



SOME CHARACTERIZATIONS ON CUBIC SETS

V. Chinnadurai*, K. Suganya** and A. Swaminathan***

* Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Tamilnadu

** Research Scholar, Department of Mathematics, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Tamilnadu

*** Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, Aksheyaa College of Engineering, Tamilnadu

Abstract:

*In this paper we have defined * cubic sets and discussed some of their characterizations.*

Index Terms: Cubic Set, Internal Cubic Set, External Cubic Sets, P-(R-) Order, P-(R-) Union & P-(R-) Intersection.

Introduction:

In 1965, Zadeh [6] has initiated the notion of fuzzy sets and Zadeh [6] made an extension of the concept of a fuzzy set by an interval-valued fuzzy set. In traditional fuzzy logic, the expert's degrees of certainty in different statements were given by numbers from the interval [0, 1]. It is often difficult for an expert to exactly quantify his or her certainty. Therefore, instead of a real number, it is more adequate to represent this degree of certainty by an interval or even by a fuzzy set. Some properties of Fuzzy Ideals in Algebraic structures were discussed by Chinnadurai [1]. Interval-valued fuzzy sets have been actively used in real-life applications. Sambuc [3] used this in Medical diagnosis in thyroidian pathology. Kohout [2] also used this in Medicine, in a system CLINAID, Gorzalczany in Approximate reasoning. Turksen [4] in Interval-valued logic, in preferences modelling. These works show the importance of cubic sets. Cubic sets were discussed by Jun [5]

In this paper, using a some properties of Cubic ideals of near rings studied by Chinnadurai fuzzy set and an interval-valued fuzzy set, we introduce a new notion, called (interval, external) * cubic set, and investigate several properties. We particularly it deals with P-union, P-intersection, R-union, R-intersection of * cubic sets, and related properties.

Definition: 1.1 Let X be a nonempty set. A fuzzy set \mathcal{A} in X is characteristic by its membership function (generalized characteristic function).

$$\mu_A: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

And $\mu_A(x)$ is interpreted as its degree of membership elements x in a fuzzy set A for each $x \in X$. i.e. $[0, 1]$ is the subset of nonnegative real numbers whose supremum is finite.

Definition: 1.2 Let X be any set. A mapping $\bar{A}: X \rightarrow D[0,1]$ is called an interval-valued fuzzy subset (briefly, i-v fuzzy subset) of X , where $D[0,1]$ denotes the family of all closed subintervals of $[0, 1]$ and $\bar{A}(x) = [A^-(x), A^+(x)]$ for all $x \in X$, where A^- and A^+ are fuzzy subsets of X such that $A^-(x) \leq A^+(x)$ for all $x \in X$.

Definition: 1.3 Let X be a nonempty set. A cubic set \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is a structure of the form

$$\mathcal{A} = \{ \langle x, A(x), \lambda(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \} \text{ and } \mathcal{B} = \{ \langle x, B(x), \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$$

Then by define * property

$$\mathcal{A}^* = \{ \langle x, A(x), \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \} \text{ and } \mathcal{B}^* = \{ \langle x, B(x), \lambda(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$$

in which A and B is an interval valued fuzzy set (IVF) in X and λ and μ is a fuzzy set in X .

A cubic set $\mathcal{A}^* = \{ \langle x, A(x), \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ is simply denoted by $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B}^* = \{ \langle x, B(x), \lambda(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ is simply denoted by $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$.

Definition: 1.4 Let X be a nonempty set. A cubic set $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ in X said to be internal cubic set (briefly, ICS) if $A^-(x) \leq \mu(x) \leq A^+(x)$ and $B^-(x) \leq \lambda(x) \leq B^+(x)$ for all $x \in X$.

Definition: 1.5 Let X be a nonempty set. A cubic set $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ in X said to be external cubic set (briefly, ECS) if $\mu(x) \notin (A^-(x), A^+(x))$ and $\lambda(x) \notin (B^-(x), B^+(x))$ for all $x \in X$.

Example: 1.6 Let $X = \{a, b\}$ be a nonempty set. A cubic set \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is defined as $\mathcal{A} = \{ \langle a, [0.1, 0.3], 0.5 \rangle, \langle b, [0.2, 0.4], 0.6 \rangle \}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{ \langle a, [0.5, 0.7], 0.6 \rangle, \langle b, [0.8, 0.9], 0.3 \rangle \}$ then $*$ property as $\mathcal{A}^* = \{ \langle a, [0.1, 0.3], 0.6 \rangle, \langle b, [0.2, 0.4], 0.3 \rangle \}$ and $\mathcal{B}^* = \{ \langle a, [0.5, 0.7], 0.5 \rangle, \langle b, [0.8, 0.9], 0.6 \rangle \}$.

