



Separation axioms in ideal bitopological spaces

P. Maragatha Meenakshi^{1*} and A. Vanitha²

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce and study (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_0 and (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 spaces. Also we obtain several characterizations of this axioms.

Keywords

Ideal bitopological spaces, (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -closed set, (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open set, (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -closure, (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -kernal.

AMS Subject Classification

54D10.

¹Department of Mathematics, Periyar E.V.R. College, Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli-620023, Tamil Nadu, India.

²Department of Mathematics, Valluvar College of Science and Management, Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Karur-639003, Tamil Nadu, India.

*Corresponding author: ¹maragathameenakship@gmail.com; ²vanithavalluvar@gmail.com

Article History: Received 11 October 2019; Accepted 25 December 2019

©2020 MJM.

Contents

1	Introduction	99
2	Preliminaries	99
3	On (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_0 and (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 spaces ..	100
	References	103

1. Introduction

The concept of ideals in topological spaces has been introduced and studied by Kuratowski [6] and Vaidyanathasamy [10]. An ideal \mathcal{I} on a topological space (X, τ) is a nonempty collection of subsets of X which satisfies (i) $A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $B \subset A$ implies $B \in \mathcal{I}$ and (ii) $A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $B \in \mathcal{I}$ implies $A \cup B \in \mathcal{I}$. Given a bitopological space (X, τ_1, τ_2) with an ideal \mathcal{I} on X and if $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is the set of all subsets of X , a set operator $(\cdot)_i^*$: $\mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$, called the local function [10] of A with respect to τ_i and \mathcal{I} , is defined as follows: for $A \subset X$, $A_i^*(\tau_i, \mathcal{I}) = \{x \in X | U \cap A \notin \mathcal{I} \text{ for every } U \in \tau_i(x)\}$, where $\tau_i(x) = \{U \in \tau_i | x \in U\}$. Observe additionally that $\tau_i\text{-Cl}^*(A) = A \cup A_i^*(\tau_i, \mathcal{I})$ defines a Kuratowski closure operator for $\tau^*(\mathcal{I})$, when there is no chance of confusion, $A_i^*(\mathcal{I})$ is denoted by A_i^* and $\tau_i\text{-Int}^*(A)$ denotes the interior of A in $\tau_i^*(\mathcal{I})$. In this paper, we introduce and study (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_0 and (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 spaces. Also we obtain several characterizations of this axioms.

2. Preliminaries

Let A be a subset of a bitopological space (X, τ_1, τ_2) . We denote the closure of A and the interior of A with respect to τ_i by $\tau_i\text{-Cl}(A)$ and $\tau_i\text{-Int}(A)$, respectively.

Definition 2.1. [1] A subset A of an ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is said to be (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open [1] if $A \subset \tau_j\text{-Cl}^*(\tau_i\text{-Int}(A))$.

The complement of an (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open set is called an (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -closed set.

Definition 2.2. [1] The intersection (resp. union) of all (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -closed (resp. (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open) sets of X containing (resp. contained in) $A \subset X$ is called the (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -closure (resp. (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -interior) of A and is denoted by $(i, j)\text{-s}\mathcal{I}\text{-Cl}(A)$ (resp. $(i, j)\text{-s}\mathcal{I}\text{-Int}(A)$). The intersection of all (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open sets of X containing A is called the (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -kernal of A and is denoted by $(i, j)\text{-s}\mathcal{I}\text{-Ker}(A)$.

Definition 2.3. [7] An ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is said to be

1. (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_0 if for every pair of distinct points in X , there exists an (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open set of X containing one of the points but not the other.
2. (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_1 if for every pair of distinct points x, y of X , there exists a pair of (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open sets one containing x but not y and the other containing y but not x .

3. (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - T_2 if for every pair of distinct points x, y of X , there exists a pair of disjoint (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} -open sets, one containing x and the other containing y .

3. On (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 and (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_1 spaces

Definition 3.1. An ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is said to be (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 if for every (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} -open set of X contains the (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} -closure of each of its singletons.

Definition 3.2. An ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is said to be (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} -symmetric if for each $x, y \in X$, $x \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ implies $y \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$.

Theorem 3.3. An ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 if, and only if it is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} -symmetric.

