Fuzzy semi-topogenous orders and fuzzy supra topologies

Yong Chan Kim and Jung Mi Ko

Department of Mathematics, Kangnung National University

Abstract

We investigate the properties of fuzzy (semi-)topogenous orders in the framework of fuzzy (supra) topologies and fuzzy (supra) interior operators. We study the relationship between fuzzy (semi-)topogenous structures, fuzzy (supra)topologies and fuzzy (supra)interior operators.

Key Words: Fuzzy (semi-)topogenous order, Fuzzy (supra) interior operator, Fuzzy (supra) topology.

1. Introduction and Preliminaries

Csaszar [3] introduced the concept of a syntopogenous structure to develop to the three main structures of topologies, proximities and uniformities.

Katsaras and Petalas [11] extended them to the theory of fuzzy sets. Katsaras [4-11] has developed in many directions. El-Monsef and Ramadan [1] defined and studied the concept of fuzzy supra topological spaces.

In this paper, we investigate the properties of fuzzy (semi-) topogenous orders, fuzzy (supra)topological spaces and fuzzy (supra) interior operators. We study the relationship between them.

Thought this paper, let X be a nonempty set, I=[0,1] and I^X the family of all fuzzy subsets of X. For $\alpha \in I$, $\overline{\alpha}(x) = \alpha$ for all $x \in X$. For a subset A of X, χ_A is a characteristic function of A.

Definition 1.1([1,2]) A subset τ of I^X is called a fuzzy supra topology on X if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (O1) $\overline{0}$, $\overline{1} \in \tau$,
- (O2) $\bigvee_{i \in \Gamma} \mu_i \in \tau$ for any $\mu_i \in \tau$.

A fuzzy supra topology r is called a fuzzy topology if it satisfies

(O3) $\mu_1 \land \mu_2 \in \tau$ for any $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \tau$.

The pair (X, τ) is called a fuzzy (resp. supra) topological space.

Definition 1.2([1,2]) A function int: $I^X oup I^X$ is called a fuzzy supra interior operator on X if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (I1) $int(\overline{1}) = \overline{1}$.
- (I2) $int(\lambda) \leq \lambda$.
- (I3) If $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$, then $int(\lambda_1) \leq int(\lambda_2)$.

A fuzzy supra interior operator int is called a fuzzy interior operator if it satisfies

(I) $\operatorname{int}(\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2) = \operatorname{int}(\lambda_1) \wedge \operatorname{int}(\lambda_2)$.

A fuzzy supra interior operator int is called topological if it satisfies

(T) $int(int(\lambda)) = int(\lambda)$.

Theorem 1.3([1,2]) Let (X, τ) be a fuzzy (resp. supra) topological space. We define a function int $\tau I^X \to I^X$ as follows:

int
$$_{\tau}(\lambda) = \bigvee \{ \mu \in I^X \mid \mu \leq \lambda, \mu \in \tau \}$$

Then int $_{\tau}$ is a topological fuzzy (resp. supra) interior operator on X.

2. Fuzzy (semi-)topogenous orders and fuzzy (supra) topologies

Let \ll be a binary relation on X; i.e. $\ll \subset I^X \times I^X$. The facts that $(\lambda, \mu) \in \ll$ and $(\lambda, \mu) \in \ll$ are denoted by $\lambda \ll \mu$ and $\lambda \subset \langle \mu \rangle$, respectively.

Definition 2.1 ([11]) A binary relation \ll on I^X is called a fuzzy semi-topogenous order on X if it satisfies:

- (T1) $\overline{1} \ll \overline{1}$ and $\overline{0} \ll \overline{0}$,
- (T2) if $\lambda \ll \mu$, then $\lambda \leq \mu$,
- (T3) if $\lambda \leq \lambda_1 \ll \mu_1 \leq \mu$, then $\lambda \ll \mu$.

Remark 2.2 Let \ll be a fuzzy semi-topogenous order on X. Define by

$$\lambda \langle \langle {}^{s} \mu \text{ iff } (\overline{1} - \mu) \ll (\overline{1} - \lambda).$$

Then $\langle \langle s \rangle$ is a fuzzy semi-topogenous order on X.

