

SOME RESULTS ON THE π -WEIGHT OF COUNTABLE FRÉCHET-URYSOHN SPACES

ALAN DOW

ABSTRACT. The π -weight spectrum for countable regular Fréchet-Urysohn spaces is the set of uncountable cardinals that are equal to the π -weight for some such space. We determine this π -weight spectrum in the standard Miller rational perfect set model and in the Random real model.

1. INTRODUCTION

A topological space is Fréchet-Urysohn providing it satisfies that if a point is in the closure of a set, there is an ω -sequence from that set converging to the point. In this paper we assume that all topologies are regular and Hausdorff. A π -base for a topology is a family of non-empty open sets such that every non-empty member of the topology contains one. The π -weight of a topological space is the minimum cardinality of a π -base. Determining the possible values of the π -weights of countable Fréchet-Urysohn spaces, i.e. the π -weight spectrum, seems to be an interesting challenge. Malyhin's problem for countable Fréchet-Urysohn topological groups motivated Juhasz's question of whether the existence of a countable Fréchet-Urysohn space with uncountable π -weight could be proven in ZFC. Naturally, for every cardinal $\kappa < \mathfrak{p}$, every countable dense subset of the Tychonoff product 2^κ is a countable Fréchet-Urysohn space with π -weight equal to κ . The other general known results concerning the possible uncountable π -weights of countable Fréchet-Urysohn spaces seem to be these three. There is a space with π -weight at least \mathfrak{b} [4], there are models in which spaces may have π -weight $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c} > \omega_1$ but none with π -weight strictly between ω and \mathfrak{c} [8], in the Cohen model there are no spaces with π -weight greater than \aleph_1 . It was also shown in [8] that in many models, in fact those satisfying a weak parametrized \diamond principle, there are spaces with π -weight \aleph_1 .

One natural source of examples of Fréchet-Urysohn spaces is $C_p(X)$ for a space $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ that is a γ -set (see [5] and [7]). In particular countable dense subsets of such $C_p(X)$ spaces yield countable Fréchet-Urysohn spaces with π -weight equal to the cardinality of the γ -set. It is well-known that, in Laver's model of the Borel conjecture, there are no uncountable γ -sets and so these were not a ZFC source of countable Fréchet-Urysohn spaces of uncountable π -weight. One of the very interesting results in [7, Theorem 1.3] is that in the usual Miller model, namely the forcing extension by the countable support iteration of the Miller trees poset, there are no γ -sets of cardinality greater than \aleph_1 . The same result holds in the random real model (adding any number of random reals) as can be deduced from [6, Lemma 2.29] as explained in Proposition 3.1.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E50, 03E35, 54A35, 54D55.

Key words and phrases. Fréchet-Urysohn, π -weight.

The main results of this paper are to determine the very different π -weight spectrum of countable Fréchet-Urysohn spaces in the Miller model and in the κ random real model for any cardinal $\kappa > \omega_1$. As is well-known, the Miller model satisfies that $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{b} < \mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c}$, while $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d} < \kappa = \mathfrak{c}$ holds in the random real models. In the Miller model, like the Cohen model, every countable regular Fréchet-Urysohn space has π -weight at most \aleph_1 . In any model obtained by adding κ random reals over a model of CH, every cardinal λ with $\omega \leq \lambda \leq \kappa$ equals the π -weight of some countable regular Fréchet-Urysohn space.

2. FRÉCHET-URYSOHN SPACES IN THE MILLER MODEL

In this section we prove this next theorem. The proof is completed at the end of the section.

Theorem 2.1 (CH). *In the forcing extension by a countable support iteration of length ω_2 of Miller's rational perfect set poset, every regular Fréchet-Urysohn countable space has π -weight at most \aleph_1 .*

By a Miller tree we mean a sub-tree T of $\omega^{<\omega}$ which satisfies that every branching node of T has infinitely many immediate successors and every $t \in T$ has an extension that is a branching node. We let \mathbb{M} denote the forcing notion consisting of the set of Miller trees ordered by $T_2 < T_1$, in the forcing sense, if $T_2 \subset T_1$.

The main new idea of the proof is the preservation of the following bounding notion.

Definition 2.2. Say that (τ, \mathcal{I}) is a Fréchet-Urysohn pair if τ is a clopen basis for a topology on ω and \mathcal{I} is a family of τ -converging sequences.

Say that a subset Y of ω is \mathcal{I} -closed if Y contains the τ -limit of I for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$ that meets Y in an infinite set. Say that a set Y is (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense if Y is \mathcal{I} -closed and $U \setminus Y$ is not empty for all $\emptyset \neq U \in \tau$.

For a countable elementary submodel M of $H(\mathfrak{c}^+)$, say that a set A is (M, τ, \mathcal{I}) -bounding if $A \setminus Y$ is infinite for every subset Y of ω in M that is (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense.

Let us recall that if G is a generic filter for some poset and if \dot{Y} is a P -name for a set such that $\text{val}_G(\dot{Y})$ is a (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense set for some Fréchet-Urysohn pair (τ, \mathcal{I}) , then there is a P -name \dot{Y}_1 satisfying that 1_P forces that \dot{Y}_1 is (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense and that $\text{val}_G(\dot{Y}_1) = \text{val}_G(\dot{Y})$. Therefore in what follows we simply focus on names that are forced by 1 to be (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense.

Our proof of the theorem will follow Shelah's methods for proving that countable support iterations of proper almost ω^ω -bounding posets are weakly ω^ω -bounding. More precisely we will utilize the presentation by Abraham, see [1, 4.1]. Unfortunately we have been unable to formulate a suitable relation R so that we could just quote one of Shelah's many preservation results. Nor could we construct a proof based on the Laver method of proving that single stage names of reals can give much information about general names of reals as in [9, Lemma 2.2].

