



On Nowhere Dense Sets

Preecha Yupapin^{1,2}, Vadakasi Subramanian³, Yasser Farhat^{4,*}

¹ *Computational Optics Research Group, Science and Technology Advanced Institute, Van Lang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam*

² *Faculty of Technology, Van Lang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam*

³ *Department of Mathematics, A.K.D.Dharma Raja Women's College, Rajapalayam*

⁴ *Academic Support Department, Abu Dhabi Polytechnic, P. O. Box 111499, Abu Dhabi, UAE*

Abstract. We introduce two types of strongly nowhere dense sets, namely (s, v) -strongly nowhere dense set, $(s, v)^*$ -strongly nowhere dense set and analyze their characteristics in a bigeneralized topological space (BGTS). Further, it is also given some relations between these two types of strongly nowhere dense sets along with its various properties for $(s, v)^*$ -strongly nowhere dense set. Finally, the necessary and sufficient condition is found between μ -strongly nowhere dense set and $(s, v)^*$ -strongly nowhere dense set in a BGTS.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classifications: 54A05, 54A10

Key Words and Phrases: Bigeneralized topological spaces, $\mu_{(s,v)}$ -open, (s, v) -open, (s, v) -nowhere dense

1. Introduction

The concept of a generalized topological space was introduced by Császár in [4]. Let X be any non-null set. A collection μ of subsets of X is a *generalized topology* [8] in X if it contains the empty set and it closed under arbitrary union. Then the pair (X, μ) is called as a *generalized topological space* (GTS) [8]. The pair (X, μ) is called a *strong generalized topological space* (sGTS) [8] if $X \in \mu$.

If $Q \in \mu$, then Q is called a μ -open set and if $X - Q \in \mu$, then Q is said to be a μ -closed set. Let D be a subset of a GTS (X, μ) . The *interior of D* [8] denoted by iD , is the union of all μ -open sets contained in D and the *closure of D* [8] denoted by cD , is the intersection of all μ -closed sets containing D when no confusion can arise. Denote $\{D \in \mu \mid D \neq \emptyset\}$ by $\tilde{\mu}$ [7] and denote $\{D \in \mu \mid x \in D\}$ by $\mu(x)$ [7].

Define a generalized topology μ^* as follows; $\mu^* = \{\bigcup_t (U_1^t \cap U_2^t \cap U_3^t \cap \dots \cap U_{n_t}^t) \mid U_1^t, U_2^t, \dots, U_{n_t}^t \in \mu\}$ [7]. Then $\mu \subset \mu^*$ and μ^* is closed under finite intersection [7].

*Corresponding author.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29020/nybg.ejpam.v15i2.4283>

Email addresses: preecha.yupapin@vlu.edu.vn (P. Yupapin), farhat.yasser.1@gmail.com (Y. Farhat)

2. Preliminaries

Let (X, μ) be a GTS and $Q \subset X$. Then Q is called a μ -nowhere dense [6] (resp. μ -dense [6, 7], μ -codense [7]) set if $icQ = \emptyset$ (resp. $cQ = X$; $c(X - Q) = X$).

Let μ_1 and μ_2 be two generalized topologies on a non-null set X . Then (X, μ_1, μ_2) is called as a *bigeneralized topological space* (briefly, BGTS) [2].

Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS and $D \subset X$. Then $c_s(D)$ denote the *closure of D* and $i_s(D)$ denote the *interior of D* with respect to μ_s , respectively, for $s = 1, 2$ [2].

A subset Q of a BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) is called (s, v) -closed if $c_s(c_v(Q)) = Q$, where $s, v = 1$ or 2 ; $s \neq v$. If $X - Q$ is (s, v) -closed, then Q is called as (s, v) -open [2] set.

In [2], let Q be a subset of a BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) is called

- (1) (s, v) - g -preopen if $Q \subseteq i_s(c_v(Q))$ where $s, v = 1$ or 2 ; $s \neq v$.
- (2) (s, v) - g - α -open if $Q \subseteq i_s(c_v(i_s(Q)))$ where $s, v = 1$ or 2 ; $s \neq v$.

Lemma 1. [3] Let Q be a subset of a generalized topological space (X, μ) . Then $y \in c(Q)$ if and only if $M \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ for any $M \in \mu(y)$.

Lemma 2. [8, Lemma 3.2] Let (X, μ) be a generalized topological space and $D, B \subset X$. If $B \in \tilde{\mu}$; $B \cap D = \emptyset$, then $B \cap cD = \emptyset$.

3. Nowhere dense sets

In this section, we define a set namely, $(s, v)^*$ -nowhere dense and give some of their properties in a BGTS.

Let Q be a subset of a generalized topological space (X, μ) . Then Q is called μ -semi-open if $Q \subset c_\mu(i_\mu(Q))$ [5]. If $X - Q$ is a μ -semi-open set, then Q is called μ -semi-closed [5].

Moreover, $\sigma(\mu)$ or $\sigma(\mu(X)) = \{Q \subset X \mid Q \text{ is } \mu\text{-semi-open set in } X\}$ [8]. Also, $i_\sigma(Q)$ denote the μ -semi-interior of $Q \subset X$ is defined by the union of all μ -semi-open subsets of (X, μ) contained in Q [8].