Proof. Assume that $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 . Let $x \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ and U be any (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} -open set such that $y \in U$. Then by hypothesis, $x \in U$. Therefore, every (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} -open set which contains y contains x . Hence, $y \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$. Conversely, let U be an (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} -open set and $x \in U$. If $y \notin U$, then $x \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$, and thus by assumption, $y \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$. Therefore, (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \subset U$, and hence, $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 . \square

Theorem 3.4. An ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - T_1 if, and only if $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - T_0 and (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0

Proof. Let $x, y \in X$ and $x \neq y$. Since $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - T_0 , we may assume without loss of generality that $x \in G \subset X \setminus \{y\}$ for some (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} -open set G . Thus, $x \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$, and by Theorem 3.3, $y \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$. Therefore, $X \setminus (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$ is an (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} -open set containing y but not x . Hence, $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - T_1 . The converse is clear. \square

Proposition 3.5. The following statements are equivalent for an ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$:

1. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 space;
2. If for any $F \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}C(X)$, $x \notin F$, then $F \subset U$ and $x \notin U$ for some $U \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}O(X)$;
3. If for any $F \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}C(X)$ such that $x \notin F$, then $F \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) = \emptyset$;
4. If for any two distinct points $x, y \in X$, then either (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) = (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ or (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Let $F \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}C(X)$ and $x \notin F$. Then by (1) (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \subset X \setminus F$. Set $U = X \setminus (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$, then $U \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}O(X)$ with $F \subset U$ and $x \notin U$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): Let $F \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}C(X)$ such that $x \notin F$. Then by (2), there exists $U \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}O(X)$ such that $F \subset U$ and $x \notin U$. Since $U \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}O(X)$, $U \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) = \emptyset$ and $F \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) = \emptyset$.

(3) \Rightarrow (4): Suppose that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ for the distinct points $x, y \in X$. Then there exists $z \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$ such that $z \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ (or $z \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ such that $z \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$). Then there exists $V \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}C(X, z)$ such that $y \notin V$, hence $x \in V$. Therefore, $x \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. By (3), we obtain (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\}) = \emptyset$. The proof for the other case is similar.

(4) \Rightarrow (1): Let $V \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}O(X, x)$. For each $y \notin V$, we have $x \neq y$ and $x \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. This shows that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. Hence (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\}) = \emptyset$ for each $y \in X \setminus V$ and (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \cap (\bigcup_{y \in X \setminus V} (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})) = \emptyset$. Since $V \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}O(X)$ and $y \in X \setminus V$, (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\}) \subset X \setminus V$ and hence $X \setminus V = \bigcup_{y \in X \setminus V} (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. Therefore, we obtain $(X \setminus V) \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) = \emptyset$ and hence (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \subset V$. Then $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 . \square

Theorem 3.6. An ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 if, and only if for any $x, y \in X$, (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ implies (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Suppose that $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 and $x, y \in X$ such that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. There exists $z \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$ such that $z \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ (or $z \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ such that $z \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$). Since $z \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$, there exists $V \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}O(X, z)$ such that $y \notin V$. But $z \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$ so $x \in V$. Then $x \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. Hence $x \in X \setminus (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\}) \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}O(X)$. Since $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 , we have (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \subset X \setminus (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. Hence (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\}) = \emptyset$. The proof for otherwise is similar. Conversely, let $V \in (i, j)$ - $S\mathcal{S}O(X, x)$. We will show that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \subset V$. Let $y \notin V$, that is, $y \in X \setminus V$. Then $x \neq y$ and $x \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. This shows that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. By assumption, (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\}) = \emptyset$. Hence $y \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$ and therefore (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \subset V$. Hence $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 . \square

Theorem 3.7. An ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 if, and only if for any points x and y in X , (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Ker(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Ker(\{y\})$ implies (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Ker(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Ker(\{y\}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Suppose $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is an (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{S} - R_0 space. Then for any points x and y in X , if (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Ker(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Ker(\{y\})$, then (i, j) - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. As



sume that $z \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{y\})$. By $z \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\})$, $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{z\})$. Thus by Theorem 3.6, $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{z\})$. Similarly, we have $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{z\}) = ((i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}))$, a contradiction. Hence $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{y\}) = \emptyset$. Conversely, let $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{y\})$ implies $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{y\}) = \emptyset$. Assume that $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Then $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{y\})$, and therefore by assumption, $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{y\}) = \emptyset$. Now if $z \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$, then $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{z\})$, and therefore, $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{z\}) \neq \emptyset$. By hypothesis, $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{z\})$. Thus $z \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\})$ implies $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{z\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{y\})$, a contradiction. Therefore $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\})$ implies that $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\}) = \emptyset$, and Theorem 3.6, $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$. \square

Theorem 3.8. For an ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$, the following statements are equivalent:

1. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$.
2. For any nonempty subset A of X and $G \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X)$ such that $A \cap G \neq \emptyset$, there exists $F \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}C(X)$ such that $A \cap F \neq \emptyset$ and $F \subset G$.
3. For any $G \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X)$, $G = \cup\{F : F \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}C(X), F \subset G\}$.
4. For any $F \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}C(X)$, $F = \cap\{G : G \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X), F \subset G\}$.
5. For any $x \in X$, $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \subset (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\})$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Let A be a nonempty set of X and $G \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X)$ such that $A \cap G \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists $x \in A \cap G$. Since $x \in G \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X)$, $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \subset G$. Set $F = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$. Then $F \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}C(X)$, $F \subset G$ and $A \cap F \neq \emptyset$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): Let $G \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X)$, then $G \supset \cup\{F : F \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}C(X), F \subset G\}$. Let x be any point of G . Then there exists $F \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}C(X)$ such that $x \in F$ and $F \subset G$. Therefore, $x \in F \subset \cup\{F : F \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}C(X), F \subset G\}$, and hence $G = \cup\{F : F \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}C(X), F \subset G\}$.

(3) \Rightarrow (4): This is obvious.

(4) \Rightarrow (5): Let x be any point of X and $y \notin (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\})$. Then there exists $V \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X, x)$ any $y \notin V$; hence $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\}) \cap V = \emptyset$. By (4), $\cap\{G : G \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X), (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\}) \subset G\}$, and there exists $G \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X)$ such that $x \notin G$ and $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\}) \subset G$. Therefore, $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \cap G = \emptyset$ and $y \notin (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$. Consequently, we obtain $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \subset (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\})$.

(5) \Rightarrow (1): Let $G \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X, x)$. If $y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\})$, then $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\})$ and so $y \in G$. This implies that $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \subset G$. Therefore, $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \subset$

$(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \subset G$. This shows that $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is an $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$ space. \square

Corollary 3.9. For an ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$ if, and only if $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\})$ for each $x \in X$.

Proof. Suppose $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is an $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$ space. By Theorem 3.8, $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \subset (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\})$ for each $x \in X$. Let $y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\})$. Then we have $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\})$ and by Theorem 3.6 $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Therefore, $y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$ and hence $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \subset (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$. This shows that $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\})$. The converse follows from Theorem 3.8. \square

Theorem 3.10. The following statements are equivalent for an ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$:

1. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$.
2. $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\}) \Leftrightarrow y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$ for any points x and y in X .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Assume that $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$ and $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Then $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Hence $y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$. The other part is similar.

(2) \Rightarrow (1): Let $x \in U \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X, x)$. If $y \notin U$, then $x \notin (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\})$ and hence $y \notin (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$ (by (2)). Thus $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \subset U$. Hence $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$. \square

Theorem 3.11. The following statements are equivalent for an ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$:

1. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$.
2. If F is an $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}closed$ subset of X , then $F = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(F)$.
3. If F is an $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}closed$ subset of X and $x \in F$, then $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \subset F$.
4. If $x \in X$, then $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \subset (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Let F be an $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}closed$ subset of X and $x \notin F$. Thus $X \setminus F \in (i, j)\text{-}S\mathcal{S}O(X, x)$. Since $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$, $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \subset X \setminus F$. Thus $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\}) \cap F = \emptyset$ and $x \notin (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(F)$. Therefore, $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(F) = F$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): If $A \subset B$, then $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(A) \subset (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(B)$. Then $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \subset (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(F) = F$.

(3) \Rightarrow (4): Since $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$ and $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$ is $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}closed$, $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \subset (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$.

(4) \Rightarrow (1): If $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\})$, then $y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\})$. Since $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$ and $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$ is $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}closed$, by (4), we obtain $y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Ker}(\{x\}) \subset (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$. Then $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{y\})$ implies that $y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S} \text{Cl}(\{x\})$. So $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-}s\text{semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$. \square



Definition 3.12. A net $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ in an ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is called (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -convergent to a point x in X if for every $U \in (i, j)$ - $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{O}(X, x)$, there exists $\alpha_0 \in \Lambda$ such that $x_\alpha \in U$ for each $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$.

Lemma 3.13. Let $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ be an ideal bitopological space and let x and y any two points in X such that every net in X (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -converging to y (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -converges to x . Then $x \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$.

