

## Dense $S_\delta$ -diagonals and linearly ordered extensions

MASAMI HOSOBUCHI

**ABSTRACT.** The notion of the  $S_\delta$ -diagonal was introduced by H. R. Bennett to study the quasi-developability of linearly ordered spaces. In an earlier paper, we obtained a characterization of topological spaces with an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal and we showed that the  $S_\delta$ -diagonal property is stronger than the quasi- $G_\delta$ -diagonal property. In this paper, we define a dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal of a space and show that two linearly ordered extensions of a generalized ordered space  $X$  have dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonals if the sets of right and left looking points are countable.

**Keywords:**  $S_\delta$ -diagonal, dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal, linearly ordered space (LOTS), generalized ordered space (GO-space), linearly ordered extension.

**2000 AMS Classification:** 54F05.

### 1. $S_\delta$ -DIAGONALS

We review in this section the definitions of  $S_\delta$ -set and  $S_\delta$ -diagonal, and state our results obtained in [5].

The following definition is a generalization of a  $G_\delta$ -set and was introduced by H. R. Bennett [2] to study the quasi-developability of linearly ordered (topological) spaces.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $X$  be a topological space. A subset  $A$  of  $X$  is called an  $S_\delta$ -set if there exists a countable collection  $\{U(1), U(2), \dots\}$  of open subsets of  $X$  such that, for two points  $p \in A$  and  $q \in X \setminus A$ , there exists an  $n$  such that  $p \in U(n)$  and  $q \notin U(n)$ .

It is easy to see that a  $G_\delta$ -set is an  $S_\delta$ -set. Hence the notion of  $S_\delta$ -set is a generalization of  $G_\delta$ -set. See [3] for a description of  $\mathcal{S}$ -normal spaces whose closed subsets are  $S_\delta$ -sets.

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $X$  be a topological space.  $X$  has an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal if the diagonal subset  $\Delta_X$  of  $X \times X$  is an  $S_\delta$ -set of  $X \times X$ , where  $\Delta_X$  denotes the

diagonal set  $\{(x, x) : x \in X\}$  in the Cartesian product  $X \times X$ . The symbol  $(, )$  is used to stand for a point of  $X \times X$ .

It is useful to show the following lemma that relates to the property (\*) given in [2].  $\mathbb{N}$  denotes the set of natural numbers.

**Lemma 1.3.** [5] *Let  $X$  be a topological space. Let  $\{\mathcal{G}(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a family of countable collections of open subsets of  $X$ . Suppose that, for any three points  $x, y$  and  $z$  with  $y \neq z$ , there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{G}(m)$  and that no element of  $\mathcal{G}(m)$  contains the set  $\{y, z\}$ , where  $\bigcup \mathcal{G}(m)$  denotes  $\bigcup\{U : U \in \mathcal{G}(m)\}$ . Then, there exists a family  $\{\mathcal{F}(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  of countable collections of open subsets of  $X$  such that, for such three points above, there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{F}(m)$  and any two distinct points of  $\{x, y, z\}$  do not belong to the same member of  $\mathcal{F}(m)$ .*

**Theorem 1.4.** [5] *Let  $X$  be a topological space.  $X$  has an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal if and only if there exists a family  $\{\mathcal{G}(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  of countable collections of open subsets of  $X$  such that, for three points  $x, y$  and  $z$  with  $y \neq z$ , there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{G}(m)$  and any two distinct points of  $\{x, y, z\}$  do not belong to the same member of  $\mathcal{G}(m)$ .*