Let Q be a subset of a BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) is called (s, v) -nowhere dense [1] set in X if $i_s(c_v(Q)) = \emptyset$ where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$.

Definition 1. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a bigeneralized topological space and K be a non-null subset of X . Then K is called to be a $(s, v)^*$ -nowhere dense set if $i_{\sigma_v}(c_s(K)) = \emptyset$ where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$; $\sigma_v = \sigma_{\mu_v}$.

Moreover, $(s, v)^* - \mathcal{N}(X) = \{Q \subset X \mid Q \text{ is } (s, v)^*\text{-nowhere dense set in } X\}$ where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$.

Example 2. Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}$; $\mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}\}$. Then $\sigma_1 = \{\emptyset, \{s\}, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$ and $\sigma_2 = \{\emptyset, \{r\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$.

1. Take $E = \{s\}$. Then $i_{\sigma_2}(c_1(E)) = i_{\sigma_2}(E) = \emptyset$. Thus, E is a $(1, 2)^*$ -nowhere dense set in X .

2. Choose $F = \{p, r\}$. Then $i_{\sigma_1}(c_2(F)) = i_{\sigma_1}(\{p, r\}) = \emptyset$. Then F is a $(2, 1)^*$ -nowhere dense in X .

In a bigeneralized topological space, if $K \in (s, v)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$ and $L \subset K$, then $L \in (s, v)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$. Also, every $(s, v)^*$ -nowhere dense set where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$, is a μ_v -codense set for $v = 1, 2$ in X .

Moreover, any $(s, v)^*$ -nowhere dense set is a (v, s) -nowhere dense set in a bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$, since $\mu \subset \sigma$ [3].

Example 3. Consider the BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}$ and μ_1, μ_2 are defined in Example 2.

Take $P = \{s\}$. Then P is $(1, 2)^*$ -nowhere dense set, by Example 2. Now $i_2(c_1(P)) = i_2(P) = \emptyset$. Therefore, P is $(2, 1)$ -nowhere dense set in X .

Choose $D = \{p, r\}$. In Example 2, D is $(2, 1)^*$ -nowhere dense set in X . Here $i_1(c_2(D)) = i_1(D) = \emptyset$. Thus, D is $(1, 2)$ -nowhere dense set in X .

Theorem 4. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a bigeneralized topological space. Then the followings are true.

- (a) If (X, μ_1) is a sGTS and $Q \subset X$ is a $(1, 2)$ -nowhere dense set, then $Q \in (2, 1)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.
- (b) If (X, μ_2) is a sGTS and $J \subset X$ is a $(2, 1)$ -nowhere dense set, then $J \in (1, 2)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.

Proof. (a). Assume that, (X, μ_1) is a sGTS and Q is a $(1, 2)$ -nowhere dense set. Then $i_1(c_2(Q)) = \emptyset$. Suppose $i_{\sigma_1}(c_2(Q)) \neq \emptyset$. Then there exist $G \in \tilde{\sigma}_1$ such that $G \subset c_2(Q)$. Since $G \in \tilde{\sigma}_1$ we have $G \subset c_1(i_1(G))$ which implies $c_1(i_1(G)) \neq \emptyset$ which turn implies that $i_1(G) \neq \emptyset$, by assumption. Thus, $i_1(G) \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ and $i_1(G) \subset c_2(Q)$. Then $i_1(c_2(Q)) \neq \emptyset$ which is not possible. Therefore, $i_{\sigma_1}(c_2(Q)) = \emptyset$.

(b). Follows from the similar arguments in (a).

In Theorem 4, the condition “ μ_1 is a sGT” is necessary as shown by the below Example 5. The condition “ μ_2 is a sGT” in Theorem 4 is necessary as shown by Example 6.

Example 5. Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s, t\}$; $\mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{p, s\}, \{p, q, s\}\}$; $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}\}$. Here μ_1 is not a sGT. Then $\sigma_1 = \{\emptyset, \{r\}, \{t\}, \{r, t\}, \{p, q\}, \{p, s\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, q, t\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{p, s, t\}, \{p, q, r, s\}, \{p, q, r, t\}, \{p, q, s, t\}, \{p, r, s, t\}, X\}$.

Take $D = \{r\}$. Then $i_1(c_2(D)) = i_1(\{r, s, t\}) = \emptyset$. Thus, D is a $(1, 2)$ -nowhere dense set in X . But $i_{\sigma_1}(c_2(D)) = i_{\sigma_1}(\{r, s, t\}) = \{r, t\} \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $D \notin (2, 1)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.

Example 6. Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s, t\}$; $\mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, \{p, q, r, s\}\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}\}$. Here μ_2 is not a sGT. Then $\sigma_2 = \{\emptyset, \{s\}, \{t\}, \{s, t\}, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, q, t\}, \{q, r, s\}, \{q, r, t\}, \{p, q, r, s\}, \{p, q, r, t\}, \{p, q, s, t\}, \{q, r, s, t\}, X\}$.

Choose $D = \{s\}$. Then $i_2(c_1(D)) = i_2(\{s, t\}) = \emptyset$. Thus, D is a $(2, 1)$ -nowhere dense set in X . But $i_{\sigma_2}(c_1(D)) = i_{\sigma_2}(\{s, t\}) = \{s\} \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $D \notin (1, 2)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.

