

Some Properties Concerning the Quasi-inverse of a t -norm

Dionís Boixader

Sec. Matemàtiques i Inf., E.T.S. Arquitectura del Vallès
Univ. Politècnica de Catalunya. Sant Cugat del Vallès. Barcelona
e-mail: dionis.boixader@ea.upc.es

Abstract

Some properties of the quasi-inverse operators are presented. They are basic tools in order to reduce complex expressions involving several of such operators. An effective calculation for the quasi-inverse of a continuous t -norm is also provided.

1 Introduction.

The aim of this paper is to provide the reader with a set of elementary properties, which are useful tools in order to reduce complex expressions where a t -norm and its associated quasi-inverse appear several times.

Some of the results presented here are not new and they can be found disseminated in the literature, mainly under two different forms: as specific properties concerning a restrictive class of t -norms, (even a particular t -norm like $T = \text{Min}$, $T = \text{L}...$) or into the setting of more general logic and algebraic structures (mainly GL-Monoids and MV-Algebras [3]).

The properties are arranged into three different classes depending on the continuity of the chosen t -norm: the general case –arbitrarily t -norms–, left continuous t -norms and continuous t -norms.

Let us recall some elementary concepts.

Definition 1.1. *A t -norm is an operation $T : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which is associative, commutative, non-decreasing in both variables and that satisfies $T(1, x) = x$, $T(0, x) = 0$ for any $x \in [0, 1]$.*

Definition 1.2. *Given a t -norm T , its quasi-inverse \hat{T} is defined by*

$$\hat{T}(x|y) = \sup\{\alpha \in [0, 1] / T(\alpha, x) \leq y\}, \quad \text{for any } x, y \in [0, 1].$$

Definition 1.3. Given a t-norm T , its symmetrized quasi-inverse E_T is defined by $E_T(x, y) = \text{Min}\{\hat{T}(x|y), \hat{T}(y|x)\} = \hat{T}(\text{Max}\{x, y\} | \text{Min}\{x, y\})$ for any $x, y \in [0, 1]$.

In the same way that, in the setting of fuzzy logic, T can be interpreted as an extension of the classical $(\{0, 1\})$ conjunction \wedge to the whole unit interval, \hat{T} can be viewed as the residuated implication associated to T , and it is very common to note $\hat{T}(x|y)$ by $x \xrightarrow{T} y$ and $E_T(x, y)$ by $x \xleftrightarrow{T} y$ (the natural equivalence). However, care is needed when dealing with arbitrarily chosen t-norms, because, in this case, $\hat{T}(x|y)$ could not define neither an implication function [5] nor a T-preorder [6], which are the most common ways to generalize the classical implication to the fuzzy framework. In the same way, $E_T(x, y)$ could not define a fuzzy equivalence relation (T-indistinguishability, similarity,...). As we will see later, the left-continuity of the t-norm T is needed in order to ensure that \hat{T} accomplishes with these basic structures.

Examples of t-norms and its associated quasi-inverses are:

- (1) $T(x, y) = \text{Min}\{x, y\}$, and $\hat{T}(x|y) = \begin{cases} \text{Min}\{x, y\}, & \text{if } x \geq y, \\ 1, & \text{in other case.} \end{cases}$
- (2) $T(x, y) = \text{L}(x, y) = \text{Max}\{x + y - 1, 0\}$, (The Lukasiewicz t-norm), and $\hat{T}(x|y) = \begin{cases} 1 - x + y & \text{if } x \geq y, \\ 1 & \text{in other case.} \end{cases}$
- (3) $T(x, y) = x \cdot y$ and $\hat{T}(x|y) = \begin{cases} y/x & \text{if } x \geq y \\ 1 & \text{in other case.} \end{cases}$
- (4) $T(x, y) = Z(x, y) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } y = 1 \\ y & \text{if } x = 1 \\ 0 & \text{in other case} \end{cases}$ and $\hat{T}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x < 1 \\ y & \text{if } x = 1. \end{cases}$

Definition 1.4. A continuous t-norm T is archimedean if $T(x, x) < x$ for any $x \in (0, 1)$.

