ON VAGUE FILTERS IN BE-ALGEBRAS

Sun Shin Ahn and Jung Mi Ko

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we introduce the notion of a vague filter in BE-algebras, and investigate some properties of them. Also we give conditions for a vague set to be a vague filter, and we characterize vague filters in BE-algebras.

1. Introduction

Y. Imai and K. Iséki introduced two classes of abstract algebras: BCKalgebras and BCI-algebras ([6, 7]). It is known that the class of BCK-algebras is a proper subclass of the class of BCI-algebras. In [4, 5], Q. P. Hu and X. Li introduced a wide class of abstract algebras: BCH-algebras. They have shown that the class of BCI-algebras is a proper subclass of the class of BCHalgebras. J. Neggers and H. S. Kim ([16]) introduced the notion of d-algebras which is another generalization of BCK-algebras, and also they introduced the notion of B-algebras ([17, 18]), i.e., (I) x * x = 0; (II) x * 0 = x; (III) (x*y)*z = x*(z*(0*y)), for any $x,y,z \in X$, which is equivalent in some sense to the groups. Moreover, Y. B. Jun, E. H. Roh and H. S. Kim ([9]) introduced a new notion, called an BH-algebra, which is a generalization of BCH/BCI/BCK-algebras, i.e., (I); (II) and (IV) x * y = 0 and y * x = 0imply x = y for any $x, y \in X$. A. Walendziak obtained the another equivalent axioms for B-algebra ([20]). H. S. Kim, Y. H. Kim and J. Neggers ([12]) introduced the notion a (pre-) Coxeter algebra and showed that a Coxeter algebra is equivalent to an abelian group all of whose elements have order 2, i.e., a Boolean group. C. B. Kim and H. S. Kim ([10]) introduced the notion of a BM-algebra which is a specialization of B-algebras. They proved that the class of BM-algebras is a proper subclass of B-algebras and also showed that a BM-algebra is equivalent to a 0-commutative B-algebra. In [11], H. S. Kim and Y. H. Kim introduced the notion of a BE-algebra as a generalization of a BCK-algebra. Using the notion of upper sets they gave an equivalent condition of the filter in BE-algebras.

Received April 4, 2010.

 $2010\ Mathematics\ Subject\ Classification.\ 06F35.$

 $Key\ words\ and\ phrases.\ BE$ -algebra, vague set, (vague) filter.

In this paper, we introduce the notion of a vague filter in BE-algebras, and investigate some properties of them. Also we give conditions for a vague set to be a vague filter, and we characterize vague filters in BE-algebras.

2. Preliminaries

We recall some definitions and results discussed in [11].

Definition 2.1. An algebra (X; *, 1) of type (2, 0) is called a BE-algebra if

```
(BE1) x * x = 1 for all x \in X;
```

(BE2)
$$x * 1 = 1$$
 for all $x \in X$;

(BE3)
$$1 * x = x$$
 for all $x \in X$;

(BE4)
$$x * (y * z) = y * (x * z)$$
 for all $x, y, z \in X$ (exchange).

We introduce a relation " \leq " on X by $x \leq y$ if and only if x * y = 1. A non-empty subset S of X is said to be a subalgebra of a BE-algebra X if it is closed under the operation "*". Noticing that x * x = 1 for all $x \in X$, it is clear that $1 \in S$.

Proposition 2.2. If (X; *, 1) is a BE-algebra, then x * (y * x) = 1 for any $x, y \in X$.

Example 2.3. Let $X := \{1, a, b, c, d, 0\}$ be a set with the following table:

Then (X; *, 1) is a BE-algebra.

Definition 2.4. Let (X; *, 1) be a BE-algebra and let F be a non-empty subset of X. Then F is said to be a *filter* of X if

- (F1) $1 \in F$;
- (F2) $x * y \in F$ and $x \in F$ imply $y \in F$.

In Example 2.3, $F_1 := \{1, a, b\}$ is a filter of X, but $F_2 := \{1, a\}$ is not a filter of X, since $a * b \in F_2$ and $a \in F_2$, but $b \notin F_2$.

Proposition 2.5. Let (X; *, 1) be a BE-algebra and let F be a filter of X. If $x \le y$ and $x \in F$ for any $y \in X$, then $y \in F$.