Example: 1.7 Let $\mathcal{A} = \{ \langle x, A(x), \lambda(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{ \langle x, B(x), \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ be a cubic set in X . If $A(x) = [0.2, 0.7]$, $\lambda(x) = 0.5$ and $B(x) = [0.4, 0.6]$, $\mu(x) = 0.6$ for all $x \in X$, then \mathcal{A}^* and \mathcal{B}^* is an ICS.

Example: 1.8 Let $\mathcal{A} = \{ \langle x, A(x), \lambda(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{ \langle x, B(x), \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ be a cubic set in X . If $A(x) = [0.2, 0.5]$, $\lambda(x) = 0.9$ and $B(x) = [0.6, 0.8]$, $\mu(x) = 0.1$ for all $x \in X$, then \mathcal{A}^* and \mathcal{B}^* is an ICS.

Theorem: 1.9 Let $\mathcal{A} = \{ \langle x, A(x), \lambda(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{ \langle x, B(x), \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ be a cubic sets in X . If \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is both an ICS and an ECS. Also let \mathcal{A}^* and \mathcal{B}^* is both an ICS and an ECS, then $\mu(x) \in U(A) \cup L(A)$ and $\lambda(x) \in U(A) \cup L(A)$ (for all $x \in X$) where $U(A) = \{ A^+(x) \mid x \in X \}$ and $L(A) = \{ A^-(x) \mid x \in X \}$.

Proof: Assume that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is both an ICS and ECS. Also \mathcal{A}^* and \mathcal{B}^* is both an ICS and ECS. Using definition of ICS and ECS and we have $A^-(x) \leq \mu(x) \leq A^+(x)$, $B^-(x) \leq \lambda(x) \leq B^+(x)$ and $\mu(x) \notin (A^-(x), A^+(x))$ and $\lambda(x) \notin (B^-(x), B^+(x))$ for all $x \in X$. Thus $\mu(x) = A^-(x)$ or $A^+(x) = \mu(x)$, $\lambda(x) = B^-(x)$ or $B^+(x) = \lambda(x)$ and so $\mu(x) \in U(A) \cup L(A)$, $\lambda(x) \in U(A) \cup L(A)$.

Definition: 1.10 Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be cubic sets in X . Also $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ be a cubic sets in X . Then we define

- (a) (Equality) $\mathcal{A}^* = \mathcal{B}^* \Leftrightarrow A = B$ and $\mu = \lambda$.
- (b) (P-order) $\mathcal{A}^* \leq_P \mathcal{B}^* \Leftrightarrow A \subseteq B$ and $\mu \leq \lambda$.
- (c) (R-order) $\mathcal{A}^* \leq_R \mathcal{B}^* \Leftrightarrow A \subseteq B$ and $\mu \geq \lambda$.

Definition: 1.11 For any $\mathcal{A}_i = \{ \langle x, \mathcal{A}_i(x), \lambda_i(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\mathcal{B}_i = \{ \langle x, \mathcal{B}_i(x), \mu_i(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$. Also

$\mathcal{A}_i^* = \{ \langle x, \mathcal{A}_i(x), \mu_i(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\mathcal{B}_i^* = \{ \langle x, \mathcal{B}_i(x), \lambda_i(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ be a cubic sets where $i \in \Omega$, and i taken as even sets only we define

(a) P-union

$$\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} {}_P \mathcal{A}_i^* = \{ \langle x, (\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} \mathcal{A}_i)(x), (\bigvee_{(i \in \Omega)} \mu_i)(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$$

$$\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} {}_P \mathcal{B}_i^* = \{ \langle x, (\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} \mathcal{B}_i)(x), (\bigvee_{(i \in \Omega)} \lambda_i)(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$$

(b) P-intersection

$$\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} {}_P \mathcal{A}_i^* = \{ \langle x, (\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} \mathcal{A}_i)(x), (\bigwedge_{(i \in \Omega)} \mu_i)(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$$

$$\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} {}_P \mathcal{B}_i^* = \{ \langle x, (\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} \mathcal{B}_i)(x), (\bigwedge_{(i \in \Omega)} \lambda_i)(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$$