Definition 2.3 ([11]) A fuzzy semi-topogenous order ≪ is called:

- (1) symmetric if $\ll = \langle \langle s, \text{ that is,} \rangle$ (T4) $\lambda \ll \mu$ iff $(\overline{1} - \mu) \ll (\overline{1} - \lambda)$
- (2) fuzzy topogenous if for any $\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mu, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in I^X$,

접수일자: 2002년 8월 14일 완료일자: 2003년 4월 18일 (T5) $\lambda_1 \vee \lambda_2 \ll \mu$ iff $\lambda_1 \ll \mu$, $\lambda_2 \ll \mu$

(T6) $\lambda \ll \mu_1 \wedge \mu_2$ iff $\lambda \ll \mu_1$, $\lambda \ll \mu_2$

(3) perfect if, for any $\{\mu, \lambda_i \mid i \in \Gamma\} \subset I^X$,

(T7) $\bigvee_{i \in \Gamma} \lambda_i \ll \mu$ iff $\lambda_i \ll \mu$, for all $i \in \Gamma$.

(4) biperfect if it is perfect and for any $\{\lambda, \mu_i \mid i \in \Gamma\} \subset I^X$,

(T8) $\lambda \ll \bigwedge_{i=\Gamma} \mu_i$ iff $\lambda \ll \mu_i$, for all $i \in \Gamma$.

Definition 2.4 ([11]) Let $\langle \langle \rangle_1$ and $\langle \langle \rangle_2$ be fuzzy semi-topogenous orders on X. $\langle \langle \rangle_1$ is finer than $\langle \langle \rangle_2$ ($\langle \langle \rangle_2$ is coarser than $\langle \langle \rangle_1$) if $\lambda \langle \langle \rangle_1 \mu$ for all $\lambda \langle \langle \rangle_2 \mu$.

Definition 2.5 ([11]) A fuzzy topogenous order \ll on X is called a fuzzy topogenous structure satisfying the following condition:

(T) $\ll \cdot \ll$ is finer than \ll where $\ll \cdot \ll$ is defined by, for any $\lambda, \mu \in I^X, \lambda(\ll \cdot \ll)\mu$ iff there exists $\rho \in I^X$ such that $\lambda \ll \rho$ and $\rho \ll \mu$.

The pair (X, \ll) is called a fuzzy topogenous space.

A fuzzy topogenous structure \ll is called perfect (resp. biperfect, symmetric, etc.) if \ll is perfect (resp. biperfect, symmetric, etc.).

Theorem 2.6 Let \ll be a fuzzy semi-topogenous order on X. A mapping int $\langle \cdot : I^X \rightarrow I^X \rangle$ is defined by

int
$$\langle \langle (\lambda) = \bigvee \{ \mu \in I^X \mid \mu \ll \lambda \} \rangle$$
.

Then we have the following properties:

- (1) int (is a fuzzy supra interior operator.
- (2) If ≪ satisfies (T6), then int (is a fuzzy interior operator.
- (3) If ≪ satisfies (T5), then int ((*) is a fuzzy interior operator.
- (4) If $\ll \cdot \ll$ is finer than \ll , then, for each $\lambda \in I^X$, int $((\inf ((\lambda))) = \inf ((\lambda))$.
- (5) If \ll is a fuzzy topogenous structure, then int \ll is a topological fuzzy interior operator.

Proof (1) (I1) Since $\overline{1} \ll \overline{1}$, int $((\overline{1}) \approx \overline{1})$.

- (I2) Let $\mu \ll \lambda$. By (T2), $\mu \leq \lambda$. It implies int $((\lambda) \leq \lambda)$.
- (I3) If $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2$ and $\mu \ll \lambda_1$, by (T3), $\mu \ll \lambda_2$. Thus, int $((\lambda_1) \le \text{int}) (\lambda_2)$
- (2) From (I3), we have

int
$$\langle\langle(\lambda_1 \land \lambda_2) \leq \text{int } \langle\langle(\lambda_1) \land \text{int } \langle\langle(\lambda_2)$$

Conversely, suppose there exist $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in I^X$ such that

int
$$\langle\langle(\lambda_1 \land \lambda_2)\rangle$$
 int $\langle\langle(\lambda_1) \land$ int $\langle\langle(\lambda_2)\rangle$

