

1-1-2003

On Intuitionistic Fuzzy Subhypernear-rings of Hypernear-Rings

KYUNG HO KIM

Follow this and additional works at: <https://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/math>



Part of the [Mathematics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

KIM, KYUNG HO (2003) "On Intuitionistic Fuzzy Subhypernear-rings of Hypernear-Rings," *Turkish Journal of Mathematics*: Vol. 27: No. 3, Article 8. Available at: <https://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/math/vol27/iss3/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. It has been accepted for inclusion in Turkish Journal of Mathematics by an authorized editor of TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. For more information, please contact academic.publications@tubitak.gov.tr.

On Intuitionistic Fuzzy Subhypernear-rings of Hypernear-Rings

Kyung Ho Kim

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce the concept of an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of a hypernear-ring and obtain some results in this connection.

Key Words: Fuzzy subhypernear-ring, intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring, upper (resp. lower) t -level cut, homomorphism.

1. Introduction

After the introduction of the concept of fuzzy sets by Zadeh [3], several researchers were conducted on the generalizations of the notion of fuzzy set. The idea of “intuitionistic fuzzy set” was first published by Atanassov [1], as a generalization of the notion of fuzzy set. In this paper, using Atanassov’s idea, we establish the intuitionistic fuzzification of the concept of subhypernear-rings in hypernear-rings and investigate some of their properties. Also, for any intuitionistic fuzzy set $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ and a homomorphism f from hypernear-ring R to hypernear-ring R' , we define IFS $A^f = (\mu_A^f, \gamma_A^f)$ in R by $\mu_A^f(x) := \mu_A(f(x))$, $\gamma_A^f(x) := \gamma_A(f(x))$ for all $x \in R$. Then we show that If an IFS $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ in R' is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R' , then an IFS $A^f = (\mu_A^f, \gamma_A^f)$ in R is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R . We consider the notion of equivalence relations on the family of all intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-rings of a hypernear-ring and investigate some related properties.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 03F55, 06F05, 20M12, 03B52

2. Preliminaries

First we shall present the fundamental definitions.

A hyperstructure is a set H together with a map $+ : H \times H \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^*(H)$ called hyperoperation, where $\mathcal{P}^*(H)$ denotes the set of all the nonempty subsets of H . A *hypernear-ring* is an algebraic structure $(R, +, \cdot)$ which satisfies the following axioms:

(H1) $x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z,$

(H2) There is $0 \in R$ such that $x + 0 = 0 + x = x.$

(H3) For every $x \in R$ there exists one and only one $x' \in R$ such that $0 \in x + x'$ where we shall write $-x$ for x' and we call it the opposite of $x,$

(H4) $z \in x + y$ implies $y \in -x + z$ and $x \in z - y,$

(H5) With respect to the multiplication, (R, \cdot) is a semigroup having a bilaterally absorbing element $0,$ that is, $x0 = 0x = 0$ for all $x \in R.$

(H6) The multiplication is distributive with respect to the hyperoperation $+$ on the left side, that is, $x \cdot (y + z) = x \cdot y + x \cdot z$ for all $x, y, z \in R.$

If $x \in R$ and A, B are subsets of $R,$ then by $A + B, A + x$ and $x + B$ we mean

$$A + B = \bigcup_{a \in A, b \in B} a + b, A + x = A + \{x\}, x + B = \{x\} + B$$

A subhyper group $A \subseteq R$ is *normal* if we have $x + A - x \subseteq A.$

By a *fuzzy set* μ in a nonempty set X we mean a function $\mu : X \rightarrow [0, 1],$ and the complement of $\mu,$ denoted by $\bar{\mu},$ is the fuzzy set in X given by $\bar{\mu}(x) = 1 - \mu(x)$ for all $x \in X.$

A fuzzy set μ in R is called a *fuzzy subhypernear-ring* of R (see[2]) if it satisfies

(F1) $\min\{\mu(x), \mu(y)\} \leq \inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\mu(\alpha)\},$

(F2) $\mu(x) \leq \mu(-x),$

(F3) $\min\{\mu(x), \mu(y)\} \leq \mu(xy).$

An intuitionistic fuzzy set (briefly, IFS) A in a nonempty set X is an object having the form

$$A = \{(x, \mu_A(x), \gamma_A(x)) \mid x \in X\}$$

where the functions $\mu_A : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\gamma_A : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denote the degree of membership and the degree of nonmembership, respectively, and

$$0 \leq \mu_A(x) + \gamma_A(x) \leq 1$$

for all $x \in X$.

