

STRICTLY S-MENGER BOUNDED GROUPS

MUHAMMAD ASAD IQBAL[†] AND MOIZ UD DIN KHAN

Date of Receiving : 09. 08. 2020

Date of Acceptance : 09. 09. 2020

Abstract. In this paper, we define and investigate s-Menger-bounded groups. Also, we define strictly s-Menger-bounded groups using infinite topological game between two players. It is shown that strictly s-Menger-bounded group structure is preserved under irresolute epimorphism and possess open hereditary property.

1. Introduction

Throughout in this paper, a space mean an infinite topological space, e mean identity of the group G and along with the generally accepted symbols, we use our own notations and those from [13] and [19]. Let $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are families of set X . $\mathcal{S}_{fin}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ (resp. $S_1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$) represents the selection hypothesis: For each $(\mathcal{U}_i)_{i \in N} \in \mathcal{U}$ there is $(\mathcal{V}_i)_{i \in N}$ (resp. $(b_i)_{i \in N}$) such that for each $i \in N$, a finite set $\mathcal{V}_i \subset \mathcal{U}_i$ (resp. $b_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$), and $\bigcup_{i \in N} \mathcal{V}_i$ (resp. $\{b_i\}_{i \in N} \in \mathcal{V}$) (see [23]).

The Menger (M) (resp. Rothberger (R)) covering property of a space X is given as $\mathcal{S}_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$ (resp. $S_1(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$) and s-Menger (sM) (resp. s-Rothberger (sR)) covering property [13, 19], is given as $\mathcal{S}_{fin}(s\mathcal{O}, s\mathcal{O})$ (resp. $S_1(s\mathcal{O}, s\mathcal{O})$). The family of all open and semi open covers of a space X is represented as $\mathcal{O}$ and $s\mathcal{O}$ respectively.

In 1924 M property was demonstrated by Karl Menger with name of M basis property [16] and next year W. Hurewicz [9] verified an if and only if relation between M basis property and M covering property for a metric space. For more data about selection principles (SP) theory, we allude the peruser to see [14, 21, 22, 25].

For the SP $\mathcal{S}_{fin}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ the infinite game, represented as $G_{fin}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ [24]. In this game Tom and Jerry, play an inning per positive integer. In the i th turn Tom chooses $U_i \in \mathcal{U}$, and then Jerry counters with a finite set $V_i \subseteq U_i$. Thusly they set up a play $U_1, V_1, \dots, U_i, V_i, \dots$ such a play is won by Jerry if $\bigcup \{V_i : i \in N\} \in \mathcal{V}$; else, Tom wins. When $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are open covers of the space or topological group (TG) then the game is known as M-game.

For the SP $S_1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ the infinite game, represented as $G_1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ [5]. In this game Tom

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 91A44, 54C08, 54D20, 54H10.

Key words and phrases. irresolute mapping, irresolute topological group, s-Menger-bounded group, strictly s-Menger-bounded group.

Communicated by. M. L. Thivagar and S. Jafari

and Jerry, play an inning per positive integer. In the i th turn Tom chooses $U_i \in \mathcal{U}$, then Jerry counters with a $V_i \in U_i$. Thusly they set up a play $U_1, V_1, \dots, U_i, V_i, \dots$ such a play is won by Jerry if $\{V_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \in \mathcal{V}$; else, Tom wins. When $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are open covers of the space or TG then the game is known as R-game.

Definition 1.1. A TG $(G, *, \tau)$ is known as M-bounded (resp. R-bounded) [12] if there is for each progression $(U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of neighborhoods (nbhds) of $e \in G$, a progression $(V_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$) of finite subset (resp. elements) of G such that $G = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} V_i * U_i$ (resp. $G = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} x_i * U_i$).