For a poset P , we will use Γ_P to denote the canonical name for the P -generic filter. Recall that if $P \in M$ where M is a countable elementary submodel of $H(\theta)$, for a suitably large θ , and if q is an (M, P) -generic condition then q forces that $M[\Gamma_P]$ is a countable elementary submodel of $H(\theta)[\Gamma_P]$. A subset S of P is said to be pre-dense below a condition $p \in P$, if for every $q \leq p$, there is an $s \in S$ such

that q and s are compatible in P . Given two conditions r, p of P let us say that a set S is pre-dense below $r \wedge p$ if S is pre-dense below every common extension of r and p .

Naturally we begin with the single stage poset. The minimal branching node of $T \in \mathbb{M}$ is denoted as $\text{stem}(T)$. For each $n \in \omega$, $\mathbf{Br}_n(T)$ is the set of branching nodes t of T that satisfy the set of $s < t$ that are branching nodes has cardinality n . For $T_1, T_2 \in \mathbb{M}$ and $n \in \omega$, the relation $T_2 <_n T_1$ corresponds to $T_2 \leq T_1$ and $\mathbf{Br}_n(T_2) = \mathbf{Br}_n(T_1)$.

For $T \in \mathbb{M}$ and $t \in T$, the sub-tree $T_t = \{s \in T : s \leq t \text{ or } t \leq s\}$ satisfies that $T_t \leq T$. For an $n \in \omega$ and $T_n \in \mathbb{M}$, a standard fusion step to construct $T_{n+1} <_n T_n$ is to choose, for each $t \in \mathbf{Br}_{n+1}(T_n)$ any condition $\tilde{T}_t < (T_n)_t$ and to let $T_{n+1} = \bigcup \{\tilde{T}_t : t \in \mathbf{Br}_{n+1}(T_n)\}$. Indeed, if $T_0 \in \mathbb{M}$ is an element of a countable elementary submodel M of $H(\mathfrak{c}^+)$ and if $\{D_n : n \in \omega\}$ is an enumeration of the dense subsets of \mathbb{M} that are elements of M , then $T_\omega = \bigcap \{T_n : n \in \omega\}$ is an (M, \mathbb{M}) -generic condition if, for each $n \in \omega$, $T_{n+1} <_n T_n$ satisfies that, $(T_{n+1})_t \in D_n \cap M$ for each $t \in \mathbf{Br}_{n+1}(T_n)$. Notice that it is not necessary that $T_{n+1} \in M$, only that $(T_{n+1})_t \in M$ for each $t \in \mathbf{Br}_{n+1}(T_n)$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let (τ, \mathcal{I}) be a Fréchet-Urysohn pair and let A be an (M, τ, \mathcal{I}) -bounding set for a countable elementary submodel M of $H(\mathfrak{c}^+)$ such that $\tau, \mathcal{I} \in M$. Then for every \mathbb{M} condition $T_0 \in M$, there is an (M, \mathbb{M}) -generic condition T_ω extending T that forces that A is $(M[\Gamma_{\mathbb{M}}], \tau, \mathcal{I})$ -bounding.*

Proof. Fix an enumeration, $\{D_n : n \in \omega\}$ of the dense subsets of \mathbb{M} that are elements of M . Also, fix an enumeration $\{\dot{Y}_n : n \in \omega\}$ of the \mathbb{M} -names in M that are forced by 1 to be subsets of ω that are (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense. For convenience ensure that each $\dot{Y} \in \{\dot{Y}_n : n \in \omega\}$ is listed infinitely many times. Let $n \in \omega$ and assume that, we have chosen $\{T_k : k \leq n\} \subset \mathbb{M}$ so that, for each $k < n$

- (1) $T_{k+1} <_k T_k$,
- (2) for each $t \in \mathbf{Br}_{k+1}(T_k)$, $(T_k)_t \in M \cap D_k$,
- (3) for each $t \in \mathbf{Br}_{k+1}(T_k)$, there is an $a \in A$ such that $(T_{k+1})_t$ forces that $a \notin \dot{Y}_k$.

First we explain how to construct T_{n+1} . Fix any $t \in \mathbf{Br}_{n+1}(T_n)$. Consider \dot{Y}_n , and let $(\dot{Y}_n)_{(T_n)_t}^-$ denote the set of all $m \in \omega$ such that $(T_n)_t$ forces that $m \in \dot{Y}_n$. Clearly $(T_n)_t$ forces that $(\dot{Y}_n)_{(T_n)_t}^-$ is a subset of \dot{Y}_n . Since 1 forces that \dot{Y}_n is \mathcal{I} -closed it follows that $(\dot{Y}_n)_{(T_n)_t}^-$ is \mathcal{I} -closed and, similarly it follows that $(\dot{Y}_n)_{(T_n)_t}^-$ is (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense. Since, by the induction assumption $(T_n)_t$ is an element of M , it follows that $(\dot{Y}_n)_{(T_n)_t}^-$ is also an element of M . Therefore, there is an $n < a \in A$ such that $(T_n)_t$ does not force that $a \in \dot{Y}_n$. Choose any $\tilde{T}_{n,t} < (T_n)_t$ in M that forces that $a \notin \dot{Y}_n$. By further extending, if necessary, we can also assume that $\tilde{T}_{n,t}$ is an element of $D_n \cap M$. Then we set T_{n+1} equal to $\bigcup \{\tilde{T}_{n,t} : t \in \mathbf{Br}_{n+1}(T_n)\}$. It should be clear that the inductive hypotheses are preserved.