There exist $x \in X$ and $t \in I_1$ such that

int
$$\langle\langle(\lambda_1 \land \lambda_2)(x) \land t \land \text{ int } \langle\langle(\lambda_1)(x) \land \text{ int } \langle\langle(\lambda_2)(x)$$

Since int $\langle \langle (\lambda_i)(x) \rangle t$, for each $i \in \{1,2\}$, there exists $\mu_i \in I^X$ with $\mu_i \ll \lambda_i$ such that

int
$$\langle\langle (\lambda_i)(x) \geq \mu_i(x) \rangle t$$

On the other hand, since

$$\mu_1 \ll \lambda_1$$
, $\mu_2 \ll \lambda_2 \Rightarrow (\mu_1 \wedge \mu_2) \ll \lambda_i$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ((T3))

$$\Rightarrow (\mu_1 \land \mu_2) \ll (\lambda_1 \land \lambda_2) ((T6))$$

we have int $\langle (\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2)(x) \geq (\mu_1 \wedge \mu_2)(x) \rangle t$.

It is a contradiction. Thus,

 $\operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle}(\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2) \geq \operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle}(\lambda_1) \wedge \operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle}(\lambda_2)$

- (3) It is similarly proved as (2).
- (4) Since int $\langle\langle (\lambda) \leq \lambda \rangle$, by (T3),

int
$$\langle\langle(int \langle\langle(\lambda)) \leq int \langle\langle(\lambda)$$

Suppose there exists $\lambda \in I^X$ such that

int
$$((int)(\lambda)) \ge int(\lambda)$$

There exist $x \in X$ and $t \in I_1$ such that int $\langle \langle (\operatorname{int} \langle \langle (\lambda) (x) \rangle \langle t \langle \operatorname{int} \langle \langle (\lambda) (x) \rangle \rangle$.

Since int $\langle \langle (\lambda)(x) \rangle t$, there exists $\mu \in I^X$ with $\mu \ll \lambda$ such that int $\langle \langle (\lambda)(x) \rangle \mu(x) \rangle t$.

Since $\ll \cdot \ll$ is finer than \ll , then $\mu \ll \lambda$

implies $\mu(\ll \cdot \ll)\lambda$.Then there exists $\rho \in I^X$ such that $\mu \ll \rho$ and $\rho \ll \lambda$. Hence $\mu \ll \rho \leq \operatorname{int}_{\ll}(\lambda)$

implies $\mu \ll \text{int}_{\ll}(\lambda)$. Thus

int
$$\langle\langle(int \langle\langle(\lambda))(x) \geq \mu(x)\rangle t.$$

It is a contradiction. Thus,

int
$$\langle\langle(int \langle\langle(\lambda))\rangle\rangle int \langle\langle(\lambda)\rangle$$
.

(5) It is trivial from (2) and (4).

Theorem 2.7 Let \ll be a fuzzy semi-topogenous order on X. Define a fuzzy topology on X by

$$\tau_{\langle \langle} = \{ \lambda \in I^X \mid \text{ int } \langle \langle (\lambda) = \lambda \} \}.$$

Then:

- (1) τ_{\ll} is a fuzzy supra topology on X induced by \ll .
- (2) If \ll satisfies (T6), then τ_{\ll} is a fuzzy topology on X.
- (3) If \ll is perfect, then $\lambda \in \tau_{\ll}$ iff $\lambda \ll \lambda$, for each $\lambda \in I^X$.

Proof (1)(O1) Since $\inf_{\alpha}(\overline{0}) = \overline{0}$ and $\inf_{\alpha}(\overline{1}) = \overline{1}$, then $\overline{0}$, $\overline{1} \in \tau_{\alpha}$.

(O2) Let $\lambda_j \in \tau_{\langle\langle\rangle}$, for each $j \in \Gamma$. Then $\lambda_j = \inf_{\langle\langle\rangle} (\lambda_j)$. By Theorem 2.6 (1), we have

int
$$\langle\langle (\bigvee_{i\in\Gamma}\lambda_i)\rangle \geq \bigvee_{i\in\Gamma} \text{int } \langle\langle (\lambda_i)\rangle = \bigvee_{i\in\Gamma}\lambda_i$$
.

