only if  $A = \beta cl(A)$ .

**Theorem 1.** [19] *Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a space,  $A \subseteq Y \subseteq X$  and  $Y$  be  $\beta$ -open in  $(X, \tau)$ . Then  $A$  is  $\beta$ -open in  $(X, \tau)$  if and only if  $A$  is  $\beta$ -open in the subspace  $(Y, \tau_Y)$ .*

A function  $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$  is said to be pre  $\beta$ -closed [17] (pre  $\beta$ -open [17]) if for every  $\beta$ -closed ( $\beta$ -open) set  $A$  of  $(X, \tau)$ ,  $f(A)$  is  $\beta$ -closed ( $\beta$ -open) in  $(Y, \sigma)$  and  $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$  is said to be  $\beta$ -irresolute [17] if for every  $\beta$ -open set  $B$  of  $(Y, \sigma)$ ,  $f^{-1}(B)$  is  $\beta$ -open in  $(X, \tau)$ . If  $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$  is continuous and open, then  $f$  is  $\beta$ -irresolute and pre  $\beta$ -open.

**Lemma 2.** [11] *Let  $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$  be a surjective function. Then  $f$  is pre  $\beta$ -closed if and only if for every  $y \in Y$  and every  $\beta$ -open set  $U$  in  $(X, \tau)$  which contains  $f^{-1}(y)$ , there exists a  $V \in \beta O(Y, \sigma)$  such that  $y \in V$  and  $f^{-1}(V) \subseteq U$ .*

A space  $(X, \tau)$  is called extremally disconnected[23](briefly, e. d.) if the closure of every open set in  $X$  is open and called submaximal [8] if each dense subset of  $X$  is open in  $X$ .

**Lemma 3.** [20]  *$(X, \tau)$  is submaximal if and only if every pre-open set is open.*

**Lemma 4.** [9]  *$(X, \tau)$  is e.d. if and only if every  $\beta$ -open set is pre-open.*

A collection  $\mathcal{V}$  of subsets of a space  $(X, \tau)$  is said to be locally finite [23](resp. s-locally finite [4],  $\beta$ -locally finite [11] and  $p$ -locally finite[6]), if for each  $x \in X$  there exists  $U_x \in \tau$  (resp.  $U_x \in SO(X, \tau)$ ,  $U_x \in \beta O(X, \tau)$  and  $U_x \in PO(X, \tau)$ ) containing  $x$  and  $U_x$  intersects at most finitely many members of  $\mathcal{V}$ . Every locally finite collection of subsets of a space

$(X, \tau)$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite[11] and  $p$ -locally finite[6]. Also, a collection  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of a space  $(X, \tau)$  is said to be  $\sigma$ -locally finite if  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_n$  where each  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is locally finite family [13].

**Theorem 2.** [11] *Let  $(X, \tau)$  be an e.d. submaximal space. Then every  $\beta$ -locally finite collection of subsets of  $X$  is locally finite.*

A space  $(X, \tau)$  is said to be  $\beta$ -compact [2] if every cover of  $X$  by  $\beta$ -open sets has a finite subcover. Also a space  $(X, \tau)$  is said to be paracompact [23] (resp.  $S$ -paracompact [5],  $\beta$ -paracompact [11] and  $P_3$ -paracompact [6]), if every open cover of  $X$  has a locally finite open (resp. locally finite semi-open,  $\beta$ -locally finite  $\beta$ -open and  $p$ -locally finite preopen) refinement which covers to  $X$ .

An ideal is defined as a nonempty collection  $I$  of subsets of  $X$  satisfying the following two conditions:

- (1) If  $A \in I$  and  $B \subseteq A$ , then  $B \in I$ ,
- (2) If  $A \in I$  and  $B \in I$ , then  $A \cup B \in I$ .

