



Order-equivalent triangular norms

M. Nesibe Kesicioğlu^{a,*}, Funda Karaçal^b, Radko Mesiar^{c,d}

^a Department of Mathematics, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University, 53100 Rize, Turkey

^b Department of Mathematics, Karadeniz Technical University, 61080 Trabzon, Turkey

^c Centre of Excellence IT4Innovations, Division University of Ostrava, IRAFM, 30. dubna 22, 70103 Ostrava, Czech Republic

^d Department of Mathematics and Descriptive Geometry, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Slovak University of Technology, Radlinského 11, 81 368 Bratislava, Slovakia

Received 8 February 2012; received in revised form 8 October 2014; accepted 10 October 2014

Available online 16 October 2014

Abstract

In this paper, an equivalence relation on the class of t-norms induced by a T -partial order is provided and discussed. The equivalence classes linked to some special t-norms are characterized as well as some properties preserved by the introduced equivalence. Defining the set of incomparable elements with respect to the T -partial order, this set is deeply investigated. Finally, we give an answer to a recently posed open problem.

© 2014 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Triangular norm; Bounded lattice; T -partial order; Divisibility

1. Introduction

Triangular norms were introduced by Karl Menger in 1942 [24]. They play fundamental role in many particular fields of mathematics, for example in probabilistic metric spaces [25], or in fuzzy logic and their applications [7,17], as well as in the non-additive measure and integral theory [1,14–16].

A triangular norm (briefly t-norm) $T : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a commutative, associative, non-decreasing operation on $[0, 1]$ with neutral element 1 [13]. The four basic t-norms on $[0, 1]$ are the minimum T_M , the product T_P , the Łukasiewicz t-norm T_L and the drastic product T_D given by, respectively, $T_M(x, y) = \min(x, y)$, $T_P(x, y) = xy$, $T_L(x, y) = \max(0, x + y - 1)$ and

$$T_D(x, y) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } y = 1, \\ y & \text{if } x = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +90 464 223 61 26; fax: +90 464 223 40 19.

E-mail addresses: m.nesibe@gmail.com (M. Nesibe Kesicioğlu), fkaraçal@yahoo.com (F. Karaçal), mesiar@math.sk (R. Mesiar).

Also, t-norms on a bounded lattice $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ are defined in similar way, and then the extremal t-norms T_D as well as T_\wedge on L are defined similarly as T_D and T_M on $[0, 1]$. Several authors have studied operations and t-norms on bounded lattices, like in [2,3,8–12,21,22].

In [20], a natural order for semigroups was defined. Similarly, in [9], a partial order defined by means of t-norms on a bounded lattice was introduced. For any elements x, y of a bounded lattice L

$$x \leq_T y \Leftrightarrow T(\ell, y) = x \quad \text{for some } \ell \in L,$$

where T is a t-norm on L . This partial order \leq_T is called a T -partial order on L . Moreover, in [9], the authors have investigated some connections between the natural order \leq on L and the T -partial order \leq_T on L . Also, it was obtained that \leq_T implies the natural order \leq but its converse need not be true. So, it was also shown that the structure $(L, \leq_T, 0, 1)$ (which is trivially a bounded poset) need not be a lattice, in general. Moreover, some special cases when $(L, \leq_T, 0, 1)$ is a lattice were shown in [9].

In the present paper, we introduce an equivalence on the class of t-norms on a bounded lattice $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ based on the equality of the induced T -partial orders. The main aim is to characterize the preservation of some (algebraic) properties. The paper is organized as follows. We shortly recall some basic notions in Section 2. In Section 3, we define an equivalence on the class of t-norms on a bounded lattice $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ and we determine the equivalence class of the infimum t-norm T_\wedge and the weakest t-norm T_D . Thus, we obtain that, in the case of the standard real unit interval $L = [0, 1]$, all continuous t-norms are equivalent. Although, we give some examples illustrating that left-continuous t-norms need not be equivalent, in general. We also show by an example that the left-continuity of any of the t-norms in the equivalence class does not imply the left-continuity for another t-norm in the equivalence class. So, we have that our equivalence relation does not preserve left-continuity. By an example, we show that a t-norm and its φ -transform need not be in the same equivalence class. Although, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for a t-norm and its φ -transform to be in the same equivalence class. So, we deduce that an isomorphism isn't sufficient alone for getting an equivalence relation. In Section 4, defining the set of all incomparable elements with respect to \leq_T , we study this set in detail. In Section 5, we give an answer to an open problem posed in [9]. Finally, some concluding remarks are added.

2. Notations, definitions and a review of previous results

Definition 1. (See [11].) Let $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ be a bounded lattice. A *triangular norm* T (briefly t-norm) is a binary operation on L which is commutative, associative, monotone and has neutral element 1.

$$\text{Let } T_D(x, y) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } y = 1, \\ y & \text{if } x = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then T_D is a t-norm on L . Since it holds that $T_D \leq T$ for any t-norm T on L , T_D is the smallest t-norm on L . The largest t-norm on a bounded lattice $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ is given by $T_\wedge(x, y) = x \wedge y$.

Definition 2. (See [5].) A t-norm T on L is *divisible* if the following condition holds:

$$\forall x, y \in L \quad \text{with } x \leq y \quad \text{there is a } z \in L \quad \text{such that } x = T(y, z).$$

A basic example of a non-divisible t-norm on an arbitrary lattice L (with $\text{card } L > 2$) is the weakest t-norm T_D . Trivially, the infimum T_\wedge is divisible since $x \leq y$ is equivalent to $x \wedge y = x$.

Definition 3. (See [11].)

(i) A t-norm T on a lattice L is called \vee -*distributive* if

$$T(a, b_1 \vee b_2) = T(a, b_1) \vee T(a, b_2)$$

for every $a, b_1, b_2 \in L$.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/389442>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/389442>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)