So, int $\langle\langle (\bigvee_{i\in\Gamma}\lambda_i)\rangle = \bigvee_{i\in\Gamma}\lambda_i$. Hence $\bigvee_{i\in\Gamma}\lambda_i \in \tau_{\langle\langle \cdot\rangle}$.

Thus, $\tau_{\langle\langle}$ is a fuzzy supra topology on X.

(2) Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \tau_{\langle\langle\rangle}$. Then

$$\lambda_i = \text{int } \langle \langle (\lambda_i), i = 1, 2, \ldots \rangle$$

From Theorem 2.6 (2), we have int $\langle \langle (\lambda_1 \land \lambda_2) \rangle = \inf \langle \langle (\lambda_1) \land \inf \langle \langle (\lambda_2) \rangle \rangle = \lambda_1 \land \lambda_2$. Consequently, $\lambda_1 \land \lambda_2 \in \tau_{\langle \langle \cdot \rangle}$.

(3) Let $\mu \in \tau_{\langle\langle}$. Then

$$\mu = \text{int } \langle \langle (\mu) \rangle = \bigvee \{ \rho \in I^X \mid \rho \ll \mu \}.$$

Since \ll is perfect, $\mu \ll \mu$. Conversely, let $\lambda \ll \lambda$. Then int $((\lambda) \geq \lambda)$. So, int $((\lambda) = \lambda)$. Thus, $\lambda \in \mathcal{T}((\lambda))$.

Example 2.8 We define binary relations $\langle \langle 1, \langle \langle 2 \rangle \rangle \rangle$ as follows

$$\lambda \langle \langle 1 \mu \text{ iff } \lambda \leq \mu,$$

 $\lambda \langle \langle 2 \mu \text{ iff } \lambda = 0 \text{ or } \mu \equiv 0.$

We easily show that $(X, \langle \langle i \rangle)$ are fuzzy biperfect and symmetric topogenous spaces for i=1,2.

From Theorem 2.6, we can obtain fuzzy interior operators int $\langle \cdot \rangle I^X \rightarrow I^X$ as follows:

$$\operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle 1\rangle}(\lambda) = \lambda,$$

$$\operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle 2\rangle}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \overline{1}, & \text{if } \lambda = \overline{1}, \\ \overline{0}, & \text{otherwis.} \end{cases}$$

From Theorem 2.7, $\tau_{\langle \zeta \rangle} = I^X$ and $\tau_{\langle \zeta \rangle} = \{\overline{0}, \overline{1}\}.$

Theorem 2.9 Let int be a fuzzy supra interior operator on X. Define a binary relation $\langle \langle \rangle_{int}$ as

$$\lambda \langle \langle _{int} \mu \text{ iff } \lambda \leq int(\mu).$$

Then:

- (1) $\langle \langle \rangle_{\text{int}}$ is a perfect fuzzy semi-topogenous order on X such that $\inf_{\langle \langle \rangle_{\text{ell}}}(\lambda) = \inf(\lambda)$ for each $\lambda \in I^X$.
- (2) If int is a fuzzy interior operator on X, then $\langle \langle \rangle_{int}$ is a fuzzy topogenous order on X.
- (3) If $\operatorname{int}(\operatorname{int}(\lambda)) = \operatorname{int}(\lambda)$ for each $\lambda \in I^X$, then $(\langle \zeta_{\operatorname{int}} \circ \langle \zeta_{\operatorname{int}} \rangle)$ is finer than $\langle \zeta_{\operatorname{int}} \rangle$.
- (4) If int be a topological fuzzy interior operator on X, then ⟨< int is a fuzzy topogenous structure on X.</p>
- (5) If \ll is a fuzzy semi-topogenous order, then << int $_{''}$. is finer than \ll .
- (6) If \ll is a perfect fuzzy semi-topogenous order, then $\ll = <<$ $_{\rm int}$ $_{\rm c}$.

Proof (1) (T1) Since $int(\overline{0}) = \overline{0}$ and $int(\overline{1}) = \overline{1}$, then $\overline{0} \leqslant int(\overline{0})$, $\overline{1} \leqslant int(\overline{1})$.