Proof. Suppose $x_n = y$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a net in X that (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -convergence to y . Thus by assumption, (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -converges to x . So $x \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. \square

Theorem 3.14. The following statements are equivalent for an ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$:

1. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_0 .
2. If $x, y \in X$, then $y \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\})$ if, and only if every net in X (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -converging to y also (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -converges to x .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Let $x, y \in X$ such that $y \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\})$. Suppose that $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ be a net in X such that $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -converges to y . Since $y \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\})$, by Theorem 3.3, $x \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Conversely, let $x, y \in X$ such that every net in X (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -converging to y (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -converges to x . Then $x \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. By Theorem 3.10, $y \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\})$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1): Assume that x and y are any two points of X such that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $z \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \cap (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. There exists a net $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ in (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\})$ (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -converges to z . Since $z \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$, $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ also (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -converges to y . Hence by (2) $z \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Therefore (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{z\}) \subset (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$ (*). So $y \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{z\})$ gives (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\}) \subset (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{z\})$ (**). Hence from (*) and (**), (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\}) = (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{z\})$. Similarly it can be shown that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) = (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{z\})$ by taking the net in (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. So (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) = (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Then $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_0 . \square

Definition 3.15. An ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is said to be (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 if for each points x and y of X such that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$, there exist disjoint (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open subsets of X , say, U and V such that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \subset U$ and (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\}) \subset V$.

Proposition 3.16. Every (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 space is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_0 .

Proof. Let $U \in (i, j)$ - $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{O}(X, x)$. If $y \notin U$, then $x \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. So (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Since $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 , there exists an (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open set V_y such that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\}) \subset V_y$ and $x \notin V_y$, implies that $y \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\})$. Hence (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \subset U$. Then $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_0 . \square

Theorem 3.17. The following statements are equivalent for an ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$:

1. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_2 ,
2. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 and (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_1 ,
3. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 and (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_0 .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Since $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_2 , then it is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_1 . If $x, y \in X$ such that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$, then $x \neq y$ and there exist disjoint (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open sets U and V such that $x \in U$ and $y \in V$. Hence by Theorem 3.4, (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) = \{x\} \subset U$ and (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\}) = \{y\} \subset V$. Hence $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 .

(2) \Rightarrow (3): Since $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_1 , then it is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_0 .

(3) \Rightarrow (1): Since $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 and (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_0 , then by Proposition 3.16, $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_0 and (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_0 . Hence by Theorem 3.4, $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_1 . Let $x, y \in X$ such that $x \neq y$. Then (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) = \{x\} \neq \{y\} = (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Since $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 , there exist disjoint (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open sets U and V such that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) = \{x\} \subset U$ and (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\}) = \{y\} \subset V$. Hence we have $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_2 and thus by Theorem 3.3 (X, τ) is an (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_0 space. \square

Corollary 3.18. For an (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$, the following statements are equivalent:

1. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_2 .
2. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_1 .
3. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - T_0 .

Theorem 3.19. For an ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 if, and only if $x \in X \setminus (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$ implies that x and y have disjoint (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -neighbourhoods.

Proof. Let $x \in X \setminus (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Then (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$ and x and y have disjoint (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -neighbourhoods. Conversely, first we show that $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_0 . Let U be an (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open set and $x \in U$. Suppose that $y \notin U$. Then, (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\}) \cap U = \emptyset$ and $x \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Then there exist disjoint (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open sets U_x and U_y such that $x \in U_x$ and $y \in U_y$ and $U_x \cap U_y = \emptyset$. Hence, (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \subset (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(U_x)$ and (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(x) \cap U_y \subset (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{U_x\}) \cap U_y = \emptyset$. Therefore, $y \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\})$. Consequently, (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \subset U$ and $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_0 . Next, we show that $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{I})$ is (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} - R_1 . Suppose that (i, j) - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Assume that there exists $z \in (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{x\})$ such that $z \notin (i, j)$ - $s\mathcal{I}\text{Cl}(\{y\})$. Then there exist disjoint (i, j) -semi- \mathcal{I} -open sets V_z and V_y such



that $z \in V_z, y \in V_y$. Since $z \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}), x \in V_z$. Since $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0, (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \subset V_z, (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\}) \subset V_y$ and $V_z \cap V_y = \emptyset$. Then (X, τ_1, τ_2) is $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_1$ and thus by Theorem 3.3 (X, τ) is an $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$ space. \square

Theorem 3.20. *The following statements are equivalent for an ideal bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$:*

