

## PROPER METRIC SPACES AND HIGSON COMPACTIFICATIONS OF PRODUCT SPACES

KAZUO TOMOYASU

ABSTRACT. Let  $(X, d)$  be a non-compact metric space. We provide an equivalent condition that the metric  $d$  is proper on  $X$ .  $\overline{X}^d$  denotes the Higson compactification of a non-compact proper metric space  $(X, d)$ . In this paper we show that if  $(X, d_X)$  is a non-compact proper metric space and  $(Y, d_Y)$  is a non-compact proper metric space or a non-degenerate compact metric space, then  $\overline{X} \times \overline{Y}^{\max\{d_X, d_Y\}}$  is not equivalent to  $\overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y}$ .

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

The Higson compactification is a compactification which is defined for all locally compact metric spaces endowed with certain metrics [6]. We say that a metric  $d$  on  $X$  is *proper* provided that every bounded set in  $X$  has a compact closure. For  $X$  to have a proper metric, obviously  $X$  must be locally compact. Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. In this paper, for  $r > 0$ ,  $B_r(x, d)$  and  $\text{diam}X$  denote  $\{y \in X : d(x, y) < r\}$  and  $\sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in X\}$  respectively. Suppose that  $X$  is non-compact with  $d$  a proper metric. Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a continuous function into a metric space  $Y$  with specific metric. We say that a function  $f$  satisfies the  $(*)_d$ -condition provided that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(f(B_r(x, d))) = 0$  for any  $r > 0$ . The  $(*)_d$ -condition means that for each  $r > 0$  and each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a compact set  $K = K_{r, \varepsilon}$  in  $X$  such that for all  $x \notin K$ ,  $\text{diam}(f(B_r(x, d))) < \varepsilon$ . We now define  $C_d^*(X)$  and  $C_d(X)$ . Recall that  $C(X)$  (resp.  $C^*(X)$ ) denotes the set of all real-valued (resp. bounded real-valued) continuous functions on  $X$ . These are rings under pointwise addition and multiplication with  $C^*(X)$  a subring of  $C(X)$ . By analogy with these definitions we define  $C_d(X) = \{f \in C(X) : f \text{ satisfies the } (*)_d\text{-condition}\}$  and  $C_d^*(X) = \{f \in C^*(X) : f \text{ satisfies the } (*)_d\text{-condition}\}$ . With the supremum norm on  $C^*(X)$ ,  $C_d^*(X)$  is a closed subring of  $C^*(X)$  containing all the constant functions. Because the metric  $d$  on  $X$  is proper,  $C_d^*(X)$  generates the topology of  $X$ . It is well-known that the compactifications of  $X$  are in one-to-one correspondence with the closed subrings  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $C^*(X)$  which contain the

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 54D35; 54D40.

*Key words and phrases*. Higson compactification; Higson corona; Proper metric spaces.

constants and generate the topology of  $X$  (cf. [1], Theorem 3.7.). We are now in a position to define the Higson compactification and its corona. The Higson compactification is the compactification associated with the closed subring  $\mathcal{F} = C_d^*(X) \subset C^*(X)$  [6]. We denote the Higson compactification by  $\overline{X}^d$ , which depends on the metric  $d$ . The corona of this compactification is the set  $\overline{X}^d - X$  with the subspace topology. We denote the corona of  $X$  by  $\nu_d X$ . It is characterized as the compactification  $\overline{X}^d$  such that the real-valued continuous functions on  $X$  that extend to  $\overline{X}^d$  are precisely the ones in  $C_d^*(X)$ .

The following proposition was shown in [6].

**Proposition 1.1.** *Supposes that  $X$  is non-compact and that  $d$  is a proper metric on  $X$ . The Higson compactification  $\overline{X}^d$  is the unique compactification of  $X$  such that if  $Y$  is any compact metric space and  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous, then  $f$  has a continuous extension to  $\overline{X}^d$  if and only if  $f$  satisfies the  $(*)_d$ -condition.*

