



# Hausdorff objects

Mehmet Baran 

*Department of Mathematics, Erciyes University, Faculty of Science, Kayseri, 38039, Türkiye*

## Abstract

In previous papers, several extensions of the  $T_2$  separation property in topology to a topological category were compared. The aim of this paper is to develop further results relating to these extensions as well as to solve several open problems. Moreover, we show one of these  $T_2$ , namely  $KT_2$  limit spaces and reciprocal limit spaces are equivalent and every  $KT_2$  limit space induces the associated complete uniform limit space. Finally, we compare our results and give some applications.

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2020).** 54A05, 54B30, 54D10, 54A20, 18D15, 18B99

**Keywords.**  $T_2$  objects, reciprocal limit spaces, uniform limit spaces, sober spaces, pre-Hausdorff objects

## 1. Introduction

Several authors studied Hausdorffness in categorical setting. For example, the notions of Hausdorffness with respect to closure operators was done in [15] for abstract categories, with respect to a factorization structure were defined in [16, 22] for a general category, and with respect to initial lifts, final lifts, and discreteness was defined in [2, 25] for a topological category.

The extension of  $T_2$ -axiom has several equivalent descriptions for topological spaces and when these notions are extended to in other topological categories it may rise to distinct concepts. One form of these extensions may be more useful than another in certain applications but looking for the right extension may be meaningless. The notion of  $T_2$  separation to the arbitrary topological categories was formulated in terms of final lifts, initial lifts, and (in)discreteness in [2, 5, 25] with no reference to points and neighbourhoods since the point (resp. neighbourhood) notion may not be available for non set-based topological categories (resp. for topological categories not related to topological spaces). The relationships among these extensions of  $T_2$ , denoted by  $LT_2$ ,  $\bar{T}_2$ ,  $T'_2$ , and  $KT_2$  (see Definition 2.1, below), were investigated and it was shown that  $LT_2 \Rightarrow \bar{T}_2 \Rightarrow KT_2$  [5] and  $T'_2 \Rightarrow \bar{T}_2$  [25].

Also,  $T_2$ -axiom can be generalized to a topological category by using that the diagonal map embeds as a closed subspace of its product with itself [2, 15].

The main object of this paper consists of three parts:

(1) To find conditions on an object in arbitrary topological category such that when each

of the reverse implications above holds and when one has  $LT_2 = T'_2 = \overline{T}_2 = KT_2$  as well as to solve several open problems.

(2) To show that a limit space is  $KT_2$  iff it is reciprocal [21] and as an consequence, the categories **CULim** (completely uniform limit spaces and uniformly continuous functions) and **KT<sub>2</sub>Lim** ( $KT_2$  limit spaces and continuous functions) are isomorphic and deduce that every  $KT_2$  limit space induces the associated complete uniform limit space.

(3) To examine the results relating to these extensions in several topological categories and give some applications.

## 2. Preliminaries

Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a category with finite products and cokernel pairs (i.e., given any morphism  $f : A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ , the pushout of  $f$  with itself) and  $B \in Ob(\mathcal{B})$ . We denote by  $B^n$ , the product of  $B$  with itself  $n$  times and by  $\pi_j : B^n \rightarrow B$  the  $j$  th projection morphism,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . If  $A \in Ob(\mathcal{B})$  and  $f_i : A \rightarrow B$  are morphisms in  $\mathcal{B}$ , then there exists a unique morphism  $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n) : A \rightarrow B^n$  such that  $\pi_i f = f_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

The diagonal  $\Delta : B \rightarrow B^2$  is given by  $\Delta = (1_B, 1_B)$ , where  $1_B : B \rightarrow B$  is the identity morphism. Let  $\pi_j, \pi_k : B^2 \rightarrow B$  be projections. Define  $\pi_{jk} : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow B$  to be  $\pi_j + \pi_k$  for  $j, k = 1, 2$ , where  $B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  denotes the cokernel of  $\Delta$  along itself. More precisely, if  $i_1$  and  $i_2 : B^2 \rightarrow B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  denote the inclusions of  $B^2$  as the first and second factor, respectively, then  $i_1 \Delta = i_2 \Delta$  is a pushout diagram. Note that for morphisms  $(\pi_1, \pi_1, \pi_2) : B^2 \rightarrow B^3$  and  $(\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_1) : B^2 \rightarrow B^3$ ,  $(\pi_1, \pi_1, \pi_2) \Delta = (1_B, 1_B, 1_B) = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_1) \Delta$ , and thus,  $A = (\pi_{11}, \pi_{12}, \pi_{21}) : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow B^3$  is the unique morphism called the principal axis morphism in [2] for which  $Ai_1 = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_1)$  and  $Ai_2 = (\pi_1, \pi_1, \pi_2)$ .

Similarly,  $(\pi_1, \pi_1, \pi_2) \Delta = (1_B, 1_B, 1_B) = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_2) \Delta$  (resp.  $1_{B^2} \Delta = \Delta$ ) and so, there exists a unique morphism  $S = (\pi_{11}, \pi_{12}, \pi_{22}) : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow B^3$  (resp.  $\nabla = (\pi_{11}, \pi_{22}) : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow B^2$ ), called the skewed axis (resp. the fold) morphism in [2].

Note that  $Si_1 = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_2)$ ,  $Si_2 = (\pi_1, \pi_1, \pi_2) = Ai_2$ ,  $Ai_1 = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_1)$  and  $\nabla i_k = 1_{B^2}$  for  $k = 1, 2$ .

Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a category with finite products and cokernel pairs,  $U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a topological functor, and  $X \in Ob(\mathcal{E})$  with  $U(X) = B$ .

Let  $S_B$  (resp.  $A_B$ ) be the initial lift of the  $U$ -source  $S$  (resp.  $A$ ):  $B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(X^3)$  and  $W_{(B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2)}$  be the final lift of the  $U$ -sink  $\{q \circ i_1, q \circ i_2 : U(X^2) \rightarrow B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2\}$ , where  $i_k : B^2 \rightarrow B^2 \amalg B^2, k = 1, 2$  are the canonical injection maps and  $q : B^2 \amalg B^2 \rightarrow B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  is the quotient map [2].

**Definition 2.1.** (1) If  $S_B = A_B$  (resp.  $S_B = W_{(B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2)}$ ), then  $X$  is called a  $Pre\overline{T}_2$  (resp.  $PreT'_2$ ) object.

(2) If the initial lift of the  $U$ -source  $\nabla : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(D(B^2))$  and  $A : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(X^3)$  (resp.  $S : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(X^3)$ ) is discrete, then  $X$  is said to be a  $\overline{T}_0$  (resp.  $T_1$ ) object, where  $D$  is the discrete functor.