For the sake of simplicity, we shall use the symbol $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ for the IFS $A = \{(x, \mu_A(x), \gamma_A(x)) \mid x \in X\}$.

Definition 2.1 ([1]). Let X be a nonempty set and let $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ and $B = (\mu_B, \gamma_B)$ be IFSs in X . Then

- (i) $A \subseteq B$ iff $\mu_A(x) \leq \mu_B(x)$ and $\gamma_A(x) \geq \gamma_B(x)$ for all $x \in X$,
- (ii) $A = B$ iff $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq A$,
- (iii) $\bar{A} = \{(x, \gamma_A(x), \mu_A(x)) : x \in X\}$,
- (iv) $A \cap B = \{(x, \mu_A(x) \wedge \mu_B(x), \gamma_A(x) \vee \gamma_B(x)) : x \in X\}$,
- (v) $A \cup B = \{(x, \mu_A(x) \vee \mu_B(x), \gamma_A(x) \wedge \gamma_B(x)) : x \in X\}$,
- (vi) $\square A = \{(x, \mu_A(x), 1 - \mu_A(x)) : x \in X\}$,
- (vii) $\diamond A = \{(x, 1 - \gamma_A(x), \gamma_A(x)) : x \in X\}$.

Definition 2.2 ([1]). Let $\{A_i : i \in \Lambda\}$ be an arbitrary family of IFSs in X . Then

- (i) $\cap A_i = \{(x, \wedge \mu_{A_i}(x), \vee \gamma_{A_i}(x)) : x \in X\}$,
- (ii) $\cup A_i = \{(x, \vee \mu_{A_i}(x), \wedge \gamma_{A_i}(x)) : x \in X\}$.

3. Intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-rings of hypernear-rings

In what follows, let R denote a hypernear-ring unless otherwise specified. We first consider the intuitionistic fuzzification of the notion of subhypernear-rings in a hypernear-rings as follows.

Definition 3.1. An IFS $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ in R is called an *intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring* of R if it satisfies:

- (IF1) $\min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(y)\} \leq \inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\mu_A(\alpha)\}$ and $\max\{\gamma_A(x), \gamma_A(y)\} \geq \sup_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\gamma_A(\alpha)\}$,
- (IF2) $\mu_A(x) \leq \mu_A(-x)$ and $\gamma_A(x) \geq \gamma_A(-x)$
- (IF3) $\min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(y)\} \leq \mu_A(xy)$ and $\max\{\gamma_A(x), \gamma_A(y)\} \geq \gamma_A(xy)$

Lemma 3.2. Let $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ be an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of a hypernear-ring R . Then

$$\mu_A(x) \leq \mu_A(0), \gamma_A(x) \geq \gamma_A(0)$$

for all $x \in R$.

Proof. We have

$$\mu_A(0) \geq \inf\{\mu_A(\alpha)\} \geq \min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(-x)\} = \mu_A(x)$$

$$\gamma_A(0) \leq \sup\{\gamma_A(\alpha)\} \leq \max\{\gamma_A(x), \gamma_A(-x)\} = \gamma_A(x).$$

□

Theorem 3.3. *If $\{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ is a family of intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-rings of R , then $\cap A_i$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R .*

Proof. Let $x, y, i \in R$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\cap \mu_{A_i}(\alpha)\} &= \inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\inf\{\mu_{A_i}(\alpha)\}\} \\ &= \inf\{\inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\mu_{A_i}(\alpha)\}\} \\ &\geq \inf\{\min\{\mu_{A_i}(x), \mu_{A_i}(y)\}\} \\ &= \min\{\inf\{\mu_{A_i}(x)\}, \inf\{\mu_{A_i}(y)\}\} = \min\{\cap \mu_{A_i}(x), \cap \mu_{A_i}(y)\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\cup \gamma_{A_i}(\alpha)\} &= \sup_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\sup\{\gamma_{A_i}(\alpha)\}\} \\ &= \sup\{\inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\gamma_{A_i}(\alpha)\}\} \\ &\leq \sup\{\max\{\gamma_{A_i}(x), \gamma_{A_i}(y)\}\} \\ &= \max\{\sup\{\gamma_{A_i}(x)\}, \sup\{\gamma_{A_i}(y)\}\} = \max\{\cup \gamma_{A_i}(x), \cup \gamma_{A_i}(y)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, we have

$$\cap \mu_{A_i}(x) = \inf\{\mu_{A_i}(x)\} \leq \inf\{\mu_{A_i}(-x)\} = \cap \mu_{A_i}(-x),$$