In this paper  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{D}_\kappa$  denote the real line endowed with a usual topology, the set of all positive integers and a discrete space with cardinality  $\kappa$  respectively. In section 2, for non-compact metric space  $(X, d)$ , we show that the metric  $d$  is proper on  $X$  if and only if  $C_d^*(X)$  separates points from closed subsets of  $X$ . Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be non-compact proper metric spaces. It is natural to ask a question whether  $\overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y}$  is equivalent to  $\overline{X \times Y}^\rho$  for some proper metric  $\rho$  compatible with the topology of  $X \times Y$ . Y. Iwamoto introduced the notion that two proper metrics  $d$  and  $\rho$  on  $X$  are similar (Definition is appeared in section 3.) and he proved that  $\overline{X}^d$  is equivalent to  $\overline{X}^\rho$  if and only if  $d$  and  $\rho$  are similar. In section 3, we show that if  $d$  and  $\max\{d_X, d_Y\}$  are similar, then  $\overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y}$  is not equivalent to  $\overline{X \times Y}^d$ . Assume that  $(K, d_K)$  is a non-degenerate compact metric space. Furthermore, we show that if  $d$  and  $\max\{d_X, d_K\}$  are similar, then  $\overline{X}^{d_X} \times K$  is not equivalent to  $\overline{X \times K}^d$ . Let  $(X, d)$  be a non-compact proper metric space and  $n < \omega$ . We show that there exists a proper metric  $\rho$  on  $\mathbb{D}_n \times X$  such that  $\overline{\mathbb{D}_n \times X}^\rho$  is equivalent to  $\mathbb{D}_n \times \overline{X}^d$ . In particular, if  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  are similar, then  $\overline{K \times X}^{\rho'}$  is equivalent to  $K \times \overline{X}^d$ .

For undefined notation and terminology, see [2] and [3].

## 2. PROPER METRIC SPACES

In this section we assume that  $(X, d)$  is a non-compact metric space. A subset  $\mathcal{F} \subset C^*(X)$  separates points from closed subsets of  $X$  provided that for any closed subset  $F \subset X$  and any  $x \in X - F$  there is an  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $f(x) \notin \text{cl}_{\mathbb{R}} f(X - F)$ . In this section we discuss concerning proper metric spaces. Now, it is easy to see that  $C_d^*(X)$  separates points from closed subsets

of  $X$  if  $(X, d)$  is a proper metric space. In this section we show that the converse is true. At first, we will prove the following lemma:

**Lemma 2.1.** *If  $C_d^*(X)$  separates points from closed subsets of  $X$ , then*

$$\text{diam}X = +\infty.$$

**Proof.** Assume the contrary that  $\text{diam}X < +\infty$ . Then there exists an  $s > 0$  such that  $B_s(x, d) = X$ . In this case, every element of  $C_d^*(X)$  is a constant function. In fact, for any  $f \in C_d^*(X)$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a compact subset  $K_n$  of  $X$  such that  $\text{diam}(f(B_s(x, d))) = \text{diam}(f(X)) < 1/n$  if  $x \notin K_n$ . This indicates that  $f$  is a constant function. This contradicts for the fact that  $C_d^*(X)$  separates points from closed subsets of  $X$  and then the proof is complete.  $\square$

Lemma 2.1 shows that if  $d$  is a proper metric on  $X$ , then  $\text{diam}X = +\infty$ . From the Lemma 2.1 we will prove the theorem below:

**Theorem 2.2.** *If  $C_d^*(X)$  separates points from closed subsets of  $X$ , then  $d$  is proper on  $X$ .*

**Proof.** Assume the contrary that  $d$  is not proper. Then there exist an  $x \in X$  and an  $r > 0$  such that  $B_r(x, d)$  is not relatively compact. At first, we will show the following claim below:

**Claim.** For any  $y \in B_r(x, d)$ , there exists a  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $B_\lambda(y, d) \supset B_r(x, d)$  and  $B_\lambda(y, d) \neq B_r(x, d)$ .

In fact, from the Lemma 2.1  $\text{diam}X = +\infty$ . Then we can take a point  $z \in X - B_r(x, d)$  because  $X - B_r(x, d) \neq \emptyset$ . Put  $\lambda = 2r + d(x, z)$  and then  $B_\lambda(y, d) \supset B_r(x, d)$  holds for any  $y \in B_r(x, d)$ . Furthermore, since  $d(y, z) \leq d(y, x) + d(x, z) < r + d(x, z) < \lambda$ ,  $z \in B_\lambda(y, d)$  and thus  $B_\lambda(y, d) \neq B_r(x, d)$ . Then the proof of claim is complete.