Definition 1.5. An archimedean t-norm is strict if $T^n(x) > 0$ for any $x \in (0, 1]$ and for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Note. $T^n(x)$ is defined in a recurrent way by $T^1(x) = x$,

$$T^n(x) = T(x, T^{n-1}(x)), \quad n \geq 1.$$

Next, representation theorem characterizes the archimedean t-norms.

Theorem 1.6. (Ling). T is an archimedean t-norm if, and only if, there exists a continuous decreasing function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$, such that $f(1) = 0$ and $T(x, y) = f^{[-1]}(f(x) + f(y))$.

Usually f is termed the additive generator of T , and $f^{[-1]}$ denotes the pseudo-inverse of f , defined by

$$f^{[-1]}(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x < 0 \\ f^{-1}(x), & \text{if } x \in [0, f(0)] \\ 0, & \text{in other case} \end{cases}$$

and T is strict if, and only if, $f(0) = +\infty$.

In a more general way, we have:

Theorem 1.7. *T is a continuous t-norm if, and only if, there exists a family $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i \in I}$ of disjoint intervals of $[0, 1]$, and $f_i : [a_i, b_i] \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$, such that $f_i(b_i) = 0$, and*

$$T(x, y) = \begin{cases} f_i^{[-1]}(f_i(x) + f_i(y)) & \text{if } (x, y) \in (a_i, b_i) \times (a_i, b_i) \\ \min\{x, y\} & \text{in other case.} \end{cases}$$

Here, $f_i^{[-1]}$ is defined by

$$f_i^{[-1]}(x) = \begin{cases} b_i & \text{if } x \leq 0 \\ f_i^{-1}(x) & \text{if } x \in [0, f_i(a_i)] \\ a_i & \text{in other case.} \end{cases}$$

Note that $T = \text{Min}$ is obtained when $I = \emptyset$, and archimedean t-norms when $I = \{i_0\}$ and $(a_{i_0}, b_{i_0}) = (0, 1)$. In any other case, we say that T is an ordinal sum.

A proof of theorem 1.7 as well as further reading on these topics can be found in [4].

2 Basic properties

Let us start with the most general case, in which no hypothesis about the continuity of the t-norm T is assumed.

Proposition 2.1. *Let T be a t-norm. For any $x, y, z \in [0, 1]$, we have:*

- a) If $x \leq y$ then $\hat{T}(x|y) = 1$.
- b) If $T(x, z) \leq y$ then $\hat{T}(x|y) \geq z$.
- c) If $T \leq T'$ then $\hat{T} \geq \hat{T}'$
- d) $\hat{T}(x|T(x, y)) \geq y$
- e) If $T(\hat{T}(x|y), x) \geq y$ then $x \geq y$
- f) $T(x, y) \geq \text{Inf}\{\alpha / \hat{T}(x|\alpha) \geq y\}$

Proof. Evident. ■

Proposition 2.2. *Let T be a t-norm. For any $x, y, z \in [0, 1]$, we have:*

$$\hat{T}(T(x, z)|T(y, z)) \geq \hat{T}(x|y).$$

Proof. It is sufficient to show that $A_1 \subseteq A_2$ being $A_1 = \{\alpha \in [0, 1] / T(\alpha, x) \geq y\}$ and $A_2 = \{\alpha \in [0, 1] / T(\alpha, T(x, z)) \leq T(y, z)\}$. ■

The concept of right (or left) continuity is applied only to functions depending on a single variable, and it does not make sense in the case of several variables. However, we will say that a function $F(x, y)$ is right (or left) continuous with respect to the variable x (resp. y) if $F(x, y_0)$ is right (or left) continuous for any fixed $y_0 \in [0, 1]$ (resp. $F(x_0, y)$ for any fixed $x_0 \in [0, 1]$).

Obviously, since a t-norm is a commutative operation, $T(x, y)$ is right (or left) continuous with respect to the variable x if, and only if, it is right (or left) continuous with respect to the variable y . We will refer to these t-norms as right (or left) continuous (without any reference to the variables).