(c) R-union

$$\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} {}_R \mathcal{A}_i^* = \{ \langle x, (\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} \mathcal{A}_i)(x), (\bigvee_{(i \in \Omega)} \mu_i)(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$$

$$\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} {}_R\mathcal{B}_i^* = \{ \langle x, (\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} B_i)(x), (\bigvee_{(i \in \Omega)} \lambda_i)(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$$

(d) P-intersection

$$\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} {}_R\mathcal{A}_i^* = \{ \langle x, (\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} A_i)(x), (\bigwedge_{(i \in \Omega)} \mu_i)(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$$

$$\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} {}_R\mathcal{B}_i^* = \{ \langle x, (\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} B_i)(x), (\bigwedge_{(i \in \Omega)} \lambda_i)(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$$

The complement of $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be cubic sets in X . Also $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ is defined to be a cubic sets $\mathcal{A}^{*c} = \{ \langle x, A^c(x), 1 - \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{*c} = \{ \langle x, B^c(x), 1 - \lambda(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ where $A^c(x) = [1 - A^+(x), 1 - A^-(x)]$ and $B^c(x) = [1 - B^+(x), 1 - B^-(x)]$.

Theorem: 1.12 Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be cubic sets in X . Also $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ be a cubic sets. Then the following is true $(\mathcal{A}^{*c})^c = \mathcal{A}^*$ and $(\mathcal{B}^{*c})^c = \mathcal{B}^*$.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{A}^{*c} = \{ \langle x, A^c(x), 1 - \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$
 $(\mathcal{A}^{*c})^c = \{ \langle x, (A^c(x))^c, (1 - \mu(x))^c \rangle \mid x \in X \}$
 $= \{ \langle x, A(x), 1 - 1 - \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$
 $= \mathcal{A}$

Similarly we can prove that $(\mathcal{B}^{*c})^c = \mathcal{B}^*$.

Theorem: 1.13 For any $\mathcal{A}_i = \{ \langle x, \mathcal{A}_i(x), \lambda_i(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\mathcal{B}_i = \{ \langle x, \mathcal{B}_i(x), \mu_i(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$. Also

$\mathcal{A}_i^* = \{ \langle x, A_i(x), \mu_i(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\mathcal{B}_i^* = \{ \langle x, B_i(x), \lambda_i(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$, where $i \in \Omega$ family of cubic sets.

$$(\mathcal{A}_1^* \cup_P \mathcal{A}_2^* \dots \cup_P \mathcal{A}_n^*)^c = \mathcal{A}_1^{*c} \cup_P \mathcal{A}_2^{*c} \cup_P \dots \cup_P \mathcal{A}_n^{*c},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_1^{*c} \cap_P \mathcal{A}_2^{*c} \cap_P \dots \cap_P \mathcal{A}_n^{*c} = (\mathcal{A}_1^* \cap_P \mathcal{A}_2^* \dots \cap_P \mathcal{A}_n^*)^c$$

$$\text{We have } \left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} P\mathcal{A}_i^* \right)^c = \left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} P\mathcal{A}_i^{*c} \right)$$

$$(\mathcal{B}_1^* \cup_P \mathcal{B}_2^* \dots \cup_P \mathcal{B}_n^*)^c = \mathcal{B}_1^{*c} \cup_P \mathcal{B}_2^{*c} \cup_P \dots \cup_P \mathcal{B}_n^{*c},$$

$$\mathcal{B}_1^{*c} \cap_P \mathcal{B}_2^{*c} \cap_P \dots \cap_P \mathcal{B}_n^{*c} = (\mathcal{B}_1^* \cap_P \mathcal{B}_2^* \dots \cap_P \mathcal{B}_n^*)^c$$

$$\text{We have } \left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} P\mathcal{B}_i^* \right)^c = \left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} P\mathcal{B}_i^{*c} \right).$$

$$(\mathcal{A}_1^* \cap_P \mathcal{A}_2^* \dots \cap_P \mathcal{A}_n^*)^c = \mathcal{A}_1^{*c} \cap_P \mathcal{A}_2^{*c} \cap_P \dots \cap_P \mathcal{A}_n^{*c},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_1^{*c} \cup_P \mathcal{A}_2^{*c} \cup_P \dots \cup_P \mathcal{A}_n^{*c} = (\mathcal{A}_1^* \cup_P \mathcal{A}_2^* \dots \cup_P \mathcal{A}_n^*)^c$$

