

On the Definition of Fuzzy Relational Galois Connections Between Fuzzy Transitive Digraphs

Inma P. Cabrera¹⁰[,](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5506-6467) Pablo Cordero^{[1](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0117-4219)}⁰, Emilio Muñoz-Velasco¹⁰, Manuel Ojeda-Aciego^{1(\boxtimes)} \Box [,](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6064-6984) and Bernard De Baets^{[2](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3876-620X)} \Box

¹ Departamento Matemática Aplicada, Universidad de Málaga, Málaga, Spain *{*ipcabrera,pcordero,ejmunoz,aciego*}*@uma.es ² KERMIT, Department of Data Analysis and Mathematical Modelling, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium Bernard.DeBaets@UGent.be

Abstract. We continue the study of different generalizations of the notion of Galois connection. Previously, we had focused on the cases in which both the domain and codomain had the structure of either a transitive digraph or a fuzzy transitive digraph. Here, we extend it to the fuzzy relational framework. Specifically, we present a suitable notion of fuzzy relational Galois connection between fuzzy transitive digraphs where both components are now fuzzy relations and the underlying truth value algebra is a complete Heyting algebra. The resulting notion of fuzzy relational Galois connection inherits interesting characterisations of the notion of (crisp) relational Galois connection.

Keywords: Galois connection · Transitive digraph · Fuzzy relation

1 Introduction

The notion of Galois connection [\[17](#page-6-0)] has been playing an important role in both mathematics and computer science [\[7](#page-6-1)] since it was introduced. One of our research lines is focused on the problem of constructing Galois connections: in a nutshell, given a mapping $f: A \to B$ between different structures (for instance, the domain A being a lattice and the codomain B a plain set), one wants to establish necessary and sufficient conditions under which it is possible to equip B with a desired structure and construct a mapping $q: B \to A$ such that the couple (f,g) is a Galois connection. It is important to note that the fact that A and B need not have the same structure rules out the application of Freyd's adjoint functor theorem.

There have been different efforts to extend the notion of Galois connection to the fuzzy setting, and the degrees of freedom that come along with such efforts usually result in different levels of generality, and this is no different for the notion of fuzzy Galois connection $[1,2,8,9,11-16,18]$ $[1,2,8,9,11-16,18]$ $[1,2,8,9,11-16,18]$ $[1,2,8,9,11-16,18]$ $[1,2,8,9,11-16,18]$ $[1,2,8,9,11-16,18]$ $[1,2,8,9,11-16,18]$ $[1,2,8,9,11-16,18]$. In previous works $[3,4]$ $[3,4]$ $[3,4]$

-c Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2022 D. Ciucci et al. (Eds.): IPMU 2022, CCIS 1601, pp. 100–106, 2022. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08971-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08971-8_9)_9

we explored the construction problem mentioned in the previous paragraph in various fuzzy settings, satisfactorily extending the problem to Galois connections between a fuzzy domain A and fuzzy range B . However, the proposed notion still has crisp functions as components, hence not obtaining a truly fuzzy notion of Galois connection.

Our approach to solve this situation is based on considering relations as components of the Galois connection. Recently, we focused on the cases of the domain A having the structure of a transitive digraph [\[5](#page-6-11)] or fuzzy transitive digraph [\[6\]](#page-6-12), studying Galois connections whose left and right components are *crisp* relations satisfying certain reasonable properties expressed in terms of the so-called full powering. In this work, we expound for the first time an adequate notion of *fuzzy relational Galois connection* between fuzzy transitive digraphs, with both components now being *fuzzy* relations. The underlying algebraic setting for the truth values we are working with is that of a complete Heyting algebra. This notion of fuzzy relational Galois connection will be shown to inherit interesting equivalent characterizations of the notion of crisp Galois connection discussed in detail in [\[6\]](#page-6-12).

2 Preliminary Notions

The framework considered in this work is that of L-fuzzy set theory, where $\mathbb L$ is a complete Heyting algebra, which is an algebra $\mathbb{L} = (L, \leq, \perp, \top, \rightarrow)$, where (L, \leq) is a complete lattice, \perp is the bottom element, \top is the top element, and the following adjointness property holds for all $p, q, r \in L$:

$$
p \land q \le r
$$
 if and only if $p \le q \to r$.

