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#### Abstract

In this note, we show by examples that Theorem 5.3, partial proof of Theorem 5.3', Lemma 5.4 and Remark 5.2 in [1] contain slight flaws and then provide the correct versions.
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1. Theorem 5.3. on Page 850 is incorrect. The following example shows that this theorem does not hold in general.

Example 1. Let $U=\{a, b, c\}$, a fuzzy relation $R$ on $U$ is given as follows:

| $R$ | $a$ | $b$ | $c$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $a$ | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| $b$ | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| $c$ | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.7 |

$A=\{(a, 0.4),(b, 0.8),(c, 0.3)\}, \quad \mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}_{L}, \quad$ and $\quad \mathcal{I}=\mathcal{I}_{L}$.
It is easy to see that $R$ is symmetric and $\mathcal{T}$-transitive. By the definitions of $\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}, \overline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}}, \underline{R}$ and $\bar{R}$, we have $\underline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}}(A)(a)=1, \underline{R}(A)(a)=0.9, \overline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}}(A)(c)=0.1$ and $\bar{R}(A)(c)=0.4$. Thus, $\underline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}} \neq \underline{R}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}} \neq \bar{R}$.

Theorem 1 (The correction of Theorem 5.3). If $R \in F(U \times U)$ is symmetric and $\mathcal{T}$-transitive, then $\underline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}} \supseteq \underline{R}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}} \subseteq \bar{R}^{\mathcal{T}}$.
Proof. For any $A \in F(U), x \in U$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{R}^{\prime \prime}(A)(x) & =\wedge_{y \in U} \mathcal{I}\left(R(y, x), \wedge_{z \in U} \mathcal{I}(R(y, z), A(z))\right)=\wedge_{z \in U} \wedge_{y \in U} \mathcal{I}(R(y, x), \mathcal{I}(R(y, z), A(z)))=\wedge_{z \in U} \mathcal{I}\left(\vee_{y \in U} \mathcal{T}(R(y, x), R(y, z)), A(z)\right) \\
& =\wedge_{z \in U} \mathcal{I}\left(\vee_{y \in U} \mathcal{T}(R(x, y), R(y, z)), A(z)\right) \geqslant \wedge_{z \in U} \mathcal{I}(R(x, z), A(z))=\underline{R}(A)(x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

[^0]Thus $\underline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}}(A) \supseteq \underline{R}(A)$ for any $A \in F(U)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}} & (A)(x)
\end{aligned}=\vee_{y \in U} \mathcal{T}\left(R(y, x), \vee_{z \in U} \mathcal{T}(R(y, z), A(z))\right)=\vee_{z \in U} \vee_{y \in U} \mathcal{T}(R(y, x), \mathcal{T}(R(y, z), A(z))), ~=\vee_{z \in U} \mathcal{T}\left(\vee_{y \in U} \mathcal{T}(R(y, x), R(y, z)), A(z)\right)=\vee_{z \in U} \mathcal{T}\left(\vee_{y \in U} \mathcal{T}(R(x, y), R(y, z)), A(z)\right) \leqslant \vee_{z \in U} \mathcal{T}(R(x, z), A(z))=\bar{R}(A)(x) .
$$

Thus $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}}(A) \subseteq \bar{R}(A)$ for any $A \in F(U)$.
2. Conditions in Lemma 5.4 on Page 851 are not equivalent. A counterexample is shown as follows:

Example 2. Let $U=\{a, b\}$. A fuzzy relation $R$ on $U$ is given as follows:

| $R$ | $a$ | $b$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $a$ | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| $b$ | 0.3 | 0.1 |

$\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}_{M}$ and $\mathcal{I}=\mathcal{I}_{G}$. By the definitions of $\underline{R}$ and $\bar{R}$, we obtain $\underline{R}\left(1_{a}\right)(a)=\underline{R}\left(1_{b}\right)(b)=0$, however, $R$ is not symmetric.
Theorem 2 (The correction of Lemma 5.4). The following statements are equivalent:
(1) $R$ is symmetric.
(2) $\bar{R}\left(1_{x}\right)(y)=\bar{R}\left(1_{y}\right)(x), \quad \forall x, y \in U$.
(3) $\underline{R}\left(1_{x} \Rightarrow_{I} \hat{\alpha}\right)(y)=\underline{R}\left(1_{y} \Rightarrow_{I} \hat{\alpha}\right)(x), \quad \forall x, y \in U, \quad \forall \alpha \in[0,1]$.

Proof. It directly follows from Theorems 4.2 (3) and 4.7 of [2].
3. Proof of Theorem 5.3' on Page 851 should be modified as follows.

