Islands and proximity domains

Eszter K. Horváth, Szeged

Co-authors: Stephan Foldes, Sándor Radeleczki, Tamás Waldhauser

Novi Sad, 2013, June 5.

Island domain

$U \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(U)$

Let $h\colon U \to \mathbb{R}$ be a height function and let $S \in \mathcal{C}$ be a nonempty set.

We denote the cover relation of the poset $(\mathcal{K}, \subseteq)$ by $\prec$, and we write $K_1 \preceq K_2$ if $K_1 \prec K_2$ or $K_1 = K_2$.

We say that S is a *island* with respect to the triple $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, h)$, if every $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $S \prec K$ satisfies

$$h(u) < \min h(S) \text{ for all } u \in K \setminus S.$$

Island domain

$U \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(U)$

Let $h\colon U \to \mathbb{R}$ be a height function and let $S \in \mathcal{C}$ be a nonempty set.

We denote the cover relation of the poset $(\mathcal{K}, \subseteq)$ by $\prec$, and we write $K_1 \preceq K_2$ if $K_1 \prec K_2$ or $K_1 = K_2$.

We say that S is a *island* with respect to the triple $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, h)$, if every $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $S \prec K$ satisfies

$$h(u) < \min h(S) \text{ for all } u \in K \setminus S.$$

Island domain

$U \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(U)$

Let $h\colon U \to \mathbb{R}$ be a height function and let $S \in \mathcal{C}$ be a nonempty set.

We denote the cover relation of the poset $(\mathcal{K}, \subseteq)$ by $\prec$, and we write $K_1 \preceq K_2$ if $K_1 \prec K_2$ or $K_1 = K_2$.

We say that S is a *island* with respect to the triple $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, h)$, if every $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $S \prec K$ satisfies

$$h(u) < \min h(S) \text{ for all } u \in K \setminus S.$$

„Closeness" relation

$(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$

$\delta \subseteq \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$

$$A \delta B \Leftrightarrow \exists K \in \mathcal{K} : \quad A \preceq K \text{ and } K \cap B \neq \emptyset. \tag{1}$$

It is easy to verify that relation δ satisfies the following properties for all $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ whenever $B \cup C \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$A \delta B \Rightarrow B \neq \emptyset;$$

$$A \cap B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A \delta B;$$

$$A \delta (B \cup C) \Leftrightarrow (A \delta B \text{ or } A \delta C).$$

„Closeness" relation

$(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$

$\delta \subseteq \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$

$$A\delta B \Leftrightarrow \exists K \in \mathcal{K} : \quad A \preceq K \text{ and } K \cap B \neq \emptyset. \tag{1}$$

It is easy to verify that relation δ satisfies the following properties for all $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ whenever $B \cup C \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$A\delta B \Rightarrow B \neq \emptyset;$$

$$A \cap B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A\delta B;$$

$$A\delta(B \cup C) \Leftrightarrow (A\delta B \text{ or } A\delta C).$$

„Closeness" relation

$(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$

$\delta \subseteq \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$

$$A \delta B \Leftrightarrow \exists K \in \mathcal{K} : \quad A \preceq K \text{ and } K \cap B \neq \emptyset. \tag{1}$$

It is easy to verify that relation δ satisfies the following properties for all $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ whenever $B \cup C \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$A \delta B \Rightarrow B \neq \emptyset;$$

$$A \cap B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A \delta B;$$

$$A \delta (B \cup C) \Leftrightarrow (A \delta B \text{ or } A \delta C).$$

„Closeness" relation

$(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$

$\delta \subseteq \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$

$$A \delta B \Leftrightarrow \exists K \in \mathcal{K}: \quad A \preceq K \text{ and } K \cap B \neq \emptyset. \tag{1}$$

It is easy to verify that relation δ satisfies the following properties for all $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ whenever $B \cup C \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$A \delta B \Rightarrow B \neq \emptyset;$$
$$A \cap B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A \delta B;$$
$$A \delta (B \cup C) \Leftrightarrow (A \delta B \text{ or } A \delta C).$$

Distant families

We say that $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ are *distant* if neither $A \delta B$ nor $B \delta A$ holds.