## 2. TWO LINEARLY ORDERED EXTENSIONS AND NOTATION

Recall that a generalized ordered space (GO-space) is a triple  $(X, \tau, <)$ , where  $<$  is a linear ordering of the set  $X$  and  $\tau$  a Hausdorff topology on  $X$  having a base of order-convex sets. We will denote by  $\lambda$  the order topology on  $(X, <)$ . It is known that  $\lambda \subset \tau$ . A space of the form  $(X, \lambda, <)$  is called a linearly ordered topological space (LOTS). Every LOTS is a GO-space, but not conversely. In fact it is known that the class of GO-spaces coincides with the class of subspaces of LOTS. Given a GO-space  $X$  there are two well-known linearly ordered extensions of  $X$ . One of these is  $X^*$  and was defined by D. J. Lutzer [7]. The other one is  $L(X)$  and was studied in [8]. We review here the definitions of those linearly ordered extensions. The intervals in a GO-space or a LOTS are written in the form  $[a, b]$ ,  $[a, b[$ ,  $]a, b]$  and  $]a, b[$ . For example,  $[a, b] = \{x : a \leq x \leq b\}$ ,  $[a, b[ = \{x : a \leq x < b\}$  and so on. For a GO-space  $X$ , we set  $R = \{x \in X : [x, \rightarrow [ \in \tau - \lambda\}$  and  $L = \{x \in X : ] \leftarrow, x] \in \tau - \lambda\}$ , where  $\lambda$  denotes the order topology as mentioned above.  $R$  (resp.  $L$ ) is called the *set of right* (resp. *left*) *looking points*. Then  $X^*$  is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X^* &= (X \times \{0\}) \cup \{(x, k) : x \in R, k < 0, k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{(x, k) : x \in L, k > 0, k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \\ &\subset X \times \mathbb{Z}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{Z}$  denotes the set of integers. On the other hand,  $L(X)$  is defined as follows:

$$L(X) = (X \times \{0\}) \cup \{(x, -1) : x \in R\} \cup \{(x, 1) : x \in L\} \subset X \times \{-1, 0, 1\}.$$

$X^*$  and  $L(X)$  are linearly ordered topological spaces equipped with the lexicographic order topologies. We, furthermore, need some technical notation

for the proof of the theorems in Section 5. For a convex open subset  $U$  of a GO-space  $X$ , we define a convex open subset  $\tilde{U}$  of  $E(X)$ , where  $E(X)$  denotes either  $X^*$  or  $L(X)$ . Then eight cases can occur. In the following, the intervals must be considered in  $E(X)$ .

- (1) If  $a$  is the minimum point of  $U$ , then we define  $\tilde{U}_1 = [(a, 0), \rightarrow[ \subset E(X)$ .
- (2) Let  $a = \inf U$  and  $a \in X \setminus U$ . If  $E(X) = X^*$ , then  $\tilde{U}_1 = \{(x, k) \in X^* : a < x\} = ](a, +\infty), \rightarrow[ \subset X^*$ , where  $(a, +\infty) \in X \times (\mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\})$  and the interval is taken in  $X^*$ . Likewise, if  $E(X) = L(X)$ , then  $\tilde{U}_1 = \{(x, k) \in L(X) : a < x\} = ](a, 1), \rightarrow[ \subset L(X)$ . Note that  $(a, 1)$  may not belong to  $L(X)$ .
- (3) If there is a gap  $u = (A, B)$  such that  $u$  is the left end-point of  $U$ , then we define  $\tilde{U}_1 = ](u, 0), \rightarrow[ \subset E(X)$ .
- (4) If none of Cases 1 – 3 occurs, then we define  $\tilde{U}_1 = E(X)$ .
- (5) If  $b$  is the maximum point of  $U$ , then we define  $\tilde{U}_2 = ]\leftarrow, (b, 0] \subset E(X)$ .
- (6) Let  $b = \sup U$  and  $b \in X \setminus U$ . If  $E(X) = X^*$ , then  $\tilde{U}_2 = \{(x, k) \in X^* : x < b\} = ]\leftarrow, (b, -\infty[ \subset X^*$  (cf. (2)). If  $E(X) = L(X)$ , then  $\tilde{U}_2 = \{(x, k) \in L(X) : x < b\} = ]\leftarrow, (b, -1[ \subset L(X)$ . Note that  $(b, -1)$  may not belong to  $L(X)$ .
- (7) If there is a gap  $v = (A, B)$  such that  $v$  is the right end-point of  $U$ , then we define  $\tilde{U}_2 = ]\leftarrow, (v, 0] \subset E(X)$ .
- (8) If none of Cases 5 – 7 occurs, then we define  $\tilde{U}_2 = E(X)$ .