3. Basic results on vague sets

Definition 3.1 ([3]). A vague set A in the universe of discourse U is characterized by two membership functions given by:

(1) A truth membership function

$$t_A: U \to [0,1],$$

and

(2) A false membership function

$$f_A: U \to [0,1],$$

where $t_A(u)$ is a lower bound of the grade of membership of u derived from the "evidence for u", and $f_A(u)$ is a lower bound on the negation of u derived from the "evidence against u", and

$$t_A(u) + f_A(u) \le 1.$$

Thus the grade of membership of u in the vague set A is bounded by a subinterval $[t_A(u), 1 - f_A(u)]$ of [0, 1]. This indicates that if the actual grade of membership is $\mu(u)$, then

$$t_A(u) \le \mu(u) \le 1 - f_A(u).$$

The vague set A is written as

$$A = \{ \langle u, [t_A(u), f_A(u)] \rangle | u \in U \},$$

where the interval $[t_A(u), 1 - f_A(u)]$ is called the *vague value* of u in A and is denoted by $V_A(u)$.

Definition 3.2 ([3]). A vague set A of a set U is called

- (1) the zero vague set of U if $t_A(u) = 0$ and $f_A(u) = 1$ for all $u \in U$,
- (2) the unit vague set of U if $t_A(u) = 1$ and $f_A(u) = 0$ for all $u \in U$.
- (3) the α -vague set of U if $t_A(u) = \alpha$ and $f_A(u) = 1 \alpha$ where $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

For $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$ we now define (α, β) -cut and α -cut of a vague set.

Definition 3.3 ([3]). Let A be a vague set of a universe X with the truemembership function t_A and the false-membership function f_A . The (α, β) -cut of the vague set A is a crisp subset $A_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ of the set X given by

$$A_{(\alpha,\beta)} = \{ x \in X | V_A(x) \ge [\alpha,\beta] \}.$$

Clearly $A_{(0,0)} = X$. The (α, β) -cuts are also called *vague-cuts* of the vague set A.

Definition 3.4 ([3]). The α -cut of the vague set A is a crisp subset A_{α} of the set X given by $A_{\alpha} = A_{(\alpha,\alpha)}$.

Note that $A_0 = X$, and if $\alpha \leq \beta$, then $A_{\beta} \subseteq A_{\alpha}$ and $A_{(\alpha,\beta)} = A_{\alpha}$. Equivalently, we can define the α -cut as

$$A_{\alpha} = \{x \in X | t_A(x) \ge \alpha\}.$$

For our discussion, we shall use the following notations, which are given in [3], on interval arithmetic.

Notation. Let I[0,1] denote the family of all closed subintervals of [0,1]. If $I_1=[a_1,b_1]$ and $I_2=[a_2,b_2]$ are two elements of I[0,1], we call $I_1\geq I_2$ if $a_1\geq a_2$ and $b_1\geq b_2$. Similarly, we understand the relations $I_1\leq I_2$ and $I_1=I_2$. Clearly the relation $I_1\geq I_2$ does not necessarily imply that $I_1\supseteq I_2$ and conversely. We define the term "imax" to mean the maximum of two intervals as

$$\max(I_1, I_2) = [\max(a_1, a_2), \max(b_1, b_2)].$$

Similarly, we define "imin". The concept of "imax" and "imin" could be extended to define "isup" and "iinf" of infinite number of elements of I[0,1]. It is obvious that $L = \{I[0,1], \text{isup}, \text{iinf}, \leq\}$ is a lattice with universal bounds [0,0] and [1,1].

4. Vague filters

In what follows let X be a BE-algebra unless otherwise specified.

Definition 4.1. A vague set A of X is called a *vague filter* of X if the following conditions are true:

(c1)
$$(\forall x \in X) (V_A(1) \ge V_A(x)),$$

(c2)
$$(\forall x, y \in X)$$
 $(V_A(y) \ge \min\{V_A(x * y), V_A(x)\}),$

that is,

$$(4.1) t_A(1) \ge t_A(x), 1 - f_A(1) \ge 1 - f_A(x)$$

and

(4.2)
$$t_A(y) \ge \min\{t_A(x * y), t_A(x)\},$$
$$1 - f_A(y) \ge \min\{1 - f_A(x * y), 1 - f_A(x)\}$$

for all $x, y \in X$.

Let us illustrate this definition using the following examples.

Example 4.2. Let $X := \{0, a, b, c\}$ be a BE-algebra with the following Cayley table:

Let A be a vague set in X defined as follows:

$$A := \{ \langle 1, [0.7, 0.2] \rangle, \langle a, [0.5, 0.3] \rangle, \langle b, [0.5, 0.3] \rangle, \langle c, [0.7, 0.2] \rangle \}.$$

It is routine to verify that A is a vague filter of X.

