

ACTA UNIV. SAPIENTIAE, MATHEMATICA, 12, 1 (2020) 212-221

DOI: 10.2478/ausm-2020-0014

# More on decomposition of generalized continuity

Bishwambhar Roy Department of Mathematics, Women's Christian College, 6, Greek Church Row Kolkata-700 026, India email: bishwambhar\_roy@yahoo.co.in

**Abstract.** In this paper a new class of sets termed as  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open sets has been introduced and studied. Using these concept, a unified theory for decomposition of  $(\mu, \lambda)$ -continuity has been given.

## 1 Introduction

For the last one decade or so, the notion of generalized topological spaces and several classes of generalized types of open sets are being studied by different mathematicians. Our aim here is to study the notion of decomposition of continuity by using the concept of generalized topology introduced by  $\dot{A}$ . Császár [2]. On the otherhand the notion of decompositions of continuity was first introduced by Tong [18, 19] by defining  $\mathcal{A}$ -sets and  $\mathcal{B}$ -sets. After then decompositions of continuity and some of its weak forms have been studied by Ganster and Reilly [7, 8], Yalvac [20], Hatir and Noiri [10, 11], Przemski [14], Noiri and Sayed [13], Dontchev and Przemski [5], Erguang and Pengfei [6] and many others. Decompositions of regular open sets and regular closed sets are given by using PS-regular sets in [9]. Since then the notion of decompositions of continuity is one of the most important area of research.

<sup>2010</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification: 4C05, 54C08, 54C10 Key words and phrases:  $\mu$ -open set,  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuity

We first recall some definitions given in [2]. Let X be a non-empty set and expX denote the power set of X. We call a class  $\mu \subseteq \exp X$  a generalized topology (briefly, GT) [1, 2], if  $\emptyset \in \mu$  and  $\mu$  is closed under arbitrary unions. A set X, with a GT  $\mu$  on it is said to be a generalized topological space (briefly, GTS) and is denoted by  $(X, \mu)$ . A GT  $\mu$  is said to be a quasi topology (briefly QT) [3] if  $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}' \in \mu$  implies  $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{M}' \in \mu$ . The pair  $(X, \mu)$  is said to be a QTS if  $\mu$  is a QT on X. For a GTS  $(X, \mu)$ , the elements of  $\mu$  are called  $\mu$ -open sets and the complements of  $\mu$ -open sets are called  $\mu$ -closed sets. A GTS  $(X, \mu)$  is called a  $\mu$ -space [13] or a strong GTS [4] if  $X \in \mu$ . A subset A of a topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is called  $\omega$ -closed set is called an  $\omega$ -open set. It is well known that a subset A of a space  $(X, \tau)$  is  $\omega$ -open if and only if for each  $x \in A$ , there exists  $U \in \tau$  containing x such that  $U \setminus A$  is countable.

The purpose of this paper is to introduce the decomposition theorem for the  $(\mu, \lambda)$  continuous functions introduced in [1] which is a generalization of continuity and different weak forms of continuity. Throughout the paper, by  $(X, \mu)$  and  $(Y, \lambda)$  we shall mean GTS unless otherwise stated.

## 2 $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open sets and its properties

**Definition 1** Let  $(X, \mu)$  be a GTS. A subset A of X is called an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open  $(\omega_{\mu}\text{-open [15]})$  set if for each  $x \in A$ , there exists a  $\mu$ -open set U containing x such that  $U \setminus i_{\mu}(A)$  (resp.  $U \setminus A$ ) is countable. The complement of an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open (resp.  $\omega_{\mu}\text{-open}$ ) set is known as an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -closed (resp.  $\omega_{\mu}\text{-closed [15]}$ ) set.

It follows from Definition 1 that every  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set is an  $\omega_{\mu}$ -open set and every  $\mu$ -open set is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set but the converses are false as shown in Example 3.

