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#### Abstract

Starting from a $t$-norm $T$, it is possible to construct a class of new $t$-norms, so-called $T$-generalized $t$-norm. The purpose of this paper is to describe some properties of this class of generalized $t$-norms. An algebraic structure as well as a binary relation among $t$-norms are also investigated. Some open problems are discussed as well.


## 1. Introduction

Triangular norms are operations which represent conjunctions in fuzzy logic. They were also used in the context of probabilistic metric spaces as a special kind of associative laws defined on the unit interval, see [4]. Geometrically, a triangular norm may be visualized as a surface over the unit square that contains the skew quadrilateral whose vertices are $(0,0,0),(1,0,0),(1,1,1)$ and $(0,1,0)$. For more detail about geometrical illustration of triangular norms, see [4] for instance.

A map $T:[0,1] \times[0,1] \longrightarrow[0,1]$ is called a triangular norm (in short a $t$-norm), if the following requirements are satisfied, see $[1,2,3]$,
(i) $T(x, y)=T(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in[0,1],(T$ is commutative $)$
(ii) $T\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right) \leq T\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right)$ whenever $x_{1} \leq x_{2}$ and $y_{1} \leq y_{2}$, ( $T$ is increasing)
(iii) $T(x, T(y, z))=T(T(x, y), z)$ for all $x, y, z \in[0,1],(T$ is associative $)$
(iv) $T(x, 1)=x$ for all $x \in[0,1]$, ( $T$ has 1 as identity).

As it is well known, combining (i), (ii) and (iv) we can see that every $t$-norm $T$ satisfies $T(x, y) \leq \min (x, y)$ for all $x, y \in[0,1]$. It follows that $T(x, x) \leq x$ for every $x \in[0,1]$, with $T(0,0)=0$ and $T(1,1)=1$.

Typical examples of $t$-norms include the following:
(1) $M(x, y)=\min (x, y) ; \Pi(x, y)=x y ; L(x, y)=\max (x+y-1,0)$;
(2) $W(x, 1)=x, W(1, y)=y, W(x, y)=0$ if $x, y \in[0,1)$;
(3) $N(x, y)=\min (x, y)$ if $x+y \geq 1, N(x, y)=0$ if $x+y<1$;
(3) $H(0,0)=0, H(x, y)=\frac{x y}{x+y-x y}$ if $(x, y) \neq(0,0)$;
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and are known in the literature as the minimum or Gödel $t$-norm, product $t$-norm, Lukasiewicz $t$-norm, drastic or weak $t$-norm, nilpotent $t$-norm and Hamacher $t$-norm, respectively.

For two $t$-norms $T$ and $S$, we write $T \leq S$ if and only if $T(x, y) \leq S(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in[0,1]$. If $T \leq S$ and there is at least one pair $(a, b) \in[0,1] \times[0,1]$ such that $T(a, b)<S(a, b)$, then we briefly write $T<S$. Every $t$-norm $T$ satisfies $W \leq T \leq M$ and the above $t$-norms satisfy the chain of inequalities $W<L<\Pi<H<M$.

There are many families of $t$-norms some of which extend the standard $t$ norms listed above. For instance, we cite [1]

$$
H(\gamma ; x, y)=\frac{x y}{\gamma+(1-\gamma)(x+y-x y)}, \quad \gamma \geq 0
$$



$$
D(\alpha ; x, y)=\frac{x y}{\max (x, y, \alpha)}, \quad \alpha \in(0,1)
$$


known as the Hamacher and Dubois-Prade (parameterized) $t$-norms, respectively. Clearly, $H(0 ; x, y)=H(x, y), H(1 ; x, y)=\Pi(x, y)$ and

$$
D(0 ; x, y):=\lim _{\alpha \downarrow 0} D(\alpha ; x, y)=Z(x, y), \quad D(1 ; x, y):=\lim _{\alpha \uparrow 1} D(\alpha ; x, y)=\Pi(x, y)
$$

for all $x, y \in[0,1]$. For other families of $t$-norms (not needed here) we refer the reader to [1] for instance.