(3) If the initial lift of the  $U$ -source  $\nabla : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(D(B^2))$  and  $id : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(W_{(B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2)})$  is discrete, then  $X$  is called a  $T'_0$  object.

(4) If  $X$  is  $T'_0$  and  $Pre\overline{T}_2$  (resp.  $PreT'_2$ ), then  $X$  is called a  $KT_2$  (resp.  $T'_2$ ) object.

(5) If  $X$  is  $Pre\overline{T}_2$  (resp.  $PreT'_2$ ) and  $\overline{T}_0$ , then  $X$  is called a  $\overline{T}_2$  (resp.  $LT_2$ ) object.

If  $\mathcal{B}$  is a category with finite colimits and limits, then (3) of Definition 2.1 is given in [27].

If  $\mathcal{B} = \mathbf{Set}$ , then Definition 2.1 is given in [2, 5]. A point  $(x, y)$  in  $B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  will be denoted by  $(x, y)_1$  (resp.  $(x, y)_2$ ) if  $(x, y)$  is in the first (resp. second) component of  $B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  [2].

Note that  $S(x, y)_1 = (x, y, y)$ ,  $S(x, y)_2 = (x, x, y) = A(x, y)_2$ ,  $A(x, y)_1 = (x, y, x)$ , and  $\nabla(x, y)_i = (x, y)$  for  $i = 1, 2$  [2].

For the category of  $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{Top}$  and  $\mathcal{B} = \mathbf{Set}$ ,  $T'_0$  and  $\bar{T}_0$  (resp.  $LT_2$ ,  $\bar{T}_2$ ,  $KT_2$ , and  $T'_2$ ) reduce to the usual  $T_0$  (resp.  $T_2$ ) axiom [2, 5]. A topological space is pre-Hausdorff i.e.,  $PreT'_2 = Pre\bar{T}_2$  iff for any two distinct points, if there is a neighborhood of one missing the other, then the points have disjoint neighborhoods [2]. There is no implication between  $Pre\bar{T}_2$  and each of  $T_0$  and  $T_1$ . Take the integers set  $Z$  with indiscrete and cofinite topologies. In the realm of  $PreT_2$  topological spaces, all  $T_2, T_1$ , and  $T_0$  spaces are equivalent.

Let  $B \neq \emptyset$  and  $\alpha$  be a filter on  $B$ . The filter  $\alpha$  is improper (proper) iff  $\alpha$  contains (resp.,  $\alpha$  does not contain)  $\emptyset$ , the empty set. We denote by  $\alpha \cup \beta$  the smallest filter containing both  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

Let  $K$  be a function on  $B$  that assigns each  $x \in B$  a set of filters (the "filters converging to  $x$ ").  $K$  is said to be a limit structure on  $B$  ( $(B, K)$  a limit space [26]) iff  $K$  satisfies the following three conditions: for each  $x \in B$ ,

- (i)  $[x] \in K(x)$ , where  $[U] = \{V \subset B : U \subset V\}$ .
- (ii) if  $\alpha \in K(x)$  and  $\beta \supset \alpha$ , then  $\beta \in K(x)$  for any filter  $\beta$  on  $B$ .
- (iii) if  $\alpha, \beta \in K(x)$ , then  $\alpha \cap \beta \in K(x)$ .

Limit spaces are referred to as convergence spaces in [14, 20]. A limit space  $(B, K)$  is called reciprocal if  $K(x) \cap K(y) \neq \{\emptyset\}$ , then  $K(x) = K(y)$  for each  $x, y \in B$  [21].

A map  $f : (B, K) \rightarrow (C, L)$  between limit spaces is said to be continuous iff  $\alpha \in K(x)$  implies  $f(\alpha) \in L(f(x))$  for each  $x \in B$ , where  $f(\alpha) = [\{f(V) : V \in \alpha\}]$ .

The category of limit spaces and continuous maps is denoted by **Lim** [26].

Note that every topological space  $(A, \tau)$  induces a limit space. Indeed, for  $a \in A$ , let  $\eta_a = \{U \subset A : \exists V \in \tau \text{ such that } a \in V \subset U\}$  be a neighborhood filter at the point  $a$  and define  $K_{\tau}(a) = \{\alpha : \alpha \supset \eta_a\}$ . Then  $(A, K_{\tau})$  is a limit space. If  $f : (A, \tau) \rightarrow (B, \sigma)$  is continuous, then a map  $f : (A, K_{\tau}) \rightarrow (B, L_{\sigma})$  between limit spaces is continuous and **Top** is a bireflective subcategory of **Lim** (see [26], p.145).

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $B \neq \emptyset$ ,  $\{(B_i, K_i), i \in I\}$  be a class of limit spaces, and  $\{f_i : B \rightarrow B_i, i \in I\}$  be a source in the category **Set**. A source  $\{f_i : (B, K) \rightarrow (B_i, K_i), i \in I\}$  in **Lim** is an initial lift iff  $\alpha \in K(x)$  precisely when  $f_i(\alpha) \in K_i(f_i(x))$  for all  $i \in I$  [26].*

*An epi sink  $\{q \circ i_1, q \circ i_2 : (B^2, K) \rightarrow (B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2, L)\}$  in **Lim** is a final lift iff for any point  $s \in B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  and any filter  $\alpha$  on  $B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$ ,  $\alpha \in L(s)$  iff either  $\exists k \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\exists u \notin \Delta$ ,  $\exists \beta \in K(u)$  such that  $\alpha \supset (q \circ i_k)(\beta)$ ,  $(q \circ i_k)(u) = s$  or  $\exists u \in \Delta$ ,  $\exists \beta_1, \beta_2 \in K(u)$  such that  $\alpha \supset (q \circ i_1)(\beta_1) \cap (q \circ i_2)(\beta_2)$ ,  $(q \circ i_1)(u) = s = (q \circ i_2)(u)$ . This is a special case of [26].*

**Theorem 2.3** ([3]). (i) *Let  $\sigma$  be a filter on  $B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$ . If  $\sigma_0 = \bigcup \pi_{ij}^{-1} \pi_{ij} \sigma$ ,  $j, i = 1, 2$ , then  $\sigma_0 \subset \sigma$  and  $\pi_{ij} \sigma = \pi_{ij} \sigma_0$  for all  $j, i = 1, 2$ .*

*Let  $\alpha_{ij}$ ,  $i, j = 1, 2$  be proper filters on  $B$ .*

(ii)  *$\sigma = \bigcup_{j,i=1}^2 \pi_{ij}^{-1} \alpha_{ij}$  is proper if and only if either (a)  $(\alpha_{11} \cup \alpha_{12})$  and  $(\alpha_{21} \cup \alpha_{22})$  are proper or (b)  $(\alpha_{21} \cup \alpha_{11})$  and  $(\alpha_{22} \cup \alpha_{12})$  are proper.*

(iii) *There exists a proper filter  $\sigma$  on  $B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  with  $\pi_{ij} \sigma = \alpha_{ij}$  for all  $j, i = 1, 2$  if and only if*

(1) *If (a) does not hold, then  $\alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12}$  and  $\alpha_{21} = \alpha_{11}$ .*

- (2) If (b) does not hold, then  $\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{12}$  and  $\alpha_{21} = \alpha_{22}$ .  
(3) If both (a) and (b) hold, then  $\alpha_{22} \cap \alpha_{11} = \alpha_{21} \cap \alpha_{12}$ .