An ^L-*fuzzy set* on a universe A (also called ^L-*fuzzy subset* of A) is a mapping $X: A \to \mathbb{L}$ from A to the algebra \mathbb{L} of membership degrees, where $X(a)$ denotes the degree to which element a belongs to X^1 X^1 . A fuzzy set X is said to be *normal* if $X(a) = ⊤$ for some $a ∈ A$. Any element $a ∈ A$ induces a *singleton*, i.e., a fuzzy set $a: A \to \mathbb{L}$ defined by $a(x) = \top$ if $x = a$ and $a(x) = \bot$ otherwise.

An L-*fuzzy relation* between two universes A and B is a mapping $\mu: A \times B \rightarrow$ L, where $\mu(a, b)$ denotes the degree of relationship between the elements a and b. Given a fuzzy relation μ and an element $a \in A$, the *afterset* a^{μ} of a is the fuzzy set a^{μ} : $B \to \mathbb{L}$ defined by $a^{\mu}(b) = \mu(a, b)$. A fuzzy relation μ is said to be *total* if the aftersets a^{μ} are normal, for all $a \in A$.

The composition of an L-fuzzy relation μ between two universes A and B and an L-fuzzy relation ν between B and a universe C is the L-fuzzy relation $\mu \circ \nu$ between A and C defined by

$$
\mu \circ \nu(a,c) = \bigvee_{b \in B} (\mu(a,b) \wedge \nu(b,c)).
$$

An L-fuzzy relation on a universe A is a mapping $\rho: A \times A \to \mathbb{L}$, and is said to be:

¹ For convenience, hereafter, we will always omit the prefix \mathbb{L} .

- *reflexive* if $\rho(a, a) = \top$, for all $a \in A$.
- *transitive* if ρ(a, b) [∧] ρ(b, c) [≤] ρ(a, c), for all a, b, c [∈] A; or, equivalently, $\rho \circ \rho(a, c) \leq \rho(a, c)$, for all $a, c \in A$.

Definition 1. $A = \langle A, \rho \rangle$ *is said to be a fuzzy* T-digraph *if* ρ *is a transitive* fuzzy relation on A *fuzzy relation on* A*.*

In order to extend the definition of a relational Galois connection to the fuzzy framework considered in this paper, we need the notions of antitone and inflationary fuzzy relations between fuzzy T-digraphs.

Definition 2. *Consider two fuzzy T-digraphs* $\langle A, \rho_A \rangle$ and $\langle B, \rho_B \rangle$. *A fuzzy relation u*: $A \times B \to \mathbb{L}$ *is said to be: tion* $\mu: A \times B \to \mathbb{L}$ *is said to be:*

- *–* antitone *if* $\rho_A(a_1, a_2) \land \mu(a_1, b_1) \land \mu(a_2, b_2) \le \rho_B(b_2, b_1)$ *, for all* $a_1, a_2 \in A$
and $b_1, b_2 \in B$ *. and* $b_1, b_2 \in B$.
isotone if $a_4(a)$
- *–* isotone *if* $\rho_A(a_1, a_2) \wedge \mu(a_1, b_1) \wedge \mu(a_2, b_2) \leq \rho_B(b_1, b_2)$ *, for all* $a_1, a_2 \in A$ *and* $b_1, b_2 \in B$ $b_1, b_2 \in B$.

Definition 3. *Let* $\langle A, \rho \rangle$ *be a fuzzy T-digraph. A fuzzy relation* μ : $A \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$
is said to be is said to be:

- *–* inflationary *if* $\mu(a_1, a_2) \leq \rho(a_1, a_2)$, for all $a_1, a_2 \in A$.
- *–* idempotent *if* $\rho(x, y) = \rho(y, x) = \top$, for all $a \in A$, $x \in a^{\mu}$ and $y \in a^{\mu \circ \mu}$.

