

3.6 An alternative description of compactness

Question: $\exists \{O_i\}_{i \in I} \supseteq K$ is an infinite collection of open sets such that $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} O_i$

\Rightarrow then a finite collection $O_{n_1}, O_{n_2}, \dots, O_{n_k} \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $K \subseteq O_{n_1} \cup O_{n_2} \cup \dots \cup O_{n_k}$?

Answer: Yes! (because $[0, 1]$ is compact)
Remark: $(0, 1) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\frac{1}{n}, 1 - \frac{1}{n})$

Definition: A subset K of a metric space X has the open covering property (OCP) if whenever \mathcal{O} is a collection of open sets such $K \subseteq \bigcup_{O \in \mathcal{O}} O$, $\leftarrow O$ is an open covering of K then we can find finitely many sets O_1, O_2, \dots, O_n in \mathcal{O} such that $K \subseteq O_1 \cup O_2 \cup \dots \cup O_n$. finite subcovering

AIM: K is compact $\Leftrightarrow K$ has the OCP

Proposition: If K has the OCP, then K is compact.

Proof (contrapositive): Assume that K is not compact; we shall construct a covering \mathcal{O} that does not have a finite subcovering.

Since K is not compact, there is a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in K which does not have any subsequence converging to a point in K . If $a \in K$, this means that there is a ball $B(a; r_a)$ around a that only contains finitely many terms of the sequence. The collection

$$\mathcal{G} = \{B(a; r_a)\}_{a \in K}$$

is an open covering of K , but it does not have a finite subcovering. Why?

$$B(a_1; r_1), B(a_2; r_2), \dots, B(a_m; r_m)$$

can only contain finitely many elements of the sequence, and hence there are elements from the sequence that are lacking from K .

Lemma: Assume that \mathcal{O} is an open covering of a set K . Define $f: K \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by $f(x) = \sup \{r > 0 : B(x, r) \subseteq O \text{ for some } O \in \mathcal{O}\}$.

Then f is positive and continuous.

Proof: $f(x) > 0$ because there are $O \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $x \in O$ and since O is open, there is an $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subseteq O$.

To prove that f is continuous, it suffices to show that $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq d(x, y)$. If $f(x), f(y) \leq d(x, y)$, this obvious. Assume now that at least one of $f(x), f(y)$ is larger than $d(x, y)$, and assume that $f(x) \geq f(y)$, and assume that $f(x) \geq f(y)$. Since $f(x) \geq d(x, y)$,

\Rightarrow will for any r , $B(x, r) \subseteq B(x, f(x))$ have the situation in the diagram, and hence the ball

$$B(y, r - d(x, y)) \subseteq B(x, f(x))$$

$$f(y) \geq f(x) - d(x, y)$$

$$d(x, y) \geq |f(x) - f(y)|$$

Theorem: K is compact if and only if it has the OCP.

Proof: It remains to prove that if K is compact, then it has the OCP. So assume that K is compact, and that \mathcal{O} is an open covering of K . We know from the lemma that the function

$$f(x) = \sup \{r > 0 : B(x, r) \subseteq O \text{ for some } O \in \mathcal{O}\}$$

is strictly positive and continuous. By the extreme value theorem, there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $f(x) \geq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in K$.

Since K is compact, it is locally bounded, and hence there is a finite number of ball $B(x_1, \varepsilon), B(x_2, \varepsilon), \dots, B(x_n, \varepsilon)$

that cover K . Since $\varepsilon \leq f(x_i)$, there is

an O_i in \mathcal{O} such that $B(x_i, \varepsilon) \subseteq O_i$. But $\varepsilon \leq f(x_i)$ then

$$K \subseteq B(x_1, \varepsilon) \cup \dots \cup B(x_n, \varepsilon)$$

$$\subseteq O_1 \cup O_2 \cup \dots \cup O_n$$

finite subcovering