The category **RRel** of reflexive relation spaces where objects are sets with a reflexive relation and where morphisms  $f : (A_1, R) \rightarrow (B_1, S)$  are functions with  $f(a)Sf(b)$  if  $aRb$  for all  $a, b \in A_1$ . The category **Prord** of reflexive and transitive relation spaces is the full subcategory of **RRel** [1, 26].

### 3. Applications

The full subcategories of **Lim** (resp. **ULim**) whose objects are  $KT_2$ ,  $Pre\bar{T}_2$ , and reciprocal limit spaces (resp. completely uniform limit spaces) are denoted by **KT<sub>2</sub>Lim**, **Pre $\bar{T}_2$ Lim**, and **RLim** (resp. **CULim**). We show that the full subcategories **KT<sub>2</sub>Lim** and **RLim** of **Lim** are isomorphic categories and deduce that every  $KT_2$  limit space induces the associated complete uniform limit space.

**Theorem 3.1.** *The following are equivalent for a limit space  $(B, K)$ .*

- (a)  $(B, K)$  is  $pre\bar{T}_2$ .  
(b)  $(B, K)$  is reciprocal.  
(c)  $(B, K)$  is  $KT_2$ .

**Proof.** (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b). Suppose  $(B, K)$  is  $pre\bar{T}_2$  and  $\alpha \in K(x) \cap K(y)$  for  $x, y \in B$ . Let  $\delta \in K(x)$ . If  $\delta$  is improper, then  $\delta \in K(y)$ . Assume  $\delta$  is proper. If  $\alpha \cup \delta$  is improper, then let  $\alpha_{11} = \delta = \alpha_{12}$  and  $\alpha_{21} = \alpha = \alpha_{22}$  in the Theorem 2.3 (iii). Since  $\alpha_{22} \cup \alpha_{21} = \alpha$  and  $\alpha_{11} \cup \alpha_{12} = \delta$  are proper,  $\alpha_{11} \cup \alpha_{21} = \alpha \cup \delta = \alpha_{12} \cup \alpha_{22}$  is improper,  $\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{12}$ , and  $\alpha_{21} = \alpha_{22}$ , by Theorem 2.3 (iii)(1), there exists a proper filter  $\beta$  on  $B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  with

$$\pi_1 A\beta = \alpha_{11} = \pi_1 S\beta, \pi_2 A\beta = \alpha_{21} = \pi_2 S\beta,$$

$\pi_3 A\beta = \alpha_{12}$ , and  $\pi_3 S\beta = \alpha_{22}$ . Since

$$\pi_1 A\beta = \pi_1 S\beta = \delta \in K(x), \pi_2 A\beta = \pi_2 S\beta = \alpha \in K(x), \pi_3 S\beta = \alpha \in K(y)$$

and  $(B, K)$  is  $pre\bar{T}_2$ , Proposition 2.2 and Definition 2.1,  $\pi_3 A\beta = \delta \in K(y)$ .

If  $\alpha \cup \delta$  is proper, then let  $\alpha_{21} = \alpha = \alpha_{22}$  and  $\alpha_{11} = \delta = \alpha_{12}$  in the Theorem 2.3 (iii). Note that

$$\alpha_{11} \cup \alpha_{12} = \delta, \alpha_{22} \cup \alpha_{21} = \alpha, \alpha_{22} \cup \alpha_{12} = \alpha \cup \delta = \alpha_{11} \cup \alpha_{21}$$

are proper and  $\alpha_{12} \cap \alpha_{21} = \alpha \cap \delta = \alpha_{11} \cap \alpha_{22}$ . Hence, by Theorem 2.3 (iii) (3), there exists a proper filter  $\beta$  on  $B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  with

$$\pi_1 A\beta = \alpha_{11} = \pi_1 S\beta, \pi_2 A\beta = \alpha_{21} = \pi_2 S\beta, \pi_3 A\beta = \alpha_{12},$$

and  $\pi_3 S\beta = \alpha_{22}$ . Since  $(B, K)$  is  $pre\bar{T}_2$ , by Proposition 2.2,

$$\pi_1 A\beta = \pi_1 S\beta = \delta \in K(x), \pi_2 A\beta = \pi_2 S\beta = \alpha \in K(x), \pi_3 S\beta = \alpha \in K(y),$$

we get  $\pi_3 A\beta = \delta \in K(y)$ .

Hence,  $K(x) \subset K(y)$  and changing the role of  $x$  and  $y$ , we get  $K(y) \subset K(x)$ . Thus,  $K(x) = K(y)$  and  $(B, K)$  is reciprocal.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c). Suppose  $(B, K)$  is a reciprocal limit space. First, we show  $(B, K)$  is  $T'_0$ . Let  $W_K$  be the limit structure on  $B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  induced by the maps  $\nabla : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow (B^2, K_d)$  and  $id : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow (B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2, K_q)$ , where  $K_d$  is the discrete limit structure on  $B^2$  and  $K_q$  is the final limit structure on  $B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  induced by the maps  $q \circ i_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$  defined in Section 2.

Suppose  $\alpha \in W_K(s)$  for  $s \in B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$ . By Proposition 2.2 and Definition 2.1, either

$\exists k \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\exists u \notin \Delta$ ,  $\exists \beta \in K(u)$  such that  $(q \circ i_k)(u) = s$ ,  $\alpha \supset (q \circ i_k)(\beta)$  or  $\exists u \in \Delta$ ,  $\exists \beta_1, \beta_2 \in K(u)$  such that

$$\alpha \supset (q \circ i_1)(\beta_1) \cap (q \circ i_2)(\beta_2), (q \circ i_1)(u) = s = (q \circ i_2)(u)$$

and  $\nabla(\alpha) = [\emptyset]$  or  $[\nabla(\alpha) = \nabla(s)]$ .

If  $\nabla(\alpha) = [\emptyset]$ , then  $\alpha = [\emptyset]$ .