$$\text{We have } \left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} P\mathcal{A}_i^* \right)^c = \left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} P\mathcal{A}_i^{*c} \right)$$

$$(\mathcal{B}_1^* \cap_P \mathcal{B}_2^* \dots \cap_P \mathcal{B}_n^*)^c = \mathcal{B}_1^{*c} \cap_P \mathcal{B}_2^{*c} \cap_P \dots \cap_P \mathcal{B}_n^{*c},$$

$$\mathcal{B}_1^{*c} \cup_P \mathcal{B}_2^{*c} \cup_P \dots \cup_P \mathcal{B}_n^{*c} = (\mathcal{B}_1^* \cup_P \mathcal{B}_2^* \dots \cup_P \mathcal{B}_n^*)^c$$

$$\text{We have } \left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} P\mathcal{B}_i^* \right)^c = \left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} P\mathcal{B}_i^{*c} \right).$$

Also similarly we have $\left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} R\mathcal{A}_i^* \right)^c = \left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} R\mathcal{A}_i^{*c} \right)$, $\left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} R\mathcal{B}_i^* \right)^c = \left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} R\mathcal{B}_i^{*c} \right)$.

$\left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} R\mathcal{A}_i^* \right)^c = \left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} R\mathcal{A}_i^{*c} \right)$, have $\left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} R\mathcal{B}_i^* \right)^c = \left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} R\mathcal{B}_i^{*c} \right)$.

Proof: Straightforward.

Proposition: 1.14 Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$, $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{C} = \langle C, \gamma \rangle$, $\mathcal{D} = \langle D, \rho \rangle$ be cubic sets. Also $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$, $\mathcal{C}^* = \langle C, \rho \rangle$, $\mathcal{D}^* = \langle D, \gamma \rangle$ be cubic sets. Then the following statements are true.

- (1) If $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^*$ and $\mathcal{B}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{C}^*$ then $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{C}^*$.
- (2) If $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^*$ and \mathcal{B}^* then $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^*$.
- (3) If $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^*$ and $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{C}^*$ then $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^* \cap_R \mathcal{C}^*$.
- (4) If $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^*$ and $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^*$ then $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_p \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^*$.
- (5) If $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^*$ and $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{D}^*$ then $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_p \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{C}^* \cup_p \mathcal{D}^*$ and $\mathcal{A}^* \cap_p \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^* \cap_p \mathcal{D}^*$.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ be cubic sets. Also $\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{B}^*, \mathcal{C}^*, \mathcal{D}^*$ be cubic sets. By definition,

- (1) $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^* \Rightarrow A \subseteq B$ and $\mu \leq \lambda$.
 $\mathcal{B}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{C}^* \Rightarrow B \subseteq C$ and $\lambda \leq \rho$.
 $\Rightarrow A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ and $\lambda \leq \mu \leq \rho$
 $\Rightarrow A \subseteq C$ and $\lambda \leq \rho$.
 $\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{C}^*$.
- (2) $A^c \supseteq B^c$ and $\mu \leq \lambda$.
 $B^c \subseteq A^c$ and $\lambda \geq \mu$.
 $\mathcal{B}^{*c} \subseteq_p \mathcal{A}^{*c}$
- (3) $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^* \Rightarrow A \subseteq B$ and $\mu \leq \rho$.
 $C \subseteq B \cup C$ and $\mu \subseteq \lambda \wedge \rho$
 $A \subseteq_p B \cup_p C$ and $\mu \subseteq \lambda \wedge \rho$.
 $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^* \cap_R \mathcal{C}^*$
- (4) $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^* \Rightarrow A \subseteq B$ and $\mu \leq \lambda$.
 $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^* \Rightarrow C \subseteq B$ and $\rho \leq \lambda$.
 $A \cup C \subseteq B$ and $\mu \vee \rho \leq \lambda$.
 $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_p \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^*$.
- (5) $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^* \Rightarrow A \subseteq B$ and $\mu \leq \lambda$.
 and $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{D}^* \Rightarrow C \subseteq D$ and $\rho \leq \gamma$.
 $\Rightarrow A \cup C \subseteq B \cup D$ and $\mu \vee \rho \leq \lambda \vee \gamma$.
 $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_p \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{C}^* \cup_p \mathcal{D}^*$
 $\Rightarrow A \cap C \subseteq B \cap D$ and $\mu \wedge \rho \leq \lambda \wedge \gamma$.
 $\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}^* \cap_p \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^* \cap_p \mathcal{D}^*$.