We set  $\tilde{U} = \tilde{U}_1 \cap \tilde{U}_2$ .  $\tilde{U}$  is called *the convex open set associated with  $U$* . Let  $U$  be an open set of a GO-space  $X$ . Then  $U$  is decomposed into a union of open convex subsets  $\{U_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}$ . In this case, we define  $\tilde{U} = \bigcup\{\tilde{U}_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}$ , where  $\tilde{U}_\alpha$  is the open set associated with  $U_\alpha$ . Then  $\tilde{U}$  is an open subset of  $E(X)$ , and called the open set associated with  $U$ .

### 3. $S_\delta$ -DIAGONALS IN LINEARLY ORDERED EXTENSIONS

The following theorems are proved in our paper [5]. Let  $X$  be a GO-space. It is easily seen that  $X^*$  contains  $X$  as a closed subset and  $L(X)$  contains  $X$  as a dense subset. See [7, 8] for further information about  $X^*$  and  $L(X)$ . In both cases,  $X$  and  $X \times \{0\}$  are identified by the correspondence of  $x$  to  $(x, 0)$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** [5] *Let  $X$  be a generalized ordered space with an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal. If  $R \cup L$  is countable, then  $X^*$  has an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal.*

To prove a similar theorem concerning  $L(X)$ , it is necessary to assume the existence of sequences in  $X$  that witnesses first-countability for points of  $R \cup L$ :

**Theorem 3.2.** [5] *Let  $X$  be a GO-space with an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal. Assume that, for every point  $s \in L$ , there exists a decreasing sequence  $\{x(s, n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  in  $X$  such that  $\inf\{x(s, n)\} = s$  and, for every point  $s \in R$ , there exists an increasing sequence  $\{y(s, n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  in  $X$  such that  $\sup\{y(s, n)\} = s$ . If  $R \cup L$  is countable, then  $L(X)$  has an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal.*

4. DENSE  $S_\delta$ -DIAGONALS

The following definition gives an analogy to the dense  $G_\delta$ -diagonal in [1].

**Definition 4.1.** A Hausdorff space  $X$  has a *dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal* if there exists a dense subset  $D$  of  $\Delta_X$  such that  $D$  is an  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $X \times X$ , where  $\Delta_X$  denotes the diagonal subset of the Cartesian product  $X \times X$ .

We show the following theorem that is analogous to a result concerning spaces that have a dense  $G_\delta$ -diagonal [1].

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $X$  be a Hausdorff space. Then  $X$  has a dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal if and only if  $X$  has a dense subset  $Y$  such that  $Y$  is an  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $X$  and  $Y$  has an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal.*

*Proof.* If  $D \subset \Delta_X$  is a dense  $S_\delta$ -set in  $X \times X$ , then  $D \cap \Delta_X$  is a dense  $S_\delta$ -set in  $\Delta_X$ . Now the map  $h : \Delta_X \rightarrow X$  defined by  $h(x, x) = x$  is a homeomorphism, and the homeomorphic image of a dense  $S_\delta$ -set is a dense  $S_\delta$ -set.

Conversely, suppose  $Y$  is a dense  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $X$ . Then  $h^{-1}(Y)$  is a dense  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $\Delta_X$ . The rest is easily verified.  $\square$

5. THEOREMS CONCERNING DENSE  $S_\delta$ -DIAGONALS OF LINEARLY ORDERED EXTENSIONS

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $X = (X, \tau)$  be a GO-space with a dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal. If  $R \cup L$  is countable, then  $X^*$  has a dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal.*

We first show the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $X$  be a GO-space and  $X^*$  the linearly ordered extension of  $X$ . For a subspace  $Y$  of  $X$ , set  $Z = Y \cup (X^* \setminus X)$ . If  $Y$  is dense in  $X$  and an  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $X$ , then  $Z$  is a dense subspace of  $X^*$  and an  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $X^*$ .*