(T2) If $\lambda \langle \langle _{int} \mu \rangle$, then $\lambda \leq int(\mu) \leq \mu$

(T3) Let $\lambda \leq \lambda_1 \langle \langle _{int} \mu_1 \leq \mu \rangle$. Since $\lambda_1 \leq int(\mu_1)$, then $\lambda_1 \leq int(\mu)$. Hence $\lambda \langle \langle _{int} \mu \rangle$.

(T7) Let $\bigvee_{i \in \Gamma} \lambda_i \langle \langle i_{int} \mu \rangle$. Since $\lambda_i \leq \bigvee_{i \in \Gamma} \lambda_i \langle \langle i_{int} \mu \rangle$,

by (T3), $\lambda_i \langle \langle i_{int} \mu | for all i \in \Gamma$.

Let $\lambda_i << _{int} \mu$ for all $i \in \Gamma$. Then $\lambda_i \le int(\mu)$ for all $i \in \Gamma$. Thus, $\bigvee_{i \in \Gamma} \lambda_i \le int(\mu)$.

It implies $\bigvee_{i \in \Gamma} \lambda_i \langle \langle i_{int} \mu \rangle$ Thus, $\langle \langle i_{int} \rangle \rangle$ is a perfect fuzzy semi-topogenous order on X.

Let $\mu \leqslant \inf_{\text{int }\lambda}$. Then $\mu \le \inf(\lambda)$. By the definition of $\inf_{\leqslant \inf_{\text{unt}}}$ we have $\inf_{\leqslant \inf_{\text{unt}}} (\lambda) \le \inf(\lambda)$

Since $\operatorname{int}(\lambda) \leq \operatorname{int}(\lambda)$, then $\operatorname{int}(\lambda) \langle \langle \cdot \rangle_{\operatorname{int}} \rangle$

Thus, int $\langle \langle \rangle_{mt}(\lambda) \rangle \geq \operatorname{int}(\lambda)$.

(2) From (1), we only show $\langle \langle \cdot_{int} \rangle$ satisfies (T6).

Let $\lambda \langle \langle _{int} (\mu_1 \wedge \mu_2) \rangle$. Since $\lambda \langle \langle _{int} (\mu_1 \wedge \mu_2) \rangle \leq \mu_i$ for i = 1, 2, then , by (T3), $\lambda \langle \langle _{int} \mu_i \rangle$.

Let $\lambda \langle \langle i_{int} \mu_i \text{ for } i=1,2.$ Then $\lambda \leq int(\mu_i)$.

Since int is a fuzzy interior operator,

 $\lambda \leq \operatorname{int}(\mu_1) \wedge \operatorname{int}(\mu_2) = \operatorname{int}(\mu_1 \wedge \mu_2)$

Thus, $\lambda \langle \langle \mu_1 \wedge \mu_2 \rangle$.

(3) Let $\lambda \langle \langle i_{int} \mu \rangle$. Then $\lambda \leq int(\mu)$. Since

 $\lambda \le \operatorname{int}(\mu) = \operatorname{int}(\operatorname{int}(\mu))$ and $\operatorname{int}(\mu) \le \operatorname{int}(\mu)$

then $\lambda \langle \langle i_{int} int(\mu) \rangle$ and $int(\mu) \langle \langle i_{int} \mu \rangle$. Thus,

 $\lambda(\langle\langle i_{int} \circ \langle\langle i_{int} \rangle \mu.$

- (4) It is trivial from (2) and (3).
- (5) Let $\lambda \ll \mu$. Then $\lambda \leq \text{int}_{\langle\langle}(\mu)$.

Thus $\lambda \langle \langle _{int} , \mu \rangle \rangle$ Thus, $\langle \langle _{int} , u \rangle \rangle$ is finer than \ll .

(6) Let $\lambda \langle \langle int , \mu \rangle$. Then

 $\lambda \leq \text{int } \langle \langle (\mu) \rangle = \bigvee \{ \rho \mid \rho \ll \mu \}.$

Since \ll is perfect, then int $((\mu) \ll \mu)$

From (T3), $\lambda \leq \inf_{\alpha} (\mu) \ll \mu$ implies $\lambda \ll \mu$.

Theorem 2.10 Let τ be a fuzzy supra topology on X. Then:

- (1) $\lambda \langle \langle int_r \mu \rangle$ iff there exists $\rho \in \tau$ such that $\lambda \leq \rho \leq \mu$
- (2) $\tau_{\langle\langle \cdot \rangle_{\text{test}}} = \tau$.