$$\cup \gamma_{A_i}(x) = \sup\{\gamma_{A_i}(x)\} \geq \sup\{\gamma_{A_i}(-x)\} = \cup \gamma_{A_i}(-x),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \cap \mu_{A_i}(xy) &= \inf\{\mu_{A_i}(xy)\} \\ &\leq \inf\{\min\{\mu_{A_i}(x), \mu_{A_i}(y)\}\} \\ &= \min\{\inf\{\mu_{A_i}(x)\}, \inf\{\mu_{A_i}(y)\}\} \\ &= \min\{\cap \mu_{A_i}(x), \cap \mu_{A_i}(y)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \cup\gamma_{A_i}(xy) &= \sup\{\gamma_{A_i}(xy)\} \\
 &\geq \sup\{\max\{\gamma_{A_i}(x), \gamma_{A_i}(y)\}\} \\
 &= \max\{\sup\{\gamma_{A_i}(x)\}, \sup\{\gamma_{A_i}(y)\}\} \\
 &= \max\{\cup\gamma_{A_i}(x), \cup\gamma_{A_i}(y)\},
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.4. *An IFS $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R if and only if the fuzzy sets μ_A and $\bar{\gamma}_A$ are fuzzy subhypernear-rings of R .*

Proof. Let $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ be an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R . Clearly μ_A is a fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R . For every $x, y \in R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sup_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\bar{\gamma}_A(\alpha)\} &= \sup_{\alpha \in x+y} \{1 - \gamma_A(\alpha)\} \\
 &= 1 - \max\{\gamma_A(x), \gamma_A(y)\} \\
 &= \min\{1 - \gamma_A(x), 1 - \gamma_A(y)\} \\
 &= \min\{\bar{\gamma}_A(x), \bar{\gamma}_A(y)\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$\bar{\gamma}_A(x) = 1 - \gamma_A(x) \leq 1 - \gamma_A(-x) = \bar{\gamma}_A(-x)$$

and $\bar{\gamma}_A(xy) = 1 - \gamma_A(xy) \geq 1 - \max\{\gamma_A(x), \gamma_A(y)\} = \min\{\bar{\gamma}_A(x), \bar{\gamma}_A(y)\}$. Hence $\bar{\gamma}_A$ is a fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R . Conversely, μ_A and γ_A are fuzzy subhypernear-rings of R . For every $x, y \in R$, we get $\inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\mu_A(\alpha)\} \geq \min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(y)\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
 1 - \sup_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\gamma_A(\alpha)\} &= \inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\bar{\gamma}_A(\alpha)\} \\
 &\geq \min\{\bar{\gamma}_A(x), \bar{\gamma}_A(y)\} \\
 &= \min\{1 - \gamma_A(x), 1 - \gamma_A(y)\} \\
 &= 1 - \max\{\gamma_A(x), \gamma_A(y)\},
 \end{aligned}$$

that is, $\sup_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\gamma_A(\alpha)\} \leq \max\{\gamma_A(x), \gamma_A(y)\}$. Also, we have $\mu_A(x) \leq \mu_A(-x)$ and

$$1 - \gamma_A(x) = \bar{\gamma}_A(x) \leq \gamma_A(-x) = 1 - \gamma_A(-x),$$

that is, $\gamma_A(x) \geq \gamma_A(-x)$. Finally, we have

$$\min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(y)\} \leq \mu_A(xy)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \gamma_A(xy) &= \bar{\gamma}_A(xy) \\ &\geq \min\{\bar{\gamma}_A(x), \bar{\gamma}_A(y)\} \\ &= \min\{1 - \gamma_A(x), 1 - \gamma_A(y)\} \\ &= \max\{\gamma_A(x), \gamma_A(y)\}, \end{aligned}$$

that is, $\gamma_A(xy) \leq \max\{\gamma_A(x), \gamma_A(y)\}$. Hence $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R . \square

Theorem 3.5. *Let $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ be an IFS in R . Then $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R if and only if $\square A = (\mu_A, \bar{\mu}_A)$ and $\diamond A = (\bar{\gamma}_A, \gamma_A)$ are intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-rings R .*

Proof. If $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R , then $\mu_A = \bar{\bar{\mu}}_A$ and γ_A are fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R from Lemma 3.4, hence $\square A = (\mu_A, \bar{\mu}_A)$ and $\diamond A = (\bar{\gamma}_A, \gamma_A)$ are intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R . Conversely if $\square A = (\mu_A, \bar{\mu}_A)$ and $\diamond A = (\bar{\gamma}_A, \gamma_A)$ are intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R , then the fuzzy sets μ_A and $\bar{\gamma}_A$ are fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R , hence $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R . \square

For any $t \in [0, 1]$ and a fuzzy set μ in a nonempty set R , the set

$$U(\mu; t) = \{x \in R \mid \mu(x) \geq t\} \text{ (resp. } L(\mu; t) = \{x \in R \mid \mu(x) \leq t\})$$

is called an *upper* (resp. *lower*) t -level cut of μ .