**Remark 1** Let  $\mu$  be a GT on a topological space  $(X, \tau)$ . If  $\tau \subseteq \mu$ , then the following relations hold:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \omega \text{-}open \ set \Leftarrow \ open \ set \Rightarrow \mu \text{-}open \ set \\ \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \\ \omega_{\mu} \text{-}open \ set & \Leftarrow & \omega_{\mu}^{*} \text{-}open \ set \end{array}$$

**Example 1** (a) Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\tau$  be the usual topology on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\mu = \{\emptyset, X, \mathbb{Q}\}$ . Then  $\mu$  is a GT on the topological space  $(X, \tau)$ . It is easy to see that  $\mathbb{Q}$  is an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set but not an  $\omega$ -open set. (b) Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu$  be the usual topology on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then  $\mu$  is a GT on X. It is easy to see that  $\mathbb{I}$ , the set of irrationals is an  $\omega_{\mu}$ -open set but not an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set.

(c) Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu = \{A \subseteq X : 0 \in A\} \cup \{\varnothing\}$ . Then  $\mu$  is a GT on the set X. It is easy to see that  $\mathbb{I}$ , the set of irrationals is  $\omega_{\mu}$ -open but not  $\mu$ -open.

(d) Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu = \{A : A \text{ is uncountable}\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$  and  $\tau = \{\emptyset, X, \mathbb{Q}\}$ . Then  $\mu$  is a GT on the topological space  $(X, \tau)$ . It can be easily verified that  $\mathbb{Q}$  is an  $\omega$ -open set but not an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set.

The family of all  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open sets of a GTS  $(X, \mu)$  is denoted by  $\omega_{\mu}^*(X)$  or simply by  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ .

**Proposition 1** (a) In a GTS  $(X, \mu)$ , the collection of all  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open sets forms a GT on X. (b) If  $(X, \mu)$  is a QTS, then the collection of all  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open sets forms a QT on X.

**Proof.** (a) It is obvious that  $\emptyset$  is an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set. Let  $\{A_{\alpha} : \alpha \in \Lambda\}$  be a collection of  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open subsets of X. Then for each  $x \in \cup \{A_{\alpha} : \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ ,  $x \in A_{\alpha}$  for some  $\alpha \in \Lambda$ . Thus there exists  $U \in \mu$  containing x such that  $U \setminus i_{\mu}(A_{\alpha})$  is countable. Now as  $U \setminus i_{\mu}(\cup \{A_{\alpha} : \alpha \in \Lambda\}) \subseteq U \setminus i_{\mu}(A_{\alpha})$ , thus  $U \setminus i_{\mu}(\cup \{A_{\alpha} : \alpha \in \Lambda\})$  is countable. Hence  $\cup \{A_{\alpha} : \alpha \in \Lambda\}$  is an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set.

(b) It follows from (a) that  $(X, \omega_{\mu}^{*})$  is a GTS. Let A and B be two  $\omega_{\mu}^{*}$ -open sets and  $x \in A \cap B$ . Then there exist  $\mu$ -open sets U and V containing x such that  $U \setminus i_{\mu}(A)$  and  $V \setminus i_{\mu}(B)$  are countable. Then  $U \cap V$  is a  $\mu$ -open set containing x and  $(U \cap V) \setminus i_{\mu}(A \cap B) = (U \cap V) \setminus i_{\mu}(A) \cap i_{\mu}(B) \subseteq [U \setminus i_{\mu}(A)] \cup [V \setminus i_{\mu}(B)]$ . Thus  $(U \cap V) \setminus i_{\mu}(A \cap B)$  is countable so that  $\omega_{\mu}^{*}$  is a QT on X.

**Theorem 1** A subset A of a GTS  $(X, \mu)$  is an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set if and only if for each  $x \in A$ , there exist  $U_x \in \mu$  containing x and a countable subset C such that  $U_x \setminus C \subseteq i_{\mu}(A)$ .

**Proof.** Let A be an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set in X and  $x \in A$ . Then there exists  $U_x \in \mu$  containing x such that  $U_x \setminus i_{\mu}(A)$  is countable. Let  $C = U_x \setminus i_{\mu}(A) = U_x \cap (X \setminus i_{\mu}(A))$ . Then  $U_x \setminus C \subseteq i_{\mu}(A)$ .