*Proof.* To see that  $Z$  is dense in  $X^*$ , let  $x \in X^* \setminus Z = X \setminus Y$  and  $V$  be a neighborhood of  $x$  in  $X^*$ , where  $X$  is identified with  $X \times \{0\}$  as usual. Since  $V \cap X$  is a neighborhood of  $x$  in  $X$ , it follows that  $V \cap X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $V \cap X \cap Y \subset V \cap Z$ , it follows that  $V \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ . Hence  $Z$  is a dense subspace of  $X^*$ . To show the last part, let  $\{U(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a countable collection of open subsets of  $X$  such that, for  $y \in Y$  and  $x \in X \setminus Y$ , there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $y \in U(m)$  and  $x \notin U(m)$ . For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\tilde{U}(n)$  be the open subset associated with  $U(n)$  as in Section 3. Set  $\tilde{U}(0) = X^* \setminus X$ . Then it is obvious that  $\tilde{U}(0)$  is an open subset of  $X^*$ . We show that the countable collection  $\{\tilde{U}(n) : n \geq 0\}$  of open subsets of  $X^*$  assures that  $Z$  is an  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $X^*$ . Let  $z \in Z$  and  $x \in X^* \setminus Z = X \setminus Y$ .

**Case 1.** Let  $z \in X^* \setminus X$ . Then it is easy to see that  $z \in \tilde{U}(0)$  and  $x \notin \tilde{U}(0)$ .

**Case 2.** Let  $z \in Y$ . Since  $x \in X \setminus Y$ , there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $z \in U(m)$  and  $x \notin U(m)$ . By the definition of  $\tilde{U}(m)$ , it follows that  $z \in \tilde{U}(m)$  and  $x \notin \tilde{U}(m)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Now we shall prove Theorem 5.1.

**Proof of Theorem 5.1.** By Theorem 4.2, there exists a dense subspace  $Y$  of  $X$  such that  $Y$  is an  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $X$  and that  $Y$  has an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal. Let  $\{\mathcal{G}(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a family of countable collections of open subsets of  $Y$  such that, for three points  $x, y$  and  $z$  of  $Y$  with  $y \neq z$ , there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{G}(m)$  and no element of  $\mathcal{G}(m)$  contains  $\{y, z\}$ . The existence of the above family is guaranteed by Theorem 1.4. For an open subset  $V$  of  $Y$ , there exists an open set  $V_X$  of  $X$  such that  $V_X \cap Y = V$ . Let  $\tilde{V}_X$  be the open subset of  $X^*$  associated with  $V_X$  as explained in Section 2. Set  $V_Z = \tilde{V}_X \cap Z$ , where  $Z$  is as mentioned in Lemma 5.2.

It is clear that  $V_Z$  is open in  $Z$  and that  $V_Z \cap Y = V$ . For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , set  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(n) = \{V_Z : V \in \mathcal{G}(n)\}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(0) = \{\{x\} : x \in X^* \setminus X\}$ . Let  $S = R \cup L = \{s_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be an enumeration of the countable set  $S$ . Let  $(s_i, k) \in X^* \setminus X$ . Set  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_+(s_i, k) = \{](s_i, k), \rightarrow [ \cap Z\}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_-(s_i, k) = \{] \leftarrow, (s_i, k)[ \cap Z\}$ , where these intervals are considered in  $X^*$ . By virtue of Lemma 5.2 and Theorem 4.2, it is sufficient to show that a family of those countable collections of open subsets of  $Z$  witnesses the  $S_\delta$ -diagonal of  $Z$ . To see this, let  $x, y$  and  $z$  be three points of  $Z$  with  $y \neq z$ . We may assume without loss of generality that  $y < z$ .

**Case 1.** If  $\{x, y, z\} \subset Y$ , then there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{G}(m)$  and  $\{y, z\} \not\subset V$  for any  $V \in \mathcal{G}(m)$ . Hence it follows that  $x \in \bigcup \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(m)$  and that  $\{y, z\} \not\subset V_Z$  for any  $V_Z \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(m)$ .