Definition 1.2. A TG $(G, *, \tau)$ is:

- (1) $\aleph_0$ -bounded [7] if there is for every nbhd U of $e \in G$, a countable set $K \subset G$ such that $K * U = G$.
 - (2) o-bounded [8] if there are for every $U_0, U_1, \dots$ of nbhds of $e \in G$, finite sets $F_0, F_1, \dots$ such that $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} F_i * U_i = G$.
- It is known in [1] that o-bounded TG is equivalent to M-bounded TG.

Definition 1.3. [8] Suppose that $(G, *, \tau)$ is a TG and that we have two players, Tom and Jerry. Tom chooses an open nbhd U_0 of e in G . Then, Jerry chooses a finite set $F_0 \subset G$. In the second turn, Tom chooses another nbhd U_1 of e in G and Jerry chooses a finite set $F_1 \subset G$. The game continues in the same way until we have $U_0, U_1, \dots$ of nbhds of the neutral element and $F_0, F_1, \dots$ of finite subsets of G . Jerry wins if $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} F_i * U_i = G$. Otherwise, Tom wins. Then TG $(G, *, \tau)$ is strictly M-bounded group if there is a winning strategy for Jerry.

Definition 1.4. A mapping $\alpha : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \tau)$ is:

- (1) irresolute [3] (resp. pre-semi open) if inverse image (resp. image) of semi open set in Y (resp. X) is semi open in X (resp. Y).
- (2) semi homeomorphism [15] if it is bijective, irresolute and pre-semi open.

Lemma 1.5. A space X is extremely disconnected [10] (resp. semi P -space [20]) if intersection of two (resp. countable) semi open subsets of X is semi open.

Lemma 1.6. [18] Let Y be a subspace of X and $P \in SO(Y)$, then $P = Q \cap Y$ for some $Q \in SO(X)$.

Definition 1.7. [11] A triplet $(G, *, \tau)$ is termed as irresolute topological group (ITG) if for each $p, q \in G$ and each semi open nbhd R of $p * q^{-1}$ in G there is a semi open nbhds P containing p and Q containing q such that $P * Q^{-1} \subset R$.

We note that, if $(G, *, \tau)$ is ITG, then a mapping $\mu : G \times G \rightarrow G$ is an irresolute mapping but, if $\mu : G \times G \rightarrow G$ is an irresolute mapping, then $(G, *, \tau)$ may not be an ITG.

Lemma 1.8. [11] For an ITG $(G, *, \tau)$:

- (1) Left translation is semi homeomorphism and the inverse mapping is homeomorphism.
- (2) $P \in SO(G)$ if and only if $P^{-1} \in SO(G)$.
- (3) If $P \in SO(G)$ and $Q \subset G$, then $P * Q$ and $Q * P$ are both in $SO(G)$.

Lemma 1.9. [2] Let $(G, *, \tau)$ be an ITG, and ϵ_e be the collection of all semi open nbhds of e , then:

- (1) there is for each $P \in \epsilon_e$, a $Q \in \epsilon_e$ such that $Q^{-1} \subseteq P$.
- (2) there is for each $P \in \epsilon_e$, a $Q \in \epsilon_e$ such that $Q^2 \subseteq P$.
- (3) there is for each $P \in \epsilon_e$ and every $x \in P$, a $Q \in \epsilon_e$ such that $x * Q \subseteq P$.
- (4) there is for each $P \in \epsilon_e$, a $Q \in \epsilon_e$ such that $Q^{-1} * Q \subseteq P$.

Lemma 1.10. [17] *Let $\{Y_\alpha : \alpha \in \nabla\}$ be any family of topological spaces, $Y = \prod_{\alpha \in \nabla} Y_\alpha$ the product space and $P = \prod_{j=1}^n P_{\alpha_j} \times \prod_{\alpha \neq \alpha_j} Y_\alpha$ a non empty subset of Y , where n is a positive integer then $P_{\alpha_j} \in SO(X_{\alpha_j})$; $\forall 1 \leq j \leq n$ if and only if $P \in SO(X)$.*

Definition 1.11. A space X is termed as semi compact [4] (resp. semi-Lindelöf [6]) if every cover of X by semi open sets have a finite (resp. countable) subcover.