Conversely, let  $x \in A$  and there exist  $U_x \in \mu$  containing x and a countable subset C such that  $U_x \setminus C \subseteq i_{\mu}(A)$ . Then  $U_x \setminus i_{\mu}(A) \subseteq C$  and hence  $U_x \setminus i_{\mu}(A)$ is a countable set. Thus A is an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set in X. **Theorem 2** Let  $(X, \mu)$  be a GTS and  $C \subseteq X$ . If C is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -closed, then  $C \subseteq K \cup B$  for some  $\mu$ -closed set K and a countable subset B.

**Proof.** If C be  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -closed, then  $X \setminus C$  is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open and hence for each  $x \in X \setminus C$ , there exist  $U \in \mu$  containing x and a countable subset B such that  $U \setminus B \subseteq i_{\mu}(X \setminus C) = X \setminus c_{\mu}(C)$ . Thus  $c_{\mu}(C) \subseteq X \setminus (U \setminus B) = X \setminus (U \cap (X \setminus B)) = (X \setminus U) \cup B$ . Let  $K = X \setminus U$ . Then K is  $\mu$ -closed such that  $C \subseteq K \cup B$ .

**Proposition 2** In a GTS  $(X, \mu)$ ,  $\omega_{\mu}^* = \omega_{\omega_{\mu}^*}^*$ , where  $\omega_{\mu}^*$  denotes the family of  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open sets of the GTS  $(X, \mu)$ .

**Proof.** By Remark 1, we have  $\omega_{\mu}^* \subseteq \omega_{\omega_{\mu}^*}^*$ . Let  $A \in \omega_{\omega_{\mu}^*}^*$ . Then for each  $x \in A$ , there exist  $U_x \in \omega_{\mu}^*$  with  $x \in U_x$  and a countable set  $C_x$  such that  $U_x \setminus C_x \subseteq i_{\mu}(A)$ . Furthermore there exist a  $V_x \in \mu$  with  $x \in V_x$  and a countable set  $D_x$  such that  $V_x \setminus D_x \subseteq i_{\mu}(U_x)$ . Thus  $V_x \setminus (C_x \cup D_x) = (V_x \setminus D_x) \setminus C_x \subseteq U_x \setminus C_x \subseteq i_{\mu}(A)$ . Since  $C_x \cup D_x$  is a countable set, we obtain  $A \in \omega_{\mu}^*$ .

**Remark 2** If  $(X, \mu)$  be a  $\mu$ -space, then  $(X, \omega_{\mu}^*)$  is an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -space.

**Definition 2** A subset A of a GTS  $(X, \mu)$  is called an (i)  $(\omega_{\mu}, \omega)$ -set if  $i_{\omega_{\mu}^{*}}(A) = i_{\omega_{\mu}}(A)$ . (ii)  $(\omega_{\mu}, \mu)$ -set if  $i_{\omega_{\mu}^{*}}(A) = i_{\mu}(A)$ .

**Remark 3** Every  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set is an  $(\omega_{\mu}, \omega)$ -set and every  $\mu$ -open set is an  $(\omega_{\mu}, \mu)$ -set but the converses are usually not true.

**Example 2** (a) Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu = \{\emptyset, \mathbb{I}, X\}$ . Then  $\mu$  is a GT on X. It can be checked that  $\mathbb{N}$  (= the set of natural numbers) is not an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open but an  $(\omega_{\mu}, \omega)$ -set.

(b) Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu = \{\emptyset, (2,3), X\}$ . Then  $\mu$  is a GT on X. The set  $(1, \frac{3}{2})$  is an  $(\omega_{\mu}, \mu)$ -set but not a  $\mu$ -open set.

**Theorem 3** A subset A of a GTS  $(X, \mu)$  is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open if and only if A is  $\omega_{\mu}$ -open and an  $(\omega_{\mu}, \omega)$ -set.

**Proof.** Since every  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set is  $\omega_{\mu}$ -open (from definition) and an  $(\omega_{\mu}, \omega)$ -set (by Remark 3), we have nothing to show.