Suppose that $\underline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}}=\underline{R}$. For any $x, y \in U$, from Theorem 4.6 (7) of [1], we have

$$
\underline{R}\left(1_{x} \rightarrow_{I} \hat{\alpha}\right)(\bar{y})=\underline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}}\left(1_{x} \rightarrow_{I} \hat{\alpha}\right)(y)=\underline{\mathcal{C}_{R}^{\prime \prime}}\left(1_{y} \rightarrow_{I} \hat{\alpha}\right)(x)=\underline{R}\left(1_{y} \rightarrow_{I} \hat{\alpha}\right)(x) .
$$

By Theorem 4.7 of [2], we can conclude that $R$ is symmetric.
4. In Section 4.3 on Page 849 , Li et al. gave the following assertion that $\operatorname{co}_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\underline{\mathcal{C}_{R R}^{\prime}}(A)\right)=\overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}(\cos (A))$, $\operatorname{co}_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}(A)\right)=\underline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}\left(\cos _{\mathcal{N}}(A)\right)$ and $\cos _{\mathcal{N}}\left(\underline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime \prime}}(A)\right)=\overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime \prime}}\left(c_{\mathcal{N}}(A)\right)$.

In fact, the above three equalities do not hold in general. A counterexample is as follows:
Example 3. Let $U=\{a, b, c\}, K_{1}=\{(a, 0.4),(b, 1),(c, 0.3)\}, K_{2}=\{(a, 1),(b, 0.4),(c, 0.8)\}$,

$$
K_{3}=\{(a, 0.1),(b, 0.7),(c, 1)\}, \quad \text { and } \quad A=\{(a, 0.8),(b, 0),(c, 0.5)\} .
$$

(1) In the definitions of $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}, \overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}, \underline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime \prime}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime \prime}}, \mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}_{M}, \mathcal{I}=\mathcal{I}_{G}$, by calculating, we have $\operatorname{co} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\underline{\mathcal{C}_{f R}^{\prime}}(A)\right)(c)=1$, $\left.\overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}(\cos (A))(c)=0.4, \cos _{\mathcal{N}} \overline{\left(\underline{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{N}}^{\prime \prime}}\right.}(A)\right)(c)=1$ and $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime \prime}}\left(\cos _{\mathcal{N}}(A)\right)(c)=0.7$.
(2) In the definitions of $\underline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}, \mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}_{L}, \mathcal{I}=\mathcal{I}_{L}$, by calculating, we have $\cos _{\mathcal{N}}\left(\overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}(A)\right)(c)=0.5$ and $\underline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}\left(\operatorname{co}_{\mathcal{N}}(A)\right)(c)=0$.

The correct relationships are given in the next theorem.
Theorem 3. Let $(U, \mathcal{C})$ be a generalized fuzzy approximation space. If $\mathcal{I}$ is an $R$-implicator based on a continuous $t$-norm $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ is a negator induced by $\mathcal{I}$, then

$$
\forall A \in I F(U), \quad \operatorname{co} \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\underline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}(A)\right) \supseteq \overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}\left(\operatorname{co}_{\mathcal{N}}(A)\right), \quad \operatorname{co}\left(\overline{\mathcal{N}}\left(\overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}(A)\right) \supseteq \underline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}\left(\operatorname{co}_{\mathcal{N}}(A)\right), \quad \operatorname{co} \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\underline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime \prime}}(A)\right) \supseteq \overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime \prime}}\left(\operatorname{co}_{\mathcal{N}}(A)\right) .\right.
$$

Proof. For any $A \in I F(U), x \in U$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}\left(\cos _{\mathcal{N}}(A)\right)(x) & =\wedge_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{I}\left(C(x), \vee_{y \in U} \mathcal{T}\left(C(y),\left(\operatorname{co}_{\mathcal{N}}(A)\right)(y)\right)\right)=\wedge_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{I}\left(C(x), \vee_{y \in U} \mathcal{I}\left(C(y), \mathcal{I}\left(A(y), 0_{L}\right)\right)\right) \\
& \leqslant \wedge_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{I}\left(C(x), \vee_{y \in U} \mathcal{I}\left(\mathcal{I}(C(y), A(y)), 0_{L}\right)\right) \leqslant \wedge_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{I}\left(C(x), \mathcal{I}\left(\wedge_{y \in U} \mathcal{I}(C(y), A(y)), 0_{L}\right)\right) \\
& =\wedge_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{I}\left(\mathcal{T}\left(C(x), \wedge_{y \in U} \mathcal{I}(C(y), A(y))\right), 0_{L}\right)=\mathcal{I}\left(\vee_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{T}\left(C(x), \wedge_{y \in U} \mathcal{I}(C(y), A(y))\right), 0_{L}\right) \\
& =\mathcal{N}\left(\vee_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{T}\left(C(x), \wedge_{y \in U} \mathcal{I}(C(y), A(y))\right)\right)=\left(\cos _{\mathcal{N}}\left(\underline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}(A)\right)\right)(x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we can conclude that $\operatorname{co}_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\underline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}(A)\right) \supseteq \overline{\mathcal{C}_{F R}^{\prime}}\left(\cos _{\mathcal{N}}(A)\right)$. In the same way, the other relations can be proved.
5. Based on the correct theorems, Remark 5.2 on Page 852 must be changed accordingly.
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