Proof (1) Let $\lambda \langle \langle i_{int}, \mu \rangle$.

Then $\lambda \leq \text{ int }_{\tau}(\mu) \leq \mu$ By Definition 1.1 (O2),

we have int $_{\tau}(\mu) \in \tau$.

Let $\rho \in \tau$ such that $\lambda \leq \rho \leq \mu$.

Then $\lambda \leq \text{int }_{r}(\rho) = \rho \leq \mu$.

Hence $\lambda \langle \langle _{int}, \rho \leq \mu \rangle$. By (T3), $\lambda \langle \langle _{int}, \mu \rangle$.

(2) Since << int, is perfect semi-topogenous

order on X, by Theorem 2.7(3),

 $\lambda \in r_{(\langle i_{\text{int}} \rangle)} \Rightarrow \lambda \langle \langle i_{\text{int}} \rangle \lambda$

Then there exists $\rho \in \tau$ such that

 $\lambda \leq \rho \leq \lambda$. So $\lambda \in \tau$.

Conversely, let $\lambda \in \tau$. Then $\lambda = \operatorname{int}_{\tau}(\lambda)$. It implies $\lambda \leqslant \inf_{\lambda \in \tau} \lambda$. Thus, $\lambda \in \tau \leqslant \inf_{\lambda \in \tau} \lambda$.

Example 2.11 Let $X = \{x, y, z\}$ be a set.

Define binary relations $\langle \langle i \rangle$ on I^X as follows:

$$\lambda \langle \langle _1 \mu \text{ iff } \begin{cases} \lambda = 0 \text{ or } \mu = \overline{1}, \\ \overline{0} \neq \lambda \leq \chi_{\langle x \rangle} \overline{1} \neq \mu \geq \chi_{\langle x, y \rangle} \\ \overline{0} \neq \lambda \leq \chi_{\langle y \rangle} \overline{1} \neq \mu \geq \chi_{\langle x, y \rangle} \end{cases}$$

$$\lambda \langle \langle {}_{2}\mu \text{ iff } \begin{cases} \lambda = \overline{0} \text{ or } \mu = \overline{1}, \\ \overline{0} \neq \lambda \leq \chi_{(y)} \overline{1} \neq \mu \geq \chi_{(x,y)} \\ \overline{0} \neq \lambda \leq \chi_{(y)} \overline{1} \neq \mu \geq \chi_{(y,z)} \end{cases}$$

$$\lambda \langle \langle _{3}\mu \text{ iff } \begin{cases} \lambda = \overline{0} \text{ or } \mu = \overline{1}, \\ \overline{0} \neq \lambda \leq \chi_{(x)} \overline{1} \neq \mu \geq \chi_{(x, y)} \end{cases}$$

(1) $\langle \langle \rangle_1$ is a fuzzy semi-topogenous order on X. but not topogenous because

$$\chi_{\{x\}} \langle \langle \chi_{\{x,y\}}, \chi_{\{y\}} \rangle \langle \langle \chi_{\{x,y\}} \rangle$$
 but $(\chi_{\{x\}} \vee \chi_{\{y\}}) \overline{\langle \langle \chi_{\{x,y\}} \rangle}$

From Theorem 2.6, we can obtain fuzzy supra interior operator int $\langle \langle I \rangle^2 I^X \rightarrow I^X$ as follows:

$$\operatorname{int}_{\lambda \ll_{1}}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \overline{1} & \text{if } \lambda = \overline{1}, \\ \chi_{(x,y)} & \text{if } \chi_{(x,y)} \leq \lambda \neq \overline{1} \\ \overline{0} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

From Theorem 2.7, we can obtain fuzzy supra topology $\tau_{\langle \zeta \rangle}$ as follows:

$$\tau_{\langle\langle,\rangle} = \{\overline{0}, \overline{1}, \chi_{\{x,y\}}\}.$$