Assume  $\nabla(\alpha) = [\nabla(s)] = [(x, y)]$  for some  $(x, y) \in B^2$ .

If  $x = y$ , then  $s = (x, x)_k$  and  $\alpha = [(x, x)_k]$  for  $k = 1, 2$ .

Suppose  $x \neq y$ . Then  $s = (x, y)_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$  and since  $\alpha$  is a filter,  $\alpha = [(x, y)_k]$  or  $\alpha = [(x, y)_1] \cap [(x, y)_2]$ .

Let  $s = (x, y)_1$ . If  $\alpha = [(x, y)_2]$ , then  $\alpha \supset (q \circ i_1)(\beta)$  for some  $\beta \in K^2(x, y)$  with  $i_1((x, y)) = s = (x, y)_1$ , a contradiction since  $x \neq y$  and  $\alpha = [(x, y)_2]$ .

If  $\alpha = [(x, y)_1] \cap [(x, y)_2]$ , then  $\alpha \supset (q \circ i_1)(\beta)$  for some  $\beta \in K^2(x, y)$  with  $i_1((x, y)) = s = (x, y)_1$ , a contradiction since  $x \neq y$ .

Hence,  $\alpha = [(x, y)_1]$ .

Similarly, if  $s = (x, y)_2$  with  $x \neq y$ , then  $\alpha = [(x, y)_2]$ .

Hence,  $\alpha = [s]$  for all  $s \in B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  or  $\alpha = [\emptyset]$ , i.e.,  $W_K(s) = \{[s], [\emptyset]\}$  is discrete and by Definition 2.1,  $(B, K)$  is  $T_0'$ .

Let  $K_A$  (resp.  $K_S$ ) be the initial lift of  $\pi_k A$  (resp.  $\pi_k S$ ),  $k = 1, 2, 3$ , where  $\pi_k : B^3 \rightarrow B$  are the projections maps. We show  $(B, K)$  is  $pre\overline{T}_2$ , i.e., by Definition 2.1,  $K_A = K_S$  and by Proposition 2.2, for any point  $s \in B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  and any filter  $\beta$  on the wedge,

$$\pi_1 A \beta \in K(\pi_1 A(s)), \pi_2 A \beta \in K(\pi_2 A(s)), \pi_3 A \beta \in K(\pi_3 A(s))$$

if and only if

$$\pi_1 S \beta \in K(\pi_1 S(s)), \pi_2 S \beta \in K(\pi_2 S(s)), \pi_3 S \beta \in K(\pi_3 S(s)).$$

Since  $\pi_1 A \beta = \pi_1 S \beta$  and  $\pi_2 A \beta = \pi_2 S \beta$ , we need to show that  $\pi_3 A \beta \in K(\pi_3 A(s))$  iff  $\pi_3 S \beta \in K(\pi_3 S(s))$ .

If  $\beta = [\emptyset]$ , then nothing to show. If  $\beta \neq [\emptyset]$  and  $s = (x, y)_1$  for  $x, y \in B$  with  $x \neq y$ , then let

$$\beta_0 = \pi_1^{-1}(\pi_1 A \beta) \cup \pi_1^{-1}(\pi_2 A \beta) \cup \pi_3^{-1}(\pi_3 A \beta) \cup \pi_3^{-1}(\pi_3 S \beta).$$

By Theorem 2.3 (i),  $\beta_0 \subset \beta$ ,  $\pi_i A \beta_0 = \pi_i A \beta$ , and  $\pi_i S \beta_0 = \pi_i S \beta$  for each  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .

We apply Theorem 2.3 (iii) with  $\alpha_{11} = \pi_1 A \beta = \pi_1 S \beta$ ,  $\alpha_{21} = \pi_2 A \beta = \pi_2 S \beta$ ,  $\alpha_{12} = \pi_3 A \beta$ , and  $\alpha_{22} = \pi_3 S \beta$ . If (1) of Theorem 2.3 (iii) holds, then  $\alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12}$ ,  $\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{21}$ . Since  $\pi_1 A \beta \in K(\pi_1 A(s) = x)$ ,  $\pi_2 A \beta \in K(\pi_2 A(s) = y)$  and  $\alpha_{11} = \pi_1 A \beta = \pi_2 A \beta = \alpha_{21}$ , we have  $\pi_1 A \beta \in K(y) \cap K(x)$ . Since  $(B, K)$  is a reciprocal limit space,  $K(y) = K(x)$ . Thus,  $\pi_3 S \beta \in K(\pi_3 S(s) = y)$  and  $\pi_3 A \beta \in K(\pi_3 A(s) = x)$ .

If (2) of Theorem 2.3 (iii) holds, then  $\alpha_{22} = \alpha_{21}$ ,  $\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{12}$ . Since

$$\pi_1 A \beta \in K(\pi_1 A(s) = x), \pi_2 A \beta \in K(\pi_2 A(s) = y), \alpha_{22} = \pi_3 S \beta = \pi_2 A \beta = \alpha_{21},$$

and  $\alpha_{11} = \pi_1 A \beta = \pi_3 A \beta = \alpha_{12}$ , we have  $\pi_3 A \beta \in K(\pi_3 A(s) = x)$  and  $\pi_3 S \beta \in K(\pi_3 S(s) = y)$ .

If (3) of Theorem 2.3 (iii) holds, then  $\alpha_{11} \cap \alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12} \cap \alpha_{21}$  and  $\alpha_{11} \cup \alpha_{21}$  is proper. Since  $\alpha_{11} \cup \alpha_{21} \in K(x) \cap K(y)$  and  $(B, K)$  is reciprocal,  $K(y) = K(x)$ .  $(B, K)$  is a limit space implies  $\alpha_{11} \cap \alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12} \cap \alpha_{21} \in K(y) = K(x)$  and hence,  $\pi_3 A \beta \in K(\pi_3 A(s) = x)$  and  $\pi_3 S \beta \in K(\pi_3 S(s) = y)$ .

Suppose  $\beta$  is proper and  $s = (x, y)_2$  for  $x, y \in B$ ,  $x \neq y$ .

If (1) of Theorem 2.3 (iii) holds, then  $\alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12}$ ,  $\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{21}$  and hence,

$$\pi_k A \beta = \pi_k S \beta \in K(\pi_k A(s) = \pi_k S(s) = x), k = 1, 2,$$

$$\pi_3 A \beta \in K(\pi_3 A(s) = y), \pi_3 S \beta \in K(\pi_3 S(s) = y).$$

If (2) of Theorem 2.3 (iii) holds, then  $\alpha_{22} = \alpha_{21}$ ,  $\alpha_{11} = \alpha_{12}$ . Since  $\pi_1 A \beta \in K(\pi_1 A(s) = x)$  and  $\pi_3 A \beta \in K(\pi_3 A(s) = y)$ , we have  $\pi_1 A \beta \in K(y) \cap K(x)$  and by the assumption,

$K(y) = K(x)$ . Thus,  $\pi_3 S\beta \in K(\pi_3 S(s) = y)$ .