Hence proved.

Proposition: 1.15 Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$, $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{C} = \langle C, \gamma \rangle$, $\mathcal{D} = \langle D, \rho \rangle$ be cubic sets. Also $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$, $\mathcal{C}^* = \langle C, \rho \rangle$, $\mathcal{D}^* = \langle D, \gamma \rangle$ be cubic sets. Then the following statements are true.

- (1) If $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^*$ and $\mathcal{B}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{C}^*$ then $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{C}^*$.
- (2) If $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^*$ and $\mathcal{B}^{*c} \subseteq_R \mathcal{A}^{*c}$
- (3) If $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^*$ and $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{C}^*$ then $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^* \cap_R \mathcal{C}^*$
- (4) If $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^*$ and $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^*$ then $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_R \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{B}^*$.
- (5) If $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^*$ and $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_p \mathcal{D}^*$ then $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_R \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{C}^* \cup_R \mathcal{D}^*$ and $\mathcal{A}^* \cap_R \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^* \cap_R \mathcal{D}^*$.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ be cubic sets. Also $\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{B}^*, \mathcal{C}^*, \mathcal{D}^*$ be cubic sets. By definition,

- (1) $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^* \Rightarrow A \subseteq B$ and $\mu \leq \lambda$.
 $\mathcal{B}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{C}^* \Rightarrow B \subseteq C$ and $\lambda \leq \rho$.
 $\Rightarrow A \subseteq B \subseteq C$ and $\mu \leq \lambda \leq \rho$
 $\Rightarrow A \subseteq C$ and $\mu \leq \rho$.

- (2) $\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{C}^*.$
 $A^c \supseteq B^c$ and $\mu \leq \lambda.$
 $\Rightarrow B^c \subseteq A^c$ and $\lambda \leq \mu.$
 $\Rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{*c} \subseteq_R \mathcal{A}^{*c}$
- (3) $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^* \Rightarrow A \subseteq B$ and $\mu \leq \lambda.$
 $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{C}^* \Rightarrow A \subseteq C$ and $\mu \leq \rho.$
 $C \subseteq B \cup C$ and $\mu \leq \lambda \wedge \rho.$
 $A \subseteq B \cup C$ and $\mu \leq \lambda \wedge \rho.$
 $\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^* \cap_R \mathcal{C}^*$
- (4) $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^* \Rightarrow A \subseteq B$ and $\mu \leq \lambda.$
 $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^* \Rightarrow C \subseteq B$ and $\rho \leq \lambda.$
 $A \cup C \subseteq B$ and $\mu \vee \rho \leq \lambda.$
 $\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}^* \cup_R \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_P \mathcal{B}^*.$
- (5) $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^* \Rightarrow A \subseteq B$ and $\mu \leq \lambda.$
 and $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_P \mathcal{D}^* \Rightarrow C \subseteq D$ and $\rho \leq \gamma.$
 $\Rightarrow A \cup C \subseteq B \cup D$ and $\mu \vee \rho \leq \lambda \vee \gamma.$
 $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_R \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{C}^* \cup_R \mathcal{D}^*$
 $\Rightarrow A \cap C \subseteq B \cap D$ and $\mu \wedge \rho \leq \lambda \wedge \gamma.$
 $\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}^* \cap_R \mathcal{C}^* \subseteq_R \mathcal{B}^* \cap_R \mathcal{D}^*.$

Hence proved.

Theorem: 1.16 Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be a cubic set in X . Also let $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ be a cubic set in X . If \mathcal{A}^* is an ICS, then \mathcal{A}^{*c} is an ICS.

Proof: Since $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$ is an ICS in X , we have $A^-(x) \leq \mu(x) \leq A^+(x)$ for all $x \in X$. This implies that $1 - A^+(x) \leq 1 - \mu(x) \leq 1 - A^-(x)$. Hence $\mathcal{A}^{*c} = \{ \langle x, A^c(x), 1 - \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ is an ICS in X .

Theorem: 1.17 Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{A} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be a cubic set in X . Also let $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ be a cubic set in X . If \mathcal{A}^* is an ECS, then \mathcal{A}^{*c} is an ECS.

