MR3546508 06D22 54B05
Picado, Jorge (P-CMBR-CM); **Pultr, Aleš** (CZ-KARLMP-AM)
New aspects of subfitness in frames and spaces. **(English summary)**
Appl. Categ. Structures **24** (2016), *no. 5,* 703–714.

In this article the authors assemble new facts about subfitness and weak subfitness, two of the low separation axioms in topology. Subfitness is weaker than the T_1 axiom and has no relation with T_0. The T_D axiom is a low separation axiom that lies strictly between T_1 and T_0. However, subfitness together with T_D is equivalent to T_1. The authors show that in topological spaces, subfitness is strictly weaker than symmetry. They show that a frame L is T_1-spatial if and only if L is T_D-spatial and subfit, if and only if L is step-bounded and subfit. Furthermore, a frame L is a Boolean algebra precisely when it is dually weakly subfit. In addition, the authors define repleteness in spaces and locales and show that a frame L is subfit if and only if it contains no non-trivial replete sublocale. A space X is subfit if and only if for every open set U, $U \approx \mathfrak{s}(U) = \bigcup\{U \mid A \text{ closed}, A \subseteq U\}$, where $A \approx B$ means that for any open sets U, V, $U \cap A = V \cap A$ if and only if $U \cap B = V \cap B$. Finally, another necessary and sufficient condition for subfitness presented by the authors is the validity of the meet formula for the Heyting operation, while a necessary and sufficient condition for weakly subfitness is the validity of the meet formula for pseudocomplementation. *Mack Zakaria Matlabyana*

References

1. Aull, C.E., Thron, W.J.: Separation axioms between t_0 and t_1. Indag. Math. **24**, 26–37 (1963) MR0138082
2. Ball, R.N., Picado, J., Pultr, A.: On an aspect of scatteredness in the pointfree setting. Port. Math. **73**, 139–152 (2016) MR3500827
3. Banaschewski, B., Pultr, A.: Variants of openness. Appl. Categ. Structures **2**, 331–350 (1994) MR1300720
4. Banaschewski, B., Pultr, A.: Pointfree aspects of the t_D axiom of classical topology. Quaest. Math. **33**, 369–385 (2010) MR2755527
5. Dowker, C.H., Strauss, D.: T_1- and T_2-axioms for frames. In: Aspects of Topology, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 93, pp. 325–335. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1985) MR0787838
6. Herrlich, H.: A concept of nearness. Gen. Topology Appl. **5**, 191–212 (1974) MR0350701
7. Herrlich, H., Pultr, A.: Nearness, subfitness and sequential regularity. Appl. Categ. Structures **8**, 67–80 (2000) MR1785838
8. Isbell, J.R.: Atomless parts of spaces. Math. Scand. **31**, 5–32 (1972) MR0358725
9. Johnstone, P.T.: Stone Spaces. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1982) MR0698074
10. Klinke, O.: When consistency is redundant, manuscript (2015)
11. Morita, K.: On the simple extension of a space with respect to a uniformity I. Proc. Japan Acad. **27**, 65–72 (1951) MR0048782
12. Picado, J., Pultr, A.: Frames and Locales: Topology without Points. Frontiers in Mathematics, vol. 28. Springer, Basel (2012) MR2868166
13. Picado, J., Pultr, A.: (Sub)fit biframes and non-symmetric nearness. Topology Appl.

168, 66–81 (2014) MR3196839
14. Picado, J., Pultr, A.: More on subfitness and fitness. Appl. Categ. Structures **23**, 323–335 (2015) MR3351084
15. Pultr, A.: Frames. In: Hazewinkel, M. (ed.) Handbook of Algebra, vol. 3, pp. 791–858. Elsevier (2003) MR2035108
16. Simmons, H.: The lattice theoretic part of topological separation properties. Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. **21**(2), 41–48 (1978) MR0493959
17. Simmons, H.: Regularity, fitness, and the block structure of frames. Appl. Categ. Structures **14**, 1–34 (2006) MR2216640

Note: This list reflects references listed in the original paper as accurately as possible with no attempt to correct errors.