We recall that in the characterisation of relational Galois connections in the crisp case, a key role was played by the notion of clique [\[5](#page-6-11)]. Not surprisingly, a fuzzy version of this notion will play a similar role here.

Definition 4. Let $\langle A, \rho \rangle$ be a fuzzy T-digraph. A fuzzy set $X: A \to \mathbb{L}$ is called a clique if for all $x, y \in A$ it holds that *a clique if, for all* $x, y \in A$ *, it holds that*

$$
X(x) \wedge X(y) \le \rho(x, y) .
$$

3 Fuzzy Powerings: Extending Relations to Fuzzy Powersets

Given a relation R on a set A, it is possible to lift R to the powerset 2^A by defining the following *powerings*, for all $X, Y \in 2^A$, which correspond to the construction of the Hoare, Smyth and full powersets, respectively:

$$
X R_H Y \iff (\forall x \in X)(\exists y \in Y)(xRy)
$$

\n
$$
X R_S Y \iff (\forall y \in Y)(\exists x \in X)(xRy)
$$

\n
$$
X R_\infty Y \iff (\forall x \in X)(\forall y \in Y)(xRy).
$$

Note that if R is reflexive and transitive, then the two first relations defined above are actually preorder relations, specifically those used in the construction of the, respectively, Hoare and Smyth powerdomains; the third one need not be either reflexive nor transitive, and was introduced as a convenient tool to develop relational Galois connections. Nevertheless, it satisfies the following weakened version of transitivity:

if
$$
X R_{\infty} Y
$$
, and $Y R_{\infty} Z$, where $Y \neq \emptyset$, then $X R_{\infty} Z$. (1)

Furthermore, it is worth noting that the powerings can be defined for any relation not necessarily being a preorder.

The adaptation of these powerings to the present fuzzy framework is explained next [\[10](#page-6-13)].

Definition 5. *Consider a fuzzy T-digraph* $\langle A, \rho \rangle$. We define the Hoare, Smyth and full fuzzy powerings as follows for any X Y · $A \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$. *and full fuzzy powerings as follows, for any* $X, Y: A \to \mathbb{L}$:

(i)
$$
\rho_H(X, Y) = \bigwedge_{x \in A} \left(X(x) \to \bigvee_{y \in A} (Y(y) \land \rho(x, y)) \right);
$$

\n(ii) $\rho_S(X, Y) = \bigwedge_{y \in A} \left(Y(y) \to \bigvee_{x \in A} (X(x) \land \rho(x, y)) \right);$
\n(iii) $\rho_{\infty}(X, Y) = \bigwedge \bigwedge (X(x) \land Y(y) \to \rho(x, y)).$

$$
(iii) \ \rho_{\infty}(X,Y) = \bigwedge_{x \in A} \bigwedge_{y \in A} (X(x) \land Y(y)) -
$$

As in the crisp case, both Hoare and Smyth powerings are reflexive and transitive fuzzy relations on L^A whenever ρ is. Once again, full fuzzy powering is somehow transitive in the same sense as in (1) .

Lemma 1. *Consider a fuzzy T-digraph* $\langle A, \rho \rangle$ *and fuzzy sets* $X, Y, Z \colon A \to \mathbb{L}$.
If Y *is normal then* ρ $(X, Y) \wedge \rho$ $(X, Z) \leq \rho$ (X, Z) *If* Y *is normal, then* $\rho_{\alpha}(X, Y) \wedge \rho_{\alpha}(Y, Z) \leq \rho_{\alpha}(X, Z)$ *.*

In the particular case of *singletons* in the first argument of the fuzzy powerings, the expressions in the above definitions are greatly simplified. Indeed, for all $a \in A$, it holds:

(i)
$$
\rho_H(a, Y) = \bigvee_{y \in A} (Y(y) \wedge \rho(a, y));
$$

\n(ii) $\rho_S(a, Y) = \rho_\infty(a, Y) = \bigwedge_{y \in A} (Y(y) \to \rho(a, y)).$

Notice that cliques can be characterized in terms of this relations: a fuzzy set $X: A \to \mathbb{L}$ is called a clique if $\rho_{\alpha}(X, X) = \top$.