Proof: Since $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$ is an ECS in X , we have $\mu(x) \notin (A^-(x), A^+(x))$ for all $x \in X$. This implies that $1 - \mu(x) \notin (1 - A^+(x), 1 - A^-(x))$. Hence $\mathcal{A}^{*c} = \{ \langle x, A^c(x), 1 - \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ is an ECS in X .

Theorem: 1.18 Let $\mathcal{A}_i = \{ \langle A_i, \lambda_i \rangle \mid i \in \Omega \}$ and $\mathcal{B}_i = \{ \langle B_i, \mu_i \rangle \mid i \in \Omega \}$ be a family of ICSs in X . Also let $\mathcal{A}_i^* = \{ \langle A_i, \mu_i \rangle \mid i \in \Omega \}$ and $\mathcal{B}_i^* = \{ \langle B_i, \lambda_i \rangle \mid i \in \Omega \}$ be a family of ICSs in X . Then the P-union and P-intersection of $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ are ICSs in X .

Proof: Since \mathcal{A}_i and \mathcal{B}_i is an ICS in X . Also \mathcal{A}_i^* and \mathcal{B}_i^* is an ICS in X , we have $A_i^-(x) \leq \mu_i(x) \leq A_i^+(x)$ and $B_i^-(x) \leq \lambda_i(x) \leq B_i^+(x)$ for $i \in \Omega$. This implies that

$$\left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} A_i \right)^-(x) \leq \left(\bigvee_{(i \in \Omega)} \mu_i \right)(x) \leq \left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} A_i \right)^+(x),$$

$$\left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} B_i \right)^-(x) \leq \left(\bigvee_{(i \in \Omega)} \lambda_i \right)(x) \leq \left(\bigcup_{(i \in \Omega)} B_i \right)^+(x),$$

and

$$\left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} A_i \right)^-(x) \leq \left(\bigwedge_{(i \in \Omega)} \mu_i \right)(x) \leq \left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} A_i \right)^+(x),$$

$$\left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} B_i \right)^-(x) \leq \left(\bigwedge_{(i \in \Omega)} \lambda_i \right)(x) \leq \left(\bigcap_{(i \in \Omega)} B_i \right)^+(x),$$

Hence then the P-union and P-intersection of \mathcal{A}^* and \mathcal{B}^* are ICSs in X .

Remark: 1.19 The above theorem is not true for ECS in X with respect to P-union and P-intersection. For instances, let $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ be ECSs in $I = [0,1]$ in which $A(x) = [0.3, 0.5]$, $\lambda(x) = 0.8$, $B(x) = [0.7, 0.9]$ and $\mu(x) = 0.4$ for all $x \in X$.

(1) We know that $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_R \mathcal{B}^* = \{ \langle x, B(x), \lambda(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\lambda(x) \in [B^-(x), B^+(x)]$ for all $x \in X$. Hence $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_R \mathcal{B}^*$ is not an ECS in X.

(2) We know that $\mathcal{A}^* \cap_R \mathcal{B}^* = \{ \langle x, A(x), \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\mu(x) \in [A^-(x), A^+(x)]$ for all $x \in X$. Hence $\mathcal{A}^* \cap_R \mathcal{B}^*$ is not an ECS in X.

The following examples show that R-union and R-intersection of cubic sets need not be ECSs.

Example: 1.20 Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be two ECSs. Also let $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ be two ECSs in $I = [0,1]$ in which $A(x) = [0.3, 0.5]$, $\lambda(x) = 0.4$, $B(x) = [0.7, 0.9]$ and $\mu(x) = 0.8$ for all $x \in X$.

(1) We know that $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_R \mathcal{B}^* = \{ \langle x, B(x), \lambda(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\lambda(x) \notin [B^-(x), B^+(x)]$ for all $x \in X$. Hence $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_R \mathcal{B}^*$ is not an ICS in X.

(2) We know that $\mathcal{A}^* \cap_R \mathcal{B}^* = \{ \langle x, A(x), \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\mu(x) \notin [A^-(x), A^+(x)]$ for all $x \in X$. Hence $\mathcal{A}^* \cap_R \mathcal{B}^*$ is not an ICS in X.

The following theorem provides a condition for the R-union of two ICSs to be an ICS.

Theorem: 1.21 Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be two ICSs in X. Also let $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ be two ICSs in X such that

$$\max\{A^-(x), B^-(x)\} \leq (\mu \wedge \lambda)(x)$$

for all $x \in X$. Then the R-union of \mathcal{A}^* and \mathcal{B}^* is an ICS in X.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be ICSs in X. Also let $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$, be ICSs in X which satisfy the condition.