It is easy to see that in this case A and B are also incomparable (in fact, disjoint), whenever $A, B \neq \emptyset$.

A nonempty family $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ will be called a *distant family*, if any two incomparable members of $\mathcal{H}$ are distant.

Lemma If $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is a distant family, then $\mathcal{H}$ is CDW-independent. Moreover, if $U \in \mathcal{H}$, then U is admissible.

Distant families

We say that $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ are *distant* if neither $A\delta B$ nor $B\delta A$ holds.

It is easy to see that in this case A and B are also incomparable (in fact, disjoint), whenever $A, B \neq \emptyset$.

A nonempty family $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ will be called a *distant family*, if any two incomparable members of $\mathcal{H}$ are distant.

Lemma If $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is a distant family, then $\mathcal{H}$ is CDW-independent. Moreover, if $U \in \mathcal{H}$, then U is admissible.

Distant families

We say that $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ are *distant* if neither $A\delta B$ nor $B\delta A$ holds.

It is easy to see that in this case A and B are also incomparable (in fact, disjoint), whenever $A, B \neq \emptyset$.

A nonempty family $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ will be called a *distant family*, if any two incomparable members of $\mathcal{H}$ are distant.

Lemma If $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is a distant family, then $\mathcal{H}$ is CDW-independent. Moreover, if $U \in \mathcal{H}$, then U is admissible.

Distant families

We say that $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ are *distant* if neither $A \delta B$ nor $B \delta A$ holds.

It is easy to see that in this case A and B are also incomparable (in fact, disjoint), whenever $A, B \neq \emptyset$.

A nonempty family $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ will be called a *distant family*, if any two incomparable members of $\mathcal{H}$ are distant.

Lemma If $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is a distant family, then $\mathcal{H}$ is CDW-independent. Moreover, if $U \in \mathcal{H}$, then U is admissible.

CD-independent subsets in posets

Definitions

Let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set and $a, b \in P$. The elements a and b are called *disjoint* and we write $a \perp b$ if

either $\mathbb{P}$ has least element $0 \in P$ and $\inf\{a, b\} = 0$,

or if $\mathbb{P}$ is without 0, then a and b have no common lowerbound

A nonempty set $X \subseteq P$ is called *CD-independent* if for any $x, y \in X$, $x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$ or $x \perp y$ holds.

CD-independent subsets in posets

Definitions

Let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set and $a, b \in P$. The elements a and b are called *disjoint* and we write $a \perp b$ if

either $\mathbb{P}$ has least element $0 \in P$ and $\inf\{a, b\} = 0$,

or if $\mathbb{P}$ is without 0, then a and b have no common lowerbound.

A nonempty set $X \subseteq P$ is called *CD-independent* if for any $x, y \in X$, $x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$ or $x \perp y$ holds.

CD-independent subsets in posets

Definitions

Let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set and $a, b \in P$. The elements a and b are called *disjoint* and we write $a \perp b$ if

either $\mathbb{P}$ has least element $0 \in P$ and $\inf\{a, b\} = 0$,

or if $\mathbb{P}$ is without 0, then a and b have no common lowerbound.

A nonempty set $X \subseteq P$ is called *CD-independent* if for any $x, y \in X$, $x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$ or $x \perp y$ holds.

CD-independent subsets in posets

Definitions

Let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set and $a, b \in P$. The elements a and b are called *disjoint* and we write $a \perp b$ if

either $\mathbb{P}$ has least element $0 \in P$ and $\inf\{a, b\} = 0$,

or if $\mathbb{P}$ is without 0, then a and b have no common lowerbound.

A nonempty set $X \subseteq P$ is called *CD-independent* if for any $x, y \in X$, $x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$ or $x \perp y$ holds.

CD-independent subsets in posets

Definitions

Let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set and $a, b \in P$. The elements a and b are called *disjoint* and we write $a \perp b$ if

either $\mathbb{P}$ has least element $0 \in P$ and $\inf\{a, b\} = 0$,

or if $\mathbb{P}$ is without 0, then a and b have no common lowerbound.

A nonempty set $X \subseteq P$ is called *CD-independent* if for any $x, y \in X$, $x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$ or $x \perp y$ holds.