2. s-Menger-bounded groups

In this section we define and explore s-Menger-bounded and s-Rothberger-bounded groups.

Definition 2.1. An ITG $(G, *, \tau)$ is:

- (1) sM-bounded if there is for each progression $(U_i)_{i \in N}$ of semi open nbhds of $e \in G$, a progression of finite set $(V_i)_{i \in N} \subset G$ such that $G = \bigcup_{i \in N} V_i * U_i$.
- (2) sR-bounded if there is for each progression $(U_i)_{i \in N}$ of semi open nbhds of $e \in G$, a progression $(x_i)_{i \in N} \in G$ such that $G = \bigcup_{i \in N} x_i * U_i$.

There is an M-bounded TG which is not sM-bounded ITG.

Example 2.2. We note that real line $(R, +, \tau)$ with usual topology is an ITG. It is given in [19], that it is not s-Menger space but Menger space. Since $(R, +, \tau)$ is TG so it is M-bounded group but not sM-bounded group because it is not s-Menger space.

Theorem 2.3. *Every open subgroup $(H, *)$ of an sM-bounded group $(G, *, \tau)$ is sM-bounded.*

Proof. The proof is easy. □

Theorem 2.4. *Let (G, τ) be a semi P-space. Then semi-Lindelöf, ITG $(G, *, \tau)$ is sM-bounded.*

Proof. Consider that a progression $(P_i)_{i \in N}$ of semi open nbhds of e in G . As G is semi P-space so $U = \bigcap_{i \in N} P_i$ is also semi open nbhd in G containing e_G . Due to semi-Lindelöfness of G , we have countable subset $M = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ of G such that $\bigcup_{i \in N} x_i * U = G$. Let $Q_i = \{x_i\}$ for each $i \in N$, then $\bigcup_{i \in N} Q_i * P_i = G$. Therefore, G is sM-bounded. □

Theorem 2.5. *Let G and H be ITGs and $\alpha : (G, \tau) \rightarrow (H, \tau)$ be an irresolute epimorphism. If G is an sM-bounded group, then H is sM-bounded.*

Proof. The proof is easy. □

Definition 2.6. An ITG $(G, *, \tau)$ is n_0 -bounded if there is for every semi open nbhd P of $e \in G$, a countable subset Q of G such that $Q * P = G$.

Theorem 2.7. *An n_0 -bounded group $(G, *, \tau)$ is sM-bounded if and only if all second countable irresolute homomorphic images of G are sM-bounded.*

Proof. The necessity of the condition follows from Theorem 2.5. Consider that G is an n_0 -bounded group whose second countable, irresolute, homomorphic images are sM-bounded. Let $(U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be semi open nbhds of e in G . Then by Lemma 1.9(2), for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a semi open nbhd V_i of e such that $V_i^2 \subseteq U_i$.

As G is an n_0 -bounded group, for every V_i one can prove an irresolute homomorphism $\psi_i : G \rightarrow H_i$ onto a second countable group H_i and semi open nbhd V_i^* of e in H_i such that: $\psi_i^{-1}(V_i^*) \subseteq V_i$. Let $\varphi = \Delta_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \psi_i : G \rightarrow \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} H_i$ be the diagonal product of the homomorphism ψ_i . The group $K = \varphi(G)$ is second countable and, by assumption sM-bounded. Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & K \subseteq \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} H_i \\ & \searrow \psi_i & \downarrow f_i \\ & & H_i \end{array}$$

where f_i is the restriction of the projection $\pi_i : \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} H_j \rightarrow H_i$. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, define $W_i = f_i^{-1}(V_i^*)$. Since K is sM-bounded, there is $\{E_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of finite subsets of K such that $K = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} E_i * W_i$. For every $x \in E_i$, choose $g_x \in \varphi^{-1}(x)$ and define $F_i = \{g_x : x \in E_i\}$. Let us show that $G = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} F_i * U_i$. For every $g \in G$, there exist $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \in E_i$ such that $\varphi(g) \in y * W_i$. Since $N = \ker \varphi \subseteq V_i$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We have $g \in \varphi^{-1}(y * W_i) = (g_y * N) * \varphi^{-1}(W_i) \subseteq (g_y * N) * V_i \subseteq g_y * V_i^2 \subseteq g_y * U_i$. Therefore, $g \in F_i * U_i$, and hence $G = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} F_i * U_i$. So we have that G is sM-bounded. $\square$

Remark 2.8. The class of sM-bounded groups is not productive in general.