Theorem 7. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS and $E \subset X$. Then the followings are true.

- (a) If (X, μ_2) is a sGTS and if $c_1(E)$ does not contain a non-null μ_2 -open set, then $E \in$

$(1, 2)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.

(b) If (X, μ_1) is a sGTS and if $c_2(E)$ does not contain a non-null μ_1 -open set, then $E \in (2, 1)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.

Proof. (a). Assume that, (X, μ_2) is a sGTS. Suppose $i_{\sigma_2}(c_1(E)) \neq \emptyset$. Then there is a non-null σ_2 -open set M such that $M \subset c_1(E)$. Since M is a non-null σ_2 -open set we have $M \subset c_2(i_2(M))$. This implies that $c_2(i_2(M)) \neq \emptyset$ which implies $i_2(M) \neq \emptyset$, by assumption. Thus, $c_1(E)$ contain a non-null μ_2 -open set which is not possible. Therefore, $E \in (1, 2)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.

(b). By similar arguments in (a), we get the proof.

Theorem 8. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a bigeneralized topological space. If $\mu_s \subset \mu_v$ and $Q \in (s, v)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$, then Q is a μ_v -nowhere dense set in X where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$.

Proof. Take $s = 1$ and $v = 2$. Suppose $\mu_1 \subset \mu_2$ and $Q \in (1, 2)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$. Then $i_{\sigma_2}(c_1(Q)) = \emptyset$. This implies that $i_{\mu_2}(c_{\mu_1}(Q)) = \emptyset$ which implies $i_{\mu_2}(c_{\mu_2}(Q)) = \emptyset$, by hypothesis. Hence Q is a μ_2 -nowhere dense set in X .

Similarly, we can prove the result for $s = 2$ and $v = 1$.

In Theorem 8, the conditions “ $\mu_1 \subset \mu_2$ ” and “ $\mu_2 \subset \mu_1$ ” are can not be dropped as shown by the below Example 9.

Example 9. Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}$; $\mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{r, s\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}\}$. Here $\mu_1 \not\subset \mu_2$. Now $\sigma_2 = \{\emptyset, \{r\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$. Take $Q = \{p, q\}$. Then $i_{\sigma_2}(c_1(Q)) = i_{\sigma_2}(\{p, q\}) = \emptyset$. Thus, Q is a $(1, 2)^*$ -nowhere dense set in X . Here $i_2(c_2(Q)) = i_2(X) = \{p, q, s\} \neq \emptyset$. Thus, Q is not a μ_2 -nowhere dense set in X .

(b) Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}$; $\mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, r\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}\}$. Here $\mu_2 \not\subset \mu_1$. Now $\sigma_1 = \{\emptyset, \{s\}, \{p, r\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$. Choose $H = \{r\}$. Then $i_{\sigma_1}(c_2(H)) = i_{\sigma_1}(\{r\}) = \emptyset$. Thus, H is a $(2, 1)^*$ -nowhere dense set in X . But $i_1(c_1(H)) = i_1(X) = \{p, q, r\} \neq \emptyset$. Thus, H is not a μ_1 -nowhere dense set in X .

Theorem 10. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a bigeneralized topological space. If $\mu_v \subset \mu_s$ and if μ_v is a strong generalized topology, then any μ_v -nowhere dense set in X is a $(s, v)^*$ -nowhere dense set in X where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

Proof. Take $s = 1$ and $v = 2$. Assume that, $\mu_2 \subset \mu_1$ and Q is a μ_2 -nowhere dense set in X . Then $i_{\mu_2}(c_{\mu_2}(Q)) = \emptyset$. Suppose $i_{\sigma_2}(c_1(Q)) \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists $M \in \tilde{\mu}_{\sigma_2}$ such that $M \subset c_1(Q)$. Since $M \in \tilde{\mu}_{\sigma_2}$ we have $c_2(i_2(M)) \neq \emptyset$. Then by hypothesis, $i_2(M) \neq \emptyset$ and so $i_2(c_1(Q)) \neq \emptyset$. By hypothesis, $i_2(c_2(Q)) \neq \emptyset$, which is not possible. Therefore, $i_{\sigma_2}(c_1(Q)) = \emptyset$. Hence $Q \in (1, 2)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.

Similarly, we can prove the result for $s = 2$ and $v = 1$.

The following Example 11 shows that the hypothesis of Theorem 10 can not be dropped.

Example 11. (a). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}; \mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, r\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{p, q, r\}, X\}$. Here $\mu_2 \not\subseteq \mu_1$ but μ_2 is a sGT. Now $\sigma_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, r\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{p, q, r\}, X\}$. Take $H = \{s\}$. Then $i_2(c_2(H)) = i_2(H) = \emptyset$ and so H is μ_2 -nowhere dense set in X . But $i_{\sigma_2}(c_1(H)) = i_{\sigma_2}(X) = X \neq \emptyset$. Thus, H is not a $(1, 2)^*$ -nowhere dense set in X .

(b). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}; \mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}\}$. Here $\mu_2 \subset \mu_1$ but μ_2 is not a sGT. Now $\sigma_2 = \{\emptyset, \{r\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$. Choose $P = \{r\}$. Then $i_2(c_2(P)) = i_2(P) = \emptyset$ so that P is a μ_2 -nowhere dense set in X . But $i_{\sigma_2}(c_1(P)) = i_{\sigma_2}(P) = P \neq \emptyset$. Thus, P is not a $(1, 2)^*$ -nowhere dense set in X .