Then $A^-(x) \leq \mathbb{Q}(x) \leq A^+(x)$ and $B^-(x) \leq \lambda(x) \leq B^+(x)$ which implies that $(\mu \wedge \lambda)(x) \leq (A \cup B)^+(x)$. It follows from the definition of condition that

$$(A \cup B)^-(x) = \max\{A^-(x), B^-(x)\} \leq (\mu \wedge \lambda)(x) \leq (A \cup B)^+(x)$$

So that $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_R \mathcal{B}^* = \{ \langle x, (A \cup B)(x), (\mu \wedge \lambda)(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ is an ICS in X.

The following theorem provide a condition for the R-intersection of two ICSs be an ICS.

Theorem: 1.22 Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be two ICSs in X. Also let $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$, be two ICSs in X such that

$$\min\{A^+(x), B^+(x)\} \geq (\lambda \vee \mu)(x)$$

for all $x \in X$. Then the R-intersection of \mathcal{A}^* and \mathcal{B}^* is an ICS in X.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be two ICSs in X. Also let $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$, be ICSs in X which satisfy the condition.

Then $A^-(x) \leq \mathbb{Q}(x) \leq A^+(x)$ and $B^-(x) \leq \lambda(x) \leq B^+(x)$ which implies that $(\mu \vee \lambda)(x) \leq (A \cap B)^+(x)$. It follows from the definition of condition that

$$(A \cap B)^-(x) = \min\{A^+(x), B^+(x)\} \leq (\mu \vee \lambda)(x) \leq (A \cap B)^+(x)$$

So that $\mathcal{A}^* \cap_R \mathcal{B}^* = \{ \langle x, (A \cap B)(x), (\mu \vee \lambda)(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ is an ICS in X.

The following examples show that R-union of ECSs need not be an ICS.

Example: 1.23 Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be two ECSs. Also let $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ be two ECSs in $I = [0,1]$ in which $A(x) = [0.2, 0.4]$, $\lambda(x) = 0.7$, $B(x) = [0.6, 0.8]$ and $\mu(x) = 0.9$ for all $x \in X$. We know that $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_R \mathcal{B}^* = \{ \langle x, B(x), \lambda(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\lambda(x) \in [B^-(x), B^+(x)]$ for all $x \in I$. Hence $\mathcal{A}^* \cup_R \mathcal{B}^*$ is not an ICS in X.

The following example shows that the R-intersection of ECSs need not be an ECS.

Example: 1.24 Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, \lambda \rangle$ and $\mathcal{B} = \langle B, \mu \rangle$ be two ECSs. Also let $\mathcal{A}^* = \langle A, \mu \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}^* = \langle B, \lambda \rangle$ be two ECSs in $I = [0,1]$ in which $A(x) = [0.2, 0.4]$, $\lambda(x) = 0.1$, $B(x)=[0.6,0.8]$ and $\mu(x)= 0.3$ for all $x \in X$. We know that $\mathcal{A}^* \cap_R \mathcal{B}^* = \{ \langle x, A(x), \mu(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \}$ and $\mu(x) \notin [A^-(x), A^+(x)]$ for all $x \in X$. Hence $\mathcal{A}^* \cap_R \mathcal{B}^*$ is not an ECS in X .

References:

1. V. Chinnadurai, "Fuzzy Ideals in Algebraic Structures "LAP LAMBERT Academaic publishing (2013).
2. L. J. Kohout, W. Bandler, " Fuzzy interval inference utilizing the checklist paradigm" and BK-relational products, in: R. B, Kearfort et, al educations, Application of Interval Computations, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1996, pp.291-335
3. R. Sambuc, "Functions Φ -Flous, Application al'aidu au Diagnostic en Pathologie Thyroidienne", These de Doctorate en Medecine, Marseille, 1975.
4. I. B. Turksen, "Interval-valued fuzzy sets based on normal forms, Fuzzy sets and system" 20 (1986) 191-210.
5. Young Bae Jun, "Chang Su Kim, Ki Oong Yang, Cubic Sets", Annals of Fuzzy Mathematics and Informatics, Volume 4, No.1 (July 2012), pp. 83-98.
6. L. A. Zadeh, "Fuzzy sets", Information Control 8(1965)338-353.