Example 2.9. Consider the additive group of reals R endowed with usual topology. We note that $(R, +, \tau)$ with usual topology is ITG but not sM-bounded group. Moreover $(R^2, +, \tau_R^2)$ is also ITG. Let us prove that R^2 is not sM-bounded. Then by Lemma 1.10, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, pick a semi open nbhd U_n of $(0, \dots, 0)$, $U_n = \prod_{i=1}^k V_{n,i} \times \prod_{i>k} R_i$. For $V_{n,i}$ we have four possibilities: $(-1, 1)$, $[0, 1)$, $(-1, 0]$ and $[-1, 1]$.

Case I: $V_{n,i} = (-1, 1)$ if $j \leq i$ and $V_{n,i} = R$ otherwise. For $n = 1$ we have $U_1 = (-1, 1) \times R$. For any $\{F_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ finite subsets of R^2 , we can define a point in R^2 outside of $\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty F_i + U_1$. Indeed, we consider the point $x = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in R^2$, where i th coordinate x_i satisfies $x_i \in R - (p_i(F_i) + p_i(U_1))$, where $p_i : R^2 \rightarrow R$ is the projection. It is not difficult to see that $x \notin \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} F_i + U_1$. Hence, the group R^2 is not sM-bounded group. For first case $(R^2, +, \tau_R^2)$ is not sM-bounded group. Therefore, there is no need to check the remaining possibilities.

Theorem 2.10. Let $(G, *, \tau_1)$ be an extremely disconnected, sM-bounded group and $(H, *, \tau_2)$ be hereditarily semi-Lindelöf, ITG. Then the product $(G \times H, \tau_1 \times \tau_2)$ is hereditarily sM-bounded.

Proof. Let S be the subset of the $G \times H$. Moreover let $(U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(V_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are progressions of semi open nbhds of e_G and e_H respectively. As G is sM-bounded so

there are finite sets P_i in G such that $\bigcup_{i \in N} P_i * W_i = G$, where $W_i = U_i \cap U_i^{-1}$. For each $i \in N$ and each $p \in P_i$ define, $Q(i, p) = \{h \in H : \text{there is } g \text{ in a } W_i \text{ such that } (g, h) \in S\}$. Fix $i \in N$ and $p \in P_i$. Since H is hereditarily semi Lindelöf, hence $Q(i, p)$ is semi Lindelöf, there is a finite set $M(i, p) \subset Q(i, p)$ such that $\bigcup_{i \in N} M(i, p) * V_i = H$. For each $y \in M(i, p)$ there is $g(y, i, p) \in p * W_i$ such that $(g(y, i, p), y) \in S$. The set $A(i, p) = \{(g(y, i, p), y) : y \in M(i, p)\}$ is a finite subset of S . Take any $(g, h) \in S$ there are $k \in N$ and $p \in P_k$ such that $g \in p * W_k$. Therefore $h \in Q(k, p)$ and there exists some $b \in Q(k, p)$ such that $h \in b * V_k$. Thus $(g(b, k, p), b) \in A(k, p)$, where $g(b, k, p) \in p * W_k$. Using the symmetry of W_k , we get $(g, h) \in g(b, k, p) * (W_k)^2 \times b * V_k$. This means that the finite sets $A_k = \bigcup_{p \in P_k} A(k, p)$ witness that $G \times H$ is sM-bounded. $\square$

Theorem 2.11. *Let (G, τ) be a semi P-space. Then semi-Lindelöf, ITG $(G, *, \tau)$ is sR-bounded.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.4. $\square$

Theorem 2.12. *Every open subgroup $(H, *)$ of sR-bounded group $(G, *, \tau)$ is sR-bounded.*

Proof. The proof is easy. $\square$

3. Strictly s-Menger-bounded groups

The following concept is defined in terms of infinite topological game.