## 2. On a class of $\boldsymbol{t}$-norms

For the sake of simplicity, we denote by $C^{+}([0,1])$ the set of all continuous strictly increasing maps $\Phi:[0,1] \longrightarrow[0,1]$. We denote by $i d \in C^{+}([0,1])$ the identity map of $[0,1]$. It is well known that, if for some $\Phi \in C^{+}([0,1])$ we set

$$
T_{\Phi}(x, y)=\Phi^{-1}(T((\Phi(x), \Phi(y)))
$$

for all $x, y \in[0,1]$, then $T_{\Phi}$ defines a $t$-norm called the $T$-generalized $t$-norm associated to $\Phi$. Note that $T_{i d}=T$, and note also the following:

- $\left(T_{\Phi}\right)_{\Psi}=T_{\Phi \circ \Psi}$ and so $\left(T_{\Phi}\right)_{\Phi^{-1}}=T$ for all $\left.\Phi, \Psi \in C^{+}([0,1])\right]$.
- If $T$ and $S$ are two $t$-norms such that $T_{\Phi}=S_{\Phi}$ for some $\left.\Phi \in C^{+}([0,1])\right]$, then $T=S$.
- If $T$ and $S$ are two $t$-norms such that $T \leq S$, then $T_{\Phi} \leq S_{\Phi}$ for every $\left.\Phi \in C^{+}([0,1])\right]$.
- $T_{\Phi}=T_{\Psi}$ does not ensure $\Phi=\Psi$.

One of the most interesting examples of $\Phi \in C^{+}([0,1])$ is $\Phi(x)=x^{p}$ for some real number $p>0$. In this case, we write $T_{p}$ instead of $T_{\Phi}$, i.e.,

$$
\forall x, y \in[0,1] \quad T_{p}(x, y):=\left(T\left(x^{p}, y^{p}\right)\right)^{1 / p}
$$

The following properties hold:

- $\left(T_{p}\right)_{q}=T_{p q}=\left(T_{q}\right)_{p}$ for all $p, q>0$. In particular, $\left(T_{p}\right)_{1 / p}=T_{1}=T$ and so $\left(T_{2}\right)_{1 / 2}=\left(T_{1 / 2}\right)_{2}=T$.
- Let $T$ and $S$ be two $t$-norms. If $T_{p}=S_{p}$ for some $p>0$, then $T=S$, but $T_{p}=T_{q}$ does not ensure $p=q$.
- If $T$ and $S$ are two $t$-norms such that $T<S$, then $T_{p}<S_{p}$ for each $p>0$.

It is easy to see that $M_{\Phi}=M$ and $W_{\Phi}=W$ for all $\Phi \in C^{+}([0,1])$ and so $M_{p}=M$ and $W_{p}=W$ for every $p>0$. Further, $\Pi_{p}=\Pi$ for each $p>0$. Now, we will illustrate the above with the following examples.

Example 2.1. Let $\Phi \in C^{+}([0,1])$ be as follows

$$
\Phi(x)=\frac{2 x}{x+1}, \quad \Phi^{-1}(x)=\frac{x}{2-x} .
$$

(i) Take $T=\Pi$. Simple computation yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{\Phi}(x, y) & =\frac{2 x y}{x+y-x y+1}=H(1 / 2 ; x, y) \\
\Pi_{\Phi^{-1}}(x, y) & =\frac{x y}{x y-x-y+2}=H(2 ; x, y)
\end{aligned}
$$

(ii) Let $T=H$. An elementary computation leads to $H_{\Phi}=H$. Detail is simple and therefore omitted here.

Example 2.2. Let $\Phi$ be as in the previous example. We can reiterate the above by choosing $T=\Pi_{\Phi}$. If we denote by $\Pi_{\Phi^{n+1}}:=\left(\Pi_{\Phi^{n}}\right)_{\Phi}$ for all integer $n \geq 0$, a simple mathematical induction shows that

$$
\forall x, y \in[0,1] \quad \Pi_{\Phi^{n}}(x, y)=\frac{2^{n} x y}{\left(2^{n}-1\right)(x+y-x y)+1}=H\left(1 / 2^{n} ; x, y\right)
$$

It is worth mentioning that the $t$-norm $(x, y) \longmapsto \Pi_{\Phi^{n}}(x, y)$, for fixed $n \geq 0$, is a point-wise approximation of the non-differentiable $t$-norm $(x, y) \longmapsto H(x, y)$, i.e.,

$$
\lim _{n \uparrow \infty} \Pi_{\Phi^{n}}(x, y)=H(x, y)=\frac{x y}{x+y-x y}
$$

for all $x, y \in[0,1]$ with $\Pi_{\Phi^{n}}(0,0)=H(0,0)=0$. We omit all discussion about this latter point which is outside the scope of this paper.