Since $\chi_{(x,y)} \in \tau_{\langle \zeta_1 \rangle}$, but $\chi_{(x,y)} \subset \chi_{(x,y)}$, by Theorem 2.7 (3), $\langle \zeta_1 \rangle$ is not perfect From Theorem 2.9(5), $\langle \zeta_1 \rangle$ in finer than $\langle \zeta_1 \rangle$, but $\langle \zeta_1 \rangle \neq \langle \zeta_1 \rangle$ as follows:

$$\lambda \leqslant \inf_{\text{int } \ll_{i}} \mu \text{ iff } \begin{cases} \lambda = 0 \text{ or } \mu = 1, \\ 0 \neq \lambda \le \chi_{\{x, y\}} 1 \neq \mu \ge \chi_{\{x, y\}} \end{cases}$$

(2) $\langle \langle \rangle_2$ is a perfect fuzzy semi-topogenous order on X but not topogenous because:

$$\chi_{\{y\}} \langle \langle \chi_{\{x,y\}}, \chi_{\{y\}} \langle \langle \chi_{\{y,z\}} \rangle \rangle$$

but
$$\chi_{y} \stackrel{\checkmark}{\checkmark} (\chi_{(x,y)} \wedge \chi_{(y,z)}).$$

From Theorem 2.6, we can obtain fuzzy supra interior operator int $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle I^X \to I^X$ as follows:

$$\operatorname{int}_{\lambda \leqslant 2}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \overline{1} & \text{if } \lambda = \overline{1}, \\ \chi_{(y)} & \text{if } \chi_{(x, y)} \leq \lambda \neq \overline{1} \\ \chi_{(y)} & \text{if } \chi_{(y, z)} \leq \lambda \neq \overline{1} \\ \overline{0} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

But it is not a fuzzy interior operator because

$$\overline{0} = \operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle z\rangle}(\chi_{(x,y)} \wedge \chi_{(y,z)})$$

$$\neq \operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle z\rangle}(\chi_{(x,y)}) \wedge \operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle z\rangle}(\chi_{(y,z)}) = \chi_{(y)}.$$

From Theorem 2.9(6), since $\langle \langle \rangle_2$ is perfect, we have $\langle \langle \rangle_2 = \langle \langle \rangle_{\text{int } \langle \langle \rangle_2}$ as follows:

$$\lambda \langle \langle _{\text{int}}_{\ll}, \mu \text{ iff } \begin{cases} \lambda = \overline{0} \text{ or } \mu = \overline{1}, \\ \overline{0} \neq \lambda \leq \chi_{(y)} \overline{1} \neq \mu \geq \chi_{(x, y)} \\ \overline{0} \neq \lambda \leq \chi_{(y)} \overline{1} \neq \mu \geq \chi_{(y, z)} \end{cases}$$

Furthermore.

$$\tau_{\langle \langle \rangle} = \{\overline{0}, \overline{1}\} \text{ iff } \lambda \langle \langle \rangle_{\lambda}, \text{ for all } \lambda \in \{\overline{0}, \overline{1}\}.$$

(3) $\langle \langle \rangle_3$ is a fuzzy topogenous order on X but not topogenous structure from the following statements: For any $\rho \in I^X$ with $\chi_{\{x\}} \leq \rho \leq \chi_{\{x,y\}}$, we have

$$\chi_{\{x\}} \overline{\langle \langle _3 \rho, \rho \rangle \langle \langle _3 \chi_{\{x,y\}} \rangle}$$

Thus, $\chi_{(x)}$ $(\langle \langle \rangle_3 \circ \langle \langle \rangle_3)\chi_{(x,y)}$ but $\chi_{(x)} \langle \langle \rangle_3 \chi_{(x,y)}$. From Theorem 2.6(2), int $\langle \langle \rangle_2$ is a fuzzy interior operator from:

$$\operatorname{int}_{\lambda \ll_{3}}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \overline{1} & \text{if } \lambda = \overline{1}, \\ \chi_{(x)} & \text{if } \chi_{(x,y)} \leq \lambda \neq \overline{1} \\ \overline{0} & \text{otherwis} e \end{cases}$$

From Theorem 2.6(3), since $\langle \langle \rangle_3 \rangle \langle \langle \rangle_3$ is not finer than $\langle \langle \rangle_3$, in general, we have

$$\chi_{\{x\}} = \operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle x_3}(\chi_{\{x,y\}}) \neq \operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle x_3}(\operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle x_3}(\chi_{\{x,y\}})) = \overline{0}.$$