The following lemma establishes the relationship between the fuzzy powerings defined above.

Lemma 2. *Consider a fuzzy T-digraph* $\langle A, \rho \rangle$, *a fuzzy set* $X : A \to \mathbb{L}$ *and* $a \in A$ *.*

(i) If X *is a normal fuzzy set, then*

$$
\rho_S(a, X) = \rho_{\infty}(a, X) \le \rho_H(a, X).
$$

(ii) If X *is a clique, then*

$$
\rho_H(a, X) \le \rho_S(a, X) = \rho_\infty(a, X).
$$

Finally, notions of antitone/isotone fuzzy relations, inflationarity and idempotency can be stated in terms of the full fuzzy powering \propto .

Consider two fuzzy T-digraphs $\langle A, \rho_A \rangle$ and $\langle B, \rho_B \rangle$. A fuzzy relation $\mu \colon A \times \mathbb{R}$ is said to be: $B \to \mathbb{L}$ is said to be:

– *antitone* if $ρ_A(a_1, a_2) ≤ ρ_{B\infty}(a_2^{\mu}, a_1^{\mu})$, for all $a_1, a_2 ∈ A$ and $b_1, b_2 ∈ B$.
 \rightarrow *isotone* if $ρ_A(a_1, a_2) ≤ ρ_{B\infty}(a_1^{\mu}, a_1^{\mu})$ for all $a_1, a_2 ∈ A$ and $b_1, b_2 ∈ B$.

– isotone if $ρ_A(a_1, a_2)$ ≤ $ρ_{B_{\infty}}(a_1^{\mu}, a_2^{\mu})$, for all $a_1, a_2 \in A$ and $b_1, b_2 \in B$.

Let $\langle A, \rho \rangle$ be a fuzzy T-digraph. A fuzzy relation $\mu \colon A \times A \to \mathbb{L}$ is said to be:

- *inflationary* if $\rho_{\alpha}(a, a^{\mu}) = \top$, for all *a* ∈ *A*.
- *idempotent* if $\rho_{\infty}(a^{\mu \circ \mu}, a^{\mu}) = \top$ and $\rho_{\infty}(a^{\mu}, a^{\mu \circ \mu}) = \top$, for all $a \in A$.

4 Fuzzy Relational Galois Connections Between Fuzzy T-Digraphs

The next definition follows the classical approach of Galois connection instantiated on fuzzy transitive digraphs.

Definition 6. *Consider two fuzzy T-digraphs* $\langle A, \rho_A \rangle$ and $\langle B, \rho_B \rangle$ and two total $f_{\mu \nu \nu \nu}$ relations $\mu \cdot A \times B \to \mathbb{I}$, and $\nu \cdot B \times A \to \mathbb{I}$. We say that the counle (μ, ν) *fuzzy relations* $\mu: A \times B \to \mathbb{L}$ *and* $\nu: B \times A \to \mathbb{L}$ *. We say that the couple* (μ, ν) *is a* fuzzy relational Galois connection *if both* μ *and* ν *are antitone and both* μ◦ν *and* $\nu \circ \mu$ *are inflationary.*

This definition is usually followed by a characterization in terms of the socalled Galois condition. We explore if it remains valid on this framework.

Definition 7. *Consider two fuzzy T-digraphs* $\langle A, \rho_A \rangle$ and $\langle B, \rho_B \rangle$ and two total $f_{1/2721}$ relations $\mu: A \times B \to \mathbb{I}$, and $\mu: B \times A \to \mathbb{I}$. We say that the counle (μ, μ) *fuzzy relations* $\mu: A \times B \to \mathbb{L}$ *and* $\nu: B \times A \to \mathbb{L}$ *. We say that the couple* (μ, ν) *satisfies the* fuzzy Galois condition *if the following holds for all* $a_1, a_2 \in A$ *and* $b_1, b_2 \in B$ *:*