Conversely, let A be an  $\omega_{\mu}$ -open and an  $(\omega_{\mu}, \omega)$ -set. Then  $A = i_{\omega_{\mu}}(A) = i_{\omega_{\mu}^{*}}(A)$ . Thus A is an  $\omega_{\mu}^{*}$ -open set.

**Theorem 4** A subset A of a GTS  $(X, \mu)$  is  $\mu$ -open if and only if A is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open and an  $(\omega_{\mu}, \mu)$ -set.

**Proof.** One part follows from the fact that every  $\mu$ -open set is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open and  $(\omega_{\mu}, \mu)$ -set.

Conversely, let A be an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set and an  $(\omega_{\mu}, \mu)$ -set. Then  $A = i_{\omega_{\mu}^*}(A) = i_{\mu}(A)$ . Thus A is  $\mu$ -open.

#### **Definition 3** A GTS $(X, \mu)$ is called

(i)  $\mu$ -locally countable if each  $x \in X$  is contained in a countable  $\mu$ -open set.

(ii) anti  $\mu$ -locally countable if each non-empty  $\mu$ -open subsets are uncountable.

**Theorem 5** Let  $(X, \mu)$  be a  $\mu$ -locally countable space. Then

(i) for any subset A of X, A is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open.

(ii) A is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open if and only if A is  $\omega_{\mu}$ -open.

**Proof.** (i) Let  $A \subseteq X$  and  $x \in A$ . Then there is a countable  $\mu$ -open set U containing x. Then  $U \setminus i_{\mu}(A)$  is a countable set. Thus A is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open.

(ii) One part follows from the fact that every  $\omega_{\mu}^{*}$ -open is  $\omega_{\mu}$ -open.

Conversely, let A be  $\omega_{\mu}$ -open. Then by (i), A is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open.

**Remark 4** Let  $(X, \mu)$  be a countable GTS. Then for any subset A of X, A is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open.

**Theorem 6** (i) Let  $(X, \mu)$  be a GTS and  $A \subseteq X$ . If  $(X, \mu)$  is anti  $\mu$ -locally countable, then so is  $(X, \omega_{\mu}^{*})$ . (ii) Let  $(X, \mu)$  be a QTS which is anti  $\mu$ -locally countable. Then for any  $\mu$ -open subset A of X,  $c_{\mu}(A) = c_{\omega_{\mu}^{*}}(A)$ .

**Proof.** (i) Let A be an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set and  $x \in A$ . Then there exist  $U_x \in \mu$  containing x and a countable subset C such that  $U_x \setminus C \subseteq i_{\mu}(A)$ . Thus  $i_{\mu}(A)$  is uncountable and hence A is uncountable.

(ii) Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{c}_{\mu}(A)$  and G be an  $\omega_{\mu}^{*}$ -open set containing x. Then there exist  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mu$  containing x and a countable subset C such that  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{x}} \setminus C \subseteq \mathbf{i}_{\mu}(G)$ . Then  $(\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{x}} \setminus C) \cap A \subseteq \mathbf{i}_{\mu}(G) \cap A$  i.e.,  $(\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{x}} \cap A) \setminus C \subseteq \mathbf{i}_{\mu}(G) \cap A$ . Since  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{x}}$  is a  $\mu$ -open set,  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{x}} \cap A \neq \emptyset$  and thus  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{x}} \cap A$  is a non-empty  $\mu$ -open set. Hence by anti  $\mu$ -locally countableness of  $(X, \mu)$ , it follows that  $\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{x}} \cap A$  is uncountable and hence  $(\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{x}} \cap A) \setminus C$  is also uncountable. Thus  $\mathbf{i}_{\mu}(G) \cap A$  is uncountable. Hence  $G \cap A \neq \emptyset$ . So  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{c}_{\omega_{\mu}^{*}}(A)$  i.e.,  $\mathbf{c}_{\mu}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{c}_{\omega_{\mu}^{*}}(A)$ . The other part is obvious.  $\Box$ 

**Definition 4** A  $\mu$ -space  $(X, \mu)$  is said to be  $\mu$ -Lindelöf [17] if every cover of X by  $\mu$ -open sets has a countable subcover.