Now let $T_\omega = \bigcap T_n$. As discussed above T_ω is an extension of T_0 that is an (M, \mathbb{M}) -generic condition. Suppose that T_ω is an element of a generic filter G for \mathbb{M} and let $\dot{Y} \in M$ be any \mathbb{M} -name that is forced by 1 to be (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense. Then fix any $n \in \omega$ such that $\dot{Y}_n = \dot{Y}$. The family $\{\tilde{T}_{n,t} : t \in \mathbf{Br}_{n+1}(T_n)\}$ is pre-dense below T_{n+1} , and therefore also pre-dense below T_ω . Choose the unique

$t \in \mathbf{Br}_{n+1}(T_n)$ such that $\tilde{T}_{n,t} \in G$. By assumption, there is an $n < a \in A$ such that $a \notin \text{val}_G(\dot{Y}_n)$. \square

A somewhat subtle point of the above construction is that, almost surely, T_{n+1} is not an element of M . However, for each $t \in \mathbf{Br}_{n+1}(T_{n+1})$, $(T_{n+1})_t$ is an element of M . If we consider the standard countable support iteration, $\langle P_\lambda, \dot{Q}_\alpha : \lambda \leq \omega_2, \alpha < \omega_2 \rangle$ where, for all $\alpha < \omega_2$, $P_\alpha \Vdash \dot{Q}_\alpha = \mathbb{M}$, then, officially we can let $p_{n+1} \in P_1$, be defined by the property that $1 = p_{n+1} \restriction 0$ forces that $p_{n+1}(0) = (T_{n+1})_t$, where \dot{t} is the P_0 -name of the unique element t of $\mathbf{Br}_{n+1}(T_{n+1})$ such that $(T_{n+1})_t \in \Gamma_{\dot{Q}_0}$. Then, even though p_{n+1} is not an element of M , $p_{n+1} \restriction 0$ forces that $p_{n+1}(0)$ is an element of $M[\Gamma_{P_0}] = M$. This is a key element of this next proof that is based on [1, 4.1].

Lemma 2.4 (CH). *Let $\lambda < \omega_2$ and $\langle P_\beta, \dot{Q}_\alpha : \beta \leq \lambda, \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be the countable support iteration where, for each $\alpha < \lambda$, \dot{Q}_α is the P_α -name for the Miller tree poset \mathbb{M} . Let (τ, \mathcal{I}) be a Fréchet-Urysohn pair and let $\langle P_\beta, \dot{Q}_\alpha : \beta \leq \lambda, \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ and (τ, \mathcal{I}) be elements of a countable elementary submodel M of $H(\mathfrak{c}^+)$. Let A be (M, τ, \mathcal{I}) -bounding.*

Then, for any $\gamma_0 < \lambda$ and $q_0 \in P_{\gamma_0}$ that is (M, P_{γ_0}) -generic and that forces that A is $(M[\Gamma_{P_{\gamma_0}}], \tau, \mathcal{I})$ -bounding and any P_{γ_0} -name \dot{p}_0 that is forced by q_0 to be an element of $M \cap P_\lambda$ and also $q_0 \Vdash \dot{p}_0 \restriction \gamma_0 \in \Gamma_{P_{\gamma_0}}$, then there is a $q < p_0$ that is (M, P_λ) -generic such that $q \restriction \gamma_0 = q_0$ and such that q forces that A remains $(M[\Gamma_{P_\lambda}], \tau, \mathcal{I})$ -bounding.

Proof. We prove the Lemma by induction on λ . Let $\{\dot{Y}_n : n \in \omega\}$ enumerate all the P_λ -names in M such that 1_{P_λ} forces that \dot{Y}_n is (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense. Ensure that each member of $\{\dot{Y}_n : n \in \omega\}$ is enumerated infinitely many times. Also let $\{D_n : n \in \omega\}$ be an enumeration of the dense subsets of P_λ that are elements of M .

It is a standard result of proper forcing, combined with Lemma 2.3, that we may assume that λ is a limit ordinal. Let δ be the supremum of $M \cap \lambda$. Choose any strictly increasing sequence $\langle \gamma_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ of ordinals in $M \cap \lambda$ that is cofinal in δ . Following [1, Theorem 4.1], we define, by induction, conditions $q_n \in P_{\gamma_n}$ that are (M, P_{γ_n}) -generic, and P_{γ_n} -names \dot{p}_n such that:

- (1) $q_{n+1} \restriction \gamma_n = q_n$,
- (2) q_n forces that \dot{p}_n is in $P_\lambda \cap M$ and extends \dot{p}_{n-1} , and q_n also forces that $\dot{p}_n \restriction \gamma_n$ is in $\Gamma_{P_{\gamma_n}}$,
- (3) q_n forces that A is $(M[\Gamma_{P_{\gamma_n}}], \tau, \mathcal{I})$ -bounding,
- (4) for $n > 1$, q_n forces that if $p_n \in P_\lambda \cap M$ is equal to \dot{p}_n , then $p_n \in D_n$ and there is an $n < a \in A$ such that $p_n \Vdash a \notin \dot{Y}_n$.

If the recursive construction succeeds, then, as per the proof of [1, Lemma 2.8], the condition $q = \bigcup_n q_n$ is (M, P_λ) -generic and $q < p_0$. Moreover if q is an element of a P_λ -generic filter G , then, for each $n \in \omega$, there is a $p_n \in P_\lambda \cap M$ such that $p_n = \text{val}_G(\dot{p}_n)$, and, by item 4, there is an $n < a \in A \setminus \text{val}_G(\dot{Y}_n)$. Therefore, if q is an element of a P_λ -generic filter G , we will have that A is $(M[G], \tau, \mathcal{I})$ -bounding as required.

Assume that $0 < n \in \omega$ and that q_k and \dot{p}_k have been chosen for all $k < n$ and that q_{n-1} is $(M, P_{\gamma_{n-1}})$ -generic and forces that A is $(M[\Gamma_{P_{\gamma_{n-1}}}], \tau, \mathcal{I})$ -bounding. Let q_{n-1} be an element of a $P_{\gamma_{n-1}}$ -generic filter $G_{\gamma_{n-1}}$ and let $p_{n-1} \in M$ be the