If (3) of Theorem 2.3 (iii) holds, then  $\alpha_{21} \cap \alpha_{12} = \alpha_{22} \cap \alpha_{11}$  and  $\alpha_{11} \cup \alpha_{12}$  is proper. Since  $\alpha_{11} \cup \alpha_{12} \in K(y) \cap K(x)$  and  $(B, K)$  is a reciprocal limit space,  $K(y) = K(x)$  and  $\alpha_{11} \cap \alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12} \cap \alpha_{21} \in K(y) = K(x)$ . Consequently,  $\pi_3 A\beta \in K(\pi_3 A(s) = x)$  and  $\pi_3 S\beta \in K(\pi_3 S(s) = y)$ .

Suppose  $\beta$  is proper and  $s = (x, x)_2 = (x, x)_1$  for some  $x \in B$ . If (1) and (2) of Theorem 2.3 (iii) hold, then  $\pi_3 A\beta \in K(\pi_3 A(s) = x)$  and  $\pi_3 S\beta \in K(\pi_3 S(s) = x)$ . If (3) of Theorem 2.3 (iii) holds, then  $\alpha_{11} \cap \alpha_{22} = \alpha_{12} \cap \alpha_{21} \in K(x)$  since  $(B, K)$  is a limit space. Hence,  $\alpha_{12} = \pi_3 A\beta \in K(\pi_3 A(s) = x)$  and  $\alpha_{22} = \pi_3 S\beta \in K(\pi_3 S(s) = x)$ .

$(B, K)$  is  $pre\bar{T}_2$  and thus,  $(B, K)$  is  $KT_2$ .

By Definition 2.1,  $KT_2$  implies  $pre\bar{T}_2$  which shows that (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a).  $\square$

**Theorem 3.2.** *The categories  $\mathbf{KT}_2\mathbf{Lim}$ ,  $\mathbf{RLim}$ ,  $\mathbf{Pre}\bar{\mathbf{T}}_2\mathbf{Lim}$ , and  $\mathbf{CULim}$  are pairwise isomorphic. Moreover,  $\mathbf{KT}_2\mathbf{Lim}$  is a topological category.*

**Proof.** By Proposition 2.1.8, Corollary 2.1.9, and Example 2.3.4 of [14] or Propositions 1.3.5 and 1.3.7 of [20], the categories  $\mathbf{RLim}$  and  $\mathbf{CULim}$  and by Theorem 3.1, the categories  $\mathbf{KT}_2\mathbf{Lim}$ ,  $\mathbf{RLim}$ , and  $\mathbf{Pre}\bar{\mathbf{T}}_2\mathbf{Lim}$  are pairwise isomorphic. The second Part follows from the first Part and Theorem 3.4 of [7].  $\square$

**Theorem 3.3.** *A reflexive space  $(A, R)$  is  $PreT'_2$  iff  $(A, R)$  is discrete.*

**Proof.** Suppose  $xRy$  for  $x, y \in A$  and  $(A, R)$  is  $PreT'_2$ . Let  $s = (y, x)_1$  and  $t = (y, x)_2$ . Since  $\pi_1 S(s)R\pi_1 S(t) = yRy$ ,  $\pi_2 S(s)R\pi_2 S(t) = xRy$ ,  $\pi_3 S(s)R\pi_3 S(t) = xRx$ , and  $(A, R)$  is  $PreT'_2$ , it follows  $(y, x)R^2(y, x)$  ( $R^2$  is the product structure on  $A^2$ ) and  $q \circ i_k(y, x) = t$ ,  $q \circ i_k(y, x) = s$  with  $k = 1, 2$ . Thus, we must have  $x = y$ .

Suppose  $(A, R)$  is discrete. We show that (I) and (II) are equivalent: for any pair  $s$  and  $t$  in the wedge,

(I) there exists a pair  $(a_1, a_2), (b_1, b_2)$  in  $A^2$  such that  $(a_1, a_2)R^2(b_1, b_2)$  and  $q \circ i_k(a_1, a_2) = s$ ,  $q \circ i_k(b_1, b_2) = t$  with  $k = 1, 2$  and

(II)  $\pi_1 S(s)R\pi_1 S(t)$ ,  $\pi_2 S(s)R\pi_2 S(t)$ , and  $\pi_3 S(s)R\pi_3 S(t)$ .

If  $(A, R)$  is discrete and (I) holds, then  $a_1 R b_1$  and  $a_2 R b_2$  since  $(a_1, a_2)R^2(b_1, b_2)$ . Consequently,  $a_1 = b_1$ ,  $a_2 = b_2$ ,  $s = t$  and (II) holds.

Next, we show that (II) implies (I). Suppose  $\pi_1 S(s)R\pi_1 S(t)$ ,  $\pi_2 S(s)R\pi_2 S(t)$ , and  $\pi_3 S(s)R\pi_3 S(t)$  for  $s = (x, x)$  or  $(x, y)_k$  and  $t = (z, z)$ ,  $(z, w)_k$  with  $k = 1, 2$  and  $x, y, z, w \in A$ . If  $s = (x, y)_1$  and  $t = (z, w)_1$ , then

$$\pi_1 S(s)R\pi_1 S(t) = xRz$$

and

$$\pi_2 S(s)R\pi_2 S(t) = yRw = \pi_3 S(s)R\pi_3 S(t).$$

Since  $(A, R)$  is discrete,  $x = z$ ,  $w = y$ , and so,  $(x, y)R^2(x, y)$  and  $q \circ i_1(x, y) = s = t$ . If  $t = (z, w)_2$  and  $s = (x, y)_1$ , then

$$\pi_1 S(s)R\pi_1 S(t) = xRz, \pi_2 S(s)R\pi_2 S(t) = yRz,$$

$\pi_3 S(s)R\pi_3 S(t) = yRw$ . Since  $(A, R)$  is discrete,  $x = z = y = w$  and consequently,  $(x, x)R^2(x, x)$  and  $q \circ i_1(x, x) = s = t$ .

Similarly, for the remaining cases of  $s$  and  $t$  the result holds. Thus, (II) implies (I) and  $(A, R)$  is  $PreT'_2$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** (1) Theorem 3.3 was proved in different way in Theorem 3.2 of [11].