A subset A of a  $\mu$ -space  $(X, \mu)$  is said to be  $\mu$ -Lindelöf relative to X [17] if every cover of A by  $\mu$ -open sets of X has a countable subcover.

**Theorem 7** Let  $(X, \mu)$  be a  $\mu$ -Lindelöf GTS and A be a  $\mu$ -closed,  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open subset of X. Then  $A \setminus i_{\mu}(A)$  is countable.

**Proof.** Clearly A is a  $\mu$ -Lindelöf space (see Corollary 3.6 of [15]). For each  $x \in A$ , there exist  $U_x \in \mu$  containing x and a countable subset C such that  $U_x \setminus C \subseteq i_{\mu}(A)$ . Thus  $\{U_x : x \in A\}$  is cover of A by  $\mu$ -open subsets of X. Hence by  $\mu$ -Lindelöfness of A, it has a countable subcover  $\{U_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Since  $A \setminus i_{\mu}(A) \subseteq \bigcup \{U_n \setminus i_{\mu}(A) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}, A \setminus i_{\mu}(A)$  becomes countable.

## 3 Decomposition of continuity by $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open sets

**Definition 5** A function  $f: (X, \mu) \to (Y, \lambda)$  is said to be  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuous (resp.  $\omega_{\mu}$ -continuous [15],  $(\mu, \lambda)$ -continuous [1]) if for every  $x \in X$  and every  $\lambda$ -open set V of Y containing f(x), there exists an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open (resp.  $\omega_{\mu}$ -open,  $\mu$ -open) set U containing x such that  $f(U) \subseteq V$ .

**Definition 6** A function  $f : (X, \mu) \to (Y, \lambda)$  is said to be weakly  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuous if for every  $x \in X$  and every  $\lambda$ -open set V of Y containing f(x), there exists an  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set U containing x such that  $f(U) \subseteq c_{\lambda}(V)$ .

**Theorem 8** For a function  $f : (X, \mu) \to (Y, \lambda)$  the following properties are equivalent: (i) f is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuous; (ii)  $f : (X, \omega_{\mu}^*) \to (Y, \lambda)$  is  $(\omega_{\mu}^*, \lambda)$ -continuous;

(iii)  $f^{-1}(V) \in \omega_{\perp}^*$  for every  $V \in \lambda$ .

**Proof.** Obvious.

**Remark 5** Let  $f : (X, \mu) \to (Y, \lambda)$  be a function. Then the following relations hold:  $(\mu, \lambda)$ -continuity  $\Rightarrow \omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuity  $\Rightarrow \omega_{\mu}$ -continuity  $\Rightarrow w_{\mu}$ -continuity.

**Example 3** (a) Let  $X = \{a, b, c\}$ ,  $\mu = \{\emptyset, \{b\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}, X\}$  and  $\lambda = \{\emptyset, \{a, c\}, \{a, b\}, \{$ 

X}. Then  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  are two GT's on X. It can be verified that the identity mapping  $f: (X, \mu) \to (X, \lambda)$  is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuous but not  $(\mu, \lambda)$ -continuous.

(b) Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu$  = the usual topology on  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $Y = \{a, b, c, d\}$  and  $\lambda = \{\emptyset, Y, \{a\}, \{a, b\}, \{c, d\}, \{a, b, c\}, Y\}$ . Consider the mapping  $f : (X, \mu) \to (Y, \lambda)$  defined by

$$f(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} a, & \mathrm{if} \quad x \in \mathbb{I} \\ b, & \mathrm{if} \quad x \notin \mathbb{I} \end{array} \right.$$

It can be checked that f is  $\omega_{\mu}$ -continuous but not  $\omega_{\mu}^{*}$ -continuous.

(c) Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$  be the set of real numbers,  $\mu = \{\emptyset, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{I}\}, Y = \{a, b, c, d\}$  and  $\lambda = \{\emptyset, Y, \{d\}, \{c, d\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$ . Consider the mapping  $f : (X, \mu) \to (Y, \lambda)$  defined by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{I} \cup \{0\} \\ b, & \text{if } x \notin \mathbb{I} \cup \{0\} \end{cases}$$

It can be verified that f is  $\omega_{\mu}$ -continuous but not weakly  $\omega_{\mu}^{*}$ -continuous.