The graphs below illustrate the point just made via Example 2.2.


## 3. On an algebraic structure

Let $T$ be a $t$-norm. We denote by $\mathcal{G}(T)$ the set of all $T$-generalized $t$-norms, i.e.,

$$
\mathcal{G}(T)=\left\{T_{\Phi}, \quad \Phi \in C^{+}([0,1])\right\}
$$

Remark that $\mathcal{G}(M)=\{M\}$ and $\mathcal{G}(W)=\{W\}$.
In all cases, we can equip $\mathcal{G}(T)$ with an internal law defined as follows: for $T_{\Phi}, T_{\Psi} \in \mathcal{G}(T)$, we set

$$
T_{\Phi} \odot T_{\Psi}=T_{\Phi \circ \Psi}
$$

With this, we have the next result.
Proposition 3.1. $(\mathcal{G}(T), \odot)$ is a group. Its identity element is $T_{i d}=T$ and the inverse of $T_{\Phi}$ is $T_{\Phi}^{-1}=T_{\Phi^{-1}}$.

Proof. Since $(\Phi \circ \Psi) \circ \Upsilon=\Phi \circ(\Psi \circ \Upsilon)$ for all $\Phi, \Psi, \Upsilon:[0,1] \longrightarrow[0,1]$ then the associativity axiom for $\odot$ follows. A simple verification leads to $T=T_{i d}$ is the identity element and $T_{\Phi^{-1}}$ is the inverse of $T_{\Phi}$, for the law $\odot$. The proof is so complete.

Let $\mathcal{P}(T)$ be the set of all power $t$-norms, i.e., $\mathcal{P}(T)=\left\{T_{p}, p>0\right\}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{P}(T)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{G}(T)$, with $T=T_{1} \in \mathcal{P}(T)$. The next result may be stated.

Proposition 3.2. For all $p, q>0$ we have

$$
T_{p}^{-1}=T_{1 / p}, \quad T_{p} \odot T_{q}=T_{q} \odot T_{p}=T_{p q}
$$

Consequently, $\mathcal{P}(T)$ is a subgroup of $\mathcal{G}(T)$ and $\odot$ induces a commutative law on $\mathcal{P}(T)$.

Proof. The relationships just stated follow from the previous proposition with a simple manipulation. Now, $T=T_{1} \in \mathcal{P}(T)$ and if $T_{p}, T_{q} \in \mathcal{P}(T)$, then we have

$$
T_{p} \odot T_{q}^{-1}=T_{p} \odot T_{1 / q}=T_{p / q} \in \mathcal{P}(T)
$$

The desired result is then obtained.
It is easy to see that $\left(C^{+}([0,1]), \circ\right)$ is a group. With this, the following result may be stated.

Theorem 3.3. Let $T$ be at-norm. Then the following assertions hold:
(1) The map $F:\left(C^{+}([0,1]), \circ\right) \longrightarrow(\mathcal{G}(T), \odot)$ defined by $F(\Phi)=T_{\Phi}$ for all $\Phi \in C^{+}([0,1])$ is a homomorphism of groups. Further, $F$ is surjective and

$$
\text { Ker } F=\left\{\Phi \in C^{+}([0,1]), \quad T_{\Phi}=T\right\} .
$$

(2) The map $f:(0, \infty) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(T)$ defined by $f(p)=T_{p}$ for all $p>0$ is a homomorphism of groups. Moreover, $f$ is surjective and Ker $f=\{p>$ $\left.0, \quad T_{p}=T\right\}$.

Proof. First, remark that $F$ and $f$ are surjective by construction. Further, for all $\Phi, \Psi \in C^{+}([0,1])$ and all $p, q>0$ we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
F(\Phi \circ \Psi)=T_{\Phi \circ \Psi}=T_{\Phi} \odot T_{\Psi}=F(\Phi) \odot F(\Psi), \\
f(p q)=T_{p q}=T_{p} \odot T_{q}=f(p) \odot f(q) .
\end{gathered}
$$

The desired result follows and the proof is complete.
The following corollary may be stated.
Corollary 3.4. Let $T$ be a t-norm. If there is no $p>0, p \neq 1$, such that $T_{p}=T$, then $\mathcal{P}(T)$ is infinite.