valuation of \dot{p}_{n-1} by $G_{\gamma_{n-1}}$. Consider the P_λ -name \dot{Y}_n in $M[G_{\gamma_{n-1}}]$ and let Y_n^- be the set of all integers j such that, for some $r \in G_{\gamma_{n-1}}$, the set of conditions that force that j is in \dot{Y}_n is predense below $r \wedge p_n$. Since p_0 forces that \dot{Y}_n is (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense and $p_n < p_0$ forces that Y_n^- is a subset of \dot{Y}_n , it follows that Y_n^- is also (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense. It is evident that Y_n^- does not contain any non-empty $U \in \tau$, and, by the definition of the forcing relation, if $Y_n^- \cap I$ is infinite for some $I \in \mathcal{I}$, then p_n forces, over $V[G_{\gamma_{n-1}}]$, that the τ -limit of I is in \dot{Y}_n . Therefore, we have that $A \setminus Y_n^-$ is an infinite set. Choose any $n < a \in A \setminus Y_n^-$ and note that there is a condition $\tilde{p}_n < p_{n-1}$ in $M \cap P_\lambda$ such that $\tilde{p}_n \restriction \gamma_{n-1} \in G_{\gamma_{n-1}}$ and $\tilde{p}_n \Vdash a \notin \dot{Y}_n$. By further extending \tilde{p}_n we may assume that it is also an element of $D_n \cap M$. Then, as in [1, 2.8], return to the ground model, and let \dot{p}_n be a $P_{\gamma_{n-1}}$ -name that is forced by q_n to equal such a condition $\tilde{p}_n \in M$ with the above properties. Since $\gamma_n < \lambda$, we can apply the induction hypothesis to secure our condition q_n that is (M, P_{γ_n}) -generic such that $q_n \restriction \gamma_{n-1} = q_{n-1}$ and such that q_n forces that $\dot{p}_n \restriction \gamma_n \in \Gamma_{P_{\gamma_n}}$ and that A is $(M[\Gamma_{P_{\gamma_n}}], \tau, \mathcal{I})$ -bounding. \square

Now we prove our main result about Miller forcing and countable Fréchet-Urysohn spaces.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We are working in a ground model of CH. Let $\langle P_\beta, \dot{Q}_\alpha : \beta \leq \omega_2, \alpha < \omega_2 \rangle$ be the countable support iteration in which, for every $\alpha < \omega_2$, \dot{Q}_α is the P_α -name for \mathbb{M} . Let $\{\dot{U}_\xi : \xi < \omega_2\}$ be a list of P_{ω_2} -names for non-empty subsets of ω such that 1 forces that the family forms a clopen basis for a Hausdorff Fréchet-Urysohn topology on ω . Since P_{ω_2} is proper, has a dense subset of cardinality \aleph_2 , and satisfies the \aleph_2 -chain condition every regular Hausdorff topology on ω can be assumed to have such a basis.

Choose any elementary submodel M of $H(\aleph_3)$ satisfying that $\{\dot{U}_\xi : \xi \in \omega_2\} \in M$, $M^\omega \subset M$, and such that M has cardinality \aleph_1 . It follows that $\mu = M \cap \omega_2$ is an element of ω_2 . Let G_μ be any P_μ -generic filter and let $\tau = \{\text{val}_{G_\mu}(\dot{U}_\xi) : \xi \in \mu\}$. We prove that $1_{P_{\omega_2}}$ forces that $\{\dot{U}_\xi : \xi < \mu\}$ is a π -basis for the final topology given by $\{\dot{U}_\xi : \xi < \omega_2\}$. Since P_{ω_2} is proper and satisfies that \aleph_2 -cc, it follows that $M[G_\mu]$, like M , is closed under ω -sequences. Additionally, $M[\Gamma_{P_{\omega_2}}]$ is forced by 1 to be an elementary submodel of $H(\aleph_3)[\Gamma_{P_{\omega_2}}]$.

Consider any $\mu \leq \zeta < \omega_2$ and suppose there is a condition $p \in P_{\omega_2}$ that forces that $U \setminus \dot{U}_\zeta$ is not empty for all non-empty $U \in \tau$. By possibly extending p we may assume there is an integer m such that $p \Vdash m \in \dot{U}_\zeta$.

It follows by standard elementarity that, in $V[G_\mu]$, τ is a Fréchet-Urysohn topology on ω . Let \mathcal{I} denote the family of τ -converging sequences. Since $M[G_\mu]$ is closed under ω -sequences each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ is an element of $M[G_\mu]$. Therefore, by elementarity, every $I \in \mathcal{I}$ is a converging sequence with respect to the final topology.

Now observe that p forces that \dot{U}_ζ is a (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense set and that $m \in \dot{U}_\zeta$. Let p, τ, \mathcal{I} and \dot{U}_ζ be elements of a countable elementary submodel \tilde{M} of $H(\aleph_3)[G_\mu]$. Note that each (τ, \mathcal{I}) -nowhere dense set Y in \tilde{M} is truly a τ -nowhere dense set. It was proven in [2] that there is a sequence $A \in \mathcal{I}$ that converges to m and satisfies that $A \cap Y$ is finite for every one of the countably many τ -nowhere dense sets Y in \tilde{M} . In particular, A is $(\tilde{M}, \tau, \mathcal{I})$ -bounding. By Lemma 2.4, there is a condition $q < p$ that forces that A is $(\tilde{M}[G_{\omega_2}], \tau, \mathcal{I})$ -bounding. It follows that $A \setminus \text{val}_{G_{\omega_2}}(\dot{U}_\zeta)$

is infinite, and contradicts the fact that A converges to m with respect to the final topology which contains $\text{val}_G(\dot{U}_\zeta)$ as a clopen set. \square

3. FRÉCHET-URYSOHN SPACES IN THE RANDOM REAL MODEL

In this section we prove that in the standard random real model, every infinite $\kappa \leq \mathfrak{c}$ equals the π -weight of some countable Fréchet-Urysohn space. The construction of these spaces are variations of the construction in [4].

Our base space is $\omega^{<\omega}$ considered with the tree ordering, and we fix an order-preserving enumeration $\{t_\ell : \ell \in \omega\}$ of it. Order-preserving means that $t_n < t_\ell$ implies that $n < \ell$ and that $t_n = t \smallfrown k$ and $t_\ell = t \smallfrown (k+1)$ implies $n < \ell$. For $t \in \omega^{<\omega}$, $[t]$ denotes the set of all s that equal or extend t .

Let τ_0 denote the topology on $\omega^{<\omega}$ using the elements of $\{[t] : t \in \omega^{<\omega}\}$ and their complements as a clopen subbasis. For any $t, \sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$, we let $t \smallfrown \sigma$ denote the function with domain $\text{dom}(t) + \text{dom}(\sigma)$ satisfying that $t \subset t \smallfrown \sigma$ and for $(t \smallfrown \sigma)(|t| + i) = \sigma(i)$ for $i \in \text{dom}(\sigma)$.

