

# ON THE MAXIMAL $G$ -COMPACTIFICATION OF PRODUCTS OF TWO $G$ -SPACES

NATELLA ANTONYAN

*Received 5 September 2005; Revised 27 December 2005; Accepted 8 January 2006*

Let  $G$  be any Hausdorff topological group and let  $\beta_G X$  denote the maximal  $G$ -compactification of a  $G$ -Tychonoff space  $X$ . We prove that if  $X$  and  $Y$  are two  $G$ -Tychonoff spaces such that the product  $X \times Y$  is pseudocompact, then  $\beta_G(X \times Y) = \beta_G X \times \beta_G Y$ .

Copyright © 2006 Hindawi Publishing Corporation. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Let  $G$  be any Hausdorff topological group and let  $\beta_G X$  denote the maximal  $G$ -compactification of a  $G$ -Tychonoff space  $X$  (i.e., a Tychonoff  $G$ -space possessing a  $G$ -compactification). Recall that a completely regular Hausdorff topological space is called pseudocompact if every continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is bounded.

In this paper, we prove that if  $X$  and  $Y$  are two  $G$ -Tychonoff spaces such that the product  $X \times Y$  is pseudocompact, then  $\beta_G(X \times Y) = \beta_G X \times \beta_G Y$  (see Theorem 2.2). This is a  $G$ -equivariant version of the well-known result of Glicksberg [16], which for  $G$  a locally compact group was proved earlier by de Vries in [10]. Note that even in the case of a locally compact acting group  $G$ , our proof is shorter than that of [10, Theorem 4.1]. It follows from Proposition 2.7 that the equality  $\beta_G(X \times Y) = \beta_G X \times \beta_G Y$  does not imply, in general, the pseudocompactness of  $X \times Y$  even if  $X$  and  $Y$  both are infinite (cf. [16, Theorem 1]).

Theorem 2.10 says that if a pseudocompact group  $G$  acts continuously on a pseudocompact space  $X$ , then  $\beta_G X = \beta X$ .

Let us introduce some terminology we will use in the paper.

Throughout the paper, all topological spaces are assumed to be Tychonoff (i.e., completely regular and Hausdorff). The letter “ $G$ ” will always denote a Hausdorff (and hence, completely regular) topological group unless otherwise stated.

For the basic ideas and facts of the theory of  $G$ -spaces or topological transformation groups, we refer the reader to [5, 7, 11]. However, we recall below some more special notions and facts we need in the paper.

## 2 On the maximal $G$ -compactification

By a  $G$ -space we mean a Tychonoff space  $X$  endowed with a continuous action  $G \times X \rightarrow X$  of a topological group  $G$ . A continuous map of  $G$ -spaces  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is called a  $G$ -map or an equivariant map if  $f(gx) = gf(x)$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $g \in G$ .

If  $X$  is a  $G$ -space and  $S$  a subset of  $X$ , then  $G(S)$  denotes the  $G$ -saturation of  $S$ , that is,  $G(S) = \{gs \mid g \in G, s \in S\}$ . In particular,  $G(x)$  denotes the  $G$ -orbit  $\{gx \in X \mid g \in G\}$  of  $x$ . If  $G(S) = S$ , then  $S$  is said to be an invariant set. The orbit space endowed with the quotient topology is denoted by  $X/G$ .

For a closed subgroup  $H \subset G$ , by  $G/H$  we will denote the  $G$ -space of cosets  $\{gH \mid g \in G\}$  under the action induced by left translations.

On any product of  $G$ -spaces we always consider the diagonal action of  $G$ .