Theorem 3.6. *An IFS $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R if and only if for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$, the sets $U(\mu_A; t)$ and $L(\gamma_A; s)$ are either empty or subhypernear-ring of R .*

Proof. Let the set $U(\mu_A; t)$ and $L(\gamma_A; s)$ be either empty or subhypernear-ring of R for each $s, t \in [0, 1]$. For any $x \in S$, let $\mu_A(x) = t$ and $\gamma_A(x) = s$. Then $x \in U(\mu_A; t) \cap L(\gamma_A; s)$, and so $U(\mu_A; t) \neq \emptyset \neq L(\gamma_A; s)$. If there are $x, y \in R$ such that

$\inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\mu_A(\alpha)\} \leq \min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(y)\}$, then $\inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\mu_A(\alpha)\} < t_0 < \min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(y)\}$ by taking $t_0 := \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\mu_A(\alpha)\} + \min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(y)\} \right\}$. Hence $t_0 < \mu_A(x)$ and $t_0 < \mu_A(y)$, and so $x \in U(\mu_A; t_0)$ and $y \in U(\mu_A; t_0)$. Since $U(\mu_A; t_0)$ is a subhypernear-ring of R , we have $x + y \in U(\mu_A; t_0)$. So, $\mu_A(x + y) \geq t_0$. This leads to a contradiction. Now let $x \in R$ be such that $\mu_A(x) \geq \mu_A(-x)$. Putting $s_0 := \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \mu_A(x) + \mu_A(-x) \right\}$, then $\mu_A(-x) < s_0 < \mu_A(x)$, and so $x \in U(\mu_A; s_0)$ but $-x \notin U(\mu_A; s_0)$. This leads to a contradiction. If there are $x, y \in R$ such that $\min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(y)\} \geq \mu_A(xy)$, then $\mu_A(xy) < r_0 < \min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(y)\}$ by taking

$$r_0 := \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \mu_A(xy) + \min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(y)\} \right\}.$$

Hence $x \in U(\mu_A; r_0), y \in U(\mu_A; r_0)$ and $xy \notin U(\mu_A; r_0)$. This leads to a contradiction. If there are $a, b \in R$ such that $\sup_{\alpha \in a+b} \{\gamma_A(\alpha)\} \leq \max\{\gamma_A(a), \gamma_A(b)\}$, then $\sup_{\alpha \in a+b} \{\gamma_A(\alpha)\} > t_0 > \max\{\gamma_A(a), \gamma_A(b)\}$ by taking $u_0 := \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \sup_{\alpha \in a+b} \{\gamma_A(\alpha)\} + \max\{\gamma_A(a), \gamma_A(b)\} \right\}$. Hence $u_0 > \gamma_A(a)$ and $u_0 > \gamma_A(b)$, and so $a \in L(\gamma_A; u_0)$ and $b \in L(\gamma_A; u_0)$. Since $L(\gamma_A; u_0)$ is a subhypernear-ring of R , we have $a + b \in L(\gamma_A; u_0)$. So, $\gamma_A(a + b) \leq u_0$. This leads to a contradiction. Now let $a \in R$ be such that $\gamma_A(a) \geq \gamma_A(-a)$. Putting $v_0 := \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \gamma_A(a) + \gamma_A(-a) \right\}$, then $\gamma_A(-a) > v_0 > \gamma_A(a)$, and so $a \in L(\gamma_A; v_0)$ but $-a \notin L(\gamma_A; v_0)$. This leads a contradiction. If there are $a, b \in R$ such that $\max\{\gamma_A(a), \gamma_A(b)\} \leq \gamma_A(ab)$, then $\gamma_A(ab) > r_0 > \max\{\gamma_A(a), \gamma_A(b)\}$ by taking

$$w_0 := \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \gamma_A(ab) + \max\{\gamma_A(a), \gamma_A(b)\} \right\}.$$

Hence $a \in L(\gamma_A; w_0), b \in L(\gamma_A; w_0)$ and $ab \notin L(\gamma_A; w_0)$. This leads to a contradiction and this completes the proof. \square

Theorem 3.7. *Let $\{I_t \mid t \in \Lambda\}$ be a collection of subhypernear-rings of R such that*

- (i) $R = \cup_{t \in \Lambda} I_t$,
- (ii) $s > t$ if and only if $I_s \subset I_t$ for all $s, t \in \Lambda$.