For any index set I , let \mathcal{M}_I denote the measure algebra (a Boolean algebra) on ω^I . That is, for each $i \in I$ and $m \in \omega$, the clopen set $[(i, m)] = \{\rho \in \omega^I : \rho(i) = m\}$ has measure $\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}$. We will let μ_I denote the measure on the elements of \mathcal{M}_I . If I is countable, then \mathcal{M}_I is the set of Borel subsets of ω^I modulo the sets of measure 0. \mathcal{M}_I is (forcing) ordered by $b_1 \leq b_2$ providing $\mu(b_1 \setminus b_2) = 0$. For any $B \subset I$, let π_B denote the projection map from ω^I onto ω^B . Then, for any uncountable set I , \mathcal{M}_I is equal to the family $\bigcup \{\pi_B^{-1}(b) : b \in \mathcal{M}_B, B \in [I]^{\aleph_0}\}$. Also for any countable $B \subset I$ and $b \in \mathcal{M}_B$, we can say that the support of $\pi_B^{-1}(b)$ is contained in B and the value of $\mu_I(\pi_B^{-1}(b))$ is equal to $\mu_B(b)$. It is easily checked that $\mu_I(\pi_B^{-1}(b))$ is well-defined. Finally, for $b_1, b_2 \in \mathcal{M}_I$, we again say that $b_1 \leq b_2$ providing $\mu_I(b_1 \setminus b_2) = 0$. Naturally when we are forcing with \mathcal{M}_I we mean that we are forcing with the poset of non-zero elements.

Before proceeding with the construction of our examples, we complete the proof using the results from [6], and other fundamental references, that every γ -set in such random reals models has cardinality at most \aleph_1 .

Proposition 3.1 (CH). *In any forcing extension by adding random reals, every γ -set has cardinality at most \aleph_1 .*

Proof. It was shown in [5], where γ -sets were introduced, that every γ -set has the property of Rothberger denoted by C'' . Rothberger [10] showed that every set of reals with property C'' has strong measure zero. Following the notation of [6], a set $X \subset 2^\omega$ has strong measure zero, if for every $h \in \omega^\omega$, there is a function $\nu^h : \omega \mapsto 2^{<\omega}$ satisfying that $\nu^h(k) \in 2^{h(k)}$ for all $k \in \omega$, such that $X \subset \bigcup_{k \in \omega} [\nu^h(k)]$.

Now, suppose that \dot{X} is an \mathcal{M}_κ -name of a set of strong measure zero for some cardinal $\kappa > \omega_1$. Let G be an \mathcal{M}_κ -generic filter. Choose any elementary submodel M of $H(\kappa^+)$ with $\kappa, \dot{X} \in M$, $M^\omega \subset M$, and $|M| = \aleph_1$. Let $\dot{X} \cap M = \dot{X}_M$ and let $G_M = G \cap \mathcal{M}_{\kappa \cap M}$. By standard results, also explained in more detail below, $X_M = \text{val}_{G_M}(\dot{X}_M)$ is a strong measure zero set in $V[G_M]$ and X_M is a subset of $\text{val}_G(\dot{X})$. Since \mathcal{M}_κ is an ω^ω -bounding poset, the family $\mathcal{H} = \omega^\omega \cap V$

is a dominating family in $V[G_M]$. In addition, the model $M[G]$ is an elementary submodel of $H(\kappa^+)[G]$, while $M[G] \cap 2^\omega = V[G_M] \cap 2^\omega$. For each $h \in \mathcal{H}$, choose a function $\nu^h \in \prod_{k \in \omega} 2^{h(k)}$ satisfying that $X_M \subset \bigcup_{k \in \omega} [\nu^h(k)]$. By elementarity, for each $x \in \text{val}_G(\dot{X})$ and each $h \in \mathcal{H}$, $x \in \bigcup_{k \in \omega} [\nu^h(k)]$.

The final model $V[G]$ can be viewed as a forcing extension of $V[G_M]$ by the poset $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa \setminus M}$. It is shown in [6, Fact 1.16] that $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa \setminus M}$ is strongly ω^ω -bounding [6, Definition 1.13] and therefore, by [6, Lemma 2.30], $X \subset \bigcap_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(\bigcup_{k \in \omega} [\nu^h(k)] \right)$ is a subset of $V[G_M] \cap 2^\omega$. \square

Our chosen index set for \mathcal{M}_I is $I = \kappa \times \omega^{<\omega} \times \omega$. For each $\alpha < \kappa$ and each $t \in \omega^{<\omega}$, we are adding a function, $\dot{g}_{\alpha,t} \in \omega^\omega$ defined by the condition that the clopen set $[(\alpha, t, n), m] \in \mathcal{M}_I$ forces that $\dot{g}_{\alpha,t}(n) = m$.

As usual, for a forcing statement φ , $[[\varphi]]$ denotes the element of \mathcal{M}_I that is equivalent to φ being forced to hold. Take any maximal anti-chain of conditions that decide the truth value of φ and set $[[\varphi]]$ to be (forcing equivalent to) the join of all the conditions in the anti-chain that force φ to hold. Thus, e.g., $[[\dot{g}_{\alpha,t}(n) = m]]$ is the clopen set $[((\alpha, t, n), m)]$.

For each $B \subset \kappa$, let $\tilde{B} = B \times \omega^{<\omega} \times \omega$. The mapping sending $b \in \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{B}}$ to $\pi_{\tilde{B}}^{-1}(b)$ defines a complete embedding of $\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{B}}$ into $\mathcal{M}_I = \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\kappa}}$. For clarity we may sometimes use $[[\varphi]]_{\tilde{\kappa}}$ and $[[\varphi]]_{\tilde{B}}$ to indicate which poset, $\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\kappa}}$ or $\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{B}}$, is being referenced.