A  $G$ -compactification of a  $G$ -space  $X$  is a pair  $(b, bX)$ , where  $b : X \rightarrow bX$  is a  $G$ -homeomorphic embedding into a compact  $G$ -space  $bX$  such that the image  $b(X)$  is dense in  $bX$ . Usually  $bX$  alone is a sufficient denotation. We will say that two  $G$ -compactifications  $b_1X$  and  $b_2X$  are equivalent if there exists a  $G$ -homeomorphism  $f : b_1X \rightarrow b_2X$  such that  $f(b_1(x)) = b_2(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ . Clearly, the equivalence of  $G$ -compactifications is an equivalence relation in the class of all  $G$ -compactifications of  $X$ . We will identify equivalent  $G$ -compactifications; any class of equivalent  $G$ -compactifications will be denoted by the same symbol  $bX$ , where  $bX$  is any  $G$ -compactification from this equivalence class. An order relation in the family of all  $G$ -compactifications is defined as follows:  $b_1X \preceq b_2X$  if there exists a  $G$ -map  $f : b_2X \rightarrow b_1X$  such that  $f b_2 = b_1$ . It is easy to see that  $b_1X$  and  $b_2X$  are equivalent if and only if  $b_1X \preceq b_2X$  and  $b_2X \preceq b_1X$ . We will write  $b_1X = b_2X$  whenever  $b_1X$  and  $b_2X$  are equivalent  $G$ -compactifications. In a standard way, one can show that each nonempty family of  $G$ -compactifications of  $X$  has a least upper bound with respect to the order  $\preceq$ . In particular, if a  $G$ -space  $X$  has a  $G$ -compactification, then there exists a largest  $G$ -compactification  $\beta_G X$  with respect to the order  $\preceq$ ;  $\beta_G X$  is called the maximal  $G$ -compactification of  $X$ .

A continuous real-valued function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on a  $G$ -space  $X$  is said to be  $G$ -uniform if for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of the identity element in  $G$  such that  $|f(gx) - f(x)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $x \in X, g \in U$ .

A  $G$ -space  $X$  is said to be  $G$ -Tychonoff if for any closed set  $A \subset X$  and any point  $x \in X \setminus A$ , there exists a  $G$ -uniform function  $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(x) = 0$  and  $A \subset f^{-1}(1)$ .

It is evident that each continuous function on a compact  $G$ -space is  $G$ -uniform, and hence every compact  $G$ -space is  $G$ -Tychonoff. Since an invariant subspace of a  $G$ -Tychonoff space is again  $G$ -Tychonoff, we see that if a  $G$ -space has a  $G$ -compactification, then it is  $G$ -Tychonoff. The converse is also true (see, e.g., [1, 2]). Thus, a  $G$ -space is  $G$ -Tychonoff if and only if it admits a  $G$ -compactification, and in particular, a maximal  $G$ -compactification. In [8, 9], it was proved that if  $G$  is a locally compact group, then every Tychonoff  $G$ -space is  $G$ -Tychonoff. The local compactness of  $G$  is essential here (see [18]).

Given a space  $Z$ , we will denote by  $C(Z, \mathbb{R})$  the space of all continuous real-valued functions  $f : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  equipped with the compact-open topology (see, e.g., [13, Chapter 12, Section 1]). A subset  $K \subset C(Z, \mathbb{R})$  is called equicontinuous at a point  $z_0 \in Z$  if for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a neighborhood  $O$  of  $z_0 \in Z$  such that  $|f(z) - f(z_0)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $z \in O$

and  $f \in K$ . If  $K$  is equicontinuous at each point  $z_0 \in Z$ , then we will say that it is an equicontinuous set.

If additionally  $Z$  is a  $G$ -space for a group  $G$ , then one can define the following (in general not continuous) action of  $G$  on  $C(Z, \mathbb{R})$ :

$$(g\psi)(z) = \psi(g^{-1}z), \quad \psi \in C(Z, \mathbb{R}), z \in Z, g \in G. \quad (1.1)$$

If  $G$  is locally compact, then this action is continuous, otherwise it may be discontinuous (see, e.g., [7, Chapter I, Section 2.1]). However, the following result is true.

LEMMA 1.1. *Let  $Z$  be a  $G$ -space and  $K$  an invariant equicontinuous subset of  $C(Z, \mathbb{R})$ . Then the closure  $\overline{K}$  is also an invariant set and the restriction of the action (1.1) to  $G \times \overline{K}$  is continuous.*

*Proof.* For every  $g \in G$ , define the map  $g_* : C(Z, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C(Z, \mathbb{R})$  by setting  $g_*(\psi) = g\psi$ , where  $g\psi$  is defined as in (1.1). First we show that  $g_*$  is a continuous map.