Given a topological space  $(X, \tau)$  with an ideal  $I$  on  $X$  and if  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is the set of all subsets of  $X$ , a set operator  $(\cdot)^* : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ , called a local function [15] of  $A$  with respect to  $\tau$  and  $I$  is defined as follows: for  $A \subseteq X$ ,  $A^*(I, \tau) = \{x \in X : V \cap A \notin I \text{ for every } V \in \tau(x)\}$  where  $\tau(x) = \{V \in \tau : x \in V\}$ . A Kuratowski closure operator  $cl^*(\cdot)$  for a topology  $\tau^*(I, \tau)$ , called the  $*$ -topology, finer than  $\tau$ , is defined by  $cl^*(A) = A \cup A^*(I, \tau)$  [14]. A basis  $\beta(I, \tau)$  for  $\tau^*(I, \tau)$  can be described as follows:  $\beta(I, \tau) = \{V - J : V \in \tau \text{ and } J \in I\}$ [14]. We will simply write  $A^*$  for  $A^*(I, \tau)$ ,  $\tau^*$  or  $\tau^*(I)$  for  $\tau^*(I, \tau)$  and  $\beta$  for  $\beta(I, \tau)$ . If  $I$  is an ideal on  $X$ , then  $(X, \tau, I)$  is called an ideal topological space.

A space  $(X, \tau, I)$  is said to be  $I$ -paracompact [24] ( $I$ - $S$ -paracompact [21]) if every open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  has a locally finite open (semi-open) refinement  $\mathcal{V}$ , not necessarily a cover, such that  $X - \bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}\} \in I$ . A collection  $\mathcal{V}$  of subsets of  $X$  such that  $X - \bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}\} \in I$  is called an  $I$ -cover [24] of  $X$ . A space  $(X, \tau, I)$  is said to be  $I$ -regular[12] if for each closed set  $F$  and a point  $p \notin F$ , there exist disjoint open sets  $U$  and  $V$  such that  $p \in U$  and  $F - V \in I$ .

### 3. $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompactness

**Definition 1.** *A space  $(X, \tau, I)$  is said to be  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact or  $\beta$ -paracompact with respect to  $I$  if every open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  has a  $\beta$ -locally finite  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{V}$  (not necessarily a cover) such that  $X - \bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}\} \in I$ .*

*A subset  $A$  of a space  $(X, \tau, I)$  is called an  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact set in  $(X, \tau, I)$  if every open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $A$  has a  $\beta$ -locally finite (with respect to  $\tau$ )  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{V}$  such that  $A - \bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}\} \in I$ .*

**Proposition 1.** *If  $(X, \tau)$  is  $\beta$ -paracompact, then  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact.*

*Proof.* It is obvious since  $\emptyset \in I$ .

Obviously, every compact space is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact since every compact space is  $\beta$ -paracompact [11].

The following example shows that the converse of Proposition 1 may not be true, in general.

**Example 1.** Let  $X = \mathbb{N}$  be the set of natural numbers with the topology  $\tau = \{G \subseteq \mathbb{N} : 5 \in G\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$  and the ideal  $I = \{U \subseteq \mathbb{N} : 5 \notin U\}$ . Observe that  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact space but  $(X, \tau)$  is not  $\beta$ -paracompact since the collection  $\{\{5, x\} : x \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is an open cover of  $X$  which admits no  $\beta$ -locally finite  $\beta$ -open refinement in  $X$ .

**Remark 1.**

(1) If  $I = \{\emptyset\}$ , then  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact if and only if  $(X, \tau)$  is  $\beta$ -paracompact.

(2) If  $I = \{\emptyset\}$  and  $(X, \tau, I)$  is an e.d. space, then  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact if and only if  $(X, \tau)$  is  $P_3$ -paracompact.

**Proposition 2.** If  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ -S-paracompact then it is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact.

*Proof.* Since every locally finite collection of subsets of  $X$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite and every semi-open set is  $\beta$ -open, it is clear.

Clearly, every S-paracompact space is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact since every S-paracompact space is  $I$ -S-paracompact[21]. Also, every  $I$ -paracompact space is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact since every  $I$ -paracompact space is  $I$ -S-paracompact[21].

The following example shows that the converse of Proposition 2 may not be true, in general.

**Example 2.** Let  $X = [0, 2] \cup [3, 10]$  with the topology  $\tau = \{U \subseteq X : [0, 2] \subseteq U\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$  and the ideal  $I = \{A : A \subseteq [0, 2]\}$ . Then  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact since every open cover of  $X$  has  $\beta$ -locally finite  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{V} = \{\{x\} : x \in [0, 2]\} \cup \{\{y, z\} : y \in [0, 2], z \in [3, 10]\}$  such that  $X - \bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}\} \in I$ . But it is not  $I$ -S-paracompact since  $\tau = SO(X)$ .