(2)  $PreT'_2$  objects play a role in the theory of geometric realizations, their associated interval and corresponding homotopy structures [25]. It is proved in Corollary 6.3 of [25] that an exact image of a topos in a topological category by a geometric morphism is a

$PreT'_2$  interval. Each interval in a topological category defines a homotopy structure for the category [24] and consequently, any set-based topological category in which  $PreT'_2$  objects are discrete admits only trivial interval based homotopy structures [23].

By Theorem 3.3, we obtain:

**Theorem 3.5.** *The category  $\mathbf{RRel}$  is homotopically trivial.*

**Remark 3.6.** (1) In  $\mathbf{Top}$ , by Proposition 1.5.4 of [27], if  $B$  is a finite topological space, then the partitions of  $B$  are in one-to-one correspondence with the distinct pre-Hausdorff topologies on  $B$ . By Lemma 4.2.3 of [27], every zero-dimensional topological space is pre-Hausdorff.

(2) In  $\mathbf{RRel}$ , Theorem 3.2 of [11],

$$T'_2 = LT_2 = \bar{T}_2 \Rightarrow KT_2 = Pre\bar{T}_2 \Rightarrow T'_0$$

$$LT_2 = T'_2 = \bar{T}_2 = T_1 \Rightarrow \bar{T}_0 \Rightarrow T'_0.$$

In the presence of  $\bar{T}_0$  reflexive spaces,  $T'_2 = LT_2 = \bar{T}_2 = T_1 = KT_2$  and  $\bar{T}_0 = T'_0$ . There is no implication between  $\bar{T}_0$  and  $KT_2$  reflexive spaces. ( $A = \{p, r, s\}, R = \{(p, p), (r, r), (s, s), (p, r)\}$ ) is  $\bar{T}_0$  (i.e.,  $R$  is anti-symmetric) but it is not  $KT_2$  (i.e.,  $R$  is an equivalence relation) and the indiscrete reflexive space ( $A = \{p, r, s\}, A^2$ ) is  $KT_2$  but it is not  $\bar{T}_0$ .

By Theorem 3.2 of [11], the equivalence (rep. equals) relations can be characterized in terms of  $KT_2$  (resp.  $\bar{T}_2$ ) reflexive spaces.

(3) In  $\mathbf{Prord}$ , by Theorems 4.5 and 6.5 of [8] and Theorem 3.5 of [10],

$$T'_2 = LT_2 = \bar{T}_2 = KT_2 = T_1 \Rightarrow PreT'_2 = Pre\bar{T}_2$$

$$T'_2 = LT_2 = KT_2 = \bar{T}_2 = T_1 \Rightarrow \bar{T}_0 = T'_0.$$

The equivalence (rep. partial, equals) relations can be characterized in terms of  $Pre\bar{T}_2$  (resp.  $\bar{T}_0, KT_2$ ) preordered spaces. By Theorem 6.5 of [8], a preordered space is zero-dimensional iff it is pre-Hausdorff.

(4) In  $\mathbf{Lim}$ , let  $\mathbf{T}_k$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2$  denote the usual  $T_k$  limit spaces. By Theorem 2.4, Remark 2.8 of [5] and Theorem 3.1,  $T'_2 = \bar{T}_2 = LT_2 = \mathbf{T}_2 \Rightarrow KT_2$  and  $T'_2 = \bar{T}_2 = LT_2 = \mathbf{T}_2 \Rightarrow \mathbf{T}_1 = T_1 \Rightarrow \mathbf{T}_0 = \bar{T}_0 \Rightarrow T'_0$  but the reverse of each implication is not true. There is no implication between  $KT_2$  and each of  $\bar{T}_0$  and  $T_1$  limit spaces. ( $(R, F(R))$ ,  $R$  the real numbers, is both  $KT_2$  and  $T'_0$  but it is neither  $\bar{T}_0$  nor  $T_1$  nor  $LT_2$ . Let  $B = \{x, y\}$ ,  $K(y) = \{[y], [\emptyset]\}$  and  $K(x) = F(B)$ .  $(B, K)$  is  $\bar{T}_0$  but it is not  $KT_2$ . Let  $(R, \tau)$  be a cofinite topological space. Then the induced limit space  $(R, K_\tau)$  is  $T_1$  but it is not  $KT_2$ .

In limit spaces the concepts of uniform continuity and completeness are not available but in  $KT_2$  limit spaces, these concepts are available. If  $(B, K)$  is a  $KT_2$  limit space, then by Proposition 2.1.8 of [14] and Theorem 3.1,  $K$  induces the associated uniform limit structure on  $B$  which is complete.

(5) If an extended pseudo-quasi-semi metric space  $(A, d)$  is  $KT_2$ , then by Theorem 3.13 of [17] and Theorem 3.20 of [13], open and closed subsets of  $A$  are the same and  $A$  has a partition consisting of closed subsets. The relationship among various form of  $preT_2$ ,  $T_0$ ,  $T_1$ , and  $T_2$  extended pseudo-quasi-semi metric spaces is investigated in [12, 13].

(6) In the category  $\mathbf{Chy}$  of Cauchy spaces, the relationship among various form of the  $T_0$ ,  $T_1$ , and  $T_2$  Cauchy spaces is studied in [18, 19].



#### 4. General results

In this section, we want to find under what conditions each of the reverse implications  $LT_2 \Rightarrow \bar{T}_2 \Rightarrow KT_2$ ,  $T'_2 \Rightarrow \bar{T}_2$ , and  $\bar{T}_0 \Rightarrow T'_0$  hold in an arbitrary topological category and to solve several open problems.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a category with finite products and cokernel pairs and  $U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a topological functor.*

(A) (a)  $PreT'_2$  (resp.  $\bar{T}_0$ ) implies  $Pre\bar{T}_2$  (resp.  $T'_0$ ).

(b)  $T'_2 = LT_2$  and there is no implication between  $KT_2$  and each of  $\bar{T}_0$  and  $T_1$ , in general.

(B) In the realm of  $\bar{T}_0$  objects, we have  $KT_2 \Rightarrow \bar{T}_2$ .

(C) In the realm of  $PreT'_2$  objects,

(a) one has  $\bar{T}_2 \Rightarrow T'_2$  and  $T'_0 \Rightarrow \bar{T}_0$ .

(b) the following are equivalent:

(i)  $T'_0$ .

(ii)  $\bar{T}_0$ .

(iii)  $T_1$ .

(iv)  $\bar{T}_2$ .

(v)  $KT_2$ .

(vi)  $LT_2$ .

(vii)  $T'_2$ .

(D) In the realm of  $Pre\bar{T}_2$  objects, the following are equivalent:

(i)  $\bar{T}_0$ .

(ii)  $T_1$ .