Definition 3.1. Consider that $(G, *, \tau)$ is an ITG and an infinite topological game is played between two players, Tom and Jerry. Tom chooses a semi open nbhd U_0 of e in G . Then, Jerry chooses a finite set $F_0 \subset G$. In the second turn, Tom chooses another semi open nbhd U_1 of e in G and Jerry chooses a finite set $F_1 \subset G$. The game continues in the same way until we have $U_0, U_1, \dots$ of semi open nbhds of e and $F_0, F_1, \dots$ of finite subsets of G . Jerry wins if $\bigcup_{i \in N} F_i * U_i = G$. Otherwise, Tom wins. Then we say that the ITG $(G, *, \tau)$ is strictly sM-bounded if there exists a winning strategy for the Jerry.

Remark 3.2. Every strictly sM-bounded group is sM-bounded group but converse is not true in general.

The following example shows that there is an sM-bounded group which is not strictly sM-bounded.

Example 3.3. Let R be a real line, and R^N its countable powers. The additive group R^N is ITG. R^N is not strictly sM-bounded because R^N is not strictly M-bounded [8]. So we just have to prove R^N is sM-bounded. Let $\beta = \{(p, q) : p < q; p, q \in R\}$ be a base for real line R , then there exists four types of semi open sets in R of the form : (p, q) , $[p, q)$, $(p, q]$ and $[p, q]$.

Case I: Consider that $(U_n)_{n \in N}$ be semi open nbhds of $(0, \dots, 0) \in R^N$. Then by Lemma 1.10, for each $n \in N$, pick a semi open nbhd V_n of $(0, \dots, 0)$, $V_n = \prod_{i=1}^k V_{n,i} \times \prod_{i>k} R_i$ such that $V_n + \dots + V_n \subset U_n$ (n times taken V_n). Define an increasing sequence $m_1 < m_2 < \dots$ in N such that $\{j \in N : V_{n,i} \neq R = R_j\} \subset \{1, 2, \dots, m_n\}$ for each n . To each m_i associate the set $Q_i \subset R^N$ defined by $Q_i = \prod_{n \in N} P_{i,j}$, where $P_{i,j} = (-m_{i+1}, m_{i+1})$, for $j \leq m_i$, and $P_{i,j} = R$, for $j > m_i$. Observe that $X \subset \bigcup_{n \in N} Q_n$. "Indeed, if

$x = (x_n)_{n \in N} \in X$. Then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x_{n_k}}{n_{k+1}} = 0$ implies that there is $s \in N$ such that $|x_{n_k}| < n_{k+1}$ for all $k \geq s$. Put $t = \max\{x_{n_1}, \dots, x_{n_s}\}$ and choose i^* and l in N such that $m_{i^*} > t$ and $m_{i^*} \leq n_l < m_{i^*+1}$. Let $k \in N$ be arbitrary. If $n_k > m_{i^*}$, then $P_{i^*, n_k} = R$, hence $x_{n_k} \in P_{i^*, n_k}$; if $k < s$ and $n_k < m_{i^*}$, then $|x_{n_k}| \leq t < m_{i^*}$ so that $x_{n_k} \in P_{i^*, n_k}$; if $k \geq s$ and $n_k \leq m_{i^*}$, then $k < l$, hence $|x_{n_k}| < n_{k+1} < m_{i^*+1}$, which implies $x_{n_k} \in P_{i^*, n_k}$, and thus $|x_j| \in P_{i^*, j}$ for each $j \in N$. So, $x \in Q_{i^*}$. For each $n \in N$ choose a finite set $F_n \subset R^N$ such that $Q_n \subset F_n + V_n$. Let $E_n = F_n + \dots + F_n$ (n times F_n). We prove that $(E_n)_{n \in N}$ witnesses for $(U_n)_{n \in N}$ that R^N is sM-bounded. Let $g \in R^N$; then $g = x_1 + \dots + x_r$, $x_i \in X$ for each $i \leq r$. We have that for each $i \leq r$, $x_i \in Q_{k_i}$ for some $k_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. If we put $k = \max\{k_1, \dots, k_r, r\}$, then $x_i \in Q_k$ for each $i \leq r$. It follows $g = x_1 + \dots + x_r \in r(F_k + V_k) \subset k(F_k + V_k) \subset E_k + U_k$. **Case II:** For $P = [-m_{i+1}, m_{i+1}]$ and $P = [-m_{i+1}, m_{i+1}]$ we follow the same argument. **Case III:** For $P = (-m_{i+1}, m_{i+1}]$, define a decreasing sequence $m_1 > m_2 > \dots$ in N , then follow the same way for this decreasing sequence. In each case, it is proved that $(R^N, *, \tau)$ is sM-bounded group.