Indeed, let  $C$  be a compact set in  $Z$ ,  $U$  an open set in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $M(C, U) = \{\psi \in C(Z, \mathbb{R}) \mid \psi(C) \subset U\}$ . Since all the sets of the form  $M(C, U)$  constitute a subbase of the compact-open topology of  $C(Z, \mathbb{R})$  and  $g_*^{-1}(M(C, U)) = M(g^{-1}C, U)$ , we infer that  $g_*$  is continuous.

Now choose  $\varphi \in \overline{K}$  and  $h \in G$  arbitrary. One needs to show that  $h\varphi \in \overline{K}$ . Let  $V$  be a neighborhood of  $g\varphi$ . Since the above-defined map  $h_*$  is continuous, the set  $h_*^{-1}(V) = h^{-1}V$  is a neighborhood of  $\varphi$ . Consequently,  $h^{-1}(V) \cap K \neq \emptyset$ , which is equivalent to  $V \cap hK \neq \emptyset$ . But  $hK = K$  because  $K$  is invariant. Hence,  $V \cap K \neq \emptyset$ , as required. Thus, the proof that the closure  $\overline{K}$  is an invariant subset is complete.

Next we observe that the closure of an equicontinuous set is again equicontinuous [17, Chapter 7, Theorem 14]; so  $\overline{K}$  is an equicontinuous invariant subset of  $C(Z, \mathbb{R})$ .

Now the continuity of the restriction of the action (1.1) to  $G \times \overline{K}$  follows easily from the continuity of the evaluation map  $\omega : \overline{K} \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\omega(\psi, z) = \psi(z)$ ,  $\psi \in \overline{K}$ ,  $z \in Z$  (see, e.g., [17, Chapter 7, Theorem 15]). We refer the reader to [2, Lemma 2] for more details.  $\square$

We will need this lemma in the proof of Theorem 2.2.

In what follows, we will need also the following two characterizations of the maximal  $G$ -compactification  $\beta_G X$  established in [8] (see also [4]).

PROPOSITION 1.2. *Let  $G$  be a group and  $X$  a  $G$ -Tychonoff space. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *Each  $G$ -map  $f : X \rightarrow B$  to a compact  $G$ -space has a unique  $G$ -extension  $F : \beta_G X \rightarrow B$ .*
- (2) *Let  $bX$  be a  $G$ -compactification of  $X$  such that every  $G$ -map  $f : X \rightarrow B$  to a compact  $G$ -space has a  $G$ -extension  $F : bX \rightarrow B$ . Then  $bX$  is equivalent to  $\beta_G X$ .*

PROPOSITION 1.3. *Let  $G$  be a group and  $X$  a  $G$ -Tychonoff space. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *Each bounded  $G$ -uniform function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  possesses a unique continuous extension  $F : \beta_G X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .*
- (2) *If  $bX$  is a  $G$ -compactification such that each bounded  $G$ -uniform function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  admits a continuous extension  $F : bX \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , then  $bX$  is equivalent to  $\beta_G X$ .*

## 2. Main results

LEMMA 2.1. *Let  $G$  be any group,  $X$  a  $G$ -space, and  $A$  a dense  $G$ -subset of  $X$ . Assume that  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a continuous map such that the restriction  $f|_A : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $G$ -uniform. Then  $f$  is  $G$ -uniform as well.*

*Proof.* Define the map  $f' : X \rightarrow C(G, \mathbb{R})$  by setting  $f'(x)(g) = f(gx)$ ,  $x \in X$ ,  $g \in G$ . The continuity of  $f'$  follows from the fact that the compact-open topology is proper (see [14, Theorem 3.4.1]).