Now, since  $B_r(x, d) - K \neq \emptyset$  for any compact subset  $K$  of  $X$ , we can take a point  $y \in B_r(x, d) - K$ . Since  $C_d^*(X)$  separates points from closed subsets of  $X$ , there exists an  $f \in C_d^*(X)$  such that  $f(x) \notin \text{cl}_{\mathbb{R}}f(X - B_r(x, d))$ . Put  $\varepsilon_0 = d(f(x), \text{cl}_{\mathbb{R}}f(X - B_r(x, d)))$ . Let  $\lambda$  be as in the Claim and  $z \in B_\lambda(y, d) - B_r(x, d)$ . Since  $B_\lambda(y, d) \supset B_r(x, d)$  and  $B_\lambda(y, d) \cap (X - B_r(x, d)) \neq \emptyset$ , we note that  $\text{diam}(f(B_\lambda(y, d))) \geq |f(x) - f(z)| \geq \varepsilon_0$ . This is a contradiction and thus  $d$  is proper on  $X$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

From the Theorem 2.2 we can get the following corollary:

**Corollary 2.3.**  *$C_d^*(X)$  separates points from closed subsets of  $X$  if and only if  $d$  is proper on  $X$ .*

### 3. HIGSON COMPACTIFICATIONS OF PRODUCT SPACES

For compactifications  $\alpha X$  and  $\gamma X$  of  $X$ ,  $\alpha X \geq \gamma X$  if there exists a continuous map  $f : \alpha X \rightarrow \gamma X$  such that  $f \upharpoonright_X$  is an identity on  $X$ .  $\alpha X$  is equivalent

to  $\gamma X$  provided that if there is a homeomorphism  $f : \alpha X \rightarrow \gamma X$  such that  $f \upharpoonright_X$  is an identity on  $X$ . (We denote this by writing  $\alpha X \approx \gamma X$ .) Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and  $A$  a subset of  $X$ . Let  $d(x, A)$  and  $B_r(A, d)$  be denoted by  $\inf\{d(x, a) : a \in A\}$  and  $\{x \in X : d(x, A) < r\}$  respectively. The following definition was introduced by Y. Iwamoto.

**Definition 3.1** ([5]). *Let  $d$  and  $\rho$  be two proper metrics on  $X$ . We write  $d \prec \rho$  provided that if for any  $r > 0$ , there exists a compact set  $K$  in  $X$  and  $s_r > 0$  such that  $B_r(x, d) \subset B_{s_r}(x, \rho)$  whenever  $x \in X - K$ . If  $d \prec \rho$  and  $\rho \prec d$  then we say that  $d$  and  $\rho$  are similar. (We denote this by writing  $d \doteq \rho$ .)*

The following lemma was proved by Y. Iwamoto.

**Lemma 3.2** ([5]). *Let  $d$  and  $\rho$  be two proper metrics on non-compact space  $X$ . Then  $\overline{X}^d \approx \overline{X}^\rho$  if and only if  $d \doteq \rho$ .*

We will prove the theorem below:

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be non-compact proper metric spaces. Then  $\overline{X} \times \overline{Y}^d$  is not equivalent to  $\overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y}$ , where  $d = \max\{d_X, d_Y\}$ .*