**Case 2.** Let  $x \in Y$  and  $y$  or  $z$  belong to  $Z \setminus Y$ .

- (i) We assume that  $y \in Z \setminus Y$ . Then we can write  $y = (s_i, k)$ , where  $k \neq 0$ . If  $x < y$ , then  $x \in ] \leftarrow, y[ \cap Z$  and  $\{y, z\} \not\subset ] \leftarrow, y[$ . Hence, by the definition, it follows that  $x \in \bigcup \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_-(s_i, k)$  and that  $\{y, z\} \not\subset V$  for  $V \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_-(s_i, k)$ . If  $y < x$ , then  $x \in ]y, \rightarrow [ \cap Z$  and  $\{y, z\} \not\subset ]y, \rightarrow [$ . Hence it follows that  $x \in \bigcup \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_+(s_i, k)$  and that  $\{y, z\} \not\subset V$  for  $V \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_+(s_i, k)$ .
- (ii) Let  $z \in Z \setminus Y$ . Then the proof is analogous to (i).

**Case 3.** Let  $x \in Z \setminus Y$ . Then it follows that  $x \in \bigcup \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(0)$  and  $\{y, z\} \not\subset V$  for any  $V \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(0)$ . Therefore, by virtue of Lemma 1.3 and Theorem 1.4,  $X^*$  has a dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $X = (X, \tau)$  be a GO-space with a dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal. If  $R \cup L$  is countable, then  $L(X)$  has a dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.2, there exists a dense subspace  $Y$  of  $X$  such that  $Y$  is an  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $X$  and  $Y$  has an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal. Since  $X$  is dense in  $L(X)$ , it follows that  $Y$  is a dense subspace of  $L(X)$ . To prove that  $L(X)$  has a dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal, it is sufficient to show, by Theorem 4.2, that  $Y$  is an  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $L(X)$ . Let  $\{U(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a countable collection of open subsets of  $X$  such that, for  $y \in Y$  and  $x \in X \setminus Y$ , there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $y \in U(m)$  and  $x \notin U(m)$ . For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\tilde{U}(n)$  be the open subset of  $L(X)$  associated with  $U(n)$ . For  $s_i \in S = R \cup L$  and  $\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}$ , set  $\tilde{U}_+(s_i, \varepsilon) = ](s_i, \varepsilon), \rightarrow [$  and  $\tilde{U}_-(s_i, \varepsilon) = ] \leftarrow, (s_i, \varepsilon)[$ , where the intervals are considered in  $L(X)$ . The

countable collection  $\{\tilde{U}(n), \tilde{U}_+(s_i, \varepsilon), \tilde{U}_-(s_i, \varepsilon) : n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in \mathbb{N}, \varepsilon = \pm 1\}$  of open subsets of  $L(X)$  guarantees that  $Y$  is an  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $L(X)$ . To see this, let  $y \in Y$  and  $z \in L(X) \setminus Y$ .

**Case 1.** Let  $z \in X \setminus Y$ . Then there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $y \in U(m)$  and  $z \notin U(m)$ . Hence it follows that  $y \in \tilde{U}(m)$  and  $z \notin \tilde{U}(m)$ .

**Case 2.** Let  $z \in L(X) \setminus X$ . We can write  $z = (s_i, \varepsilon)$ , where  $\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}$ . If  $y < z$ , then it follows that  $y \in \tilde{U}_-(s_i, \varepsilon)$  and  $z \notin \tilde{U}_-(s_i, \varepsilon)$ . If  $z < y$ , then it follows that  $y \in \tilde{U}_+(s_i, \varepsilon)$  and  $z \notin \tilde{U}_+(s_i, \varepsilon)$ . Hence  $Y$  is an  $S_\delta$ -subset of  $L(X)$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 5.3.  $\square$

## 6. EXAMPLES

**Example 6.1.** Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 do not hold without the assumption of the countability of the set  $R \cup L$ . Let us consider the Sorgenfrey line  $X = (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{S})$ . In this case, the right looking points  $R = \mathbb{R}$  is uncountable. Since  $X$  has a  $G_\delta$ -diagonal,  $X$  has an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal. However,  $X^*$  does not have an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal. To prove this, it is sufficient to see that  $X^*$  does not have a quasi- $G_\delta$ -diagonal [5]. We easily see that there does not exist a family of countable collections of open subsets of  $X^*$  that separates two points of the form  $(x, 0)$  and  $(x, 1)$ , where  $x \in X$ .