**Definition 7** A function  $f: (X, \mu) \to (Y, \lambda)$  is said to be  $(\omega_{\mu}^*, \omega)$ -continuous (resp.  $(\omega_{\mu}^*, \mu)$ -continuous) if for every  $\lambda$ -open set A of Y,  $f^{-1}(A)$  is an  $(\omega_{\mu}, \omega)$ -set (resp. an  $(\omega_{\mu}, \mu)$ -set).

**Remark 6** Every  $(\mu, \lambda)$ -continuous function is  $(\omega_{\mu}^{*}, \mu)$ -continuous and every  $\omega_{\mu}^{*}$ -continuous function is  $(\omega_{\mu}^{*}, \omega)$ -continuous but the converses are not true.

**Example 4** (a) Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu = \{\emptyset, (2,3), X\}$ . Then  $\mu$  is a GT on X. Let  $B = (1, \frac{3}{2})$  and  $\lambda = \{\emptyset, B, X \setminus B, X\}$ . Consider the mapping  $f : (X, \mu) \to (X, \lambda)$  defined by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{5}{4}, & \text{if } x \in (1,2) \\ 4, & \text{if } x \notin (1,2) \end{cases}$$

It can be verified that f is  $(\omega_{\mu}^{*}, \mu)$ -continuous but not  $(\mu, \lambda)$ -continuous.

(b) Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu = \{\emptyset, \mathbb{I}, \dot{X}\}$  where  $\mathbb{I}$  is the set of irrationals. Then  $\mu$  is a GT on X. Consider the mapping  $f : (X, \mu) \to (X, \mu)$  defined by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2}, & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{N} \\ 1, & \text{if } x \notin \mathbb{N} \end{cases}$$

It can be verified that f is  $(\omega_{u}^{*}, \omega)$ -continuous but not  $\omega_{u}^{*}$ -continuous.

**Definition 8** For any subset A of a GTS  $(X, \mu)$ , the  $\mu$ -frontier [16] of A is denoted by  $Fr_{\mu}(A)$  and defined by  $Fr_{\mu}(A) = c_{\mu}(A) \cap c_{\mu}(X \setminus A)$ .

**Definition 9** A function  $f : (X, \mu) \to (Y, \lambda)$  is said to be co-weakly  $(\omega_{\mu}^*, \lambda)$ -continuous if  $f^{-1}(Fr_{\lambda}(V))$  is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -closed in X for every  $\lambda$ -open set V in Y.

**Theorem 9** For a function  $f: (X, \mu) \to (Y, \lambda)$  the following are equivalent: (i) f is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuous. (ii) f is  $\omega_{\mu}$ -continuous and  $(\omega_{\mu}, \omega)$ -continuous.

**Proof.** (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (ii) Follows from Theorem 3.

**Theorem 10** Let  $(X, \mu)$  be a QTS. Then for a function  $f : (X, \mu) \to (Y, \lambda)$  the following are equivalent: (i) f is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuous. (ii) f is co-weakly  $(\omega_{\mu}^*, \lambda)$ -continuous and weakly  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuous.