Proposition 4.3. Every vague filter A of X satisfies:

$$(4.3) \qquad (\forall x, y \in X)(x \le y \Rightarrow V_A(x) \le V_A(y)).$$

Proof. Let $x, y \in X$ be such that $x \leq y$. Then x * y = 1 and so

$$t_A(y) \ge \min\{t_A(x * y), t_A(x)\} = \min\{t_A(1), t_A(x)\} = t_A(x),$$

$$1 - f_A(y) \ge \min\{1 - f_A(x * y), 1 - f_A(x)\} = 1 - f_A(x).$$

This shows that $V_A(y) \geq V_A(x)$.

Proposition 4.4. Every vague filter A of X satisfies:

$$(4.4) \qquad (\forall x, y, z \in X)(V_A(x*z) \ge \min\{V_A(x*(y*z)), V_A(y)\}).$$

Proof. Using (c2) and (BE4), we have

$$V_A(x*z) \ge \min\{V_A(y*(x*z)), V_A(y)\}$$

= $\min\{V_A(x*(y*z)), V_A(y)\}$

for all $x, y, z \in X$.

Theorem 4.5. If A is a vague set in X satisfying (c1) and (4.4), then A is a vague filter of X.

Proof. Taking x := 1 in (4.4) and using (BE3), we have

$$V_A(z) = V_A(1 * z)$$

 $\geq \min\{V_A(1 * (y * z)), V_A(y)\}$
 $= \min\{V_A(y * z), V_A(y)\}$

for all $y, z \in X$. Hence A is a vague filter of X.

Corollary 4.6. Let A be a vague set in X. Then A is a vague filter of X if and only if it satisfies (c1) and (4.4).

Theorem 4.7. Let A be a vague set in X. Then A is a vague filter of X if and only if it satisfies the following conditions:

$$(4.5) \qquad (\forall x, y \in X)(V_A(y * x) \ge V_A(x)),$$

$$(4.6) (\forall x, a, b \in X)(V_A((a * (b * x)) * x) \ge \min\{V_A(a), V_A(b)\}).$$

Proof. Assume that A is a vague filter of X. Using (c2), Proposition 2.2, and (c1), we get

$$V_A(y * x) \ge \min\{V_A(x * (y * x)), V_A(x)\}\$$

= $\min\{V_A(1), V_A(x)\} = V_A(x)$

for all $x, y \in X$.

$$V_A((a*(b*x))*x) \ge \min\{V_A((a*(b*x))*(b*x)), V_A(b)\}$$

 $\ge \min\{V_A(a), V_A(b)\}.$

Conversely, let A be a vague set in X satisfying conditions (4.5) and (4.6). If we take y := x in (4.5), then $V_A(1) = V_A(x * x) \ge V_A(x)$ for all $x \in X$. Using (4.6), we obtain

$$V_A(y) = V_A(1 * y)$$

= $V_A(((x * y) * (x * y)) * y)$
 $\geq \min\{V_A(x * y), V_A(x)\}$

for all $x, y \in X$. Hence A is a vague filter of X.

Proposition 4.8. Let A be a vague set in X. Then A is a vague filter of X if and only if it satisfies:

П

$$(4.7) \qquad (\forall x, y, z \in X)(z \le x * y \Rightarrow V_A(y) \ge \min\{V_A(x), V_A(z)\}).$$

Proof. Assume that A is a vague filter of X. Let $x, y, z \in X$ be such that $z \leq x * y$. By Proposition 4.3 and (c2), we have

$$V_A(y) \ge \min\{V_A(x * y), V_A(x)\}$$

$$\ge \min\{V_A(z), V_A(x)\}.$$

Conversely, suppose that A satisfies (4.7). By (BE2), we have $x \leq x * 1 = 1$. Hence $V_A(1) \geq \min\{V_A(x), V_A(x)\} = V_A(x)$ by (4.7). Thus (c1) is valid. Using (BE1) and (BE4), we obtain $x \leq (x * y) * y$ for all $x, y \in X$. It follows from (4.7) that $V_A(y) \geq \min\{V_A(x * y), V_A(x)\}$. Hence (c2) holds. Therefore A is a vague filter of X.

As a generalization of Proposition 4.8, we have the following results.