If \dot{A} is an \mathcal{M}_I -name of a subset of $\omega^{<\omega}$, we will say that a set $B \subset \kappa$ contains the support of \dot{A} providing $[[t \in \dot{A}]] \in \{\pi_{\tilde{B}}^{-1}(b) : b \in \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{B}}\}$ for every $t \in \omega^{<\omega}$. Similarly, if $b \in \mathcal{M}_I$, we may say that B contains the support of b if $b \in \{\pi_{\tilde{B}}^{-1}(c) : c \in \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{B}}\}$. Since \mathcal{M}_I is ccc, for every such \dot{A} there is a countable set $B \subset \kappa$ such that B contains its support. When $B \subset \kappa$ and contains the support of an \mathcal{M}_I -name \dot{A} , we let $\pi_{\tilde{B}}(\dot{A})$ denote the $\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{B}}$ -name where $[[t \in \pi_{\tilde{B}}(\dot{A})]]_{\tilde{B}} = [[t \in \dot{A}]]_{\tilde{\kappa}}$.

Similarly, if \dot{A} is an $\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{B}}$ -name for a subset of $\omega^{<\omega}$ with $B \subset \kappa$, we will use $\pi_{\tilde{B}}^{-1}(\dot{A})$ to denote the \mathcal{M}_I -name where $[[t \in \pi_{\tilde{B}}^{-1}(\dot{A})]]_I = [[t \in \pi_{\tilde{B}}^{-1}(\dot{A})]]_{\tilde{\kappa}} = \pi_{\tilde{B}}^{-1}([[m \in \dot{A}]]_{\tilde{B}})$.

Now what is the topology on $\omega^{<\omega}$ in the forcing extension?

For each $\alpha < \kappa$, we define an \mathcal{M}_I -name, \dot{W}_α , of a dense open subset W_α of the usual rational topology on $\omega^{<\omega}$. The support of \dot{W}_α will be $\{\tilde{\alpha}\} = \{\alpha\} \times \omega^{<\omega} \times \omega$. We will let \dot{U}_α denote the \mathcal{M}_I -name of the complement, $\omega^{<\omega} \setminus \dot{W}_\alpha$, of \dot{W}_α . Clearly $\{\tilde{\alpha}\}$ contains the support of \dot{W}_α and \dot{U}_α .

For each $\alpha \in \kappa$ and $n \in \omega$, let \dot{s}_{α,t_n} be the \mathcal{M}_I -name for an element of $\omega^{<\omega}$ given by $t_n^\frown (\dot{g}_{\alpha,t_n} \upharpoonright n+2)$. Observe that, for any $\sigma \in \omega^{n+2}$, the forcing element $[[\dot{s}_{\alpha,t_n} \subset t_n^\frown \sigma]]$ has measure less than $\frac{1}{2^{n+2}}$.

Then \dot{W}_α is the \mathcal{M}_I -name of the set $\bigcup \{[\dot{s}_{\alpha,t_n}] : n \in \omega\}$, and, as mentioned above, \dot{U}_α is the \mathcal{M}_I -name for $\omega^{<\omega} \setminus \dot{W}_\alpha$. It is worth remarking that for any $s \in \omega^{<\omega}$, the value of $[[s \in \dot{W}_\alpha]]$ is equal to the join of the finite family $\{[[\dot{s}_{\alpha,t_n} \subset s]] : t_n \subset s\}$.

For any $B \subset \kappa$, let $\dot{\tau}_B$ denote the \mathcal{M}_I -name for the topology on $\omega^{<\omega}$ generated by the family $\tau_0 \cup \{\dot{U}_\alpha : \alpha \in B\}$. For any countable $B \subset \kappa$, we will abuse notation

and also let $\dot{\tau}_B$ denote the $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{B}}$ -name for the topology on $\omega^{<\omega}$ generated by the family $\tau_0 \cup \{\pi_B(\dot{U}_\alpha) : \alpha \in B\}$.

Claim 1. For any $n_0, \ell \in \omega$ and $t_{n_0} \ell \subset s \in \omega^{<\omega}$, $[[t_{n_0} \in \dot{U}_\alpha]] \wedge [[s \in \dot{W}_\alpha]]$ has measure less than $\frac{1}{2^{n_0+\ell}}$. For emphasis we note that $[[t_{n_0} \in \dot{U}_\alpha]]$ and $[[s \in \dot{W}_\alpha]]$ have support $\{\tilde{\alpha}\}$.

Proof of Claim. Choose the appropriate $\bar{\ell} \in \omega$, so that there is a sequence $n_0 < n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_{\bar{\ell}}$ satisfying that

$$\{t_{n_0}, t_{n_1}, t_{n_2}, \dots, t_{n_{\bar{\ell}}}\} = \{t \in \omega^{<\omega} : t_0 \subseteq t \subseteq s\}.$$

Note that $[[\dot{s}_{\alpha, t_{n_{\bar{\ell}}}} \subset s]] = 0$. More generally, for any $1 \leq i < \bar{\ell}$ such that $\text{dom}(s) \subset \text{dom}(t_{n_i}) + n_i$, $[[\dot{s}_{\alpha, t_{n_i}} \subset s]]$ is also 0. For other values of $1 \leq i < \bar{\ell}$, $[[\dot{s}_{\alpha, t_{n_i}} \subset s]]$ has measure less than $\frac{1}{2^{n_i+1}} \leq \frac{1}{2^{n_0+\ell+i}}$. Since $[[t \in \dot{U}_\alpha]] \wedge [[s \in \dot{W}_\alpha]]$ is equal to $[[t \in \dot{U}_\alpha]] \wedge (\bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq \bar{\ell}} [[\dot{s}_{\alpha, t_{n_i}} \subset s]])$, this proves the Claim. \square

Claim 2. Let $n_0 \in \omega$ and let countable $B \subset \kappa$. For any $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{B}}$ -names \dot{A} and $\{\dot{s}_n : n \in \dot{A}\}$ such that $1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\bar{B}}$ forces that $\dot{A} \subset \omega$ and that, for $n \in \dot{A}$, $t_{n_0} n \subset \dot{s}_n$ (i.e. that $\{\dot{s}_n : n \in \dot{A}\}$ is a sequence that converges to t_{n_0} with respect to τ_0). Then, for any $\alpha \in \kappa \setminus B$, $1 \in \mathcal{M}_I$ forces that if $t_{n_0} \in \dot{U}_\alpha$, then $\{\pi_{\bar{B}}^{-1}(\dot{s}_n) : n \in \pi_{\bar{B}}^{-1}(\dot{A})\}$ is mod finite contained in \dot{U}_α .