**Proof.** Assume the contrary that  $\overline{X} \times \overline{Y}^d \approx \overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y}$ . Since both  $X$  and  $Y$  are non-compact metric spaces, there exist countable infinite closed discrete subsets  $N$  and  $M$  of  $X$  and  $Y$  respectively. Let us denote these sets by  $N = \{x_n : n < \omega\}$  and  $M = \{y_n : n < \omega\}$ . We now construct subsets  $P \subset N$  and  $Q \subset M$  as subsequences. Let  $p_0 = x_0$  and  $q_0 = y_0$ . Since  $d_X$  and  $d_Y$  on  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively, are proper, there must be  $x_i \notin B_3(p_0, d_X)$  and  $y_i \notin B_3(q_0, d_Y)$ . Choose such  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  and let  $p_1 = x_i$  and  $q_1 = y_i$ . Similarly, there must be  $x_i \notin \bigcup_{i < 2} B_4(p_i, d_X)$  and  $y_i \notin \bigcup_{i < 2} B_4(q_i, d_Y)$ . Choose such  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  and let  $p_2 = x_i$  and  $q_2 = y_i$ . Continuing in these fashions we obtain subsets  $P = \{p_n : n < \omega\} \subset N$  and  $Q = \{q_n : n < \omega\} \subset M$  such that  $p_n \notin \bigcup_{k < n} B_{n+2}(p_k, d_X)$  and  $q_n \notin \bigcup_{k < n} B_{n+2}(q_k, d_Y)$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Now, let  $D = \{t_n : t_n = (p_n, q_n), n < \omega\}$ . We will verify that  $B = \{B_{r_n}(t_n, d) : n < \omega\}$  is a discrete open collection of  $X \times Y$ , where  $r_n = (n+1)/2$  for  $n < \omega$ . In fact, it is sufficient to show that  $\{B_{r_n}(p_n, d_X) : n < \omega\}$  and  $\{B_{r_n}(q_n, d_Y) : n < \omega\}$  are discrete open collections of  $X$  and  $Y$  respectively and then we will show the following claim:

**Claim 1.**

- (1)  $|\{n : B_{r_n}(p_n, d_X) \cap B_{1/2}(x, d_X) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } n < \omega\}| \leq 1$  holds for any  $x \in X$ ,
- (2)  $|\{n : B_{r_n}(q_n, d_Y) \cap B_{1/2}(y, d_Y) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } n < \omega\}| \leq 1$  holds for any  $y \in Y$ .

We will show the Claim 1-(1). In fact, assume the contrary that there exist  $i, j < \omega$  and  $x \in X$  such that  $B_{r_i}(p_i, d_X) \cap B_{1/2}(x, d_X) \neq \emptyset$  and  $B_{r_j}(p_j, d_X) \cap B_{1/2}(x, d_X) \neq \emptyset$  hold. Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $i < j$ .

From the assumption above we can take  $z_k \in B_{r_k}(p_k, d_X) \cap B_{1/2}(x, d_X)$  for  $k = i, j$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} d_X(p_i, p_j) &\leq d_X(p_i, z_i) + d_X(z_i, x) + d_X(x, z_j) + d_X(z_j, p_j) \\ &\leq \frac{i+1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{j+1}{2} < j + 2. \end{aligned}$$

However, this contradicts the choice of  $p_j, d_X(p_i, p_j) \geq j + 2$ . By the similar argument of Claim 1-(1) we can show the Claim 1-(2).

From the Claim 1 we note the following claim:

**Claim 2.**

- (1)  $|\{n : (X \times \{y\}) \cap B_{r_n}(t_n, d) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } n < \omega\}| \leq 1$  holds for any  $y \in Y$ ,
- (2)  $|\{n : (\{x\} \times Y) \cap B_{r_n}(t_n, d) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } n < \omega\}| \leq 1$  holds for any  $x \in X$ .

Then we will define a map  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$  as follows:

$$f(p) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } p \notin \bigcup_{n < \omega} B_{r_n}(t_n, d), \\ (r_n - d(p, t_n))/r_n, & \text{if } p \in B_{r_n}(t_n, d). \end{cases}$$

**Claim 3.**  $f \in C_d^*(X \times Y)$ .

It is sufficient to show that  $f$  satisfies the  $(*)_d$ -condition. In fact, let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be fixed and let  $r > 0$ . Then there exists an  $n < \omega$  such that  $r_i > 4r/\varepsilon$  for  $i \geq n$ . Put  $K = \bigcup_{i < n} B_{r_i}(t_i, d)$ . Since  $d$  is proper,  $\text{cl}_{X \times Y} B_r(K, d)$  is compact in  $X \times Y$ .

Now, if  $p \notin \text{cl}_{X \times Y} B_r(K, d)$  and  $B_r(p, d) \cap B_{r_i}(t_i, d) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $r_i \geq r_n > 4r/\varepsilon$ . We will show that  $\text{diam}(f(B_r(p, d))) \leq \varepsilon$ . It is sufficient to show that  $d(f(p), f(z)) < \varepsilon/2$  for every  $z \in B_r(p, d)$ . To that end of the proof of Claim 3, it is sufficient to consider the following four cases below:

- (1)  $z \in B_r(p, d), z \in B_{r_i}(t_i, d)$  and  $p \in B_{r_i}(t_i, d)$ ,
- (2)  $z \in B_r(p, d), z \in B_{r_i}(t_i, d)$  and  $p \notin B_{r_i}(t_i, d)$  for every  $i < \omega$ ,
- (3)  $z \in B_r(p, d)$  and  $p, z \notin B_{r_i}(t_i, d)$  for every  $i < \omega$ ,
- (4)  $z \in B_r(p, d), p \in B_{r_i}(t_i, d)$  and  $z \in B_{r_j}(t_j, d)$  for some  $i, j < \omega$  with  $i \neq j$ .