Proposition 2.3. *For any t-norm T , its quasi-inverse $\hat{T}(x|y)$ is a non-decreasing and right continuous function with respect to the variable y .*

Proof. If $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq [0, 1]$ is decreasing and such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = y$, we can consider for any $x \in [0, 1]$, $A_n = \{\alpha \in [0, 1] / T(\alpha, x) \leq y_n\}$, and $A = \{\alpha \in [0, 1] / T(\alpha, x) \leq y\}$. It is evident that $A = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$, and the $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{T}(x|y_n) = \hat{T}(x|y)$. ■

3 Quasi-inverses of left continuous t-norms

Left continuity plays a crucial role in order to relate the quasi-inverse with logical and algebraic structures. In this case, $([0, 1], \leq, T)$ is a GL-monoid where its residuated structure is given by \hat{T} [3].

In this section we prove some relevant properties such as proposition 3.4.a and Theorem 3.2.c –they ensure that $\hat{T}(x|y)$ defines an implication function and that it accomplishes with multivalued Modus Ponens [2], [5]–, and theorem 3.2.b (T-transitivity) which relates \hat{T} and E_T with T-preorders and T-indistinguishabilities [6].

Proposition 3.1. *If T is a left continuous t-norm, then $\hat{T}(x|y)$ is a non increasing and left continuous function with respect to x .*

Proof. Analogous to Proposition 2.3. ■

Theorem 3.2. *For any t-norm T , these are equivalent statements:*

- a) T is left continuous.
- b) $T(\hat{T}(x|y), \hat{T}(y|z)) \leq \hat{T}(x|z)$ (T -transitivity)
- c) $T(x, \hat{T}(x|y)) \leq y$ (*Modus Ponens*)
- d) $T(x, y) \leq z$ if, and only if, $x \leq \hat{T}(y|z)$
- e) $\text{Inf}\{\alpha \in [0, 1] / \hat{T}(x|\alpha) \geq y\} = T(x, y)$.

Proof. It is straightforward showing that (a) \Rightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (c) \Rightarrow (d) \Rightarrow (a), (d) \Rightarrow (e) and (e) \Rightarrow (c). ■

Theorem 3.2.e. has an interesting meaning from a structural point of view. It establishes that the map that sends each t-norm T to its quasi-inverse is an injective one when only left continuous t-norms are considered [2]. This is not true for arbitrarily t-norms, as it is shown in next example.

Example 3.3. Let us consider T_1 and T_2 t-norms defined by:

$$T_1(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } (x, y) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \times [0, \frac{1}{2}] \\ \text{Min}\{x, y\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$T_2(x, y) = \begin{cases} T_1(x, y), & \text{if } (x, y) \neq (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \\ \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } (x, y) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}). \end{cases}$$

Obviously, $\hat{T}_1 = \hat{T}_2$ and $T_1 \neq T_2$. ■

Proposition 3.4. Let T be a left-continuous t-norm. For any $x, y, z \in [0, 1]$ we have:

- a) $\hat{T}(x | \hat{T}(y|z)) = \hat{T}(y | \hat{T}(x|z)) = \hat{T}(T(x, y)|z)$
- b) $T(x, \hat{T}(y|z)) \leq \hat{T}(y | T(x, z))$
- c) $\hat{T}(\hat{T}(z|x) | \hat{T}(z|y)) \geq \hat{T}(x|y)$
- d) $\hat{T}(\hat{T}(y|z) | \hat{T}(x|z)) \geq \hat{T}(x|y)$
- e) $\hat{T}(\hat{T}(x|y)(z) \geq T(x, \hat{T}(y|z))$.

Proof.

- (a) From Theorem 3.2 it is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \{\alpha \in [0, 1] / T(\alpha, x) \leq \hat{T}(y|z)\} &= \{\alpha \in [0, 1] / T(\alpha, y) \leq \hat{T}(x|z)\} = \\ &= \{\alpha \in [0, 1] / T(\alpha, T(x, y)) \leq z\}, \end{aligned}$$

and (a) is obtained by taking the suprema of this set.