- (4) We easily show that $\langle\langle 1, \langle\langle 2 \rangle\rangle\rangle$ and $\langle\langle 3 \rangle\rangle$ are not symmetric.
- (5) We define a fuzzy interior operator int: $I^X \rightarrow I^X$ as follows:

$$\operatorname{int}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \overline{1} & \text{if } \lambda = \overline{1}, \\ \chi_{(x)} & \text{if } \chi_{(x,y)} \leq \lambda \neq \overline{1} \\ \overline{0} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

From Theorems 2.6 and 2.9, we obtain the followings:

$$\lambda \langle \langle _{int} \mu \text{ iff } \begin{cases} \lambda = \overline{0} \text{ or } \mu = \overline{1}, \\ \overline{0} \neq \lambda \leq \chi_{(x)} \overline{1} \neq \mu \geq \chi_{(x,y)} \end{cases}$$

$$\operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle _{\operatorname{sr}}}(\lambda)\rangle = \begin{cases} \overline{1} & \text{if } \lambda = \overline{1}, \\ \chi_{\langle x\rangle} & \text{if } \chi_{\langle x, y\rangle} \leq \lambda \neq \overline{1} \\ \overline{0} & \text{otherwis} e \end{cases}$$

We have $\operatorname{int}_{\langle\langle \operatorname{int}(\lambda)\rangle} = \operatorname{int}(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in I^X$.

References

- [1] M. Abd El-Monsef and A.E. Ramadan," On fuzzy supra topological spaces", *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math..*, vol 28(4) pp322–329, 1987
- [2] C.L. Chang," Fuzzy topological spaces", J. Math. Anal. Appl. vol 24, pp182-190, 1968.
- [3] A. Csaszar, Foundations of General topology, Pergamon Press, 1963.
- [4] A.K. Katsaras," On fuzzy proximity spaces", *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, vol 75, 571-583,1980
- [5] A.K. Katsaras, "Fuzzy proximity spaces," *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* vol 68,pp100-110. 1979
- [6] A.K. Katsaras, "Totally bounded fuzzy syntopogenous structures", Fuzzy Sets and System, vol 28, pp 91-105,1988.
- [7] A.K. Katsaras," Fuzzy syntopogenous structures compatible with Lowen fuzzy uniformities and Artico-Moresco fuzzy proximities", Fuzzy Sets and Systems vol 36, pp 375-393,1990
- [8] A.K. Katsaras,"Operations on fuzzy syntopogenous structures", *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol 43, pp 199–217,1991.
- [9] A.K. Katsaras, "Fuzzy quasi-proximities and fuzzy quasi-uniformities", Fuzzy Sets and Systems vol 27, pp 335-343, 1988.
- [10] A.K. Katsaras and C.G. Petalas, "A unified theory of fuzzy topologies, fuzzy proximities and fuzzy uniformities", *Rev.Roum. Math.Pures Appl* vol 28(9), pp 845–856, 1983.
- [11] A.K. Katsaras and C.G. Petalas," On fuzzy syntopogenous structures" *J. Math. Anal.* Appl. vol 99(1) pp 219--236,1984.

Jung-Mi Ko



Jung-Mi Ko was born March 16, 1958. She received the B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degree in Department of Mathematics from Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea, in 1988. Since 1988, she has been a faculty member of the Department of Mathematics in Kangnung National

University, where she is currently a Professor. Her research interests are Fuzzy topology, Fuzzy logic, and Differential Geometry. She is a member of KMS, KKMS, and KFIS.

Phone : +82-33-640-2268 Fax : +82-33-647-3256 E-mail : jmko@kangnung.ac.kr

처 자 소 개



Yong-Chan Kim

Yong-Chan Kim was born August 6, 1957. He received the B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degree in Department of Mathematics from Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea, in 1991. Since 1991, he has been a faculty member of the Department of Mathematics in

Kangnung National University, where he is currently a Professor. His research interests are Fuzzy topology, Fuzzy logic . He is a member of KMS, KKMS, and KFIS.

Phone : +82-33-640-2270 Fax : +82-33-647-3256 E-mail : yck@kangnung.ac.kr