Theorem 3.4. *Every open subgroup $(H, *)$ of a strictly sM-bounded group $(G, *, \tau)$ is strictly sM-bounded.*

Proof. Consider that G be a strictly sM-bounded group with e_G . Suppose that in turn i , Tom chooses a semi open nbhd U_i of e in H . So by Lemma 1.6, there is a semi open nbhd V_i of e in G such that $V_i \cap H = U_i$ and by definition of ITG, there exists $W_i \in SO(G, e_G)$ such that $W_i^{-1} * W_i \subseteq V_i$. As G is strictly sM-bounded so Jerry can choose the finite F_i corresponding to the winning strategy in G for W_i in such a way that $\bigcup_{i \in N} F_i * W_i = G$. If $x \in F_i$ and $x * W_n$ intersects H , we choose $a_x \in H \cap (x * W_i)$, otherwise we put $a_x = e_G$. It is easy to see that $A_i = \{a_x : x \in F_i\}$ is finite. Let us verify that $\bigcup_{i \in N} A_i * U_i = H$. It is clear that $\bigcup_{i \in N} A_i * U_i \subseteq H$. If $y \in H$, there is $x \in F_i$ such that $y \in x * W_i$ for some $i \in N$. So, $a_x \in H \cap (x * W_i)$ i.e., $x \in a_x * W_i^{-1}$. Hence, $y \in x * W_i \subseteq a_x * W_i^{-1} * W_i \subseteq a_x * V_i$. Since y and a_x are elements of H , it follows that $a_x^{-1} * y \in V_i \cap H \subseteq U_i$. Thus, $y \in a_i * U_i \subseteq A_i * U_i$. $\square$

Theorem 3.5. *Consider that $(G, *_1, \tau)$ and $(H, *_2, \tau)$ be ITGs. Let $\alpha : (G, \tau_1) \rightarrow (H, \tau_2)$ be an irresolute epimorphism and G be a strictly sM-bounded. Then H is strictly sM-bounded.*

Proof. Suppose that at step i Tom chooses a nbhd U_i of e_H in H . For each $i \in N$, the set $V_i = \alpha^{-1}(U_i)$ is a semi open nbhd of e_G in G . As G is strictly sM-bounded, Jerry can choose the finite sets Q_i corresponding to the winning strategy in G for V_i . Then for each $i \in N$, sets $P_n = \alpha(Q_n)$ are finite and $\bigcup_{i \in N} P_i *_2 U_i = \alpha(\bigcup_{i \in N} Q_i *_1 V_i) = \alpha(G) = H$. $\square$

References

- [1] L. Babinkostova, LjDR. Kočinac and M. Scheepers, Combinatorics of open covers (VIII), Topology and its Appl., 140 (2004), 15-32.
- [2] M.S. Bosan, s-Topological groups and Related Structures, PhD Dissertation, COMSATS University Islamabad, 2016.
- [3] S.G. Crossley and S.K. Hildebrand, Semi-topological properties, Fund Math., 74 (1972), 233-254.
- [4] C. Dorsett, Semi compactness semi separation axioms and product space, Bull Malays Math Sci Soc., 4 (1981), 21-28.