(b) Let us consider $A = \{\alpha \in [0, 1] / T(\alpha, y) \leq z\}$

$$\begin{aligned} T\left(T(x, \hat{T}(y|z)), y\right) &= T(T(x, \sup A), y) = \\ &= \sup_{\alpha \in A} T(x, T(\alpha, y)) \leq T(x, z), \end{aligned}$$

so

$$T(x, \hat{T}(y, z)) \leq \hat{T}(y|T(x, z)).$$

(c) and (d) are elementary consequences of Theorem 3.2.b.

(e) From theorem 3.2.c it follows

$$T\left(T(x, \hat{T}(y|z)), \hat{T}(x|y)\right) = T\left(x, T(\hat{T}(x|y), \hat{T}(y|z))\right) \leq T(x, \hat{T}(x|z)) \leq z. \blacksquare$$

Any property in proposition 3.4 gives sufficient condition in order to ensure the left continuity of T : the t-norm $T = Z$, that clearly is not left continuous satisfies all them.

Proposition 3.5. $\hat{T}(x|y) = \sup\{\alpha \in [0, 1] / \hat{T}(\alpha|y) \geq x\}$ for any left continuous t-norm T .

Proof. It is evident since $\{\alpha \in [0, 1] / T(\alpha, x) \leq y\} = \{\alpha \in [0, 1] / \hat{T}(\alpha|y) \geq x\}$ (Theorem 3.2.d). \blacksquare

Proposition 3.5 does not characterize left continuous t-norms, as it is shown in next example.

Example 3.6. Let us consider T_1 and T_2 the t-norms defined in Example 3.3.

T_1 is a left continuous t-norm, and T_2 is not. Clearly $\hat{T}_1 = \hat{T}_2$, since both \hat{T}_1 and \hat{T}_2 satisfy $\hat{T}(x|y) = \sup\{\alpha \in [0, 1] / \hat{T}(\alpha|y) \geq x\}$.

Next corollary can be obtained by applying Proposition 3.4.a,c and d recurrently.

Corollary 3.5. Given a left continuous t-norm. For any $x, y, z, x_1, \dots, x_n, z_1, \dots, z_n \in [0, 1]$ we have:

$$(a) \hat{T}\left(x_1|\hat{T}(x_2|\dots|\hat{T}(x_{n-1}|x_n))\dots\right) = \hat{T}(T(\dots T(x_1, x_2), \dots, x_{n-1})|x_n), n \geq 4$$

$$(b) \hat{T}\left(\hat{T}(\dots\hat{T}(x|z_1)|\dots|z_n)|\hat{T}(\hat{T}(\dots\hat{T}(y|z_1)|\dots|z_n))\right) \geq \begin{cases} \hat{T}(x|y) & \text{if } n = 2m \\ \hat{T}(y|x) & \text{if } n = 2m + 1 \end{cases}$$

$$(c) \hat{T}\left(\hat{T}(\dots\hat{T}(x_1|x_2)|\dots)|x_n\right) \geq \begin{cases} T\left(\dots T(\hat{T}(x_1|x_2), \hat{T}(x_3|x_4), \dots), \hat{T}(x_{n-1}|x_n)\right) & \text{if } n = 2m \\ T\left(\dots T(x_1, \hat{T}(x_2|x_3))\dots, \hat{T}(x_{n-1}|x_n)\right) & \text{if } n = 2m + 1, (m \geq 2). \end{cases}$$

4 Quasi-inverses of continuous t-norms

Let us recall that any continuous t-norm T is either archimedean, $T = \text{Min}$ or an ordinal sum (Theorem 1.7). From an algebraic point of view, it is worth noting that, if T is a non strict archimedean t-norm, then $([0, 1], \leq, T)$ is a MV-algebra.

Proposition 4.1. *If T is an archimedean t-norm with additive generator f , then $\hat{T}(x|y) = f^{[-1]}(f(y) - f(x))$, for any $x, y \in [0, 1]$.*

Proof. [6]. ■

Next theorem provides us with an effective way to calculate the quasi-inverse of any continuous t-norm.