Proof. With our assumption, the map $f$ (previously defined) is one-to-one and by the first theorem of isomorphism we can deduce that $(0, \infty)$ and $\mathcal{P}(T)$ are isomorphic. We then conclude that $\mathcal{P}(T)$ is infinite.

## 4. On a binary relation among $\boldsymbol{t}$-norms

Let $T$ be a $t$-norm. Throughout this section, we set $g_{T}(x)=T(x, x)$ for every $x \in[0,1]$. We then say that $g_{T}$ is the associated function of $T$. We ask the question: is it true that $g_{T}=g_{S}$ implies $T=S$ ? Put another way, we ask if $T$ is characterized by its associated function $g_{T}$. In the general case we have no affirmative answer. For the lower and upper $t$-norms $W$ and $M$, however the two following results may be stated.

Proposition 4.1. Let $T$ be a $t$-norm such that $g_{T}=g_{M}$, i.e., $T(x, x)=x$ for each $x \in[0,1]$. Then $T=M$.

Proof. Assume that $T(x, x)=x$ for all $x \in[0,1]$. We would like to show that $T(x, y)=M(x, y)=\min (x, y)$ for all $x, y \in[0,1]$. It is always true that $T(x, y) \leq M(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in[0,1]$ and so it is necessary to prove only that $T(x, y) \geq M(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in[0,1]$. By the commutativity axiom (i) we can assume, without loss the generality, that $x \leq y$. In this case, the monotonicity axiom (ii) of $T$ yields, for all $x, y \in[0,1]$,

$$
T(x, y) \geq T(x, x)=x=\min (x, y)=M(x, y)
$$

The proof of the proposition is so completed.
Proposition 4.2. Let $T$ be a $t$-norm such that $g_{T}=g_{W}$. Then $T=W$.
Proof. First, it is easy to see that

$$
g_{W}(x):=W(x, x)=1 \text { if } x=1, \quad g_{W}(x)=0 \text { if } x \neq 1
$$

The inequality $W \leq T$ is always true and we have to prove that $T(x, y) \leq$ $W(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in[0,1]$. Since $T$ is a $t$-norm then

$$
T(x, 1)=x=W(x, 1) \text { and } T(1, y)=y=W(1, y)
$$

We can then assume that $x, y \in[0,1)$, further with $x \leq y$ by virtue of the commutativity axiom (i). Then, by the monotonicity axiom (ii), we have

$$
T(x, y) \leq T(y, y)=g_{T}(y)=g_{W}(y)=0=W(x, y)
$$

which completes the proof.
We can interpret the previous results in another point of view. In fact, let $\mathcal{T}$ be the set of all $t$-norms. For $T, S \in \mathcal{T}$, we define the following binary relation

$$
T \equiv S \text { if and only if } g_{T}=g_{S},
$$

which is obviously an equivalence relation. The coset of $T$ is given by

$$
c(T):=\left\{S \in \mathcal{T}, \quad g_{S}=g_{T}\right\}
$$

The above propositions mean that $c(M)=\{M\}$ and $c(W)=\{W\}$, respectively. Some questions, posed here as open problems, arise from the above study.
Problem 1: Find $c(T)$ for $T \in\{\Pi, L, N, H\}$.

Problem 2: Let $T$ and $S$ be two t-norms such that $g_{T}=g_{S}$. Is it true that $T=S$ ?

It is not hard to verify that the three functions $g_{M}, g_{\Pi}$ and $g_{H}$ belong to $C^{+}([0,1])$ while the three ones $g_{L}, g_{W}$ and $g_{N}$ do not. We then put the following open question.
Problem 3: Let $T$ be a given t-norm. Under what (necessary and sufficient) condition on $T$ we have $g_{T} \in C^{+}([0,1])$ ?

In Example 2.1, (ii) we have seen that $H_{\Phi}=H$ with $\Phi(x)=\frac{2 x}{x+1}$. We then deduce that $H_{\Phi^{-1}}=H$ with

$$
\forall x \in[0,1] \quad \Phi^{-1}(x)=\frac{x}{2-x}=g_{H}(x)
$$

We can then write $H_{g_{H}}=H$. This allows us to put the following.
Problem 4: How can t-norms $T$ such that $T_{g_{T}}=T$ be described?
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