**Theorem 3.** If  $(X, \tau, I)$  is an e.d. submaximal  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact space, then it is  $I$ -S-paracompact.

*Proof.* It is obvious from Lemma 3, Lemma 4 and Theorem 2.

**Theorem 4.** If  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact and  $J$  is an ideal on  $X$  with  $I \subseteq J$ , then  $(X, \tau, J)$  is  $J$ - $\beta$ -paracompact.

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \tau, I)$  be  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact and  $I \subseteq J$ . And let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  be an open cover of  $X$ . Since  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact,  $\mathcal{U}$  has a  $\beta$ -locally finite  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{V}$  such that  $X - \bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}\} \in I$ . Since  $I \subseteq J$ ,  $X - \bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}\} \in J$ . Thus,  $(X, \tau, J)$  is  $J$ - $\beta$ -paracompact.

**Lemma 5.** [11] Let  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  be a collection of subsets of a space  $(X, \tau)$ .  $\mathcal{V}$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite if and only if  $\{\beta cl(V_\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite.

**Lemma 6.** *If a cover  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  of a space  $(X, \tau, I)$  has a  $\beta$ -locally finite  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{V}$  such that  $X - \bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}\} \in I$  then there exists a  $\beta$ -locally finite precise  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{H} = \{H_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  such that  $X - \bigcup\{H_\lambda : H_\lambda \in \mathcal{H}\} \in I$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Lemma 1.3 in [21].

**Definition 2.** *A collection  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of a space  $(X, \tau)$  is said to be  $\sigma$ - $\beta$ -locally finite if  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_n$  where each collection  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is a  $\beta$ -locally finite family.*

**Lemma 7.** *Every  $\beta$ -locally finite collection of subsets of a space  $(X, \tau)$  is  $\sigma$ - $\beta$ -locally finite.*

*Proof.* It is obvious.

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a regular space. If  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact, then every open cover of  $X$  has a  $\beta$ -closed  $\beta$ -locally finite  $I$ -cover refinement.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be an open cover of  $X$ . By regularity of  $X$ , for each  $x \in X$  and  $U_x \in \mathcal{U}$  containing  $x$ , there exists an open set  $G_x$  of  $x$  such that  $cl(G_x) \subseteq U_x$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}_1 = \{G_x : x \in X\}$  is an open cover of  $X$ . Since  $X$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact,  $\mathcal{U}_1$  has  $\beta$ -locally finite  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{V}_1 = \{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  such that  $X - \bigcup\{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \in I$ . Then  $X - \bigcup\{\beta cl(V_\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \in I$ . By Lemma 5,  $\mathcal{V} = \{\beta cl(V_\lambda) : V_\lambda \in \mathcal{V}_1\}$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite. Since  $\mathcal{V}_1$  refines  $\mathcal{U}_1$ , for every  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , there is some  $G_x \in \mathcal{U}_1$  such that  $V_\lambda \subseteq G_x$ . Then  $\beta cl(V_\lambda) \subseteq cl(V_\lambda) \subseteq cl(G_x)$  implies  $\beta cl(V_\lambda) \subseteq U_x$ . Hence  $\mathcal{V}$  refines  $\mathcal{U}$ . So,  $\mathcal{V} = \{\beta cl(V_\lambda) : V_\lambda \in \mathcal{V}_1\}$  is  $\beta$ -closed  $\beta$ -locally finite  $I$ -cover refinement.

**Remark 2.** *If  $(X, \tau, I)$  is considered to be e.d. submaximal regular space, then the Theorem 5 becomes the Theorem 2.20 in [22].*

**Theorem 6.** *If  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact, then every open cover of  $X$  has a  $\beta$ -open  $\sigma$ - $\beta$ -locally finite  $I$ -cover refinement.*

*Proof.* It is obvious by Lemma 7.