Theorem 4.2. *A function $F : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the quasi-inverse of a continuous t-norm T (i.e. $F = \hat{T}$) if, and only if, there exists a family $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i \in I}$ of disjoint intervals of $[0, 1]$, and a family of continuous and decreasing functions $f_i : [a_i, b_i] \rightarrow [0, f_i(a_i)]$ such that $f_i(b_i) = 0$ satisfying*

$$F(x|y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \leq y \\ f^{[-1]}(f_i(y) - f_i(x)), & \text{if } (x, y) \in [a_i, b_i] \times [a_i, b_i] \\ y & \text{in any other case.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. It is a consequence of Theorem 1.7. ■

Note that, in this case, T is the ordinal sum associated to $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i \in I}$ and to $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$.

Under the hypothesis of continuity for the t-norm T , there are some inequalities in Section 3 that become equalities.

Corollary 4.3. *Given a continuous t-norm T , for any $x, y, z \in [0, 1]$ such that $z \leq y \leq x$, we have:*

$$(a) \quad T\left(\hat{T}(x|y), \hat{T}(y|z)\right) = \hat{T}(x|z)$$

$$(b) \quad \hat{T}\left(\hat{T}(x|y) \mid \hat{T}(x|z)\right) = \hat{T}(y|z).$$

Proof. It can be easily obtained from Theorem 4.2 by considering four different cases, namely: $x, y, z \in (a_i, b_i)$ for some $i \in I$; $y, z \in (a_i, b_i)$ but $x \notin (a_i, b_i)$; $x, y \in (a_i, b_i)$ but $z \notin (a_i, b_i)$; any other case.

It is worth noting that $\hat{T}\left(\hat{T}(y|z) \mid \hat{T}(x|z)\right) \geq \hat{T}(y|z)$, but the equality does not hold ($T = \text{Min}$ is an easy counterexample).

By applying Corollary 4.3 recurrently, we obtain:

Corollary 4.4. *Given a continuous t-norm T , for any x, z, y_1, \dots, y_n such that $z \leq y_1 \leq \dots \leq y_n \leq x$ have:*

$$T\left(\hat{T}(x|y_n), \hat{T}(y_n|y_{n-1}), \dots, \hat{T}(y_1|z)\right) = \hat{T}(x|z).$$

Corollary 4.5. *Given a continuous t-norm T , for any $x_1, \dots, x_n, y, z \in [0, 1]$ such that $z \leq y \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n$, we have:*

$$\hat{T} \left(\hat{T}(\dots|x_1), \dots, x_n | y \mid \hat{T}(\dots|x_1) \dots x_n | z \right) = \hat{T}(y|z).$$

Proposition 4.4. (*Modus Ponens*) *If T is a continuous t-norm and $x, y \in [0, 1]$, then $T(x, \hat{T}(x|y)) = y$ if, and only if, $x \geq y$.*

Proof. [6]. ■

Proposition 4.5. *Let T be a continuous t-norm, and $A \subseteq [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ the set containing all points (x, y) where $\hat{T}(x|y)$ is a continuous function. We have:*

- (a) *If $A = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$, then T is a non strict archimedean t-norm.*
- (b) *If $A = [0, 1] \times (0, 1]$, then T is a strict archimedean t-norm.*
- (c) *In any other case, T is an ordinal sum or $T = \text{Min}$.*

Proof. It is a consequence of Theorem 4.2. ■

References

1. Alsina, C., Trillas, E., Valverde, L. (1983). On Some Logical Connectives for Fuzzy Sets Theory. *J. Math. Anal. and Appl.* 93, 15-26.
2. Godo, L., *Contribució a l'estudi de models d'inferència en els sistemes possibilístics*. Ph. D. Thesis. Univ. Politècnica de Catalunya. 1990.
3. Klawoon, F., Castro, J.L. (1995) Similarity in Fuzzy Reasoning, *Mathware & Soft Computing* 2, 197-228.
4. Schweizer, B., Sklar, A. (1983). *Probabilistic Metric Spaces*. North Holland.
5. Trillas, E., Valverde, L. (1984). On implication and indistinguishability in the setting of fuzzy logic. J. Kacprzyk and R.R. Yager, Eds. *Management Decision Support System Using Fuzzy Sets and Possibility Theory*. Verlag TUV. Rheinland, 198-212.
6. Valverde, L. (1982). *Contribució a l'estudi dels models matemàtics per a lògiques multivalents*. Ph. D. Thesis. Univ. Politècnica de Catalunya.