In the case (1),  $|f(p) - f(z)| = |(r_i - d(p, t_i))/r_i - (r_i - d(z, t_i))/r_i| = |d(z, t_i) - d(p, t_i)|/r_i < r/r_i < \varepsilon/4$ . In the case (2),  $|f(p) - f(z)| = |f(z)| = |r_i - d(z, t_i)|/r_i < r/r_i < \varepsilon/4$ . In the case (3),  $|f(p) - f(z)| = 0$ . Finally, in the case (4), without loss of generality, we may assume that  $i < j$ . Then  $|f(p) - f(z)| \leq \varepsilon/2$  because  $|f(p)| = |r_i - d(p, t_i)|/r_i < r/r_i < \varepsilon/4$  and  $|f(z)| = |r_j - d(z, t_j)|/r_j < r/r_i < \varepsilon/4$ . This completes the proof that  $\text{diam}(f(B_r(p, d))) \leq \varepsilon$ . Hence,  $f$  satisfies the  $(*)_d$ -condition and then  $f \in C_d^*(X \times Y)$ .

From Claim 2 for any  $x \in X$ , there exists a compact set  $K_x$  of  $Y$  such that  $f(p) = 0$  if  $p \in \{x\} \times (Y - K_x)$ . Similarly, for any  $y \in Y$ , there exists a compact set  $K_y$  of  $X$  such that  $f(p) = 0$  if  $p \in (X - K_y) \times \{y\}$ . Since  $\overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y} \approx \overline{X} \times \overline{Y}^d, f$  has a continuous extension  $\bar{f}$  on  $\overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y}$ . R

denotes  $\overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y} - X \times Y$ . From the facts above we note that  $\overline{f}(x) = 0$  if  $x \in R$ . Since  $\text{cl}_{\overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y}} D \cap R \neq \emptyset$ , we take a point  $p \in \text{cl}_{\overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y}} D \cap R$ . Then we can verify that  $\sup_{z \in U_p} |\overline{f}(z) - \overline{f}(p)| = 1$  for any neighborhood  $U_p$  of  $p$ . This contradicts the continuity of  $\overline{f}$  and then  $\overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y}$  is not equivalent to  $\overline{X \times Y}^d$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

From Lemma 3.2 we can get the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be non-compact proper metric spaces. If  $d = \max\{d_X, d_Y\}$ , then  $\overline{X \times Y}^d$  is not equivalent to  $\overline{X}^{d_X} \times \overline{Y}^{d_Y}$ .*

Furthermore, the following theorem holds even if one factor is non-degenerate compact metrizable.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $(K, d_K)$  be a non-degenerate compact metric space,  $(X, d)$  a non-compact proper metric space and  $\rho = \max\{d, d_K\}$ . Then  $\overline{X \times K}^\rho$  is not equivalent to  $\overline{X}^d \times K$ .*

**Proof.** Assume the contrary that  $\overline{X \times K}^\rho \approx \overline{X}^d \times K$ . Let  $r$  be denoted by a diameter of  $K$  and a  $k \in K$ . We will define a function  $f : X \times K \rightarrow [0, 1]$  as follows:

$$f((x, z)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } z \notin B_{s/3}(k, d_K), \\ (s - 3 \cdot d_K(k, z))/s, & \text{if } z \in B_{s/3}(k, d_K), \end{cases}$$