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $(X, \tau, I)$  be a regular space and  $\beta O(X, \tau)$  be closed under finite intersection. Then,  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact if and only if every open cover of  $X$  has a  $\beta$ -open  $\sigma$ - $\beta$ -locally finite  $I$ -cover refinement.*

*Proof.* To show sufficiency, let  $\mathcal{U}$  be an open cover of  $X$ . By hypothesis, there exists a  $\sigma$ - $\beta$ -locally finite  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  such that  $X - \bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}\} \in I$ . Also,  $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}_n$  where each collection  $\mathcal{V}_n$  is a  $\beta$ -locally finite. For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $H_n = \bigcup\{V : V \in \mathcal{V}_n\}$  so that  $X - \bigcup\{H_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \in I$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $G_n = H_n - \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} H_i$ . Then  $\{G_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  refines  $\{H_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Let  $x \in X$ , and let  $n$  be the smallest member of  $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : x \in H_n\}$ . Then  $x \in G_n$  and  $X - \bigcup\{G_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \in I$ . Also,  $G_{nx}$  is a  $\beta$ -open set containing  $x$  that intersects only finite family number of members of  $G_n$  so

that  $\{G_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite. Let  $\mathcal{O} = \{V \cap G_n : V \in \mathcal{V}_n \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Since  $\{G_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite,  $\mathcal{O}$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite. Also, since  $\beta\mathcal{O}(X, \tau)$  is closed under finite intersection and  $\mathcal{V}$  is  $\beta$ -open refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ ,  $\mathcal{O}$  is  $\beta$ -open refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ . Then,  $X - \bigcup\{V \cap G_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \in I$  because  $X - \bigcup\{G_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \in I$ . Thus,  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact.

**Remark 3.** *If  $(X, \tau, I)$  is considered to be e.d. submaximal regular space, then Theorem 7 becomes Theorem 2.22 in [22].*

**Theorem 8.** *For any ideal topological space  $(X, \tau, I)$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *For every closed subset  $A$  of  $X$  and every  $x \notin A$ , there exist disjoint  $\beta$ -open sets  $U$  and  $V$  such that  $x \in U$  and  $A - V \in I$ .*
- (ii) *For every open subset  $G$  of  $X$  and every  $x \in G$ , there exists a  $\beta$ -open set  $U$  such that  $x \in U$  and  $\beta\text{cl}(U) - G \in I$ .*

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) Let  $G \subseteq X$  be open and  $x \in G$ . Then  $X - G = A$  is closed and  $x \notin A$ . From (i), there exist disjoint  $\beta$ -open sets  $U$  and  $V$  such that  $x \in U$  and  $A - V \in I$ . Since  $U$  and  $V$  are disjoint, we have  $\beta\text{cl}(U) \subseteq X - V$ . Thus,  $A \cap \beta\text{cl}(U) \subseteq A - V$ . Then,  $\beta\text{cl}(U) \cap (X - G) \in I$ . Therefore,  $\beta\text{cl}(U) - G \in I$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) Let  $A \subseteq X$  be closed and  $x \notin A$ . Then,  $X - A = G$  is open and  $x \in G$ . From (ii), there exists a  $\beta$ -open set  $U$  such that  $x \in U$  and  $\beta\text{cl}(U) - G \in I$ . Thus,  $X - \beta\text{cl}(U) = V \in \beta\mathcal{O}(X)$  and  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ . Furthermore,  $A - V = (X - G) - (X - \beta\text{cl}(U)) = \beta\text{cl}(U) - G \in I$ .

The following example reveals that for a locally finite collection of subsets of  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  of a space  $(X, \tau)$ , the equality  $\text{cl}(\bigcup\{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}) = \bigcup\{\text{cl}(V_\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  always holds whereas for  $\beta$ -locally finite collection of subsets  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  of a space  $(X, \tau)$ , the equality  $\beta\text{cl}(\bigcup\{U_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}) = \bigcup\{\beta\text{cl}(U_\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  does not hold in general.