Proof of Claim. Let G_B be an $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{B}}$ -generic filter and work in the forcing extension $V[G_B]$. Let $A = \text{val}_{G_B}(\dot{A})$ and, for each $n \in A$, let $s_n = \text{val}_{G_B}(\dot{s}_n)$. For each $n \in \omega \setminus A$, let $s_n = t_{n_0} n$. It follows that $\{s_n : n \in \omega\}$ converges to t_{n_0} with respect to τ_0 . In this forcing extension, the final model is obtained by forcing with $\mathcal{M}_{I \setminus \bar{B}}$, and let $b = [[t_{n_0} \in \dot{U}_\alpha]]$ be the Boolean value with respect to $\mathcal{M}_{I \setminus \bar{B}}$. Consider any b_1 less than b . Choose any $\ell_0 \in \omega$ such that $\sum_{\ell > \ell_0} \frac{1}{2^{n_0+\ell}} = \frac{1}{2^{n_0+\ell_0}} < \mu(b_1)$. By Claim 1, $[[t_{n_0} \in \dot{U}_\alpha]] \wedge [[s_\ell \in \dot{W}_\alpha]]$ has measure less than $\frac{1}{2^{n_0+\ell}}$ for each $\ell > \ell_0$. Since all these elements of \mathcal{M}_I have support contained in $\{\alpha\}$ and $\alpha \notin B$, it follows that their projections into $\mathcal{M}_{I \setminus \bar{B}}$ have the same measure. Therefore,

$$[[t_{n_0} \in \dot{U}_\alpha]]_{I \setminus \bar{B}} \wedge [[(\exists \ell > \ell_0) s_\ell \in \dot{W}_\alpha]]_{I \setminus \bar{B}} \leq [[t_{n_0} \in \dot{U}_\alpha]]_{I \setminus \bar{B}} \wedge (\bigvee_{\ell > \ell_0} [[s_\ell \in \dot{W}_\alpha]]_{I \setminus \bar{B}})$$

has measure less than $\frac{1}{2^{n_0+\ell_0}} < \mu(b_1)$. This proves that b_1 does not force, with respect to $\mathcal{M}_{I \setminus \bar{B}}$, that $\dot{W}_\alpha \cap \{s_n : n \in \omega\}$ is infinite. Since b_1 was arbitrary, this proves that $[[t_{n_0} \in \dot{U}_\alpha]]_{I \setminus \bar{B}}$ forces that $\{s_n : n \in A\}$ is mod finite contained in \dot{U}_α as claimed. \square

Claim 3. For each $\lambda \leq \kappa$, $\dot{\tau}_\lambda$ is forced by 1 over \mathcal{M}_I to be Fréchet-Urysohn.

Proof of Claim. Let $n_0 \in \omega$ and let \dot{Y} be any \mathcal{M}_I -name of a subset of $\omega^{<\omega}$ and assume that $b \in \mathcal{M}_I$ forces that t_{n_0} is in the $\dot{\tau}_\lambda$ -closure of \dot{Y} . Choose any countable $B \subset \kappa$ such that the supports of b and of \dot{Y} are contained in B . Let $b \in G$ for any \mathcal{M}_I -generic filter G and let $G_B = \{c \in \mathcal{M}_{\bar{B}} : \pi_{\bar{B}}^{-1}(c) \in G\}$. It follows that G_B is an $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{B}}$ -generic filter and that $V[G_B]$ is a submodel of $V[G]$ and that $V[G]$ is an $\mathcal{M}_{I \setminus \bar{B}}$ -generic extension of $V[G_B]$.

We work in the model $V[G_B]$. Note that $\text{val}_G(\dot{Y})$ is equal to $\text{val}_{G_B}(\pi_B(\dot{Y}))$. Let $Y = \text{val}_{G_B}(\pi_B(\dot{Y}))$ and let τ_B equal $\text{val}_{G_B}(\dot{\tau}_B)$. Note that t_{n_0} is in the τ_B -closure of Y . Since $\tau_B \supset \tau_0$ has a countable basis, it is Fréchet-Urysohn, and so we may choose a countable $A \subset \omega$ and a sequence $\{s_n : n \in A\} \subset Y$ that τ_B -converges to t_{n_0} and such that, for each $n \in A$, $t_{n_0} \in \widehat{s_n}$.

Now jump back to $V[G]$ and consider any τ_I -basic open set U such that $t_{n_0} \in U$, where $\tau_I = \text{val}_G(\dot{\tau}_I)$. By the definition of this topology, there is a finite set $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\} \subset \kappa \setminus B$ and an element $W \in \tau_B$ such that

$$t_{n_0} \in W \cap \text{val}_G(\dot{U}_{\alpha_1}) \cap \dots \cap \text{val}_G(\dot{U}_{\alpha_m}) \subset U.$$

Since, for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, $[[t_{n_0} \in \dot{U}_{\alpha_i}]] \in G$, it follows from Claim 2, that a cofinite subset of $\{s_n : n \in A\}$ is contained in U . \square

We come now to our final claim.

Claim 4. For each $\gamma < \kappa$, 1 forces that \dot{U}_γ does not contain any non-empty element of $\dot{\tau}_\gamma$. In other words, for any uncountable cardinal $\lambda \leq \kappa$, $\dot{\tau}_\lambda$ has π -weight equal to λ .

