

## A note on a triangular norm hierarchy<sup>1)</sup>

Dug Hun Hong<sup>2)</sup>

### Abstract

In Cretu(2001), triangular norms and their hierarchy are investigated. In this paper, we give new proofs which are significantly shorter than those given in Cretu, applying a known result which involves only one argument of one-place rather than two-place arguments by Klement et al.(1997).

**Keywords** :  $t$ -norm; Fuzzy logic; Comparison of  $t$ -norms

### 1. Introduction

Triangular norms ( $t$ -norms) and the corresponding  $t$ -conorms are used in several branches of mathematics in different manners, e.g., in probabilistic metric spaces, many-valued logic, fuzzy sets, decomposable measures and their applications[Butnariu and Klement(1993), Klement(1982), Mesiar(1993), Zimmermann(1991)]. A  $t$ -norm  $T$  is a two-place function from the unit square into the unit interval which is associative, commutative, non-decreasing, and fulfills, for all  $x$  in  $[0, 1]$ , the boundary condition  $T(1, x) = x$ .

Its dual function  $S$  defined via  $S(x, y) = 1 - T(1 - x, 1 - y)$  is called a  $t$ -conorm (see Schweizer and Sklar(1961)).

We are now interested in the question whether, given two  $t$ -norms  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ ,  $T_1$  is weaker than  $T_2$  or, equivalently,  $T_2$  is stronger than  $T_1$  (in symbols  $T_1 \leq$  and  $T_2$ , i.e.,  $T_1(x, y) \leq$  and  $T_2(x, y)$  for all points  $(x, y)$  in the unit square.

Cretu(2001), recently, showed the monotonicity of some well-known classes of  $t$

- 
1. This research was supported by the Catholic University of Daegu, 2002.
  2. Associate Professor, School of Mechanical and Automotive Engineering, Catholic University of Daegu, Kyungbuk 712 - 702, South Korea  
E-mail : dhhong@cuth.cataegu.ac.kr

-norms. In this paper, we simplify this result, applying a known result which involves only one argument of one-place rather than two place arguments by klement et al.(1997).

## 2. Some known results about $t$ -norm

The followings are the most important  $t$ -norms, together with their corresponding  $t$ -conorms:

$$\begin{aligned} T_M(x, y) &= \min(x, y), & S_M(x, y) &= \max(x, y), \\ T_P(x, y) &= x \cdot y, & S_P(x, y) &= x + y - x \cdot y, \\ T_L(x, y) &= \max(x + y - 1, 0), \\ S_L(x, y) &= \min(x + y, 1), \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is obvious from the monotonicity and boundary conditions.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $T$  be a  $t$ -norm. Then the following statement holds

$$T(x, y) \leq T_M(x, y), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in [0, 1].$$

**Proof.**  $T(x, y) \leq T(x, 1) = x$ ,  $T(x, y) = T(1, y) = y$   
which means that

$$T(x, y) \leq \min(x, y) = T_M(x, y).$$

Continuous  $t$ -norms ( $t$ -conorms) were studied extensively by Ling(1965), among others. A continuous  $t$ -norm  $T$  is called Archimedean if  $T(x, x) < x$  for all  $x \in (0, 1)$ . A continuous  $t$ -norm  $T$  is strict if  $T(x, y) < T(x, z)$  whenever  $x \in (0, 1)$  and  $y < z$ . Each strict  $t$ -norm  $T$  is Archimedean. Non-strict continuous Archimedean  $t$ -norms are called nilpotent. Aczél(1969), Mostert and Shields(1997) and Ling(1965) have proved the following result:

**Theorem 2.1.**  $T$  is a continuous Archimedean  $t$ -norm if and only if there is a continuous strictly decreasing function:  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  such that  $f(1) = 0$  and  $T(a, b) = f^*(f(a) + f(b))$  where  $f^*$  is the pseudoinverse of  $f$ , i.e., for all  $x \in [0, \infty]$ ,  $f^*(x) = f^{-1}(\min(x, f(0)))$ .

$T$  is strict if and only if  $f(0) = +\infty$ , i.e.,  $f$  is bijective and  $f^* = f^{-1}$ .

The function  $f$  is called an additive generator of  $T$  and it is unique up to a positive multiplicative constant.

Now, let  $T_1, T_2$  be two continuous Archimedean  $t$ -norms with additive

generators  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ , respectively. The full information about  $T_i$  is contained in  $f_i$  and, as a consequence, it should be possible to decide whether  $T_1$  is weaker than  $T_2$  only by means of  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ .

The first step into this direction was done by Schweizer and Sklar(1961), who proved that if both  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are strict, then  $T_1 \leq T_2$  if and only if the composite  $h = f_1 \circ f_2^{-1}$  is a subadditive function, i.e., if for all  $s, t \geq 0$

$$h(s + t) \leq h(s) + h(t).$$

Klement et al.(1997) showed the following result as a corollary of this result.

**Theorem 2.2.** Let  $T_1, T_2$  be two continuous Archimedean  $t$ -norms with differentiable additive generators  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ , respectively. If  $g = f_1' / f_2'$  is a non-decreasing function on  $(0, 1)$ , then we have  $T_1 \leq T_2$ .

### 3. $t$ -norm hierarchy

In this section, we reconsider families of  $t$ -norms which are investigated by Cretu(2001). The reasonings are significantly shorten the the proofs given in Klement, Mesiar and Pap(1997). Many applications deal with the Frank(1979) family of  $t$ -norms, where for  $s \in [0, \infty]$

$$T_s^F(x, y) = \begin{cases} T_M(x, y) & \text{if } s = 0, \\ T_P(x, y) & \text{if } s = 1, \\ T_L(x, y) & \text{if } s = \infty, \\ \log_s \left( 1 + \frac{(s^x - 1)(s^y - 1)}{s - 1} \right) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Cretu(2001) showed at Proposition 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 in his paper that, for  $0 < r < 1 < s < \infty$ ,

$$T_\infty^F \leq T_s^F \leq T_1^F \leq T_r^F.$$

But Klement et al.(1997) already gave a proof using Theorem 2.2 which is significantly shorter than that given in Butnariu and Klement(1993) and Cretu(2001). Here we summarize them.

Frank showed that this family is continuous with respect to the parameter  $s$ . Note that trivially  $T_0^F = T_M \geq T_s^F$  for all  $s \in (0, \infty)$ . For each  $s \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $T_s^F$  is a

strict  $t$ -norm whose generator is given by

$$f_s(x) = \begin{cases} \log x & \text{if } s = 1, \\ \log \frac{s-1}{s^x-1} & \text{if } s \neq 1. \end{cases}$$

$T_\infty^F$  is a nilpotent  $t$ -norm and its generator is given by  $f_\infty(x) = 1 - x$ . Then

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{f_\infty'(\mu)}{f_s'(\mu)} = \frac{1}{\log s} s(1 - s^{-\mu}) \quad \text{for } s \in (0, \infty) \setminus \{1\}, \\ \frac{f_\infty'(\mu)}{f_1'(\mu)} = \mu \quad \text{for } s \in (0, \infty), \\ \frac{f_t'(\mu)}{f_s'(\mu)} = \frac{\log s}{\log t} \frac{1 - b^\mu}{1 - a^\mu} \quad \text{for } 1 < s < t < \infty, \end{array} \right.$$

(the case  $0 < s < t < 1$  is completely analogous)

are non-decreasing on  $(0, 1)$ . Hence, Theorem 2.2 implies the following three results which are Proposition 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 in Cretu(2001).

**Proposition 1.** Let  $s \in (0, 1)$ ,  $T_s(x, y) = \log_s(1 + (s^x - 1)(s^y - 1)/(s - 1))$  and  $T_1(x, y) = xy$ , for all  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ .

Then

$$T_s(x, y) \geq T_1(x, y), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in [0, 1].$$

**Proposition 2.** Let  $s \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $T_s(x, y) = \log_s(1 + (s^x - 1)(s^y - 1)/(s - 1))$  and  $T_1(x, y) = xy$ , for all  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ .

Then

$$T_s(x, y) \leq T_1(x, y), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in [0, 1].$$

**Proposition 3.** Let  $s \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $T_s(x, y) = \log_s(1 + (s^x - 1)(s^y - 1)/(s - 1))$  and  $T_\infty(x, y) \leq T_s(x, y)$ , for all  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ .

Then

$$T_\infty(x, y) \leq T_s(x, y), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in [0, 1].$$

The following two propositions, which are Proposition 2.4 and 2.5 in Cretu(2001), can be easily obtained by Lemma 2.1.

**Proposition 4.** Let  $s \in (0, 1)$ ,  $T_s(x, y) = \log_s(1 + (s^x - 1)(s^y - 1)/(s - 1))$  and  $T_0(x, y) = \min(x, y)$ , for all  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ .

Then

$$T_s(x, y) \leq T_0(x, y), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in [0, 1].$$

**Proposition 5.** Let  $a \in [0, 1]$  and  $T^a(x, y) = \frac{xy}{\max(x, y, a)}$  (Dubois and Prade intersection),  $T_0(x, y) = \min(x, y)$ .