**Example 3.** *Consider the real number  $\mathbb{R}$  with usual topology  $\tau$ . Let  $\mathcal{V} = \{[0, 1), (1, 2]\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{V}$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite in  $(\mathbb{R}, \tau)$  since it is finite. But  $\beta\text{cl}([0, 1) \cup (1, 2]) \neq \beta\text{cl}([0, 1)) \cup \beta\text{cl}((1, 2])$ .*

**Theorem 9.** *Suppose that for a  $\beta$ -locally finite collection of subsets  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  of a space  $(X, \tau, I)$ , the equality  $\beta\text{cl}(\bigcup\{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}) = \bigcup\{\beta\text{cl}(V_\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  holds. If  $(X, \tau, I)$  is Hausdorff  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact, then for every closed subset  $A$  of  $X$  and every  $x \notin A$ , there exist disjoint  $\beta$ -open sets  $U$  and  $V$  such that  $x \in U$  and  $A - V \in I$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \subseteq X$  closed and  $x \notin A$ . Since  $X$  is Hausdorff space, there exists an open set  $H_y$  containing  $y$  for each  $y \in A$  such that  $x \notin \text{cl}(H_y)$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{H} = \{H_y : y \in A\} \cup \{X - A\}$  is an open cover of  $X$ . By hypothesis and Lemma 6,  $\mathcal{H}$  has a  $\beta$ -locally finite precise  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{W} = \{W_y : y \in A\} \cup \{G\}$  such that  $W_y \subseteq H_y$  for each  $y \in A$ ,  $G \subseteq X - A$  and  $X - (\bigcup\{W_y : y \in A\} \cup \{G\}) \in I$ . Since  $A - (\bigcup\{W_y : y \in A\}) = A - (\bigcup\{W_y : y \in A\} \cup \{G\}) \subseteq X - (\bigcup\{W_y : y \in A\} \cup \{G\})$ , we have  $A - (\bigcup\{W_y : y \in A\}) \in I$ . Let

we say  $V = \bigcup\{W_y : y \in A\}$ . Then,  $V$  is  $\beta$ -open set in  $X$  and  $A - V \in I$ . Since  $x \notin cl(H_y)$ , we have  $x \notin cl(W_y)$ . This implies that  $x \notin \beta cl(W_y)$ . Since  $\mathcal{W}$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite,  $\beta cl(V) = \beta cl(\bigcup\{W_y : y \in A\}) = \bigcup\{\beta cl(W_y) : y \in A\}$  by hypothesis. Thus, for a  $\beta$ -open set  $U = X - \beta cl(V)$ , we have  $U \cap V = \emptyset$  such that  $x \in U$ .

From Theorem 8 and Theorem 9, we have the following Corollary.

**Corollary 1.** *If  $(X, \tau, I)$  is an e.d. submaximal Hausdorff  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact space, then  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ -regular.*

**Theorem 10.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be subsets in ideal topological space  $(X, \tau, I)$ . If  $A$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact set in  $X$  and  $B$  is closed in  $X$ , then  $A \cap B$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact set in  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  be an open cover of  $A \cap B$ . Since  $X - B$  is open in  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{U}' = \{U_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \cup \{X - B\}$  is open cover of  $A$ . By hypothesis and Lemma 6,  $\mathcal{U}'$  has a  $\beta$ -locally finite precise  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \cup \{V\}$  such that  $V_\lambda \subseteq U_\lambda$  for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $V \subseteq X - B$  and  $A - (\bigcup\{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \cup \{V\}) \in I$ . Since  $(A \cap B) - (\bigcup\{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}) = (A \cap B) - (\bigcup\{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \cup \{V\}) \subseteq A - (\bigcup\{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \cup \{V\})$ , we have  $(A \cap B) - (\bigcup\{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}) \in I$ . Hence,  $A \cap B$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact set in  $X$ .

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $(X, \tau, I)$  be an  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact space and  $A \subseteq X$ . If  $A$  is closed in  $X$ , then  $A$  is an  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact set in  $X$ .*

**Lemma 8.** [13] *If  $I \neq \emptyset$  is an ideal on  $X$  and  $Y$  is a subset of  $X$ , then  $I_Y = \{Y \cap G \mid G \in I\} = \{G \in I \mid G \subseteq Y\}$  is an ideal on  $Y$ .*