Theorem 4.9. If a vague set A in X is a vague filter of X, then

(4.8)
$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} w_i * x = 1 \Rightarrow V_A(x) \ge \min\{V_A(w_i) | i = 1, \dots, n\}$$

for all
$$x, w_1, \ldots, w_n \in X$$
, where $\prod_{i=1}^n w_i * x = w_n * (w_{n-1} * (\cdots * (w_1 * x) \cdots))$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on n. Let A be a vague filter of X. By Proposition 4.3 and (4.7), we know that the condition (4.8) is valid for n = 1, 2. Assume that A satisfies the condition (4.8) for n = k, i.e.,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} w_i * x = 1 \Rightarrow V_A(x) \ge \min\{V_A(w_i) | i = 1, \dots, k\}$$

for all $x, w_1, \ldots, w_k \in X$. Let $x, w_1, \ldots, w_k, w_{k+1} \in X$ be such that $\prod_{i=1}^{k+1} w_i * x = 1$. Then

$$V_A(w_1 * x) \ge \min\{V_A(w_j)|j=2,\ldots,k+1\}.$$

Since A is a vague filter of X, it follows from (c2) that

$$V_A(x) \ge \min\{V_A(w_1 * x), V_A(w_1)\}$$

$$\ge \min\{V_A(w_1), \{V_A(w_j) | j = 2, \dots, k+1\}\}$$

$$= \min\{V_A(w_j) | j = 1, \dots, k+1\}.$$

This completes the proof.

Now we consider the converse of Theorem 4.9.

Theorem 4.10. Let A be a vague set in X satisfying the condition (4.8). Then A is a vague filter of X.

Proof. Note that
$$\underbrace{1*(1*(1*\cdots(1}*x))\cdots)=x$$
. By (BE2), we have $x\leq x*1=1$. Hence $V_A(1)\geq V_A(x)$ for all $x\in X$. Thus (c1) is valid. Let $x,y,z\in X$ be

such that $z \leq x * y$. Then

$$1 = z * (x * y) = z * (\underbrace{1 * \cdots (1 * (1 * (x * y))) \cdots}_{n-2 \text{ times}}))$$

and so

$$V_A(y) \ge \min\{V_A(z), V_A(x), V_A(1)\}\$$

= $\min\{V_A(z), V_A(x)\}.$

Hence by Proposition 4.8, we conclude that A is a vague filter of X.

Theorem 4.11. Let A be a vague filter of X. Then for any $\alpha, \beta \in [0,1]$, the vague-cut $A_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ is a crisp filter of X.

Proof. Obviously, $1 \in A_{(\alpha,\beta)}$. Let $x,y \in X$ be such that $x \in A_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ and $x * y \in A_{(\alpha,\beta)}$. Then $V_A(x) \geq [\alpha,\beta]$, i.e., $t_A(x) \geq \alpha$ and $1 - f_A(x) \geq \beta$; and $V_A(x*y) \geq [\alpha,\beta]$, i.e., $t_A(x*y) \geq \alpha$ and $1 - f_A(x*y) \geq \beta$. It follows from (4.2) that

$$t_A(y) \ge \min\{t_A(x * y), t_A(x)\} \ge \alpha,$$

 $1 - f_A(y) \ge \min\{1 - f_A(x * y), 1 - f_A(y)\} \ge \beta$

so that $V_A(y) \geq [\alpha, \beta]$. Hence $y \in A_{(\alpha, \beta)}$ and so $A_{(\alpha, \beta)}$ is a filter of X.

The filter like $A_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ are also called vague-cut filters of X. Clearly we have the following results.

Proposition 4.12. Let A be a vague filter of X. Two vague-cut filters $A_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ and $A_{(\omega,\gamma)}$ with $[\alpha,\beta] < [\omega,\gamma]$ are equal if and only if there is no $x \in X$ such that

$$[\alpha, \beta] \le V_A(x) \le [\omega, \gamma].$$

Theorem 4.13. Let X be a finite BE-algebra and let A be a vague filter of X. Consider the set V(A) given by

$$V(A) := \{V_A(x) | x \in X\}.$$

Then A_i are the only vague-cut filters of X, where $A_i \in V(A)$.

Proof. Consider $[a_1,a_2] \in I[0,1]$ where $[a_1,a_2] \notin V(A)$. If $[\alpha,\beta] < [a_1,a_2] < [\omega,\gamma]$ where $[\alpha,\beta], [\omega,\gamma] \in V(A)$, then $A_{(\alpha,\beta)} = A_{(a_1,a_2)} = A_{(\omega,\gamma)}$. If $[a_1,a_2] < [a_1,a_3]$ where $[a_1,a_3] = \min\{V_A(x)|x \in X\}$, then $A_{(a_1,a_3)} = X = A_{(a_1,a_2)}$. Hence for any $[a_1,a_2] \in I[0,1]$, the vague-cut filter $A_{(a_1,a_2)}$ is one of $A_i \in V(A)$. This competes the proof.

Theorem 4.14. Any filter F of X is a vague-cut filter of some vague filter of X.