(iii)  $\bar{T}_2$ .

**Proof.** Assume  $\mathcal{E}$  is a topological category over  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $Y \in Ob(\mathcal{E})$ .

(A) (a) Let  $T = i_1 \circ (\pi_2, \pi_1) + i_2$ , where  $\pi_i : B^2 \rightarrow B$  are projection morphisms for  $i = 1, 2$  and  $i_1, i_2 : B^2 \rightarrow B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2$  are the inclusions of  $B^2$  as the first and second factor. Note that for the category  $\mathcal{B} = \mathbf{Set}$ ,  $T(x, y)_2 = (x, y)_2$  and  $T(x, y)_1 = (y, x)_1$ . The proof of part (a) is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1 of [6] and Theorem 3.2 of [4].

(b) If  $Y$  is  $LT_2$ , then  $Y$  is  $\bar{T}_0$  and by part (a),  $Y$  is  $T'_0$ . Hence,  $Y$  is  $T'_2$ .

If  $Y$  is  $T'_2$ , then  $Y$  is  $T'_0$  and so, the initial lift of the  $U$ -source  $\nabla : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(D(B^2))$  and  $id : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(W_{B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2})$  is discrete, where  $U(Y) = B$ . Since  $Y$  is  $T'_2$ ,  $Y$  is  $PreT'_2$  and by part (a), we get  $Y$  is  $Pre\bar{T}_2$  and  $W_{(B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2)} = S_B = A_B$ . Hence, the initial lift of the  $U$ -source  $\nabla : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(D(B^2))$  and  $A : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(Y^3)$  is discrete, i.e.,  $Y$  is  $\bar{T}_0$  and hence,  $Y$  is  $LT_2$ .

By Remark 3.4 (4), there is no implication between  $KT_2$  and each of  $\bar{T}_0$  and  $T_1$ .

(B) If  $Y$  is  $KT_2$ , then  $Y$  is  $Pre\bar{T}_2$  and by assumption,  $Y$  is  $\bar{T}_0$ . Thus,  $Y$  is  $\bar{T}_2$ .

(C) Let  $Y$  be a  $PreT'_2$  object.

(a) If  $Y$  is  $\bar{T}_2$ , then  $Y$  is  $\bar{T}_0$  and by part A (a),  $Y$  is  $T'_0$ . By assumption,  $Y$  is  $PreT'_2$  and hence,  $Y$  is  $T'_2$ .

If  $Y$  is  $T'_0$ , then the initial lift of the  $U$ -source  $\nabla : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(D(B^2))$  and  $id : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(W_{B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2})$  is discrete, where  $U(Y) = B$ . Since  $Y$  is  $PreT'_2$  and by part A (a),  $Y$  is  $Pre\bar{T}_2$  and  $W_{(B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2)} = S_B = A_B$ . Hence, the initial lift of the  $U$ -source  $\nabla : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(D(B^2))$  and  $A : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(Y^3)$  is discrete, i.e.,  $Y$  is  $\bar{T}_0$ .

(b) By Part (a), we get (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii).

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii). Suppose  $Y$  is  $\bar{T}_0$ . Then the initial lift of the  $U$ -source  $A : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(Y^3)$  and  $\nabla : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(D(B^2))$  is discrete and since  $Y$  is  $PreT'_2$ , by part A (a),  $Y$  is  $Pre\bar{T}_2$ , i.e.,  $S_B = A_B$  and hence, the initial lift of the  $U$ -source  $S : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(Y^3)$  and  $\nabla : B^2 \vee_{\Delta} B^2 \rightarrow U(D(B^2))$  is discrete. Thus,  $Y$  is  $T_1$ .

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv). Since  $Y$  is  $T_1$  and  $Pre\bar{T}_2$ , i.e.,  $S_B = A_B$ , we get  $Y$  is  $\bar{T}_0$  and hence,  $Y$  is  $\bar{T}_2$ .



(iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (v). If  $Y$  is  $\overline{T_2}$ , then by part A (a),  $Y$  is  $T'_0$  and by Definition 2.1,  $Y$  is  $KT_2$ .

(v)  $\Rightarrow$  (vi). If  $Y$  is  $KT_2$ , then  $Y$  is  $T'_0$  and by Part (a),  $Y$  is  $\overline{T_0}$ . Thus,  $Y$  is  $LT_2$ .

By Part (A) and Definition 2.1, we have (vi)  $\Rightarrow$  (vii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i).

(D) Let  $Y$  be a  $Pre\overline{T_2}$  object. By Definition 2.1, we have  $S_B = A_B$  and as in the proof of (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv), we get  $Y$  is  $T_1$  iff  $Y$  is  $\overline{T_0}$  iff  $Y$  is  $\overline{T_2}$ .

Recall from [9] that  $Y$  is called  $\overline{T_0}$  (resp.  $T'_0$ ) sober if  $Y$  is  $\overline{T_0}$  (resp.  $T'_0$ ) and quasi-sober (every nonempty irreducible [13] closed [2] subset of  $Y$  is the closure of a point) for  $Y \in Ob(\mathcal{E})$  with  $\mathcal{E}$  is a set-based topological category.

In **Top**,  $\overline{T_0}$  (resp.  $T'_0$ ) sober spaces reduce to the usual sober spaces [9].

By Theorem 4.1, we obtain the following results that were given in [5, 10] as unsolved problems.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.2.** *In any topological category, in the realm of  $PreT'_2$  objects, we have:*

(i)  $LT_2 = T'_2 = \overline{T_2} = KT_2$  and  $\overline{T_0} = T'_0$ .

(ii)  $\overline{T_0} = T_1 = KT_2$ .

(iii)  $T'_0$  sober and  $\overline{T_0}$  sober objects are equivalent.

## 5. Comments

In **Top**, one has

$$\begin{aligned} T'_2 &= LT_2 = \overline{T_2} = KT_2 \Rightarrow T_1 \Rightarrow T'_0 = \overline{T_0}, \\ T'_2 &= LT_2 = \overline{T_2} = KT_2 \Rightarrow \text{soberity} \Rightarrow \overline{T_0} = T'_0, \\ T'_2 &= LT_2 = \overline{T_2} = KT_2 \Rightarrow PreT'_2 = Pre\overline{T_2}, \end{aligned}$$

and there is no implication between  $Pre\overline{T_2}$  (resp. soberity) and each of  $\overline{T_0}$ ,  $T_1$ , and soberity (resp.  $T_1$ ). Take the Sierpinski space and an infinite set  $X$  with indiscrete and cofinite topologies.

For  $\mathcal{B} = \mathbf{Set}$  in Definition 2.1, Theorem 4.1 (A) (a) and (D) generalize the results in [4, 5, 7] and Corollary 4.2 solves several open problems in [5, 10].