(i) $\rho_A(a_1, a_2) \wedge \mu(a_1, b_1) \wedge \nu(b_2, a_2) \leq \rho_B(b_2, b_1)$; *(ii)* $\rho_B(b_2, b_1) \wedge \mu(a_1, b_1) \wedge \nu(b_2, a_2) \leq \rho_A(a_1, a_2)$;

or, equivalently, for all $a \in A$ *and* $b \in B$ *:*

(i) $\rho_{AH}(a, b^{\nu}) \leq \rho_{BS}(b, a^{\mu})$;

(ii) $\rho_{B,H}(b, a^{\mu}) \leq \rho_{A,S}(a, b^{\nu}).$

The following example shows that the fuzzy Galois condition is not sufficient to ensure that a couple of fuzzy relations is a fuzzy relational Galois connection.

Example 1. Consider the fuzzy T-digraphs $\mathbb{A} = \langle \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}, \rho_A \rangle$ and $\mathbb{B} = \langle \{b_1, b_2, b_3\}, \rho_B \rangle$ and the fuzzy relations $\mu : A \times B \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\mu : B \times A \rightarrow [0, 1]$ $\langle \{b_1, b_2, b_3\}, \rho_B \rangle$, and the fuzzy relations $\mu : A \times B \to [0, 1]$ and $\nu : B \times A \to [0, 1]$
defined below: defined below:

It is routine to check that (μ, ν) satisfies the fuzzy Galois condition, although it is not a fuzzy relational Galois connection, since $\mu \circ \nu$ is not inflationary. Indeed, for instance. $(\mu \circ \nu)(a_1, a_4) = 0.5 \nless \rho_A(a_1, a_4) = 0$. for instance, $(\mu \circ \nu)(a_1, a_4) = 0.5 \nleq \rho_A(a_1, a_4) = 0.$

As said above, we need to add the clique condition to the aftersets in order to get the desired characterization.

Theorem 1. *Consider two fuzzy T-digraphs* $\langle A, \rho_A \rangle$ and $\langle B, \rho_B \rangle$ and two total
fuzzy relations $\mu: A \times B \to \mathbb{L}$ and $\mu: B \times A \to \mathbb{L}$. The counte (μ, μ) is a fuzzy rela*fuzzy relations* $\mu: A \times B \to \mathbb{L}$ *and* $\nu: B \times A \to \mathbb{L}$ *. The couple* (μ, ν) *is a fuzzy relational Galois connection between* $\langle A, \rho_A \rangle$ and $\langle B, \rho_B \rangle$ *if and only if the following conditions hold*. *conditions hold:*

- *(i)* (μ, ν) *satisfies the fuzzy Galois condition*;
- *(ii)* a^{μ} *and* b^{ν} *are cliques, for all* $a \in A$ *and* $b \in B$ *.*

Now, by using Lemma [2,](#page-3-1) we can give the previous result in terms of the full powering where the fuzzy Galois condition can be expressed as an equality.

Corollary 1. *Consider two fuzzy T-digraphs* $\langle A, \rho_A \rangle$ and $\langle B, \rho_B \rangle$ and two total f_{uzzu} relations $u: A \times B \to \mathbb{I}$, and $u: B \times A \to \mathbb{I}$. The counte (u, u) is a fuzzy relations *fuzzy relations* $\mu: A \times B \to \mathbb{L}$ *and* $\nu: B \times A \to \mathbb{L}$ *. The couple* (μ, ν) *is a fuzzy relational Galois connection between* $\langle A, \rho_A \rangle$ and $\langle B, \rho_B \rangle$ *if and only if the following*
conditions hold for all $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. *conditions hold, for all* $a \in A$ *and* $b \in B$ *:*

(i) $\rho_{A_{\infty}}(a, b^{\nu}) = \rho_{B_{\infty}}(b, a^{\mu});$ *(ii)* a^{μ} *and* b^{ν} *are cliques.*

5 Conclusions and Future Works

A new generalization of the notion of Galois connection has been introduced. Building upon previous approaches, we have given a suitable notion of *fuzzy* relational Galois connection between fuzzy transitive digraphs where both components are fuzzy relations and the underlying truth values belong to a complete Heyting algebra. The resulting notion inherits interesting properties of the notion of crisp relational Galois connection.