**Example 6.2.** Theorem 3.2 does not hold without the existence of the sequences for points of  $R \cup L$ . To show a counterexample, let  $Y$  be the set of countable ordinals  $[0, \omega_1[$  with the discrete topology. The right looking points of  $Y$  comprise the set of limit ordinals. Let  $Y^*$  be the linear extension of  $Y$  defined in Section 2. Let  $X = Y^* \cup \{(\omega_1, 0)\}$ , where  $X$  is ordered as  $(\omega_1, 0) > \alpha$  for all  $\alpha \in Y^*$ , and given the discrete topology. Then  $R = \{(\omega_1, 0)\}$  is a singleton and  $L(X) = Y^* \cup \{(\omega_1, -1)\} \cup \{(\omega_1, 0)\}$ , where  $\alpha < (\omega_1, -1) < (\omega_1, 0)$  for all  $\alpha \in Y^*$ . There does not exist an increasing sequence in  $Y^*$  that converges to  $(\omega_1, -1)$ . Furthermore,  $L(X)$  does not have a quasi- $G_\delta$ -diagonal, because the points of  $X$  and the point  $\{(\omega_1, -1)\}$  are not separated by a family of countable collections of open subsets of  $L(X)$ . Hence  $L(X)$  does not have an  $S_\delta$ -diagonal.

**Example 6.3.** A generalized ordered space does not necessarily have a dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal. To show this, consider the linearly ordered space  $Z$  that was constructed by H. R. Bennett and D. J. Lutzer [4]. They proved that  $Z$  is not first-countable at any point.  $Z$  is defined as follows:

$$Z = \{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n, \omega_1, \omega_1, \dots) : \alpha_i < \omega_1, 1 \leq i \leq n, \alpha_i = \omega_1, i > n, n \geq 1\},$$

with the lexicographic order. Since  $Z$  is densely-ordered, a dense subset  $Y$  of  $Z$  is a LOTS. If  $Y$  has a quasi- $G_\delta$ -diagonal,  $Y$  is quasi-developable. Since a quasi-developable space is first-countable,  $Y$  does not have a quasi- $G_\delta$ -diagonal. Therefore,  $Z$  does not have a dense  $S_\delta$ -diagonal.

**Acknowledgements.** The author is grateful to the referees for their helpful comments.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. V. Arhangel'skii and Lj. D. Kočinac, *On a dense  $G_\delta$ -diagonal*, Publ. L'Institut Math. **47 (61)** (1990), 121–126.
- [2] H. R. Bennett, *LOTS with  $S_\delta$ -diagonals*, Topology Proc. **12** (1987), 211–216.
- [3] H. R. Bennett, M. Hosobuchi and D. J. Lutzer, *A note on perfect generalized ordered spaces*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **29 (4)** (1999), 1195–1207.
- [4] H. R. Bennett and D. J. Lutzer, *Point countability in generalized ordered spaces*, Topology Appl. **71** (1996), 149–165.
- [5] M. Hosobuchi,  *$S_\delta$ -diagonals and generalized ordered spaces*, J. Tokyo Kasei Gakuin Univ. (Nat. Sci. Tech.) **41** (2001), 1–7.
- [6] D. J. Lutzer, *A metrization theorem for linearly orderable spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **22** (1969), 557–558.
- [7] D. J. Lutzer, *On generalized ordered spaces*, Dissertationes Math. **89** (1971), 1–32.
- [8] T. Miwa and N. Kemoto, *Linearly ordered extensions of GO spaces*, Topology Appl. **54** (1993), 133–140.

RECEIVED JANUARY 2002

REVISED DECEMBER 2002

MASAMI HOSOBUCHI  
*Tokyo Kasei Gakuin University,  
Department of Housing and Planning,  
2600 Aihara, Machida,  
Tokyo 194-0292,  
Japan.*

*E-mail address:* mhsbc@kasei-gakuin.ac.jp