**Proof.** (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): Obvious.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Let f be a co-weakly  $(\omega_{\mu}^*, \lambda)$ -continuous and weakly  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuous function. Let  $x \in X$  and V be a  $\lambda$ -open set of Y containing f(x). As f is a weakly  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuous function, there exists a  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open set U containing x such that  $f(U) \subseteq c_{\lambda}(V)$ . Since  $\operatorname{Fr}_{\lambda}(V) = c_{\lambda}(V) \cap c_{\lambda}(X \setminus V) = c_{\lambda}(V) \setminus V$ , we have  $f(x) \notin \operatorname{Fr}_{\lambda}(V)$ . Since f is co-weakly  $(\omega_{\mu}^*, \lambda)$ -continuous,  $x \in U \setminus f^{-1}(\operatorname{Fr}_{\lambda}(V))$ , which is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -open in X. Then for every  $y \in f(U \setminus f^{-1}(\operatorname{Fr}_{\lambda}(V)))$ ,  $y = f(x_1)$  for a point  $x_1 \in U \setminus f^{-1}(\operatorname{Fr}_{\lambda}(V))$ . Thus we have  $f(x_1) = y \in f(U) \subseteq c_{\lambda}(V)$  and  $y \notin \operatorname{Fr}_{\lambda}(V)$  with  $f(x_1) \in V$ . Thus  $f(U \setminus f^{-1}(\operatorname{Fr}_{\lambda}(V))) \subseteq V$ . Hence f is  $\omega_{\mu}^*$ -continuous.

**Theorem 11** For a function  $f: (X, \mu) \to (Y, \lambda)$  the following are equivalent: (i)  $f(\mu, \lambda)$ -continuous. (ii) f is  $\omega_{\mu}^{*}$ -continuous and  $(\omega_{\mu}^{*}, \mu)$ -continuous.

**Proof.** Follows from Theorem 4.

### Acknowledgement

The author acknowledges the financial support from Department of Higher education, Science and technology and Biotechnology, Government of West Bengal, India.

 $\square$ 

## References

- A. Császár, Generalized topology, generalized continuity, Acta Math. Hungar., 96 (2002), 351–357.
- [2] A. Császár, Generalized open sets in generalized topologies, Acta Math. Hungar., 106 (2005), 53–66.
- [3] A. Császár, Remarks on quasi topologies, Acta Math. Hungar., 119 (2008), 197–200.
- [4] A. Császár, On generalized neighbourhood systems, Acta Math. Hungar., 121 (2008), 359–400.
- [5] J. Dontchev and M. Przemski, On various decompositions of continuous and some weakly continuous functions, *Acta Math. Hungar.*, **71** (1996), 109–120.
- [6] Y. Erguang and Y. Pengfei, On decomposition of A continuity, Acta Math. Hungar., 110 (2006), 309–313.
- [7] M. Ganster and I. L. Reilly, A decomposition of continuity, Acta Math. Hungar., 56 (1990), 299–301.
- [8] M. Ganster and I. L. Reilly, Locally closed sets and LC continuous functions, Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci., 12 (1989), 417–424.
- [9] A. Gupta and R. D. Sarma, PS-regular sets in topology and generalized topology, *Journal of Mathematics*, (2014), Article ID 274592, 6 pages.
- [10] E. Hatir and T. Noiri, Decomposition of continuity and complete continuity, Acta Math. Hungar., 113 (2006), 281–287.
- [11] E. Hatir, T. Noiri and S. Yuksel, A decomposition of continuity, Acta Math Hungar., 70 (1996), 145–150.
- [12] H. Z. Hdeib, ω-continuous functions, Dirasat Jour., 16, (2)(1989), 136– 153.
- [13] T. Noiri and O. R. Sayed, On decomposition of continuity, Acta Math. Hungar., 110 (2006), 307–314.
- [14] M. Przemski, A decomposition of continuity and α-continuity, Acta Math. Hungar., 61 (1993), 93–98.

- [15] B. Roy, More on μ-Lindelöf spaces in μ-spaces, Questions and Answers in Gen. Topol., 33 (2015), 25–31.
- [16] B. Roy, On weakly (μ,λ)-open functions, Ukrainian Math Jour., 66 (10) (2015), 1595–1602.
- [17] M. S. Sarsak, On μ-compact sets in μ-spaces, Questions and Answers in Gen. Topol., **31** (1) (2013) 49–57.
- [18] J. Tong, On decomposition of continuity in topological spaces, Acta Math. Hungar., 54 (1989), 51–55.
- [19] J. Tong, Classification of weak continuities and decomposition of continuity, Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci., 51 (2004), 2755–2760.
- [20] T. H. Yalvac, Decompositions of continuity, Acta Math. Hungar., 64 (1994), 309–313.

*Received: May 28, 2018*