It is easy to see that the  $G$ -uniformness of  $f$  is just equivalent to the equicontinuity of the image  $f'(X)$  in  $C(G, \mathbb{R})$ . Since the restriction  $f|_A$  is  $G$ -uniform, we infer that the set  $f'(A)$  is equicontinuous. But closure of an equicontinuous set is again equicontinuous [17, Chapter 7, Theorem 14]; so  $\overline{f'(A)}$  is equicontinuous. By continuity of  $f'$ ,  $f'(X) \subset \overline{f'(A)}$ , yielding that  $f'(X)$  is also equicontinuous. Hence,  $f$  is  $G$ -uniform.  $\square$

THEOREM 2.2. *Let  $G$  be any group and let  $X$  and  $Y$  be  $G$ -Tychonoff spaces such that  $X \times Y$  is pseudocompact. Then  $\beta_G(X \times Y) = \beta_G X \times \beta_G Y$ .*

*Proof.* According to Proposition 1.3, it suffices to prove that every bounded  $G$ -uniform function  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has a continuous extension  $F : \beta_G X \times \beta_G Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

The idea is first to extend  $f$  to a bounded  $G$ -uniform function  $\varphi : \beta_G X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and then to extend in a similar way  $\varphi$  to obtain the desired extension  $F$ . In the nonequivariant case, this is due to Todd [21].

Define the map  $f' : X \rightarrow C(G \times Y, \mathbb{R})$  by setting

$$f'(x)(g, y) = f(gx, gy) \quad \forall x \in X, (g, y) \in G \times Y. \quad (2.1)$$

Continuity of  $f'$  follows from the fact that the compact-open topology is proper (see [13, Theorem 3.1]).

Claim 2.3. The image  $f'(X)$  is an equicontinuous set in  $C(G \times Y, \mathbb{R})$ .

*Proof of the claim.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $(g_0, y_0) \in G \times Y$ . We have to show that there exist neighborhoods  $U$  of  $g_0$  and  $V$  of  $y_0$  such that

$$|f'(x)(g, y) - f'(x)(g_0, y_0)| < \varepsilon \quad \forall x \in X, g \in U, y \in V. \quad (2.2)$$

Since  $f$  is a  $G$ -uniform function, one can choose a neighborhood  $U$  of the unity in  $G$  such that

$$|f(tx, ty) - f(x, y)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \quad \forall (x, y) \in X \times Y, t \in U. \quad (2.3)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |f'(x)(g, y) - f'(x)(g_0, y_0)| &= |f(gx, gy) - f(g_0x, g_0y_0)| \\ &\leq |f(gx, gy) - f(gx, g_0y_0)| + |f(gx, g_0y_0) - f(gx, gy_0)| \\ &\quad + |f(gx, gy_0) - f(g_0x, g_0y_0)|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

It follows from (2.3) that for all  $x \in X$  and  $g \in Ug_0$ , we have

$$|f(gx, gy_0) - f(g_0x, g_0y_0)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (2.5)$$

It is known that the formula

$$\varphi(y) = \sup_{x \in X} |f(x, y) - f(x, g_0y_0)|, \quad y \in Y, \quad (2.6)$$

defines a continuous function  $\varphi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (see [15, Lemma 1.3]).

Since  $\varphi(g_0y_0) = 0$ , we conclude that there is a neighborhood  $V$  of  $g_0y_0$  in  $Y$  such that  $\varphi(v) < \varepsilon/3$  for all  $v \in V$ . Hence, one has

$$|f(x, v) - f(x, g_0y_0)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \quad \forall v \in V, x \in X. \quad (2.7)$$

By continuity of the action on  $Y$ , there exist neighborhoods  $O$  and  $W$  of  $g_0$  and  $y_0$ , respectively, such that  $OW \subset V$  and  $O \subset Ug_0$ . Consequently, if  $g \in O$  and  $y \in W$ , then  $gy \in V$  and  $gy_0 \in V$ . Hence, (2.7) yields for all  $x \in X$

$$|f(gx, gy) - f(gx, g_0y_0)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \quad |f(gx, gy_0) - f(gx, g_0y_0)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (2.8)$$

Now, (2.4), (2.5), and (2.8) imply for all  $g \in Ug_0$  and  $y \in W$  that

$$|f'(x)(g, y) - f'(x)(g_0, y_0)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} = \varepsilon, \quad (2.9)$$

as required. Thus,  $f'(X)$  is indeed an equicontinuous set, and the proof of the claim is complete.  $\square$