Then an IFS $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ in R defined by

$$\mu_A(x) := \sup\{t \in \Lambda \mid x \in I_t\}, \quad \gamma_A(x) := \inf\{t \in \Lambda \mid x \in I_t\}$$

for all $x \in R$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R .

Proof. According to Theorem 3.6, it is sufficient to show that nonempty level sets $U(\mu_A; t)$ and $L(\gamma_A; s)$ are subhypernear-rings of R for every $s, t \in [0, 1]$. In order to prove that $U(\mu_A; t) (\neq \emptyset)$ is a subhypernear-ring of R , we consider the following two cases:

$$(1^\circ) \quad t = \sup\{q \in \Lambda \mid q < t\}, \quad (2^\circ) \quad t \neq \sup\{q \in \Lambda \mid q < t\}.$$

Case (1°) implies that

$$x \in U(\mu_A; t) \Leftrightarrow x \in I_q \quad \text{for all } q < t \Leftrightarrow x \in \bigcap_{q < t} I_q,$$

so that $U(\mu_A; t) = \bigcap_{q < t} I_q$, which is a subhypernear-ring of R . For the case (2°) , we claim that $U(\mu_A; t) = \bigcup_{q \geq t} I_q$. If $x \in \bigcup_{q \geq t} I_q$, then $x \in I_q$ for some $q \geq t$. It follows that $\mu_A(x) \geq q \geq t$, so that $x \in U(\mu_A; t)$. This shows that $\bigcup_{q \geq t} I_q \subseteq U(\mu_A; t)$. Now assume that $x \notin \bigcup_{q \geq t} I_q$. Then $x \notin I_q$ for all $q \geq t$. Since $t \neq \sup\{q \in \Lambda \mid q < t\}$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $(t - \varepsilon, t) \cap \Lambda = \emptyset$. Hence $x \notin I_q$ for all $q > t - \varepsilon$, which means that if $x \in I_q$, then $q \leq t - \varepsilon$. Thus $\mu_A(x) \leq t - \varepsilon < t$, and so $x \notin U(\mu_A; t)$. Therefore $U(\mu_A; t) \subseteq \bigcup_{q \geq t} I_q$, and thus $U(\mu_A; t) = \bigcup_{q \geq t} I_q$ which is a subhypernear-ring of R . Next we prove that $L(\gamma_A; s) (\neq \emptyset)$ is a subhypernear-ring of R . We consider the following two cases:

$$(3^\circ) \quad s = \inf\{r \in \Lambda \mid s < r\}, \quad (4^\circ) \quad s \neq \inf\{r \in \Lambda \mid s < r\}.$$

For the case (3°) we have

$$x \in L(\gamma_A; s) \Leftrightarrow x \in I_r \quad \text{for all } s < r \Leftrightarrow x \in \bigcap_{s < r} I_r,$$

and hence $L(\gamma_A; s) = \bigcap_{s < r} I_r$ which is a subhypernear-rings of R . For the case (4°) , there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $(s, s + \varepsilon) \cap \Lambda = \emptyset$. We will show that $L(\gamma_A; s) = \bigcup_{s \geq r} I_r$. If $x \in \bigcup_{s \geq r} I_r$, then $x \in I_r$ for some $r \leq s$. It follows that $\gamma_A(x) \leq r \leq s$ so that $x \in L(\gamma_A; s)$. Hence $\bigcup_{s \geq r} I_r \subseteq L(\gamma_A; s)$. Conversely if $x \notin \bigcup_{s \geq r} I_r$, then $x \notin I_r$ for all $r \leq s$, which implies that $x \notin I_r$ for all $r < s + \varepsilon$, that is, if $x \in I_r$, then $r \geq s + \varepsilon$. Thus $\gamma_A(x) \geq s + \varepsilon > s$, that is, $x \notin L(\gamma_A; s)$. Therefore $L(\gamma_A; s) \subseteq \bigcup_{s \geq r} I_r$ and consequently $L(\gamma_A; s) = \bigcup_{s \geq r} I_r$ which is a subhypernear-ring of R . This completes the proof. \square

A mapping f from a hypernear-ring R to a hypernear-ring R' is called a *homomorphism* if $f(x + y) = f(x) + f(y)$, $f(x \cdot y) = f(x) \cdot f(y)$ and $f(0) = 0$ for all $x, y \in R$. From the above definition, we get $f(-x) = -f(x)$.