(c). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}; \mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}, X\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, r\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}\}$. Clearly, $\mu_1 \not\subseteq \mu_2$ but μ_1 is a sGT. Here $\sigma_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$. Take $Q = \{r, s\}$. Then $i_1(c_1(Q)) = i_1(Q) = \emptyset$ so that Q is a μ_1 -nowhere dense set in X . But $i_{\sigma_1}(c_2(Q)) = i_{\sigma_1}(X) = X \neq \emptyset$. Hence Q is not a $(2, 1)^*$ -nowhere dense set in X .

(d). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}; \mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{q, r\}, \{q, s\}, \{q, r, s\}\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$. Here $\mu_1 \subset \mu_2$ but μ_1 is not a sGT. Now $\sigma_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p\}, \{q, r\}, \{q, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, X\}$. Let $K = \{p, r\}$. Then $i_1(c_1(K)) = i_1(K) = \emptyset$ so that K is a μ_1 -nowhere dense set in X . But $i_{\sigma_1}(c_2(K)) = i_{\sigma_1}(K) = \{p\} \neq \emptyset$. Hence K is not a $(2, 1)^*$ -nowhere dense set in X .

4. (s, v)-strongly nowhere dense sets

In this section, we define a set namely, (s, v) -strongly nowhere dense set and give some of its properties in a BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) .

Let Q be a subset of a GTS (X, μ) . Then Q is called μ -strongly nowhere dense [7] set if for every $K \in \tilde{\mu}$, there is $P \in \tilde{\mu}$ such that $P \subset K$ and $P \cap Q = \emptyset$.

A generalized topology μ on X is said to satisfy the \mathcal{I} -property [9] whenever $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n \in \mu$ with $W_1 \cap W_2 \cap \dots \cap W_n \neq \emptyset, i_\mu(W_1 \cap W_2 \cap \dots \cap W_n) \neq \emptyset$.

A GTS (X, μ) is called as a hyperconnected space [6] if $c_\mu(Q) = X$ for each $Q \in \tilde{\mu}$.

Definition 12. Let B be a non-null subset of a bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) . Then B is said to be (s, v) -strongly nowhere dense if for every $P \in \tilde{\mu}_v$ there is $Q \in \tilde{\mu}_s$ such that $Q \subset P$ and $Q \cap B = \emptyset$ where $s, v = 1, 2; s \neq v$.

Moreover, $(s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X) = \{Q \subset X \mid Q \text{ is a } (s, v)\text{-strongly nowhere dense set in } X\}$ where $s, v = 1, 2; s \neq v$.

In a bigeneralized topological space, if $P \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ and $Q \subset P$, then $Q \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$. Moreover, every non-null μ_v -open set is need not be a (s, v) -strongly nowhere dense set in X where $s, v = 1, 2; s \neq v$.

Example 13. (a). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}; \mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$. Let $P = \{s\}$. Then $P \in (1, 2) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$.

(b). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}$; $\mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{p, r\}, \{p, q, r\}\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p\}, \{q, r\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$. Let $J = \{q, r\}$. Then $J \in (2, 1) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$.

Proposition 14. *Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a bigeneralized topological space and $D \subset X$. Then $D \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ if and only if $c_s(D) \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$.*

Example 15 shows that the collection $(s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ is need not be closed under finite union in a BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

Example 15. (a). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s, t\}$; $\mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{s\}, \{p, q\}, \{p, r\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{p, q, r, s\}\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{p, q, r, s\}\}$. Take $K = \{q, s\}, L = \{r, t\}$. Then $K, L \in (1, 2) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$. Now $K \cup L = \{q, r, s, t\}$. But $K \cup L \notin (1, 2) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$. Because, Here, for every $G \in \tilde{\mu}_2$ there is no $J \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ such that $J \subset G$ and $J \cap (K \cup L) = \emptyset$.

(b). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s, t\}$; $\mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{p, q, r, s\}\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{r\}, \{p, q\}, \{p, s\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{p, q, r, s\}\}$. Take $L = \{q, r\}, M = \{s, t\}$. Then $L, M \in (2, 1) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$. Now $L \cup M = \{q, r, s, t\}$. But $L \cup M \notin (2, 1) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$. Here, for every $H \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ there is no $K \in \tilde{\mu}_2$ such that $K \subset H$ and $K \cap (L \cup M) = \emptyset$.

Theorem 16. *Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS where $\mu_2 = \mu_1^*$. Then the family $(s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ is closed under finite union where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$.*

Theorem 17. *Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a bigeneralized topological space. If (X, μ_s) is hyperconnected and μ_s satisfy the \mathcal{I} -property, then $A_1 \cup A_2 \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ whenever $A_1, A_2 \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$.*

Proof. Take $s = 1$ and $v = 2$. Assume that, (X, μ_1) is hyperconnected and μ_1 satisfy the \mathcal{I} -property. Suppose that, A_1 and A_2 are $(1, 2)$ -strongly nowhere dense sets in X . Take $D = A_1 \cup A_2$. Let $G \in \tilde{\mu}_2$. Then there exists $H_i \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ such that $H_i \subset G$ and $H_i \cap A_i = \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2$. By our assumption, $i_{\mu_1}(H_1 \cap H_2) \neq \emptyset$. Take $J = i_{\mu_1}(H_1 \cap H_2)$. Then $J \in \tilde{\mu}_1$. Thus, there is $J \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ such that $J \subset G$ and $J \cap D = \emptyset$. Hence $D \in (1, 2) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$. Similarly, we can prove the result for $s = 2$ and $v = 1$.