Now we continue with the proof of Theorem 2.2. Consider  $G \times Y$  as a  $G$ -space endowed with the action  $h * (g, y) = (gh^{-1}, hy)$ . Then the induced action (1.1) becomes the following action:

$$(h\psi)(g, y) = \psi(gh, h^{-1}y) \quad \forall \psi \in C(G \times Y, \mathbb{R}), g, h \in G, y \in Y. \quad (2.10)$$

We claim that  $f'$  is algebraically equivariant, that is,  $hf'(x) = f'(hx)$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $h \in G$ . Indeed, if  $(g, y) \in G \times Y$ , then we have

$$(hf'(x))(g, y) = f'(x)(gh, h^{-1}y) = f(ghx, gy) = f'(hx)(g, y) = (hf'(x))(g, y), \quad (2.11)$$

which means that  $hf'(x) = f'(hx)$ .

Consequently,  $f'(X)$  is an invariant subset of  $C(G \times Y, \mathbb{R})$ . By Lemma 1.1 and the above claim, the closure  $T = \overline{f'(X)}$  also is an invariant subset of  $C(G \times Y, \mathbb{R})$ , and the restriction of the action (2.10) to  $G \times T$  is continuous.

Further, since  $f'(X)$  is a bounded subset of  $C(G \times Y, \mathbb{R})$ , it follows from the Arzela-Ascoli theorem [13, Theorem 6.4] that  $T$  is compact.

Thus,  $T$  is a compact  $G$ -space. Next, since  $f' : X \rightarrow T$  is a  $G$ -map, by Proposition 1.2,  $f'$  extends to a  $G$ -map  $F' : \beta_G X \rightarrow T \subset C(G \times Y, \mathbb{R})$ .

## 6 On the maximal $G$ -compactification

Define the map  $\phi : \beta_G X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by the formula  $\phi(z, y) = F'(z)(e, y)$ , where  $(z, y) \in \beta_G X \times Y$  and  $e$  is the unity of  $G$ . Clearly,  $\phi$  is bounded.

Since the evaluation map  $\omega : T \times (G \times Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\omega(\psi, t) = \psi(t)$ ,  $\psi \in T$ ,  $t \in G \times Y$ , is continuous (see, e.g., [17, Chapter 7, Theorem 15]), we infer that  $\phi$  is also continuous.

If  $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ , then  $\phi(x, y) = F'(x)(e, y) = f'(x)(e, y) = f(x, y)$ , showing that  $\phi$  extends  $f$ . Since  $f$  is  $G$ -uniform, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that  $\phi$  is  $G$ -uniform.

Since the product of a pseudocompact space and a compact space is pseudocompact (see, e.g., [14, Corollary 3.10.27]),  $\beta_G X \times Y$  is a pseudocompact  $G$ -space. Consequently, by the same way, one can prove that the bounded  $G$ -uniform function  $\phi : \beta_G X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  extends to a continuous function  $F : \beta_G X \times \beta_G Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , which is the desired extension of  $f$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 2.4.* For  $G$  a locally compact group, Theorem 2.2 was proved earlier by de Vries in [10] in a different way. If  $G$ , as a topological space, is a  $k$ -space (i.e., a quotient image of a locally compact space) and  $X$  is a pseudocompact  $G$ -space, then  $\beta_G X = \beta X$  (see [10, Lemma 5.5]). Hence, Theorem 2.2 follows in this case directly from the classical result of Glicksberg [16] (this is just [10, Corollary 5.7]).

In the following lemma, we just list two known important cases when the product of two pseudocompact spaces is pseudocompact.

LEMMA 2.5. *The product  $X \times Y$  of two spaces is pseudocompact, if at least one of the following conditions is fulfilled:*

- (1)  $X$  is a pseudocompact  $k$ -space and  $Y$  is a pseudocompact space;
- (2)  $X$  is a pseudocompact topological group and  $Y$  is a pseudocompact space.