Let f be a map from a set X to a set Y . If $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ and $B = (\mu_B, \gamma_B)$ are IFSs in X and Y respectively, then the *preimage* of B under f , denoted by $f^{-1}(B)$, is an IFS in X defined by

$$f^{-1}(B) = (f^{-1}(\mu_B), f^{-1}(\gamma_B)).$$

Theorem 3.8. *Let $f : S \rightarrow S'$ be a homomorphism of hypernear-rings. If $B = (\mu_B, \gamma_B)$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R' , then the preimage $f^{-1}(B) = (f^{-1}(\mu_B), f^{-1}(\gamma_B))$ of B under f is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R .*

Proof. Assume that $B = (\mu_B, \gamma_B)$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R and let $x, y \in R$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{f^{-1}(\mu_B)(\alpha)\} &= \inf_{f(\alpha) \in f(x)+f(y)} \{\mu_B(f(\alpha))\} \geq \min\{\mu_B(f(x)), \mu_B(f(y))\} \\ &= \min\{f^{-1}(\mu_B)(x), f^{-1}(\mu_B)(y)\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\alpha \in x+y} \{f^{-1}(\gamma_B)(\alpha)\} &= \sup_{f(\alpha) \in f(x)+f(y)} \{\gamma_B(f(\alpha))\} \leq \sup\{\gamma_B(f(x)), \gamma_B(f(y))\} \\ &= \sup\{f^{-1}(\gamma_B)(x), f^{-1}(\gamma_B)(y)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}(\mu_B)(x) &= \mu_B(f(x)) \leq \mu_B(-f(x)) = \mu_B(f(-x)) \\ &= f^{-1}(\mu_B)(-x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}(\gamma_B)(x) &= \gamma_B(f(x)) \geq \gamma_B(-f(x)) = \gamma_B(f(-x)) \\ &= f^{-1}(\gamma_B)(-x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}(\mu_B)(x \cdot y) &= \mu_B(f(x \cdot y)) = \mu_B(f(x) \cdot f(y)) \\ &\geq \min\{\mu_B(f(x)), \mu_B(f(y))\} \\ &= \min\{f^{-1}(\mu_B)(x), f^{-1}(\mu_B)(y)\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}(\gamma_B)(x \cdot y) &= \gamma_B(f(x \cdot y)) = \gamma_B(f(x) \cdot f(y)) \\ &\leq \sup\{\gamma_B(f(x)), \gamma_B(f(y))\} \\ &= \sup\{f^{-1}(\gamma_B)(x), f^{-1}(\gamma_B)(y)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $f^{-1}(B) = (f^{-1}(\mu_B), f^{-1}(\gamma_B))$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R . \square

Let $f : S \rightarrow S'$ be a homomorphism of hypernear-rings. For any IFS $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ in R' , we define a new IFS $A^f = (\mu_A^f, \gamma_A^f)$ in R by

$$\mu_A^f(x) := \mu_A(f(x)), \quad \gamma_A^f(x) := \gamma_A(f(x))$$

for all $x \in R$.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $f : R \rightarrow R'$ be a homomorphism of hypernear-rings. If an IFS $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ in R' is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R' , then an IFS $A^f = (\mu_A^f, \gamma_A^f)$ in R is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R .*

Proof. Let $x, y \in R$.

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\mu_A^f(\alpha)\} &= \inf_{f(\alpha) \in f(x)+f(y)} \{\mu_A(f(\alpha))\} \geq \min\{\mu_A(f(x)), \mu_A(f(y))\} \\ &= \min\{\mu_A^f(x), \mu_A^f(y)\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\alpha \in x+y} \{\gamma_A^f(\alpha)\} &= \sup_{f(\alpha) \in f(x)+f(y)} \{\gamma_A(f(\alpha))\} \leq \max\{\gamma_A(f(x)), \gamma_A(f(y))\} \\ &= \max\{\gamma_A^f(x), \gamma_A^f(y)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_A^f(x) &= \mu_A(f(x)) \leq \mu_A(-f(x)) = \mu_A(f(-x)) \\ &= \mu_A^f(-x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_A^f(x) &= \gamma_A(f(x)) \geq \gamma_A(-f(x)) = \gamma_A(f(-x)) \\ &= \gamma_A^f(-x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_A(x \cdot y) &= \mu_A(f(x \cdot y)) = \mu_A(f(x) \cdot f(y)) \\ &\geq \min\{\mu_A(f(x)), \mu_A(f(y))\} \\ &= \min\{\mu_A(x), \mu_A(y)\},\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_A(x \cdot y) &= \gamma_A(f(x \cdot y)) = \gamma_A(f(x) \cdot f(y)) \\ &\leq \max\{\gamma_A(f(x)), \gamma_A(f(y))\} \\ &= \sup\{\gamma_A(x), \gamma_A(y)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $A^f = (\mu_A^f, \gamma_A^f)$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-ring of R . □