Corollary 18. *Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a bigeneralized topological space. If (X, μ_s) is a hyperconnected space and μ_s satisfy the \mathcal{I} -property, then the family $(s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ is closed under finite union where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$.*

The following Example 19 shows that (s, v) -strongly nowhere dense and (s, v) -nowhere dense sets are not comparable in a BGTS.

Example 19. (a). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = [0, 3]$; $\mu_1 = \{\emptyset, [0, 1], \{\frac{3}{2}\}, [1, 2], [0, 1] \cup \{\frac{3}{2}\}, [0, 2]\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, [0, \frac{3}{2}], [1, 3], [0, 3]\}$. Let $G = (2, 3]$. Then $G \in (1, 2) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$. But G is not a $(1, 2)$ -nowhere dense set in X .

(b). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = [0, 3]$; $\mu_1 = \{\emptyset, [0, 2], (1, 3], [0, 3]\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, [0, 1], (1, 2), \{2\}, [0, 1] \cup \{2\}, (1, 2], [0, 1] \cup (1, 2), [0, 1] \cup$

$(1, 2]\}$. Let $H = (2, 3]$. Then $H \in (2, 1) - \mathfrak{G}(X)$. But H is not a $(2, 1)$ -nowhere dense set in X .

(c). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = [0, 3]$; $\mu_1 = \{\emptyset, [0, 2), (1, 3], [0, 3]\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, [0, 1), [1, 2), [0, 2)\}$. Let $K = [2, 3]$. Then K is a (s, v) -nowhere dense set in X where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$. But $K \notin (s, v) - \mathfrak{G}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

Theorem 20. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS and $Q \subset X$. If $Q \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{G}(X)$, then Q is a (v, s) -nowhere dense set in X where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$.

Proof. Suppose $Q \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{G}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$. Assume that, $i_v(c_s(Q)) \neq \emptyset$ where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$. Then there is a set $J \in \tilde{\mu}_v$ such that $J \subset c_s(Q)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$ which implies that $Q \notin (s, v) - \mathfrak{G}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$ which is not possible. Therefore, Q is a (v, s) -nowhere dense set in X where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$.

Definition 21. Let Q be a non-null subset of a BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) . Then for $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$,

- (a) Q is called (s, v) -meager if $Q = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} D_m$ where each D_m is a (s, v) -nowhere dense set in X .
- (b) Q is called (s, v) -residual if $X - Q$ is a (s, v) -meager set in X .
- (c) Q is of (s, v) -second category set if Q is not a (s, v) -meager set in X .

Definition 22. Let B be a non-null subset of a BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) . Then for $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$,

- (a) B is said to be a (s, v) -s-meager set if $B = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} B_m$ for each $B_m \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{G}(X)$.
- (b) B is called as a (s, v) -s-residual set if $X - B$ is a (s, v) -s-meager set in X .
- (c) B is of (s, v) -s-second category set if B is not a (s, v) -s-meager set in X .

Corollary 23. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS and $D \subset X$. For $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$, the followings are true.

- (a) If D is (s, v) -s-meager, then it is a (v, s) -meager set.
- (b) If D is (s, v) -s-residual, then it is a (v, s) -residual set.
- (c) If D is of (s, v) -second category set, then it is of (v, s) -s-second category set.

Corollary 24. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS. Then the followings are true.

- (a) If μ_2 is a strong generalized topology, then $(1, 2) - \mathfrak{G}(X) \subset (1, 2)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.
- (b) If μ_1 is a strong generalized topology, then $(2, 1) - \mathfrak{G}(X) \subset (2, 1)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.

Proof. (a). Assume that, μ_2 is a strong generalized topology. Let $Q \in (1, 2) - \mathfrak{G}(X)$. By Theorem 20, Q is a $(2, 1)$ -nowhere dense set in X . By our assumption and Theorem 4 (b), Q is a $(1, 2)^*$ -nowhere dense set in X .

(b). Suppose that, μ_1 is a strong generalized topology. Let $D \in (2, 1) - \mathfrak{G}(X)$. By Theorem 20 and Theorem 4 (a), $D \in (2, 1)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.

Definition 25. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) satisfy the condition;

$$\text{if } B_1 \in \tilde{\mu}_s, B_2 \in \tilde{\mu}_v \text{ and } B_1 \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset, \text{ then } i_s(B_1 \cap B_2) \neq \emptyset$$

where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$. Then the BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) is said to satisfy the \mathcal{I}_S -property.

Theorem 26. *Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS which has the \mathcal{I}_S -property and $K, L, Q \subset X$. Then*

- (a) If $K \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ and $L \in (v, s) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$, then $K \cup L \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2 ; s \neq v$.
- (b) If L is a (v, s) -nowhere dense set, then $L \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2 ; s \neq v$.
- (c) If $Q \in (s, v)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$, then $Q \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2 ; s \neq v$.