CDW-independence

Definition A family $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(U)$ is *weakly independent* if

$$H \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} H_i \implies \exists i \in I : H \subseteq H_i \tag{2}$$

holds for all $H \in \mathcal{H}, H_i \in \mathcal{H}\,(i \in I)$. If $\mathcal{H}$ is both CD-independent and weakly independent, then we say that $\mathcal{H}$ is *CDW-independent*.

Definition

Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ be a family of sets such that $U \in \mathcal{H}$. We say that $\mathcal{H}$ is *admissible*, if for every nonempty antichain $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$

$$\exists H \in \mathcal{A}\ \forall K \in \mathcal{K}:\ H \subset K \implies K \nsubseteq \bigcup \mathcal{A}. \tag{3}$$

Connective island domains

Definition

A pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is an *connective island domain* if

$$\forall A, B \in \mathcal{C}: \quad (A \cap B \neq \emptyset \text{ and } B \nsubseteq A) \implies \exists K \in \mathcal{K} : A \subset K \subseteq A \cup B.$$



Connective island domains

Theorem

The following three conditions are equivalent for any pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$:

(i) $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is a connective island domain.

(ii) Every system of pre-islands corresponding to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is CD-independent.

(iii) Every system of pre-islands corresponding to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is CDW-independent.

Connective island domains

Theorem

The following three conditions are equivalent for any pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$:

(i) $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is a connective island domain.

(ii) Every system of pre-islands corresponding to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is CD-independent.

(iii) Every system of pre-islands corresponding to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is CDW-independent.

Connective island domains

Theorem

The following three conditions are equivalent for any pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$:

(i) $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is a connective island domain.

(ii) Every system of pre-islands corresponding to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is CD-independent.

(iii) Every system of pre-islands corresponding to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is CDW-independent.

Standard height function

Let us consider a CD-independent family $\mathcal{H}$.

Clearly, for every $u \in U$, the set of members of $\mathcal{H}$ containing u is a finite chain.

The *standard height function* of $\mathcal{H}$ assigns to each element u the length of this chain, i.e., one less than the number of members of $\mathcal{H}$ that contain u.



Standard height function

Let us consider a CD-independent family $\mathcal{H}$.
Clearly, for every $u \in U$, the set of members of $\mathcal{H}$ containing u is a finite chain.

The *standard height function* of $\mathcal{H}$ assigns to each element u the length of this chain, i.e., one less than the number of members of $\mathcal{H}$ that contain u.



Standard height function

Let us consider a CD-independent family $\mathcal{H}$.

Clearly, for every $u \in U$, the set of members of $\mathcal{H}$ containing u is a finite chain.

The *standard height function* of $\mathcal{H}$ assigns to each element u the length of this chain, i.e., one less than the number of members of $\mathcal{H}$ that contain u.



Standard height function

Let us consider a CD-independent family $\mathcal{H}$.
Clearly, for every $u \in U$, the set of members of $\mathcal{H}$ containing u is a finite chain.
The *standard height function* of $\mathcal{H}$ assigns to each element u the length of this chain, i.e., one less than the number of members of $\mathcal{H}$ that contain u.



Distant families in connective island domains

Theorem

Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ be a connective island domain and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ with $U \in \mathcal{H}$. If $\mathcal{H}$ is a distant family, then $\mathcal{H}$ is a system of islands; moreover, $\mathcal{H}$ is the system of islands corresponding to its standard height function.

Islands and proximity domains

The island domain $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is called a *proximity domain*, if it is a connective island domain and the relation δ is symmetric for nonempty sets, that is

$$\forall A, B \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\} : \ A\delta B \Leftrightarrow B\delta A. \tag{4}$$

If a relation δ defined on $\mathcal{P}(U)$ satisfies the mentioned three properties and δ is symmetric for nonempty sets, then (U, δ) is called a *proximity space*.

δ satisfies the following properties for all $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ whenever $B \cup C \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$A\delta B \Rightarrow B \neq \emptyset;$$
$$A \cap B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A\delta B;$$
$$A\delta(B \cup C) \Leftrightarrow (A\delta B \text{ or } A\delta C).$$

The notion goes back to Frigyes Riesz (1908), however this axiomatization is due to Vadim A. Efremovich.