Proof. Consider the vague set A of X given by

$$V_A = \begin{cases} [\alpha, \alpha] & \text{if } x \in F \\ [0, 0] & \text{if } x \notin F, \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Since $1 \in F$, we have $V_A(1) = [\alpha, \alpha] \ge V_A(x)$ for all $x \in X$. Let $x, y \in X$. If $y \in F$, then

$$V_A(y) = [\alpha, \alpha] \ge \min\{V_A(x * y), V_A(x)\}.$$

Assume that $y \notin F$. Then $x \notin F$ or $x * y \notin F$. It follows that

$$V_A(y) = [0, 0] = \min\{V_A(x * y), V_A(x)\}.$$

Thus A is a vague filter of X. Clearly $F = A_{(\alpha,\alpha)}$.

Theorem 4.15. Let A be a vague filter of X. Then the set

$$F := \{x \in X | V_A(x) = V_A(1) \}$$

is a crisp filter of X.

Proof. Obviously $1 \in F$. Let $x, y \in X$ be such that $x * y \in F$ and $x \in F$. Then $V_A(x * y) = V_A(1) = V_A(x)$, and so

$$V_A(y) \ge \min\{V_A(x * y), V_A(x)\} = V_A(1)$$

by (c2). Since $V_A(1) \ge V_A(y)$ for all $y \in X$, it follows that $V_A(y) = V_A(1)$ and so that $y \in F$. Therefore F is a crisp filter of X.

References

- S. S. Ahn, Y. U. Cho, and C. H. Park, Vague quick ideals of BCK/BCI-algebras, Honam Math. J. 30 (2008), no. 1, 65–74.
- [2] H. G. Baik, On vague BH-subalgebra of BH-algebras, Int. Math. Forum 4 (2009), no. 17-20, 823–829.
- [3] R. Biswas, Vague groups, Internat. J. Comput. Cognition 4 (2006), 20-23.
- [4] Q. P. Hu and X. Li, *On BCH-algebras*, Math. Sem. Notes Kobe Univ. **11** (1983), no. 2, part 2, 313–320.
- [5] _____, On proper BCH-algebras, Math. Japon. **30** (1985), no. 4, 659–661.

- [6] K. Iséki and S. Tanaka, An introduction to theory of BCK-algebras, Math. Japon. 23 (1978), no. 1, 1–26.
- [7] K. Iséki, On BCI-algebras, Math. Sem. Notes Kobe Univ. 8 (1980), no. 1, 125–130.
- [8] Y. B. Jun and C. H. Park, Vague ideals of subtraction algebra, Int. Math. Forum. 2 (2007), no. 57-60, 2919-2926.
- [9] Y. B. Jun, E. H. Roh, and H. S. Kim, On BH-algebras, Sci. Math. 1 (1998), no. 3, $347{-}354.$
- [10] C. B. Kim and H. S. Kim, On BM-algebras, Sci. Math. Jpn. 63 (2006), no. 3, 421-427.
- [11] H. S. Kim and Y. H. Kim, On BE-algebras, Sci. Math. Jpn. 66 (2007), no. 1, 113–116.
- [12] H. S. Kim, Y. H. Kim, and J. Neggers, Coxeter algebras and pre-Coxeter algebras in Smarandache setting, Honam Math. J. 26 (2004), no. 4, 471–481.
- [13] K. J. Lee, Y. H. Kim, and Y. U. Cho, Vague set theory based on d-algebras, J. Appl. Math. Informatics 26 (2008), 1221–1232.
- [14] K. L. Lee, K. S. So, and K. S. Bang, Vague BCK/BCI-algebras, J. Korean Soc. Math. Educ. Ser. B Pure Appl. Math. 15 (2008), no. 3, 297–308.
- [15] J. Meng and Y. B. Jun, BCK-Algebras, Kyung Moon Sa, Co., Seoul, 1994.
- [16] J. Neggers and H. S. Kim, On d-algebras, Math. Slovaca 49 (1999), no. 1, 19-26.
- [17] _____, On B-algebras, Mat. Vesnik **54** (2002), no. 1-2, 21-29.
- [18] _____, A fundamental theorem of B-homomorphism for B-algebras, Int. Math. J. 2 (2002), no. 3, 207–214.
- [19] C. H. Park, Vague deductive systems of subtraction algebras, J. Appl. Math. Informatics 26 (2008), 427–436.
- [20] A. Walendziak, Some axiomatizations of B-algebras, Math. Slovaca $\bf 56$ (2006), no. 3, 301–306.

Sun Shin Ahn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATION

Dongguk University

SEOUL 100-715, KOREA

 $E ext{-}mail\ address: sunshine@dongguk.edu}$

Jung Mi Ko

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

GANGNEUNG-WONJU NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Gangneung 210-702, Korea

E-mail address: jmko@gwnu.ac.kr