where  $s = \min\{r, 1\}$ . Then  $f \in C^*(X \times K)$ . For any  $y \in K$  we define  $f_y : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by  $f_y(x) = f((x, y))$ . Since  $f_y \in C_d^*(X)$ , there exists a continuous extension  $\overline{f}_y : \overline{X}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $\overline{f}_y \upharpoonright_X = f_y$ . We will define a function  $\overline{f} : \overline{X}^d \times K \rightarrow [0, 1]$  as follows:  $\overline{f}((x, y)) = \overline{f}_y(x)$  for any  $(x, y) \in \overline{X}^d \times K$ . We will verify that  $\overline{f} \in C^*(\overline{X}^d \times K)$  with  $\overline{f} \upharpoonright_{X \times K} = f$ . To do this it is sufficient to show that if  $p \in \nu_d X$  and  $q \in K$  then  $\overline{f} \upharpoonright_{(X \times K) \cup \{(p, q)\}}$  is continuous (cf. 6H of [4]). Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. We must find  $V$  open in  $\overline{X}^d$  and  $W$  open in  $K$  for which  $(p, q) \in V \times W$  and  $\overline{f}((V \times W) \cap (X \times K)) \subset (\overline{f}((p, q)) - \varepsilon, \overline{f}((p, q)) + \varepsilon)$ . As  $\overline{f}_q$  is continuous there exists an open subset  $V$  of  $\overline{X}^d$  such that  $p \in V$  and  $\overline{f}_q(V) \subset (\overline{f}_q(p) - \varepsilon/4, \overline{f}_q(p) + \varepsilon/4)$ . Thus, if  $x \in V$  then

$$\overline{f}((x, q)) \in (\overline{f}((p, q)) - \varepsilon/4, \overline{f}((p, q)) + \varepsilon/4).$$

As  $f$  is uniformly continuous there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $(x, v)$  and  $(x', w)$  are in  $X \times K$  and  $\rho((x, v), (x', w)) < \delta$  then  $|f((x, v)) - f((x', w))| < \varepsilon/4$ . So, let  $W = B_\delta(q, d_K)$ . Then if  $(x, v) \in (V \cap X) \times W$ , then  $|f((x, v)) - f((x, q))| < \varepsilon/4$ . Combine this with (1) and conclude that  $\overline{f}((V \times W) \cap (X \times K)) \subset (\overline{f}((p, q)) - \varepsilon, \overline{f}((p, q)) + \varepsilon)$ . Thus  $\overline{f}$  is continuous as claimed. Since  $\overline{X \times K}^\rho \approx$

$\overline{X}^d \times K$ ,  $f$  satisfies the  $(*)_\rho$ -condition. On the other hand, we note that  $\text{diam}(f(B_{r+1}((y, z), \rho))) = 1$  for any  $(y, z) \in X \times K$ . This is a contradiction and then the proof is complete.  $\square$

From Lemma 3.2 we can get the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $(K, d_K)$  be a non-degenerate compact metric space and  $(X, d)$  a non-compact proper metric space. If  $\rho = \max\{d, d_K\}$ , then  $\overline{X} \times \overline{K}^\rho$  is not equivalent to  $\overline{X}^d \times K$ .*

In Theorem 3.5 if  $K$  is discrete, then there exists a proper metric  $\rho$  compatible with the topology of  $K$  such that  $\overline{X} \times \overline{K}^\rho \approx \overline{X}^d \times K$ . The rest of this paper, for the sake of abbreviation, let  $\mathbb{D}_n$  be denoted by  $\{0, \dots, n - 1\}$  for  $n < \omega$ .

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a non-compact proper metric space. Then for any compact discrete space  $K$  there exists a proper metric  $\rho$  on  $K \times X$  such that  $\overline{K} \times \overline{X}^\rho \approx K \times \overline{X}^d$ .*

**Proof.** Since  $K$  is compact discrete, without loss of generality, we can consider that there exists an  $n < \omega$  such that  $K = \mathbb{D}_n$ . Fix an element  $x_0 \in X$ . Then we will define a metric  $\rho : (\mathbb{D}_n \times X) \times (\mathbb{D}_n \times X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:

$$\rho((i, x), (j, y)) = \begin{cases} d(x, y), & \text{if } i = j, \\ \max\{d(x_0, x) + i, d(x_0, y) + j\}, & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Then it is easy to see that  $\rho$  is a proper metric on  $\mathbb{D}_n \times X$  and for any  $r > 0$ ,  $B_r((i, x), \rho) = \{i\} \times B_r(x, d)$  if  $d(x_0, x) \geq r$ . Now, let  $Y$  be a compact metric space and  $f : (\mathbb{D}_n \times X, \rho) \rightarrow Y$  a continuous map satisfying the  $(*)_\rho$ -condition. Define  $f_i : X \rightarrow Y$  by  $f_i(x) = f((i, x))$  and  $d_i : X^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $d_i(x, y) = \rho((i, x), (i, y))$  for  $i < n$ . Then we note that  $d_i = d$  for  $i < n$  and it is easy to see that  $f_i$  satisfies the  $(*)_d$ -condition for  $i < n$  and then  $f_i$  has a continuous extension  $\overline{f}_i : \overline{X}^d \rightarrow Y$ . Then we will define  $\overline{f} : \mathbb{D}_n \times \overline{X}^d \rightarrow Y$  as follows:

$$\overline{f}((i, x)) = \overline{f}_i(x), \quad \text{if } x \in \overline{X}^d.$$

Then  $\overline{f} : \mathbb{D}_n \times \overline{X}^d \rightarrow Y$  is a continuous extension of  $f$ .

Conversely, we assume that a continuous map  $f : (\mathbb{D}_n \times X, \rho) \rightarrow Y$  has a continuous extension  $\overline{f} : \mathbb{D}_n \times \overline{X}^d \rightarrow Y$ . For any  $i < n$  let  $f_i$  and  $d_i$  be defined as in the argument above. For any  $i < n$  define  $\overline{f}_i : \overline{X}^d \rightarrow Y$  by  $\overline{f}_i(x) = \overline{f}((i, x))$  for  $x \in \overline{X}^d$ . Since  $\overline{X}^{d_i} \approx \overline{X}^d$ ,  $f_i$  satisfies the  $(*)_{d_i}$ -condition for  $i < n$ . To that end of the proof, we will show that  $f$  satisfies the  $(*)_\rho$ -condition. For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  be fixed and any  $r > 0$ , then there exists a compact set  $K_i$  of  $X$  such

that if  $x \notin K_i$ , then  $\text{diam}(f_i(B_r(x, d_i))) < \varepsilon$  for  $i < n$ . Put  $K = \bigcup_{i < n} \{i\} \times (K_i \cup \text{cl}_X B_r(x_0, d_i))$ . If  $(i, x) \notin K$ , then  $\text{diam}(f(B_r((i, x), \rho))) = \text{diam}(f(\{i\} \times B_r(x, d_i))) = \text{diam}(f_i(B_r(x, d_i)))$  for  $i < n$  and then  $\text{diam}(f(B_r((i, x), \rho))) < \varepsilon$ . Hence  $f$  satisfies the  $(*)_\rho$ -condition. From the uniqueness of  $\overline{\mathbb{D}_n \times \overline{X}^\rho}$ ,  $\overline{\mathbb{D}_n \times \overline{X}^\rho} \approx \mathbb{D}_n \times \overline{X}^d$  and then the proof is complete.  $\square$

From Lemma 3.2 we can get the following corollary:

**Corollary 3.8.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a non-compact proper metric space,  $K$  a compact discrete space, and  $\rho$  a proper metric on  $X \times K$  defined on Theorem 3.7. If  $\rho' \equiv \rho$ , then  $\overline{K \times \overline{X}^{\rho'}} \approx K \times \overline{X}^d$ .*

**Acknowledgements** The author would like to thank Professor Y. Iwamoto for giving information concerning Higson compactification. The author would also like to thank Mr. S. Taniyama for giving helpful advices concerning this study.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] B.J. Ball and S. Yokura *Compactifications determined by subsets of  $C^*(X)$* , Top. Appl. 13 (1982), 1-13.
- [2] R.E. Chandler, *Hausdorff Compactifications*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York-Basel, 1976.
- [3] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, Helderman Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [4] L. Gillman and M. Jerison, *Rings of Continuous Functions*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.
- [5] Y. Iwamoto, *A metric condition which gives the same Higson compactification*, manuscript.
- [6] J. Keesling, *The one-dimensional Čech cohomology of the Higson compactification and its corona*, Topology. Proc. 19 (1994), 129-148.

*Address:* INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS UNIVERSITY OF TSUKUBA, TSUKUBA-SHI IBARAKI 305-8571, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* tomoyasu@math.tsukuba.ac.jp

(Received: 26.3.1998.)