Proof of Claim. Let G be any generic filter for \mathcal{M}_I and let $G_{\{\gamma\}} = G \cap \mathcal{M}_{\{\tilde{\gamma}\}}$. We argue from the ground model $V[G_{\{\gamma\}}]$ using the τ_0 -dense open set $W_\gamma = \text{val}_G(\dot{W}_\gamma)$. For each $n_0 \in \omega$, we have the sequence $\{s(t_{n_0}, \ell) : \ell \in \omega\} \subset W_\gamma$ where $s(t_{n_0}, \ell) = \text{val}_{G_{\{\gamma\}}}(\pi_{\{\tilde{\gamma}\}}(\dot{s}_{\gamma, t_{n_0}} \ell))$. Since, for each $\ell \in \omega$, $t_{n_0} \in \widehat{s(t_{n_0}, \ell)}$, the sequence $\{s(t_{n_0}, \ell) : \ell \in \omega\}$ converges with respect to τ_0 to t_{n_0} . It then follows from Claim 2, that in the forcing extension $V[G_{\{\gamma\}}][G_{I \setminus \{\gamma\}}]$, that, for each $n_0 \in \omega$, $\{s(t_{n_0}, \ell) : \ell \in \omega\}$ also converges to t_{n_0} with respect to the topology $\text{val}_G(\dot{\tau}_\gamma)$. This, of course, implies that for each $n_0 \in \omega$, t_{n_0} is not in the $\text{val}_G(\dot{\tau}_\gamma)$ -interior of $\text{val}_G(\dot{U}_\gamma)$. \square

Theorem 3.2. For any infinite cardinal κ , in the forcing extension by the random real poset \mathcal{M}_κ , the π -weight spectrum for countable regular Fréchet-Urysohn spaces contains all uncountable cardinals that are less than or equal to κ .

Proof. The forcing poset \mathcal{M}_κ is isomorphic to the poset \mathcal{M}_I where $I = \kappa \times \omega^{<\omega} \times \omega$. Let, for $\alpha < \kappa$, the \mathcal{M}_I -name \dot{U}_α be defined as above. Now let G be an \mathcal{M}_I -generic filter, and for each $\alpha < \kappa$, let $U_\alpha = \text{val}_G(\dot{U}_\alpha)$.

For each cardinal $\omega_1 \leq \lambda \leq \kappa$, let τ_λ denote the topology generated by using the family of finite intersections from the set $\tau_0 \cup \{U_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ as a (clopen) base for a topology. It follows from Claim 3 that τ_λ is Fréchet-Urysohn.

It follows from Claim 4, that, for all $\gamma < \lambda$, the family of finite intersections from the set $\tau_0 \cup \{U_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma\}$ does not form a π -base for τ_λ . This proves that for every regular $\omega_1 \leq \lambda \leq \kappa$ the topology τ_λ is Fréchet-Urysohn with π -weight λ .

Now we prove the same for any singular cardinal $\mu \leq \kappa$. Consider any $S \subset \mu$ with $|S| = \lambda < \mu$. Choose any bijection f in the ground model from μ to μ that sends S to the initial segment λ . It then follows that there is a homeomorphism H_f from $(\omega^{<\omega}, \tau_\mu)$ to $(\omega^{<\omega}, \tau_\mu)$ that satisfies $H_f(U_\alpha) = U_{f(\alpha)}$ for all $\alpha < \mu$. This is proven using that f can be used to induce an automorphism on \mathcal{M}_I that lifts canonically to \mathcal{M}_I -names that would send \dot{W}_α to $\dot{W}_{f(\alpha)}$ for all $\alpha < \mu$ and \dot{W}_β to \dot{W}_β for all $\mu \leq \beta < \kappa$. By Claim 3, U_λ does not contain any non-empty element of τ_λ , and so, by invoking the homeomorphism H_f^{-1} , we have that the family of clopen sets generated by the family $\tau_0 \cup \{U_\alpha : \alpha \in S\}$ is not a π -base for τ_μ . \square

The following are the two most basic open problems about the π -weight spectrum of the countable regular Fréchet-Urysohn spaces. The first was astutely asked by J. Moore during a talk by the author at the 2012 Summer Topology conference.

Question 1. Is there a countable regular Fréchet-Urysohn space with π -weight equal to \mathfrak{b} ?

Question 2. Is it consistent that there are uncountable cardinals, $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_3$ such that λ_2 is not an element, while λ_1, λ_3 are elements of the π -weight spectrum of the countable regular Fréchet-Urysohn spaces?

REFERENCES

- [1] Uri Abraham, *Proper forcing*, Handbook of set theory. Vols. 1, 2, 3, Springer, Dordrecht, 2010, pp. 333–394, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4020-5764-9_6. MR2768684
- [2] Doyel Barman and Alan Dow, *Selective separability and SS^+* , Topology Proc. **37** (2011), 181–204. MR2678950
- [3] ———, *Proper forcing axiom and selective separability*, Topology Appl. **159** (2012), no. 3, 806–813, DOI 10.1016/j.topol.2011.11.048. MR2868880
- [4] Alan Dow, *π -weight and the Fréchet-Urysohn property*, Topology Appl. **174** (2014), 56–61, DOI 10.1016/j.topol.2014.06.013. MR3231610
- [5] J. Gerlits and Zs. Nagy, *Some properties of $C(X)$. I*, Topology Appl. **14** (1982), no. 2, 151–161, DOI 10.1016/0166-8641(82)90065-7. MR0667661
- [6] Martin Goldstern, Haim Judah, and Saharon Shelah, *Strong measure zero sets without Cohen reals*, J. Symbolic Logic **58** (1993), no. 4, 1323–1341, DOI 10.2307/2275146. MR1253925
- [7] Valentin Haberl, Piotr Szewczak, and Lyubomyr Zdomskyy, *Concentrated sets and γ -sets in the Miller model*, 2024.
- [8] M. Hrušák and U. A. Ramos-García, *Malykhin’s problem*, Adv. Math. **262** (2014), 193–212, DOI 10.1016/j.aim.2014.05.009. MR3228427
- [9] Dušan Repovš and Lyubomyr Zdomskyy, *M-separable spaces of functions are productive in the Miller model*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **171** (2020), no. 7, 102806, 8, DOI 10.1016/j.apal.2020.102806. MR4099834
- [10] F. Rothberger, *Eine Verschüpfung der Eigenschaft*, Fund. Math. **30** (1938), 50–55.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHARLOTTE, CHARLOTTE, NC 28223, USA