Let $IF(R)$ be the family of all intuitionistic fuzzy subhypernear-rings of R and let $t \in [0, 1]$. Define binary relations U^t and L^t on $IF(R)$ as follows:

$$(A, B) \in U^t \Leftrightarrow U(\mu_A; t) = U(\mu_B; t), \quad (A, B) \in L^t \Leftrightarrow L(\gamma_A; t) = L(\gamma_B; t),$$

respectively, for $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ and $B = (\mu_B, \gamma_B)$ in $IF(R)$. Then clearly U^t and L^t are equivalence relations on $IF(R)$. For any $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A) \in IF(R)$, let $[A]_{U^t}$ (resp. $[A]_{L^t}$) denote the equivalence class of A modulo U^t (resp. L^t), and denote by $IF(R)/U^t$ (resp. $IF(R)/L^t$) the system of all equivalence classes modulo U^t (resp. L^t); so

$$IF(R)/U^t := \{[A]_{U^t} \mid A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A) \in IF(R)\}$$

$$\text{(resp. } IF(R)/L^t := \{[A]_{L^t} \mid A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A) \in IF(R)\} \text{)}.$$

Now let $I(R)$ denote the family of all subhypernear-rings of R and let $t \in [0, 1]$. Define maps f_t and g_t from $IF(R)$ to $I(R) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ by $f_t(A) = U(\mu_A; t)$ and $g_t(A) = L(\gamma_A; t)$, respectively, for all $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A) \in IF(R)$. Then f_t and g_t are clearly well-defined.

Theorem 3.10. *For any $t \in (0, 1)$ the maps f_t and g_t are surjective from $IF(S)$ to $I(R) \cup \{\emptyset\}$.*

Proof. Let $t \in (0, 1)$. Note that $\mathbf{0}_\sim = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$ is in $IF(R)$, where $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ are fuzzy sets in R defined by $\mathbf{0}(x) = 0$ and $\mathbf{1}(x) = 1$ for all $x \in R$. Obviously $f_t(\mathbf{0}_\sim) = U(\mathbf{0}; t) = \emptyset = L(\mathbf{1}; t) = g_t(\mathbf{0}_\sim)$. Let $G(\neq \emptyset) \in I(R)$. For $G_\sim = (\chi_G, \bar{\chi}_G) \in IF(S)$, we have $f_t(G_\sim) = U(\chi_G; t) = G$ and $g_t(G_\sim) = L(\bar{\chi}_G; t) = G$. Hence f_t and g_t are surjective. □

Theorem 3.11. *The quotient sets $IF(R)/U^t$ and $IF(R)/L^t$ are equipotent to $I(R) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ for every $t \in (0, 1)$.*

Proof. For $t \in (0, 1)$ let f_t^* (resp. g_t^*) be a map from $IF(R)/U^t$ (resp. $IF(R)/L^t$) to $I(R) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ defined by $f_t^*([A]_{U^t}) = f_t(A)$ (resp. $g_t^*([A]_{L^t}) = g_t(A)$) for all $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A) \in IF(R)$. If $U(\mu_A; t) = U(\mu_B; t)$ and $L(\gamma_A; t) = L(\gamma_B; t)$ for $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A)$ and $B = (\mu_B, \gamma_B)$ in $IF(R)$, then $(A, B) \in U^t$ and $(A, B) \in L^t$; hence $[A]_{U^t} = [B]_{U^t}$ and $[A]_{L^t} = [B]_{L^t}$. Therefore the maps f_t^* and g_t^* are injective. Now let $G(\neq \emptyset) \in I(R)$. For $G_\sim = (\chi_G, \bar{\chi}_G) \in IF(R)$, we have

$$f_t^*([G_\sim]_{U^t}) = f_t(G_\sim) = U(\chi_G; t) = G,$$

$$g_t^*([G_\sim]_{L^t}) = g_t(G_\sim) = L(\bar{\chi}_G; t) = G.$$

Finally, for $\mathbf{0}_\sim = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}) \in IF(R)$ we get

$$f_t^*([\mathbf{0}_\sim]_{U^t}) = f_t(\mathbf{0}_\sim) = U(\mathbf{0}; t) = \emptyset,$$

$$g_t^*([\mathbf{0}_\sim]_{L^t}) = g_t(\mathbf{0}_\sim) = L(\mathbf{0}; t) = \emptyset.$$