The island domain $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is called a *proximity domain*, if it is a connective island domain and the relation δ is symmetric for nonempty sets, that is

$$\forall A, B \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\} : \; A\delta B \Leftrightarrow B\delta A. \tag{4}$$

If a relation δ defined on $\mathcal{P}(U)$ satisfies the mentioned three properties and δ is symmetric for nonempty sets, then (U, δ) is called a *proximity space*.

δ satisfies the following properties for all $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ whenever $B \cup C \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$A\delta B \Rightarrow B \neq \emptyset;$$

$$A \cap B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A\delta B;$$

$$A\delta(B \cup C) \Leftrightarrow (A\delta B \text{ or } A\delta C).$$

The notion goes back to Frigyes Riesz (1908), however this axiomatization is due to Vadim A. Efremovich.

Islands and proximity domains

The island domain $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is called a *proximity domain*, if it is a connective island domain and the relation δ is symmetric for nonempty sets, that is

$$\forall A, B \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\} : \ A \delta B \Leftrightarrow B \delta A. \tag{4}$$

If a relation δ defined on $\mathcal{P}(U)$ satisfies the mentioned three properties and δ is symmetric for nonempty sets, then (U, δ) is called a *proximity space*.

δ satisfies the following properties for all $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ whenever $B \cup C \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$A \delta B \Rightarrow B \neq \emptyset;$$
$$A \cap B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A \delta B;$$
$$A \delta (B \cup C) \Leftrightarrow (A \delta B \text{ or } A \delta C).$$

The notion goes back to Frigyes Riesz (1908), however this axiomatization is due to Vadim A. Efremovich.

Islands and proximity domains

The island domain $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is called a *proximity domain*, if it is a connective island domain and the relation δ is symmetric for nonempty sets, that is

$$\forall A, B \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\} : \; A\delta B \Leftrightarrow B\delta A. \tag{4}$$

If a relation δ defined on $\mathcal{P}(U)$ satisfies the mentioned three properties and δ is symmetric for nonempty sets, then (U, δ) is called a *proximity space*.

δ satisfies the following properties for all $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ whenever $B \cup C \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$A\delta B \Rightarrow B \neq \emptyset;$$
$$A \cap B \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A\delta B;$$
$$A\delta(B \cup C) \Leftrightarrow (A\delta B \text{ or } A\delta C).$$

The notion goes back to Frigyes Riesz (1908), however this axiomatization is due to Vadim A. Efremovich.

Islands and proximity domains

Proposition

If $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is a proximity domain, then any system of islands corresponding to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is a distant system.

Proof

$$h(b) < \min h(A) \leq h(a)$$

$$h(a) < \min h(B) \leq h(b)$$

Islands and proximity domains

Proposition

If $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is a proximity domain, then any system of islands corresponding to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is a distant system.

Proof

$$h(b) < \min\ h(A) \leq h(a)$$

$$h(a) < \min\ h(B) \leq h(b)$$

Characterization for system of islands for proximity domains

Corollary

If $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is a proximity domain, and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ with $U \in \mathcal{H}$, then $\mathcal{H}$ is a system of islands if and only if $\mathcal{H}$ is a distant family. Moreover, in this case $\mathcal{H}$ is the system of islands corresponding to its standard height function.

Pre-island

$U \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(U)$

Let $h \colon U \to \mathbb{R}$ be a height function and let $S \in \mathcal{C}$ be a nonempty set.

We say that S is an *pre-island* with respect to the triple $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, h)$, if every $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $S \prec K$ satisfies

$$\min h(K) < \min h(S).$$

We say that S is a *island* with respect to the triple $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, h)$, if every $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $S \prec K$ satisfies

$$h(u) < \min h(S) \text{ for all } u \in K \setminus S.$$

Pre-island

$U \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(U)$

Let $h\colon U \to \mathbb{R}$ be a height function and let $S \in \mathcal{C}$ be a nonempty set.