**Theorem 11.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be subsets in ideal topological space  $(X, \tau, I)$  such that  $B \subseteq A$ . If  $A$  is  $\beta$ -open in  $X$  and  $B$  is an  $I_A$ - $\beta$ -paracompact set in  $A$  then  $B$  is an  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact set in  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  be an open cover of  $B$  in  $X$ . Then,  $\mathcal{U}_B = \{U_\lambda \cap A : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  is an open cover of  $B$  in  $A$ . Since  $B$  is an  $I_A$ - $\beta$ -paracompact set in  $A$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_B$  has a  $\beta$ -locally finite precise  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{V}_B$  in  $A$  such that  $B - \bigcup\{V_\lambda : V_\lambda \in \mathcal{V}_B\} \in I_A$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{V}_B$  is a  $\beta$ -locally finite precise  $\beta$ -open refinement in  $X$  by Theorem 1. Also,  $B - \bigcup\{V_\lambda : V_\lambda \in \mathcal{V}_B\} \in I$ . Hence,  $B$  is an  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact set in  $X$ .

**Theorem 12.** *Let  $f : (X, \tau, I) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma, J)$  be a continuous, open and pre  $\beta$ -closed surjection with  $f^{-1}(y)$   $\beta$ -compact for every  $y \in Y$  and  $f(I) \subseteq J$ . If  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact, then  $(Y, \sigma, J)$  is  $J$ - $\beta$ -paracompact.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  be an open cover of  $Y$ . Then,  $\{f^{-1}(U_\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  is an open cover of  $X$ . Since  $(X, \tau, I)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact, this open cover has a  $\beta$ -locally finite precise  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  such that  $X - \bigcup\{V_\lambda : V_\lambda \in \mathcal{V}\} \in I$ . Since  $f$  is pre  $\beta$ -open,  $f(\mathcal{V}) = \{f(V_\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  is a precise  $\beta$ -open refinement of  $\mathcal{U}$ . Also,  $Y - \bigcup\{f(V_\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \in J$ . Now, let we prove that  $f(\mathcal{V})$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite. Let  $y \in Y$ . Since  $\mathcal{V}$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite, for  $x \in f^{-1}(y)$ , there exists a  $\beta$ -open set  $G_x$  containing  $x$  such that  $G_x$  intersects at most finitely members of  $\mathcal{V}$ . Since  $f^{-1}(y)$  is  $\beta$ -compact,  $\{G_x : x \in$

$f^{-1}(y)\}$  has a finite subcollection  $H_y$  such that  $f^{-1}(y) \subseteq \bigcup H_y$  and  $\bigcup H_y$  intersects at most finitely members of  $\mathcal{V}$ . By Lemma 2, there exists a  $\beta$ -open set  $W_y$  containing  $y$  such that  $f^{-1}(W_y) \subseteq \bigcup H_y$ . Then,  $f^{-1}(W_y)$  intersects at most finitely members of  $\mathcal{V}$ . This implies that  $W_y$  intersects at most finitely members of  $f(\mathcal{V})$ . Hence,  $f(\mathcal{V})$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite in  $Y$ . So,  $(Y, \sigma, J)$  is  $J$ - $\beta$ -paracompact.

**Theorem 13.** Let  $f : (X, \tau, I) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma, J)$  be an open,  $\beta$ -irresolute bijective mapping and  $I = f^{-1}(J)$ . If  $A$  is  $J$ - $\beta$ -paracompact in  $Y$ , then  $f^{-1}(A)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact in  $X$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  be an open cover of  $f^{-1}(A)$ . Since  $f$  is open,  $\mathcal{U}_1 = \{f(U_\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  is an open cover of  $A$ . By hypothesis, this open cover has a  $\beta$ -locally finite precise  $\beta$ -open refinement  $\mathcal{V}_1 = \{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  such that  $A - \bigcup \{V_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \in J$ . Then,  $f^{-1}(A) - \bigcup \{f^{-1}(V_\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \in f^{-1}(J) = I$ . Since  $f$  is  $\beta$ -irresolute,  $\mathcal{V} = \{f^{-1}(V_\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  is  $\beta$ -locally finite  $\beta$ -open. Let  $f^{-1}(V_\lambda) \in \mathcal{V}$ . Since  $\mathcal{V}_1$  refines  $\mathcal{U}_1$ , there exists  $f(U_\lambda) \in \mathcal{U}_1$  such that  $V_\lambda \subseteq f(U_\lambda)$ . Then  $f^{-1}(V_\lambda) \subseteq f^{-1}(f(U_\lambda)) = U_\lambda$ . Hence  $\mathcal{V}$  refines  $\mathcal{U}$ . Therefore  $f^{-1}(A)$  is  $I$ - $\beta$ -paracompact in  $X$ .

### Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the referees for their helpful suggestions.

### References

- [1] Abd El-Monsef, M. E., El-Deeb, S. N. and Mahmoud, R. A.  $\beta$ -open sets and  $\beta$ -continuous mapping, Bull. Fac. Sci. Assiut Univ. **12**, 77-90, 1983.
- [2] Abd El-Monsef, M. E. and Kozae, A. M. Some generalized forms of compactness and closedness, Delta J. Sci. **9**, 257-269, 1985.
- [3] Abd El-Monsef, M. E., Mahmoud, R. A. and Lashin, E. R.  $\beta$ -closure and  $\beta$ -interior, J. Fac. Ed. Ain Shams Univ. **10**, 235-245, 1986.
- [4] Al-Zoubi, K. Y.  $s$ -expandable spaces, Acta Math. Hungar **102**(3), 203-212, 2004.
- [5] Al-Zoubi, K. Y.  $S$ -paracompact spaces, Acta Math. Hungar **110**(1-2), 165-174, 2006.
- [6] Al-Zoubi, K. and Al-Ghour, S. On  $P_3$ -paracompact spaces, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. **2007**, 1-16, 2007.
- [7] Andrijević, D. Semipreopen sets, Mat. Vesnik **38**, 24-32, 1986.
- [8] Bourbaki, N. General topology, Part I., Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass. 1966.
- [9] Cao, J., Ganster, M. and Reilly, I. Submaximality, extremal disconnectedness and generalized closed sets, Houston Journal of Mathematics **24**(4), 681-688, 1998.



- [10] Crossely, S. G. *Semi-closed and semi-continuity in topological spaces*, Texas J. Sci. **22**, 123-126, 1971.
- [11] Demir, I. and Ozbakir, O. B. *On  $\beta$ -paracompact spaces*, Filomat **27:6**, 971-976, 2013.
- [12] Hamlet, T. R. and Janković, D. *On weaker forms of paracompactness, countable compactness, and Lindelöfness*, Ann. New York Acad. Sci., **728**, 41- 49, 1994.
- [13] Hamlet, T. R., Rose, D. and Janković, D. *Paracompactness with respect to an ideal*, Internat. J. Math. and Math. Sci. **20(3)**, 433-442, 1997.
- [14] Janković, D. and Hamlett, T. R. *New topologies from old via ideals*, Amer. Math. Monthly **97**, 295-310, 1990.
- [15] Kuratowski, K. *Topologie I*, Warszawa 1933.
- [16] Levine, N. *Semi-open sets and semi-continuity in topological spaces*, Amer. Math. Monthly **70**, 36-41, 1963.
- [17] Mahmoud, R. A. and Abd El-Monsef, M. E.  *$\beta$ -irresolute and  $\beta$ -topological invariant*, Proc. Pakistan Acad. Sci. **27**, 285- 296, 1990.
- [18] Mashhour, A.S., Abd El-Monsef, M. E. and El-Deeb, S. N. *On precontinuous and weak precontinuous mappings*, Proc. Math. and Phys. Soc. Egypt **51**, 47-53, 1981.
- [19] Navalagi, G. B. *Semi-precontinuous functions and properties of generalized preclosed sets in topological spaces*, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. **29**, 85-98, 2002.
- [20] Reilly, I. L. and Vamanamurthy, M. K. *On some questions concerning preopen sets*, Kyungpook Math. J. **30**, 87-93, 1990.
- [21] Sanabria, J., Rosas, E., Carpintero, C. , Salas-Brown, M. and García, O. *S-paracompactness in ideal topological spaces*, Mat. Vesnik **68(3)**, 192- 203, 2016.
- [22] Sathiyasundari, N. and Renukadevi, V. *Paracompactness with respect to an ideal*, Filomat **27(2)**, 333-339, 2013.
- [23] Willard, S. *General topology*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company 1970.
- [24] Zahid, M. I. *Para  $H$ -closed spaces, locally para  $H$ -closed spaces and their minimal topologies*, Ph. D. Dissertation, Univ. of Pittsburgh 1981.