Proof. (a). Let $G \in \tilde{\mu}_v$ for $v = 1, 2$. Then there is a set $J \in \tilde{\mu}_s$ such that $J \subset G$ and $J \cap K = \emptyset$ for $s = 1, 2$. By hypothesis, there is a set $M_1 \in \tilde{\mu}_v$ such that $M_1 \subset J$ and $M_1 \cap L = \emptyset$ for $v = 1, 2$. Take $P = J \cap M_1$. Then $P \subset G$ and $i_s(P) \neq \emptyset$, by hypothesis for $s = 1, 2$. Also, $i_s(P) \cap (K \cup L) = \emptyset$ for $s = 1, 2$. Thus, there is $i_s(P) \in \tilde{\mu}_s$ such that $i_s(P) \subset G$ and $i_s(P) \cap (K \cup L) = \emptyset$ where $s, v = 1, 2 ; s \neq v$. Therefore, $K \cup L \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

(b). Suppose L is a (v, s) -nowhere dense set where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$. Then $X - c_s(L)$ is μ_v -dense and also μ_s -open set where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$. Let $V \in \tilde{\mu}_v$ for $v = 1, 2$. Then $V \cap (X - c_s(L)) \neq \emptyset$ for $s = 1, 2$. By hypothesis, $i_s(V \cap (X - c_s(L))) \neq \emptyset$ for $s = 1, 2$. Take $P = i_s(V \cap (X - c_s(L)))$ for $s = 1, 2$. Then $P \subset V$ and $P \cap L = \emptyset$. Therefore, L is a (s, v) -strongly nowhere dense set in X where $s, v = 1, 2 ; s \neq v$.

(c). It follows from (b) and the fact that every $(s, v)^*$ -nowhere dense set is a (v, s) -nowhere dense set where $s, v = 1, 2 ; s \neq v$.

Theorem 27. *Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS. If $\mu_s \subset \mu_v$ and $Q \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$, then Q is a μ_s -strongly nowhere dense set in X where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.*

Definition 28. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) satisfy the condition;

$$\text{if } B_1 \in \tilde{\mu}_s, B_2 \in \tilde{\mu}_v \text{ and } B_1 \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset, \text{ then } i_v(B_1 \cap B_2) \neq \emptyset$$

where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$. Then the BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) is said to satisfy the \mathcal{I}_V -property.

Theorem 29. *Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS which has the \mathcal{I}_V -property. If $D \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$, then D is a μ_v -strongly nowhere dense set in X where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.*

Proof. Take $s = 1$ and $v = 2$. Assume that, the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) satisfy the \mathcal{I}_V -property. Let $D \in (1, 2) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ and $G \in \tilde{\mu}_2$. Then there is a set $J \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ such that $J \subset G$ and $J \cap D = \emptyset$. Here $G \in \tilde{\mu}_2, J \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ and $J \cap G \neq \emptyset$. By our assumption, $i_{\mu_2}(G \cap J) \neq \emptyset$. Take $K = i_{\mu_2}(G \cap J)$. Then $K \in \tilde{\mu}_2$. Thus, there is $K \in \tilde{\mu}_2$ such that $K \subset G$ and $K \cap D = \emptyset$. Therefore, D is a μ_2 -strongly nowhere dense set in X . Similarly, we can prove that the result is true for the case $s = 2$ and $v = 1$.

Theorem 30. *Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a bigeneralized topological space. If $\mu_v \subset \mu_s$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$, then the following hold.*

- (a) If Q is a μ_v -strongly nowhere dense set, then $Q \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

(b) If J is a μ_s -strongly nowhere dense set, then $J \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

Proof. Assume that, $\mu_v \subset \mu_s$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

(a). Suppose that, Q is a μ_v -strongly nowhere dense set where $v = 1, 2$. Take $s = 1$ and $v = 2$. Then Q is a μ_2 -strongly nowhere dense set and $\mu_2 \subset \mu_1$. Let $G \in \tilde{\mu}_2$. Then there is $H \in \tilde{\mu}_2$ such that $H \subset G$ and $H \cap Q = \emptyset$. By hypothesis, $H \in \tilde{\mu}_1$. Thus, there is a set $H \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ such that $H \subset G$ and $H \cap Q = \emptyset$. Therefore, $Q \in (1, 2) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$.

Similarly, we can prove that the result is true for the case $s = 2$ and $v = 1$.

(b). Let J be a μ_s -strongly nowhere dense set for $s = 1, 2$. Choose $s = 1$ and $v = 2$. Then J is a μ_1 -strongly nowhere dense set and $\mu_2 \subset \mu_1$. Let $H \in \tilde{\mu}_2$. Then $H \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ and so there is a set $K \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ such that $K \subset H$ and $K \cap J = \emptyset$. Thus, there is a set $K \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ such that $K \subset H$ and $K \cap J = \emptyset$. Hence $J \in (1, 2) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$.

By Similar arguments, we can prove that the result is true for the case $s = 2$ and $v = 1$.

5. $(s, v)^*$ -strongly nowhere dense sets

In this section, we introduce $(s, v)^*$ -strongly nowhere dense set and analyze its nature in a BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) .