*Proof.* For the first statement, see, for example, [14, Theorem 3.10.26]. The second one is proved in [20, Corollary 2.14].  $\square$

COROLLARY 2.6. *Let  $G$  be any group,  $H$  a closed subgroup of  $G$  such that  $G/H$  is compact, and let  $X$  be a pseudocompact  $G$ -Tychonoff space. Then  $\beta_G(G/H \times X) = G/H \times \beta_G X$ .*

The following simple result shows that the converse of Theorem 2.2 is not true even if  $X$  and  $Y$  both are infinite (cf. [16, Theorem 1]).

PROPOSITION 2.7. *Let  $G$  be any group,  $H$  a closed subgroup of  $G$  such that  $G/H$  is compact, and let  $X$  be a Tychonoff space endowed with the trivial action of  $G$ . Then  $\beta_G(G/H \times X) = G/H \times \beta X$ .*

*Proof.* Evidently,  $G/H \times \beta X$  is a  $G$ -compactification of  $G/H \times X$ . Hence, according to Proposition 1.3, it suffices to prove that every bounded  $G$ -uniform function  $f : G/H \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has a continuous extension  $F : G/H \times \beta X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

Define a function  $f' : X \rightarrow C(G/H, \mathbb{R})$  by  $f'(x)(t) = f(t, x)$ , where  $(t, x) \in G/H \times X$ . Then  $f'$  is continuous, and it follows from the  $G$ -uniformness of  $f$  that the image  $f'(X)$  is an equicontinuous set in  $C(G/H, \mathbb{R})$ . Besides, the set  $f'(X)(t_0) = \{f'(x)(t_0) \mid x \in X\}$  is bounded for all  $t_0 \in G/H$ . Consequently, by the Arzela-Ascoli theorem [13, Theorem 6.4],  $f'(X)$  has a compact closure  $\overline{f'(X)}$  in  $C(G/H, \mathbb{R})$ . Hence,  $f'$  has a continuous extension

$F' : \beta X \rightarrow \overline{f'(X)} \subset C(G/H, \mathbb{R})$ . Define  $F : G/H \times \beta X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $F(t, z) = f'(z)(t)$ . The compactness of  $G/H$  insures that  $F$  is continuous (see, e.g., [14, Theorem 3.4.3]). It remains only to observe that  $F$  extends  $f$ .  $\square$

Recall that a  $G$ -space  $X$  is called free if for every  $x \in X$ , the equality  $gx = x$  implies that  $g = e$ , the unity of  $G$ .

Below, we will need the following well-known result.

LEMMA 2.8. *Let  $G$  be a compact group and  $X$  a free  $G$ -space. Then  $(G \times X)/G$  is  $G$ -homeomorphic to  $X$ , where  $G$  acts on the orbit space  $(G \times X)/G$  according to the rule  $h * G(g, x) = G(gh^{-1}, x)$ .*

*Proof.* The desired  $G$ -homeomorphism  $f : (G \times X)/G \rightarrow X$  is defined as follows:

$$f(G(g, x)) = g^{-1}x \quad \forall (g, x) \in G \times X, \tag{2.12}$$

where  $G(g, x)$  stands for the  $G$ -orbit of the pair  $(g, x)$ .

It is easy to verify that  $f$  is continuous and bijective. The closedness of  $f$  follows from that of the map  $G \times X \rightarrow X, (g, x) \mapsto g^{-1}x$  (see [5, Chapter I, Theorem 1.2]).  $\square$

If the action of  $G$  on  $X$  is not trivial, then Proposition 2.7 is no longer true. Namely, we have the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 2.9. *Let  $G$  be an infinite, compact, metrizable group and  $X$  a finite-dimensional, paracompact, noncompact, free  $G$ -space. Then  $\beta_G(G \times X) \neq G \times \beta_G X$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose the contrary, that  $\beta_G(G \times X) = G \times \beta_G X$ . Passing to the orbit spaces, we have

$$\frac{G \times \beta_G X}{G} = \frac{\beta_G(G \times X)}{G}. \tag{2.13}$$

Using the formula  $(\beta_G Z)/G = \beta(Z/G)$  (see [4, Corollary 4.10]), we get

$$\frac{\beta_G(G \times X)}{G} = \beta\left(\frac{G \times X}{G}\right). \tag{2.14}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{G \times \beta_G X}{G} = \beta\left(\frac{G \times X}{G}\right). \tag{2.15}$$

