

### PROOF OF PROPOSITION II.1.3.32

Let  $(M, d)$  be a metric space, and assume that it is sequentially compact. Then it is compact, i.e. every open cover has a finite subcover.

The proof in the notes is poorly written. The result is important enough to warrant a careful exposition. Of course there is overlap with the language in the notes.

The argument has four steps. a)  $M$  is *totally bounded* (definition below). b) Total boundedness implies that the topology on  $M$  has a countable base. c) This implies that every open cover has a countable subcover. d) Finally, every countable open cover has a finite subcover. The assumption of sequential compactness is used in steps a) and d).

a) Claim: for every  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , there is a finite set  $Z_m = \{z_1, \dots, z_N\}$ , (with  $N$  depending on  $m$ ) such that the balls  $B(z_j, 1/m)$  cover  $M$ . A metric space with this property is called *totally bounded*.

Suppose this is not true: for some  $m$ , no finite number of balls of radius  $1/m$  covers  $M$ . We show by induction that there is a sequence  $\{z_j\}$  with the property that  $d(z_i, z_j) \geq 1/m$  for all  $i, j$ . The claim now follows, because no subsequence of such a sequence can be Cauchy, and hence there can be no convergent subsequence. This contradicts the sequential compactness hypothesis.

Pick a point  $z_1$ . We are assuming that  $B(z_1, 1/m)$  does not cover  $M$ . Now suppose as induction step that we have found points  $z_1, \dots, z_k$  such that  $\cup_{j=1}^k B(z_j, 1/m) \subsetneq M$  and  $d(z_i, z_j) \geq 1/m$  for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, k$ . Choose  $z_{k+1} \in M - \cup_{j=1}^k B(z_j, 1/m)$ . Then since  $z_{k+1}$  does not belong to any  $B(z_j, 1/m)$ , we have  $d(z_{k+1}, z_j) > 1/m$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . Furthermore, since we are assuming that no finite number of  $1/m$  balls covers  $M$ , we must have  $\cup_{j=1}^{k+1} B(z_j, 1/m) \subsetneq M$ . The sequence with the desired property exists, and the claim is established.

b) Let  $Z = \cup_m Z_m$ . Let  $y_1, y_2, \dots$  denote the points in  $Z$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the collection of balls  $B_{nm} := B(y_n, 1/m)$ . Claim: this countable collection is a base for the metric topology.

Pick  $x \in M$ , and an open  $U_x$  containing  $x$ . There is a ball centered at  $x$  that is contained in  $U_x$ , say  $B(x, \eta)$ . Now choose  $m$  with  $1/m < \eta/2$ , and a  $y_j \in Z_m$  for which  $d(y_j, x) < 1/m$ . Then  $\mathcal{B} \ni B(y_j, 1/m) \subset B(x, \eta)$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfies the first condition for basis. It is easy to show the condition about the intersection of two basis sets, and I leave that to the reader (you).

c) The next step is to show that every open cover has a countable subcover. Let  $\{O_\alpha\}$  be an open cover. For every  $x \in M$ , there is an  $O_\alpha$  containing  $x$ . Call it  $O_x$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}$  is a basis, there is a  $B(y_j, 1/m)$  containing  $x$  and contained in  $O_x$ . Call it  $B_x$ . Now,  $\mathcal{B}' := \{B_x\}$  is an open cover of  $M$ , since every  $x$  is contained in a set of  $\mathcal{B}'$ , but since  $\mathcal{B}' \subset \mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  is countable, the subcollection  $\mathcal{B}'$  must also be countable. (There may be uncountably many  $x$  and  $O_x$ , but there can be only countably many  $B' \in \mathcal{B}'$ ; this just means that a set  $B(y_j, 1/m)$  will be the  $B_x$  for many different  $x$ .) To get the countable subcover, note that each  $B \in \mathcal{B}'$  is contained in at least one  $O_x$ , by construction. For each of these  $B$ , pick one of these  $O_x$  and call it  $O_B$ . The collection  $\{O_B \mid B \in \mathcal{B}'\}$  is a countable subcover.

d) Finally, I show that every countable open cover of  $M$  has a finite subcover. Let  $\{O_n\}$  be a countable cover that has no finite subcover. Take the first set,  $O_1$ , call it  $O'_1$ , and pick an  $x_1 \in O'_1$ . Next, there is a set  $O_m$  such that  $O_m \subsetneq O'_1$  (or else  $M = O'_1$ , contrary to assumption). Write  $O'_2 = O_m$ . Pick an  $x_2 \in O'_2 - O'_1$ . Assume for induction that we have  $O'_1, \dots, O'_n$ , and for each  $k = 2, \dots, n$  an  $x_k \in O'_k - \cup_{j=1}^{k-1} O'_j$ . There is an  $O_m$ , call it  $O'_{n+1}$ , such that  $O'_{n+1} - \cup_{j=1}^n O'_j \neq \emptyset$ . Pick an  $x_{n+1}$  in this difference set. These sets  $O'_n$  cover  $M$ .

In this way, you get a sequence  $\{x_n\}$ . It is supposed to have a convergent subsequence,  $\{x_{n_j}\}$ , whose limit  $x$  will be contained in one of the sets  $O'_r$ . Hence  $x_{n_j} \in O'_r$  for all  $j > \text{some } J$ . But this is a contradiction, since  $O'_r$  contains only one element,  $x_r$ , of the sequence  $\{x_n\}$ .

QED, at long last.