Definition 31. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS and B be a non-null subset of X . Then B is called $(s, v)^*$ -strongly nowhere dense if for every $K \in \tilde{\mu}_s$ there is $M \in \tilde{\sigma}_v$ such that $M \subset K$ and $M \cap B = \emptyset$ where $s, v = 1, 2 ; s \neq v$.

Moreover, $(s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X) = \{Q \subset X \mid Q \text{ is a } (s, v)^*\text{-strongly nowhere dense set in } X\}$ where $s, v = 1, 2 ; s \neq v$.

Moreover, every non-null μ_s -open set is need not be an element of $(s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

Definition 32. Let D be a non-null subset of a BGTS (X, μ_1, μ_2) . Then for $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$,

- (a) D is said to be a $(s, v)^*$ - s -meager set if $D = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} D_m$, for each $D_m \in (s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$.
- (b) D is called $(s, v)^*$ - s -residual if $X - D$ is a $(s, v)^*$ - s -meager set in X .
- (c) D is of a $(s, v)^*$ - s -second category set if D is not a $(s, v)^*$ - s -meager set in X .

In a bigeneralized topological space, if $P \in (s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ and $Q \subset P$, then $Q \in (s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

Moreover, $(s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X) \subset (v, s)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

Theorem 33. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a bigeneralized topological space. Then the following hold.

- (a) If μ_2 is a strong generalized topology, then $(1, 2)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X) \subset (2, 1) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$.
- (b) If μ_1 is a strong generalized topology, then $(2, 1)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X) \subset (1, 2) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$.

Proof. (a). Suppose μ_2 is a strong generalized topology and $Q \in (1, 2)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$. Let $G \in \tilde{\mu}_1$. Then there is a set $P \in \tilde{\sigma}_2$ such that $P \subset G$ and $P \cap Q = \emptyset$. Since $P \in \tilde{\sigma}_2$ we have $i_2(P) \in \tilde{\mu}_2$, by assumption. Take $J = i_2(P)$. Then $J \in \tilde{\mu}_2$ and $J \subset G$. Also, $J \cap Q = \emptyset$.

Thus, there is a set $J \in \tilde{\mu}_2$ such that $J \subset G$ and $J \cap Q = \emptyset$. Therefore, $Q \in (2, 1) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$. By Similar arguments, we get the proof for (b).

Moreover, the family $(s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ is need not be closed under finite union where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$ as shown by Example 34.

Example 34. (a). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}; \mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}\}; \mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p\}, \{q\}, \{p, q\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}\}$. Then $\sigma_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p\}, \{q\}, \{r\}, \{p, q\}, \{p, r\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$. Take $P = \{q, s\}$ and $Q = \{r, s\}$. Then P and Q are $(1, 2)^*$ -strongly nowhere dense sets in X . But $P \cup Q = \{q, r, s\} \notin (1, 2)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$.

(b). Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}; \mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{r\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}; \mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{q, r\}, \{r, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, \{p, q, s\}, X\}$. Then $\sigma_1 = \{\emptyset, \{r\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$. Take $K = \{p\}$ and $L = \{q\}$. Then K and L are $(2, 1)^*$ -strongly nowhere dense sets in X . But $K \cup L = \{p, q\} \notin (2, 1)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$.

The following Example 35 shows that

- a. $P \cup Q \notin (s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ even if $P \in (s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ and $Q \in (v, s)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.
- b. $P \cup Q \notin (v, s)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ even if $P \in (s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ and $Q \in (v, s)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

Example 35. Consider the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) where $X = \{p, q, r, s\}; \mu_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p\}, \{r\}, \{p, r\}, \{p, q\}, \{q, r\}, \{p, q, r\}\}$ and $\mu_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p\}, \{p, q\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, s\}\}$. Then $\sigma_1 = \{\emptyset, \{p\}, \{r\}, \{s\}, \{p, r\}, \{p, q\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, r\}, \{r, s\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$ and $\sigma_2 = \{\emptyset, \{p\}, \{r\}, \{p, q\}, \{p, r\}, \{p, s\}, \{q, s\}, \{p, q, r\}, \{p, q, s\}, \{p, r, s\}, \{q, r, s\}, X\}$.

Take $P = \{q, s\}$ and $Q = \{q, r\}$. Then $P \in (1, 2)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ and $Q \in (2, 1)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$. Here $P \cup Q = \{q, r, s\}$. But $P \cup Q \notin (1, 2)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$. Also, $P \cup Q \notin (2, 1)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$.

Theorem 36. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS. If μ_1 and μ_2 are strong generalized topologies, then the followings are true.

- (a) $(1, 2)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X) \subset (2, 1)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.
- (b) $(2, 1)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X) \subset (1, 2)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.