It is known that a finite-dimensional, paracompact, free  $G$ -space has a free  $G$ -compactification and in this case  $\beta_G X$  is also a free  $G$ -space (see [3, Proposition 3.7]). Consequently, by virtue of Lemma 2.8, one has that  $(G \times X)/G = X$  and  $(G \times \beta_G X)/G = \beta_G X$ . In sum, we get  $\beta X = \beta_G X$ , which implies that each bounded continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $G$ -uniform. However, this is not true.

Indeed, since  $X$  is paracompact and noncompact, it is not countably compact [14, Theorem 3.10.3]. Hence, there exists a locally finite, disjoint, countable family  $\{U_1, U_2, \dots\}$  of open subsets of  $X$ . Since  $G$  is infinite, one can choose a countable base  $\{O_1, O_2, \dots\}$  of neighborhoods of the unity in  $G$ . For each  $n \geq 1$ , choose a point  $x_n \in U_n$  arbitrary. Then,

## 8 On the maximal $G$ -compactification

by continuity of the  $G$ -action at  $x_n \in X$ , there exists an element  $g_n \in O_n$  such that  $g_n$  is different from the unity of  $G$  and  $g_n x_n \in U_n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Since  $X$  is a free  $G$ -space, we see that  $g_n x_n \neq x_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ .

Now, let  $f_n : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a continuous function such that  $f_n(x_n) = 1$ ,  $f_n(g_n x_n) = 0$  and  $f_n(X \setminus U_n) = \{0\}$ . Define  $f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ . Since  $\{U_1, U_2, \dots\}$  is disjoint and locally finite,  $f$  is a well-defined, continuous, bounded function  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Hence, it should be also  $G$ -uniform, which yields a neighborhood  $Q$  of the unity in  $G$  such that  $|f(gx) - f(x)| < 1/2$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $g \in Q$ . We choose  $n \geq 1$  so large that  $O_n \subset Q$ . This implies that  $g_n \in Q$ , and hence  $1 = |f(g_n x_n) - f(x_n)| < 1/2$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

In general, if the acting group  $G$  is not discrete, an action  $G \times X \rightarrow X$  cannot be extended (continuously) to an action  $G \times \beta X \rightarrow \beta X$ ; the natural rotation-action of the circle group on the plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$  provides a counterexample (see [19, Section 1.5]). However, the following result holds true.

**THEOREM 2.10.** *Let  $G$  be a pseudocompact group and  $X$  a pseudocompact  $G$ -space. Then  $X$  is  $G$ -Tychonoff and  $\beta_G X = \beta X$ .*

*Proof.* The action  $\alpha : G \times X \rightarrow X$  uniquely extends to a continuous map  $\varphi : \beta(G \times X) \rightarrow \beta X$ . By Lemma 2.5(2), the product  $G \times X$  is pseudocompact, and hence, according to Glicksberg's theorem [16],  $\beta(G \times X) = \beta G \times \beta X$ . Thus,  $\varphi$  can be treated as a continuous map of  $\beta G \times \beta X$  in  $\beta X$  which extends  $\alpha$ . But remember that  $\beta G$  is a topological group containing  $G$  as a dense subgroup (see, e.g., [6, Theorem 4.1(f)]).

Further, the fact that  $\alpha$  satisfies the two algebraic conditions of action implies easily that the map  $\varphi : \beta G \times \beta X \rightarrow \beta X$  satisfies these conditions as well. Thus,  $\varphi$  is an action, and hence  $\beta X$  is a  $\beta G$ -space. In particular,  $\beta X$  is a  $G$ -space. Consequently,  $\beta X$  is a  $G$ -compactification of  $X$ , and hence  $X$  is a  $G$ -Tychonoff space. It is also clear that  $\beta X$  is the maximal  $G$ -compactification of  $X$ , that is,  $\beta_G X = \beta X$ , as required.  $\square$

*Remark 2.11.* It is worth to mention that there exists a pseudocompact group whose underlying topological space is not a  $k$ -space (see, e.g., [12, 20]).