Then

$$T^a(x, y) \leq T_0(x, y), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in [0, 1].$$

Next, we give a simple proof of Proposition 2.12 in Cretu(2001).

**Proposition 6.** Let  $T_{Yager(p)}: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , such that

$$T_{Yager(p)}(x, y) = 1 - \min(1, ((1-x)^p + (1-y)^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}), \quad p \geq 1.$$

Then

$$T_{\infty}(x, y) \leq T_{Yager(p)}(x, y) \leq T_0(x, y).$$

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.1  $T_{Yager(p)} \leq T_0$  is trivial. So we prove that  $T_{\infty} \leq T_{Yager(p)}$ ,  $p \geq 1$ . We know that

$$f_{\infty}(\mu) = 1 - \mu \quad \text{and} \quad f_{Yager(p)}(\mu) = (1 - \mu)^p.$$

Then

$$\frac{f_{\infty}'(\mu)}{f_{Yager(p)}'(\mu)} = \frac{1}{p(1 - \mu)^{p-1}}$$

is clearly non-decreasing on  $(0, 1)$  for  $p \geq 1$ , which completes the proof by Theorem 2.2.

Finally, we prove the following two propositions which are Proposition 3.1 and 3.2 in Cretu(2001).

**Proposition 7.** Let  $T_{Einstein}: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , such that

$$T_{Einstein}(x, y) = \frac{xy}{1 + (1-x)(1-y)}.$$

Then

$$T_{\infty}(x, y) \leq T_{Einstein}(x, y) \leq T_1(x, y), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in [0, 1].$$

**Proposition 8.** Let  $T_{Hamacher(\lambda)}: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , such that

$$T_{Hamacher(\lambda)}(x, y) = \frac{xy}{\lambda + (1 - \lambda)(x + y - xy)}, \quad \lambda \in [1, 2].$$

Then

$$T_{\infty}(x, y) \leq T_{Hamacher(\lambda)}(x, y) \leq T_1(x, y).$$

Since  $T_{Hamacher(2)} = T_{Einstein}$ , it is enough to prove Proposition 8.

**Proof of Proposition 8.** It is known that

$$f_{Hamacher(\lambda)}(\mu) = \log \lambda + \frac{(1-\lambda)\mu}{\mu}.$$

Then

$$f'_{Hamacher(\lambda)}(\mu) = - \frac{\lambda}{\mu[\lambda + (1-\lambda)\mu]}$$

and hence

$$\frac{f_{\infty}'(\mu)}{f'_{Hamacher(\lambda)}(\mu)} = \frac{\mu[\lambda + (1-\lambda)\mu]}{\lambda}$$

is increasing for  $\lambda \in [1, 2]$  and similarly  $\frac{f_{Hamacher(\lambda)}(\mu)}{f_1(\mu)} = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + (1-\lambda)\mu}$  is non-decreasing for  $\lambda \in [1, 2]$ , which completes the proof.

#### 4. Conclusion

We reconsidered most results about  $t$ -norm hierarchy given by Cretu(2001) and gave significantly simple proofs using a known result which involves only one argument of one-place rather than two-place arguments by Klement et al.(1997).

#### References

1. Aczél, J. (1969). *Lectures on Functional Equations and Their Applications*, Academic Press, New York.
2. Butnariu, D. and Klement, E. P. (1993). *Triangular Norm-based Measures and Games with Fuzzy Coalitions*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
3. Cretu, E., (2001). A triangular norm hierarchy, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 120, 37-383.
4. Frank, M. J. (1979). On the simultaneous associativity of  $F(x, y)$  and  $x + y - F(x, y)$ , *Mathematica Mathematica*, 19, 194-226.

5. Klement, E. P. (1982). Construction of fuzzy  $\sigma$ -algebras using triangular norms, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 85, 543-565.
6. Klement, E. P., Mesiar R. and Pap, E. (1997). A characterization of the ordering of continuous  $t$ -norms, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 86, 189-195.
7. Ling, C. H., (1965). Representation of associative functions, *Publications of Mathematics Debrecen*, 12, 189-212.
8. Mesiar, R. (1993). Fundamental triangular norm based tribes and measures, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 177, 633-640.
9. Mostert, P. S. and Shields, A. L. (1957). On the structure of semigroups on a compact manifold with boundary, *Annals of Mathematics*, 65, 117-143.
10. Schweizer, B. and Sklar, A. (1961). Associative functions and statistical triangle inequalities, *Publications of Mathematics Debrecen*, 8, 169-186.
11. Schweizer, B. and Sklar, A. (1983). *Probabilistic Metric Spaces*, North-Holland, New York.
12. Zimmermann, H. J. (1991). *Fuzzy Set Theory and Its Applications*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.