Proof. It is enough to prove (a) only. Let $E \in (1, 2)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$. Suppose $i_{\sigma_1}(c_2(E)) \neq \emptyset$. Then there exist $G \in \tilde{\sigma}_1$ such that $G \subset c_2(E)$. Since $G \in \tilde{\sigma}_1$ we have $i_1(G) \neq \emptyset$, by assumption. Thus, $i_1(G) \in \tilde{\mu}_1$. Since $G \subset c_2(E)$ we have $H \cap E \neq \emptyset$ for every $H \in \tilde{\sigma}_2$ such that $H \subset i_1(G)$ which is a contradiction to hypothesis. For, $H \in \tilde{\sigma}_2$ which implies $H \subset c_2(i_2(H))$. Since μ_2 is a strong generalized topology, $i_2(H) \in \tilde{\mu}_2$. Here $i_2(H) \subset i_1(G) \subset c_2(E)$. This implies $i_2(H) \cap c_2(E) \neq \emptyset$ which implies that $i_2(H) \cap E \neq \emptyset$, by Lemma 2. Thus, $H \cap E \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $E \in (2, 1)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$.

Theorem 37. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS which has the \mathcal{I}_S -property. Then $(s, v)^* - \mathcal{N}(X) \subset (v, s)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

Proof. Assume that, (X, μ_1, μ_2) satisfy the \mathcal{I}_S -property. Let $Q \in (s, v)^* - \mathcal{N}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$. By hypothesis and Theorem 26, $Q \in (s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$. Also, $(s, v) - \mathfrak{S}(X) \subset (v, s)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$. Therefore, $Q \in (v, s)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

Theorem 38. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS. If $\mu_v \subset \mu_s, \mu_v$ is a sGT and $Q \in (s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$, then Q is a μ_v -strongly nowhere dense set where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$.

Proof. Assume that, $\mu_v \subset \mu_s, \mu_v$ is a sGT and $Q \in (s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$ where $s, v = 1, 2$ and $s \neq v$. Take $s = 1$ and $v = 2$. Then $Q \in (1, 2)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X); \mu_2 \subset \mu_1$ and μ_2 is a sGT. Let $H \in \tilde{\mu}_2$. Then $H \in \tilde{\mu}_1$. By assumption, there is $K \in \tilde{\sigma}_2$ such that $K \subset H$ and $K \cap Q = \emptyset$. Since $K \in \tilde{\sigma}_2$ we have $K \subset c_2(i_2(K))$. This implies $i_2(K) \neq \emptyset$, since μ_2 is a sGT which implies that $i_2(K) \in \tilde{\mu}_2$. Take $B = i_2(K)$. Thus, there is $B \in \tilde{\mu}_2$ such that $B \subset H$ and $B \cap Q = \emptyset$. Hence Q is a μ_2 -strongly nowhere dense set in X .

By similar arguments, we can prove the result for the case $s = 2$ and $v = 1$.

Theorem 39. Let (X, μ_1, μ_2) be a BGTS which has the \mathcal{I}_S -property. If μ_v is a sGT and $D \in (s, v)^* - \mathfrak{S}(X)$, then D is a μ_s -strongly nowhere dense set where $s, v = 1, 2$; $s \neq v$.

Proof. We give the detailed proof only for $s = 2$ and $v = 1$. Assume that, the bigeneralized topological space (X, μ_1, μ_2) satisfy the \mathcal{I}_S -property and μ_1 is a strong generalized topology. Let D be $(2, 1)^*$ -strongly nowhere dense set and $G \in \tilde{\mu}_2$. Then there is a set $P \in \tilde{\sigma}_1$ such that $P \subset G$ and $P \cap D = \emptyset$. Since $P \in \tilde{\sigma}_1$ we have $i_{\mu_1}(P) \neq \emptyset$, by our assumption. Take $J = i_{\mu_1}(P)$. Then $J \in \tilde{\mu}_1$. Here $G \in \tilde{\mu}_2, J \in \tilde{\mu}_1$ and $J \cap G \neq \emptyset$. By our assumption, $i_{\mu_2}(J \cap G) \neq \emptyset$. Take $E = i_{\mu_2}(J \cap G)$. Then $E \in \tilde{\mu}_2$. Thus, there exists $E \in \tilde{\mu}_2$ such that $E \subset G$ and $E \cap D = \emptyset$. Hence D is μ_2 -strongly nowhere dense in X .

References

- [1] Santanu Acharjee, Binod Chandra Tripathy, and Kyriakos Papadopoulos. Two forms of pairwise lindelöfness and some results related to hereditary class in a bigeneralized topological space. *New Mathematics and Natural Computation*, 13(02):181–193, 2017.
- [2] Chawalit Boonpok. Weakly open functions on bigeneralized topological spaces. *Int. Journal of Math. Analysis*, 4(18):891–897, 2010.
- [3] A Csaszar. Extremally disconnected generalized topologies. In *Annales Univ. Sci. Budapest*, volume 47, pages 151–161, 2004.
- [4] Akos Császár. Generalized open sets. *Acta mathematica hungarica*, 75, 1997.
- [5] Akos Császár. Generalized open sets in generalized topologies. *Acta mathematica hungarica*, 106, 2005.
- [6] Erdal Ekici. Generalized hyperconnectedness. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 133, 2011.

- [7] Ewa Korczak-Kubiak, Anna Loranty, and Ryszard J Pawlak. Baire generalized topological spaces, generalized metric spaces and infinite games. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 140(3):203–231, 2013.
- [8] Zhaowen Li and Funing Lin. Baireness on generalized topological spaces. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 139(4), 2013.
- [9] V Renukadevi and S Vadakasi. On lower and upper semi-continuous functions. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 160(1):1–12, 2020.