1. $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_1$.
2. For each $x, y \in X$ one of the following holds:
 - (a) If U is $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-open}$, then $x \in U$ if, and only if $y \in U$.
 - (b) there exist disjoint $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-open}$ sets U and V such that $x \in U$ and $y \in V$.
3. If $x, y \in X$ and $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$, then there exist $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-closed}$ sets F_1 and F_2 such that $x \in F_1, y \notin F_1, y \in F_2, x \notin F_2$, and $X = F_1 \cup F_2$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Let $x, y \in X$. Then $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ or $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. If $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ and U is $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-open}$, then $x \in U$ implies $y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \subset U$ and $y \in U$ implies $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\}) \subset U$. Thus consider the case that $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. Then there exist disjoint $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-open}$ sets U and V such that $x \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \subset U$ and $y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\}) \subset V$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): Let $x, y \in X, (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. Then $x \notin (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ or $y \notin (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$, say $x \notin (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$. Then there exists an $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-open}$ set A such that $x \in A$ and $y \notin A$. Then by (2) there exist disjoint $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-open}$ sets U and V such that $x \in U$ and $y \in V$. Then $F_1 = X \setminus V$ and $F_2 = X \setminus U$ are $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-closed}$ sets such that $x \in F_1, y \notin F_1, y \in F_2, x \notin F_2$ and $X = F_1 \cup F_2$.

(3) \Rightarrow (1): We shall first show that $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$ space. Let U be an $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-open}$ set such that $x \in U$. We claim that $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \subset U$. For suppose $y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \cap (X \setminus U)$. Then $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) \neq (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$ (if $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\}) = (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{y\})$, then $y \in U$) and hence by (3), there exist $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-closed}$ sets F_1 and F_2 such that $x \in F_1, y \notin F_1, y \in F_2, x \notin F_2$ and $X = F_1 \cup F_2$. Then $y \in F_2 \setminus F_1 = X \setminus F_1 \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}O(X)$ and $x \notin X \setminus F_1$, a contradicts the fact that $y \in (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{x\})$. Hence $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$ space. Let $p, q \in X$ be such that $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{p\}) \neq (i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{q\})$. Then by the given condition there exist $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-closed}$ sets H_1 and H_2 such that $p \in H_1, q \notin H_1, q \in H_2, p \notin H_2$ and $X = H_1 \cup H_2$. Thus $p \in H_1 \setminus H_2$ and $q \in H_2 \setminus H_1$, where $H_1 \setminus H_2$ and $H_2 \setminus H_1$ are disjoint $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-open}$ sets. Hence $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{p\}) \subset H_1 \setminus H_2$ and $(i, j)\text{-}s\mathcal{S}Cl(\{q\}) \subset H_2 \setminus H_1$. Hence $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_1$ space. and thus by Theorem 3.3 (X, τ) is an $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}R_0$ space. \square

In view of Theorems 3.17 and 3.20, it now follows that

Theorem 3.21. *A bitopological space $(X, \tau_1, \tau_2, \mathcal{S})$ is $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-}T_2$ if, and only if for each $x, y \in X$ such that $x \neq y$, there exist $(i, j)\text{-semi-}\mathcal{S}\text{-closed}$ sets F_1 and F_2 such that $x \in F_1, y \notin F_1, y \in F_2, x \notin F_2$ and $X = F_1 \cup F_2$.*

References

- [1] M. Caldas, S. Jafari and N. Rajesh, Semiopen sets in ideal bitopological spaces, to appear in *CUBO Mathematics Journal*, 2020.
- [2] A. S. Davis, Indexed systems of neighbourhoods for general topological spaces, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 68(1961), 886–893.
- [3] D. Jankovic and T. R. Hamlett, New topologies from old via ideals, *American Math. Monthly*, 97(1990), 295–310.
- [4] J. C. Kelly, Bitopological spaces, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 13(1963), 71–89.
- [5] M. Mršević, On pairwise R_0 and pairwise R_1 bitopological spaces, *Bull. Math. De la Soc. Sci. Mathe. de. la. R. S. de Roumanie Tome*, 30(78)(1986), 17–23.
- [6] K. Kuratowski, *Topology*, Academic press, New York, 1966.
- [7] P. Maragatha Meenakshi and A. Vanitha, Bitopological separatin axioms (submitted).
- [8] M. G. Murdeshwar and S. A. Naimpally, R_1 topological spaces, *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 9(1966), 521–523.
- [9] N. A. Shanin, On separability in topological spaces, *Dokl. Akad. Sciencies. USSR*, 38(1943), 166–169.
- [10] R. Vaidyanathaswamy, The localisation theory in set topology, *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci.*, 20(1945), 51–61.

ISSN(P):2319 – 3786

Malaya Journal of Matematik

ISSN(O):2321 – 5666