We say that S is an *pre-island* with respect to the triple $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, h)$, if every $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $S \prec K$ satisfies

$$\min h(K) < \min h(S).$$

We say that S is a *island* with respect to the triple $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, h)$, if every $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $S \prec K$ satisfies

$$h(u) < \min h(S) \text{ for all } u \in K \setminus S.$$

Example

Let $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ be nonempty sets, and let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n$. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} U &= A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n, \\ \mathcal{K} &= \{B_1 \times \cdots \times B_n \colon \emptyset \neq B_i \subseteq A_i,\ 1 \leq i \leq n\} \\ \mathcal{C} &= \{C \in \mathcal{K} \colon C \subseteq \mathcal{I}\} \cup \{U\}, \end{aligned}$$

and let $h \colon U \longrightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the height function given by

$$h(a_1, \ldots, a_n) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathcal{I}; \\ 0, & \text{if } (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in U \setminus \mathcal{I}; \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in U.$$

It is easy to see that the pre-islands corresponding to the triple $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, h)$ are exactly U and the maximal elements of the poset $(\mathcal{C} \setminus \{U\}, \subseteq)$.

formal concepts

prime implicants of a Boolean function

Example

Let $A_1, \dots, A_n$ be nonempty sets, and let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n$. Let us define

$$U = A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n,$$
$$\mathcal{K} = \{B_1 \times \cdots \times B_n \colon \emptyset \neq B_i \subseteq A_i,\ 1 \leq i \leq n\}$$
$$\mathcal{C} = \{C \in \mathcal{K} \colon C \subseteq \mathcal{I}\} \cup \{U\},$$

and let $h\colon U \longrightarrow \{0,1\}$ be the height function given by

$$h\,(a_1, \dots, a_n) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathcal{I}; \\ 0, & \text{if } (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in U \setminus \mathcal{I}; \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in U.$$

It is easy to see that the pre-islands corresponding to the triple $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}, h)$ are exactly U and the maximal elements of the poset $(\mathcal{C} \setminus \{U\}, \subseteq)$.

formal concepts

prime implicants of a Boolean function

Pre-islands and admissible systems

Definition

Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ be a family of sets such that $U \in \mathcal{H}$. We say that $\mathcal{H}$ is *admissible*, if for every nonempty antichain $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$

$$\exists H \in \mathcal{A}\ \forall K \in \mathcal{K}:\ H \subset K \implies K \nsubseteq \bigcup \mathcal{A}. \tag{5}$$

Proposition

Every system of pre-islands is admissible.

Pre-islands and admissible systems

Definition

Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ be a family of sets such that $U \in \mathcal{H}$. We say that $\mathcal{H}$ is *admissible*, if for every nonempty antichain $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$

$$\exists H \in \mathcal{A}\ \forall K \in \mathcal{K}:\ H \subset K \implies K \nsubseteq \bigcup \mathcal{A}. \tag{5}$$

Proposition

Every system of pre-islands is admissible.

Pre-islands and admissible systems

Theorem

A subfamily of $\mathcal{C}$ is a maximal system of pre-islands if and only if it is a maximal admissible family.

Finally, let us consider the following condition on $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$, which is stronger than that of being a connective island domain:

$$\forall K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K} : \; K_1 \cap K_2 \neq \emptyset \implies K_1 \cup K_2 \in \mathcal{K}. \tag{6}$$

Theorem

Suppose that $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ satisfies condition (6), and assume that for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $C \prec K$ we have $|K \setminus C| = 1$. Then $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ is a proximity domain; pre-islands and islands corresponding to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ coincide. Therefore, if $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ and $U \in \mathcal{H}$, then $\mathcal{H}$ is a system of (pre-) islands if and only if $\mathcal{H}$ is a distant family. Moreover, in this case $\mathcal{H}$ is the system of (pre-) islands corresponding to its standard height function.

Example

Let $G = (U, E)$ be a connected simple graph with vertex set U and edge set E; let $\mathcal{K}$ consist of the connected subsets of U, and let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ such that $U \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ consist of he connected convex sets of vertices.

Corollary

Let G be a graph with vertex set U; let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ be a connective island domain corresponding to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$, and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ with $U \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $\mathcal{H}$ is a system of (pre-) islands if and only if $\mathcal{H}$ is distant; moreover, in this case $\mathcal{H}$ is the system of (pre-) islands corresponding to its standard height function.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!