- [5] F. Galvin, Indeterminacy of point-open games, *Bull Acad Pol Sci Sér Sci Math Astron Phys.*, 26 (1978), 445-449.
- [6] M. Ganster, On covering properties and generalized open sets in topological spaces, *Math Chronicle*, 19 (1990), 27-33.
- [7] I.I. Guran, On topological groups close to being Lindelöf, *Dokl Akad Nauk.*, 256 (1981), 1305-1307.
- [8] C. Hernández, Topological groups close to being σ -compact, *Topology Appl.*, 102 (2000), 101-111.
- [9] W. Hurewicz, Über die Verallgemeinerung des Borelschen Theorems, *Math Z.*, 24 (1925), 401-425.
- [10] D.S. Janković, On locally irreducible spaces, *Ann Soc Sci Bruxelles*, 97 (1983), 59-72.
- [11] M. Khan, A. Siab and LjDR. Kočinac, Irresolute-Topological Groups, *Math Morav.*, 1 (2015), 73-80.
- [12] LjDR. Kočinac, Star selection principles, A survey, *Khayyam J Math.*, 1 (2015), 82-106.
- [13] LjDR. Kočinac, A. Sabah, M. Khan and D. Seba, Semi-Hurewicz spaces, *Hacet J Math Stat.*, 46 (2017), 53-66.
- [14] LjDR. Kočinac, Selected results on selection principles, In *Proc Third Seminar Geom Topol.*, (2004), 71-104.
- [15] J.P. Lee, On semi-homeomorphisms, *Internat J Math.*, 13 (1990), 129-134.
- [16] K. Menger, Einige Überdeckungssätze der Punktmengenlehre *Stzungsberichte Abt. 3a Mathematik Astronomie Physik Met. und Mechanik (Wiener Akademie, Wien)*, 13 (1924), 421-444
- [17] T. Noiri, On semi continuous mappings, *Nota di Takashi Noiri presenta dal Sacio B Segre*, 54 (1974).
- [18] V. Pipitone and G. Russo, Spazi semi connessi e spazi semiaperti, *Rend Circ Mat Palermo*, 2 (1975), 273-287.
- [19] A. Sabah, M. Khan and LjDR. Kočinac, Covering properties defined by semi open sets, *J Nonlinear Sci Appl.*, 9 (2016), 4388-4398.
- [20] A. Sabah, Selection Principles and Weaker Forms of Menger, Rothberger and Hurewicz Properties in Topology, PhD Dissertation, COMSATS University Islamabad, 2017.
- [21] M. Sakai and M. Scheepers, Recent Progress in General Topology III, Atlantis Press, (2014), 751-800.
- [22] M. Scheepers, Selection principles and covering properties in Topology, *Note Mat.*, 2 (2003), 3-41.
- [23] M. Scheepers, Combinatorics of open covers I: Ramsey theory, *Topology Appl.*, 69 (1996), 31-62.
- [24] R. Telgrásky, On games of topsöe, *Math Scand.*, 54 (1984), 170-176.
- [25] B. Tsaban, Some new directions in infinite-combinatorial topology *Set Theory, Trends Math.*, (2006), 225-255.

(Muhammad Asad Iqbal) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COMSATS UNIVERSITY ISLAMABAD CHAK SHAHZAD, ISLAMABAD 45550, PAKISTAN

E-mail address: m.asadiqbal494@gmail.com

(Moiz ud Din Khan) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COMSATS UNIVERSITY ISLAMABAD CHAK SHAHZAD, ISLAMABAD 45550, PAKISTAN

E-mail address, Corresponding author: profmoiz001@yahoo.com, moiz@comsats.edu.pk