If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a full subcategory of  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is a topological functor such that the restriction  $U_1 = U|_{\mathcal{D}} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is still topological, then for an object  $X \in \mathcal{D}$  we have two notions of  $T_0, T_1, T_2$  etc. one with respect to  $U$  and one with respect to  $U_1$ . One may expect that both notions may differ. Take  $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{Lim}$  and  $\mathcal{D} = \mathbf{Top}$  or take  $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{RRel}$  and  $\mathcal{D} = \mathbf{Prord}$ . Then by Remark 3.5 and Theorems 3.1 and 3.3,

$$\mathbf{T}'_0\mathbf{Lim} = \mathbf{Lim}, \mathbf{KT}_2\mathbf{Lim} = \mathbf{RLim}, \mathbf{LT}_2\mathbf{Lim} = \mathbf{T}_2\mathbf{Lim},$$

$$\mathbf{T}'_0\mathbf{Top} = \mathbf{T}_0\mathbf{Top}, \mathbf{KT}_2\mathbf{Top} = \mathbf{LT}_2\mathbf{Top} = \mathbf{T}_2\mathbf{Top},$$

$$\mathbf{T}'_0\mathbf{RRel} = \mathbf{RRel}, \mathbf{KT}_2\mathbf{RRel} = \mathbf{EqRRel},$$

$$\mathbf{T}'_0\mathbf{Prord} = \mathbf{T}_0\mathbf{Prord}, \mathbf{KT}_2\mathbf{Prord} = \mathbf{LT}_2\mathbf{Prord} = \mathbf{LT}_2\mathbf{RRel} = \mathbf{T}_2\mathbf{Prord},$$

where **EqRRel** is the category of equivalence relation spaces.

In the realm of  $PreT_2$  topological spaces, by Theorem 4.3 of [10], all of  $T_0, T_1, T_2$ , and sober topological spaces are equivalent.

Is there any relation between soberity and separation properties in Definition 2.1 for a topological category? Under what conditions could these notions be the same?

Pre-Hausdorff objects are used to define each of Hausdorff, regular, and normal objects in topological categories [2] and Definition 2.1 opens the way to the investigation of separation properties in a much larger non set-based topological categories.

Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.2 give the relationship among various forms of  $T_0, T_1$ , and  $T_2$  objects in a topological category.

How are various forms of  $T_3$  and  $T_4$  objects related to each other in a topological category?

What is the relationship between each of  $T_k$ ,  $k = 3, 4$ , and each of  $T_i$  objects,  $i = 0, 1, 2$  in a topological category?

## Acknowledgements

This work is dedicated to the memory of my supervisor professor Marvin Victor Mielke one of the best mathematicians I have ever had.

I would like to thank the referees for their kind and useful suggestions.

## References

- [1] J. Adámek, H. Herrlich, and G. E. Strecker, *Abstract and Concrete Categories*, Wiley, New York, 1990.
- [2] M. Baran, *Separation properties*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. **23** (5), 333-341, 1991.
- [3] M. Baran, *Stacks and filters*, Turk. J. Math. **16**, 95-108, 1992.
- [4] M. Baran and H. Altindis,  *$T_0$ -objects in topological categories*, J. Univ. Kuwait **22**, 123-127, 1995.
- [5] M. Baran and H. Altindis,  *$T_2$ -objects in topological categories*, Acta Math. Hungar. **71**, 41-48, 1996.
- [6] M. Baran, *Completely regular objects and normal objects in topological categories*, Acta Math. Hungar. **80**, 211-224, 1998.
- [7] M. Baran, *Pre $T_2$  Objects in topological categories*, Appl. Categor. Struct. **17**, 591-602, 2009.
- [8] M. Baran and J. Al-Safar, *Quotient-reflective and bireflective subcategories of the category of preordered sets*, Topology Appl. **158**, 2076-2084, 2011.
- [9] M. Baran and H. Ebughalwa, *Sober spaces*, Turk. J. Math. **46**, 299-310, 2022.
- [10] M. Baran, *Stone spaces I*, Filomat, **38** (16), 2024.
- [11] M. Baran, *Separation, connectedness and disconnectedness*, Turk. J. Math. **47**, 279-295, 2023.
- [12] T. M. Baran and M. Kula *Local pre-Hausdorff extended pseudo-quasi-semi metric spaces*. Communications Faculty of Sciences University of Ankara Series A1: Mathematics and Statistics, **68** (1), 862-870, 2019.
- [13] T. M. Baran, *Closedness, separation and connectedness in pseudo-quasi-semi metric spaces*, Filomat, **34** (14), 4757-4766, 2020.
- [14] R. Beattie, and H. P. Butzmann, *Convergence Structures and Applications to Functional Analysis*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.
- [15] M. M. Clementino, E. Giuli and W. Tholen, *Topology in a category: Compactness*, Portugal Math. **53**, 129-143, 1996.
- [16] H. Herrlich, G. Salicrup and G. E. Strecker, *Factorizations, denseness, separation, and relatively compact objects*, Topology Appl. **27**, 157-169, 1987.
- [17] M. Kula and T. M. Baran, *Separation axioms, Urysohn's Lemma and Tietze Extension Theorem for extended pseudo-quasi-semi metric spaces*, Filomat, **36** (2), 703-713, 2022.
- [18] M. Kula, *A note on Cauchy spaces*, Acta Math. Hungar. **133**, 14-32, 2011.

- [19] S. Kula and M. Kula, *Seperation, irreducibility, Urysohn's lemma and Tietze extension theorem for Cauchy spaces*, Filomat, **37**, 6417-6426, 2023.
- [20] E. Lowen-Colebunders, *Function Classes of Cauchy Continuous Maps*, M. Dekker, New York, 1989.
- [21] E. Lowen-Colebunders *On composition closed function classes*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **44**, 181-189, 1984.
- [22] E. G. Manes, *Compact Hausdorff objects*, Gen. Topology Appl. **4**, 341-360, 1974.
- [23] M. V. Mielke, *Convenient categories for internal singular algebraic topology*, Illinois J. Math. **27**, 519-534, 1983.
- [24] M. V. Mielke, *The interval in algebraic topology*, Illinois J. Math. **25**, 51-62, 1981.
- [25] M. V. Mielke, *Separation, axioms and geometric realizations*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. **27** (7), 711-722, 1994.
- [26] G. Preuss, *Theory of Topological Structures, An Approach to topological Categories*, D. Reidel Publ. Co., Dordrecht, 1988.
- [27] J. Stine, *Pre-Hausdorff objects in topological categories*, PhD Dissertation, University of Miami, 1997.