This shows that f_t^* and g_t^* are surjective, and we are done. \square

For any $t \in [0, 1]$, we define another relation R^t on $IF(R)$ as follows:

$$(A, B) \in R^t \Leftrightarrow U(\mu_A; t) \cap L(\gamma_A; t) = U(\mu_B; t) \cap L(\gamma_B; t)$$

for any $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A), B = (\mu_B, \gamma_B) \in IF(R)$. Then the relation R^t is also an equivalence relation on $IF(R)$.

Theorem 3.12. For any $t \in (0, 1)$, the map $\phi_t : IF(R) \rightarrow I(R) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ defined by $\phi_t(A) = f_t(A) \cap g_t(A)$ for each $A = (\mu_A, \gamma_A) \in IF(R)$ is surjective.

Proof. Let $t \in (0, 1)$. For $\mathbf{0}_\sim = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}) \in IF(R)$,

$$\phi_t(\mathbf{0}_\sim) = f_t(\mathbf{0}_\sim) \cap g_t(\mathbf{0}_\sim) = U(\mathbf{0}; t) \cap L(\mathbf{1}; t) = \emptyset.$$

For any $H \in IF(R)$, there exists $H_\sim = (\chi_H, \bar{\chi}_H) \in IF(R)$ such that

$$\phi_t(H_\sim) = f_t(H_\sim) \cap g_t(H_\sim) = U(\chi_H; t) \cap L(\bar{\chi}_H; t) = H.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 3.13. For any $t \in (0, 1)$, the quotient set $IF(R)/R^t$ is equipotent to $I(R) \cup \{\emptyset\}$.

Proof. Let $t \in (0, 1)$ and let $\phi_t^* : IF(R)/R^t \rightarrow I(R) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ be a map defined by $\phi_t^*([A]_{R^t}) = \phi_t(A)$ for all $[A]_{R^t} \in IF(R)/R^t$. If $\phi_t^*([A]_{R^t}) = \phi_t^*([B]_{R^t})$ for any $[A]_{R^t}, [B]_{R^t} \in IF(R)/R^t$ then $f_t(A) \cap g_t(A) = f_t(B) \cap g_t(B)$, that is, $U(\mu_A; t) \cap L(\gamma_A; t) = U(\mu_B; t) \cap L(\gamma_B; t)$, hence $(A, B) \in R^t$. It follows that $[A]_{R^t} = [B]_{R^t}$ so that ϕ_t^* is injective. For $\mathbf{0}_\sim = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}) \in IF(R)$,

$$\phi_t^*([\mathbf{0}_\sim]_{R^t}) = \phi_t(\mathbf{0}_\sim) = f_t(\mathbf{0}_\sim) \cap g_t(\mathbf{0}_\sim) = U(\mathbf{0}; t) \cap L(\mathbf{1}; t) = \emptyset.$$

If $H \in IF(R)$, then for $H_\sim = (\chi_H, \bar{\chi}_H) \in IF(R)$, we have

$$\phi_t^*([H_\sim]_{R^t}) = \phi_t(H_\sim) = f_t(H_\sim) \cap g_t(H_\sim) = U(\chi_H; t) \cap L(\bar{\chi}_H; t) = H.$$

Hence ϕ_t^* is surjective, completing the proof. \square

References

- [1] K. T. Atanassov *Intuitionistic fuzzy sets*, Fuzzy sets and Systems **35** (1986), 87-96
- [2] B. Davvaz, *On Hypernear-rings and fuzzy hyperideals*, The Journal of Fuzzy Mathematics **7(3)** (1999), 745-753.
- [3] L. A. Zadeh, *Fuzzy sets*, Inform. and Control **8** (1965), 338-353.

Kyung Ho KIM
 Department of Mathematics,
 Chungju National University
 Chungju 380-702, Korea
 ghkim@gukwon.chungju.ac.kr

Received 26.12.2002