As immediate future work, working with this definition, we will focus on the characterisation of existence and the construction of the right adjoint to a mapping from a fuzzy T-digraph to an unstructured set.

Acknowledgements. Partially supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation, and Universities (MCIU), State Agency of Research (AEI), Junta de Andalucía (JA), Universidad de Málaga (UMA) and European Regional Development Fund (FEDER) through the projects PGC2018-095869-B-I00 and TIN2017-89023-P (MCIU/AEI/FEDER), and UMA2018-FEDERJA-001 (JA/UMA/FEDER).

References

- 1. Bˇelohl´avek, R.: Fuzzy Galois connections. Math. Log. Q. **45**(4), 497–504 (1999)
- 2. Bělohlávek, R., Osička, P.: Triadic fuzzy Galois connections as ordinary connections. Fuzzy Sets Syst. **249**, 83–99 (2014)
- 3. Cabrera, I., Cordero, P., Garcia-Pardo, F., Ojeda-Aciego, M., De Baets, B.: On the construction of adjunctions between a fuzzy preposet and an unstructured set. Fuzzy Sets Syst. **320**, 81–92 (2017)
- 4. Cabrera, I., Cordero, P., Garcia-Pardo, F., Ojeda-Aciego, M., De Baets, B.: Galois connections between a fuzzy preordered structure and a general fuzzy structure. IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst. **26**(3), 1274–1287 (2018)
- 5. Cabrera, I., Cordero, P., Muñoz-Velasco, E., Ojeda-Aciego, M., De Baets, B.: Relational Galois connections between transitive digraphs: characterization and construction. Inf. Sci. **519**, 439–450 (2020)
- 6. Cabrera, I., Cordero, P., Muñoz-Velasco, E., Ojeda-Aciego, M., De Baets, B.: Relational Galois connections between transitive fuzzy digraphs. Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **43**(9), 5673–5680 (2020)
- 7. Denecke, K., Ern´e, M., Wismath, S.L.: Galois Connections and Applications, vol. 565. Springer, Dordrecht (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-1898-5>
- 8. Djouadi, Y., Prade, H.: Interval-valued fuzzy Galois connections: Aaebraic requirements and concept lattice construction. Fund. Inform. **99**(2), 169–186 (2010)
- 9. Frascella, A.: Fuzzy Galois connections under weak conditions. Fuzzy Sets Syst. **172**(1), 33–50 (2011)
- 10. Georgescu, G.: Fuzzy power structures. Arch. Math. Logic **47**(3), 233–261 (2008)
- 11. Georgescu, G., Popescu, A.: Non-commutative fuzzy Galois connections. Soft. Comput. **7**(7), 458–467 (2003)
- 12. Georgescu, G., Popescu, A.: Non-commutative fuzzy structures and pairs of weak negations. Fuzzy Sets Syst. **143**(1), 129–155 (2004)
- 13. Gutiérrez-García, J., Lai, H., Shen, L.: Fuzzy Galois connections on fuzzy sets. Fuzzy Sets Syst. **352**, 26–55 (2018)
- 14. Gutiérrez-García, J., Mardones-Pérez, I., de Prada-Vicente, M., Zhang, D.: Fuzzy Galois connections categorically. Math. Logic Q. **56**(2), 131–147 (2010)
- 15. Konecny, J.: Isotone fuzzy Galois connections with hedges. Inf. Sci. **181**, 1804–1817 (2011)
- 16. Oh, J.-M., Kim, Y.-C.: Fuzzy Galois connections on Alexandrov L-topologies. J. Intell. Fuzzy Syst. **40**(1), 251–270 (2021)
- 17. Ore, Ø.: Galois connexions. Trans. AMS **55**, 493–513 (1944)
- 18. Yao, W., Lu, L.-X.: Fuzzy Galois connections on fuzzy posets. Math. Log. Q. **55**(1), 105–112 (2009)