### Acknowledgments

The author was supported by the Grants U42573-F from CONACYT and IN-105803 from PAPIIT, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM). We are thankful to the referee for useful comments.

### References

- [1] S. A. Antonjan and Yu. M. Smirnov, *Universal objects and bicomact extensions for topological groups of transformations*, Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR **257** (1981), no. 3, 521–526 (Russian), English translation: Soviet Mathematics Doklady **23** (1981), no. 2, 279–284.
- [2] S. A. Antonyan, *Equivariant embeddings and  $\omega$ -bounded groups*, Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Seriya I. Matematika, Mekhanika **49** (1994), no. 1, 16–22, 95 (Russian), English translation: Moscow University Mathematics Bulletin **49** (1994), no. 1, 13–16.
- [3] N. Antonyan, *Equivariant embeddings and compactifications of free  $G$ -spaces*, International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences **2003** (2003), no. 1, 1–14.

- [4] N. Antonyan and S. A. Antonyan, *Free  $G$ -spaces and maximal equivariant compactifications*, *Annali di Matematica* **184** (2005), no. 3, 407–420.
- [5] G. E. Bredon, *Introduction to Compact Transformation Groups*, Academic Press, New York, 1972.
- [6] W. W. Comfort and K. A. Ross, *Pseudocompactness and uniform continuity in topological groups*, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **16** (1966), no. 3, 483–496.
- [7] J. de Vries, *Topological Transformation Groups. 1*, Mathematisch Centre Tracts, no. 65, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam, 1975.
- [8] ———, *Equivariant embeddings of  $G$ -spaces*, *General topology and Its Relations to Modern Analysis and Algebra, IV* (Proceedings of 4th Prague Topological Symposium, Prague, 1976), Part B, Society of Czechoslovak Mathematicians and Physicists, Prague, 1977, pp. 485–493.
- [9] ———, *On the existence of  $G$ -compactifications*, *Bulletin de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences. Série des Sciences Mathématiques* **26** (1978), no. 3, 275–280.
- [10] ———, *On the  $G$ -compactification of products*, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **110** (1984), no. 2, 447–470.
- [11] ———, *Elements of Topological Dynamics*, *Mathematics and Its Applications*, vol. 257, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1993.
- [12] D. Dikranjan and D. Shakhmatov, *Forcing hereditarily separable compact-like group topologies on abelian groups*, *Topology and Its Applications* **151** (2005), no. 1–3, 2–54.
- [13] J. Dugundji, *Topology*, Allyn and Bacon, Massachusetts, 1966.
- [14] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, PWN—Polish Scientific, Warsaw, 1977.
- [15] Z. Frolík, *The topological product of two pseudocompact spaces*, *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal* **10(85)** (1960), 339–349.
- [16] I. Glicksberg, *Stone-Čech compactifications of products*, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **90** (1959), 369–382.
- [17] J. L. Kelley, *General Topology*, D. Van Nostrand, Toronto, 1955.
- [18] M. G. Megrelishvili, *A Tikhonov  $G$ -space not admitting a compact Hausdorff  $G$ -extension or  $G$ -linearization*, *Russian Mathematical Surveys* **43** (1988), no. 2, 177–178.
- [19] R. S. Palais, *The Classification of  $G$ -spaces*, *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, no. 36, American Mathematical Society, Rhode Island, 1960.
- [20] M. G. Tkačenko, *Compactness type properties in topological groups*, *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal* **38(113)** (1988), no. 2, 324–341.
- [21] C. Todd, *On the compactification of products*, *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin* **14** (1971), 591–592.

Natella Antonyan: Departamento de Matemáticas, División de Ingeniería y Arquitectura,  
 Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, 14380 México,  
 Distrito Federal, México  
*E-mail address:* nantonya@itesm.mx



# Hindawi

Submit your manuscripts at  
<http://www.hindawi.com>

