

Pseudo triangular norms on bounded trellises

Abdelkrim Mehenni*

LA3C Laboratory, Mathematics Faculty, Department of Algebra and Number Theory, University of Science and Technology Houari Boumediene, Bp 32, Bab Ezzouar, Algiers, Algeria

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce the notion of pseudo-triangular norm (pseudo-t-norm, for short) as a classes of weakly associative operations on trellises and as a generalization of triangular norm (t-norm, for short) on bounded trellises and we investigate their various properties and present some constructions of pseudo-t-norms on bounded trellises. Also, we study the T-distributivity on bounded trellises. Moreover, we show the relationship among pseudo-t-norms and isomorphisms on bounded trellises, which are more complicated in absence of the property of (transitivity) associativity of the trellis meet and join operations.

Keywords: Binary operation, trellis, t-norm, pseudo-t-norm, T-distributive.

1. Introduction

Binary operations play an important role in many of the technological tasks scientists are faced with nowadays. They are specifically important in many problems related to the fusion of information. More generally, binary operations are widely used in pure mathematics (e.g., group theory, monoids theory) (see, e.g., [5, 14, 15]). Binary operations have become essential tools in the unit interval and lattices and its applications, several notions and properties (see, e.g., [17, 21]).

Triangular norms (t-norms) (as specific binary operations) were introduced by Karl Menger [8] with the goal of constructing metric spaces using probabilistic distributions (and therefore values in the interval $[0, 1]$), instead of using real numbers, to describe the distance between two elements. Besides, the original proposal is very weak even including triangular conorms (t-conorms). However, only with the work of Berthold Schweizer and Abe Sklar in [18] gave an axiomatic for t-norms as they are used today.

*Corresponding author

Email address: amehenni1@usthb.dz (Abdelkrim Mehenni)

Also, they play an important role in theories of fuzzy sets and fuzzy logic [1] as they generalize the basic connectives between fuzzy sets. Thus, the main characteristic of the binary operations is that they are used in a large number of areas and disciplines.

In [3, 4] they were generalized the notion of t-norm on bounded partially ordered sets, which is a more general structure than bounded lattice. In [16] it was considered an extension of t-norm for bounded lattice which coincides with the one given by [4] and [3].

In 1970, E. Fried [7] introduced the notions of pseudo-ordered sets and trellises (also called weakly associative lattices or WA-lattices). Trellises are generalization of lattices by considering sets with a reflexive and antisymmetric order, but not necessarily transitive. In 1971, H. X. Skala [19] investigated some properties of this notion and provide some examples in particular classes of trellis and the notion of the trellis itself can be interpreted in terms of binary operations on it (see, e.g., [8, 21]).

The aim of the present paper is to introduce the notion of a pseudo-triangular norm (pseudo-t-norm, for short) and a pseudo-triangular conorm (pseudo-t-conorm, for short) on a bounded trellis as a generalization of triangular norm and triangular conorm on a bounded lattice and bounded trellis (see, e.g., [3, 4, 6, 13, 2, 10, 22]), and we investigate their fundamental properties and some constructions of pseudo-t-norms (resp. pseudo-t-conorms). More specifically, we show necessary and sufficient conditions under which a given binary operation on a trellis coincides with its meet- and its join-operation. Moreover, we characterize pseudo-t-norms (resp. pseudo-t-conorms) on bounded trellises with respect to the F -distributivity. Furthermore, we study the relationship among pseudo-t-norms and isomorphisms on a bounded trellises.

This paper is organized as follows. We briefly recall some basic concepts in Section 2. In section 3, we introduce the notion of pseudo-t-norm and pseudo-t-conorm on bounded trellises and investigate their properties. In section 4, we construct some elements, some constructions and showing necessary and sufficient conditions under which a given binary operation (resp. pseudo-t-norm and pseudo-t-conorm) on a trellis (resp. bounded trellis) coincide with its meet- and its join-operation. In section 5, we introduce the notion of T-distributivity for any pseudo-t-norm (resp. pseudo-t-conorm) on bounded trellises and characterize some properties. In section 6, we show that any isomorphism act on pseudo-t-norms generating also a new pseudo-t-norms on bounded trellises. Finally, we present some conclusions and discuss future research in Section 7.

2. Basic concepts

This section serves an introductory purpose. First, we recall some definitions and properties related to pseudo-ordered sets and trellises. Second, we present some specific elements of a trellis that will be needed throughout this paper.

2.1. Pseudo-ordered sets and trellises

In this subsection, we recall the notions of pseudo-ordered sets and trellises; more information can be found in [7, 19, 20]. A *pseudo-order (relation)* \trianglelefteq on a set X is a binary relation on X that is reflexive (i.e., $x \trianglelefteq x$, for any $x \in X$) and antisymmetric (i.e., $x \trianglelefteq y$ and $y \trianglelefteq x$ implies $x = y$, for any $x, y \in X$). A set X equipped with a pseudo-order relation \trianglelefteq is called a *pseudo-ordered set (psoset, for short)* and denoted by (X, \trianglelefteq) . For any two elements $a, b \in X$, if $a \trianglelefteq b$ and $a \neq b$, then we write $a \triangleleft b$; if $a \trianglelefteq b$ does not hold, then we also write $a \not\trianglelefteq b$. Similarly as for partially ordered sets, a finite pseudo-ordered set can be represented by a *Hasse-type diagram* with the following difference: if x and y are not related, while in a partially ordered set this would be implied by transitivity, then x and y are joined by a dashed curve.

Example 2.1. Consider the pseudo-order relation \trianglelefteq on $X = \{a, b, c, d, e, f\}$ represented by the Hasse-type diagram in Fig. 1. Here, $b \trianglelefteq d$, $c \trianglelefteq d$, $d \trianglelefteq e$, while $b \not\trianglelefteq e$ and $c \trianglelefteq e$.




Figure 1: Hasse-type diagram of (X, \trianglelefteq) .

The notions of *minimal/maximal element*, *smallest/greatest element*, *lower/upper bound*, *greatest lower bound* (or *infimum*), *least upper bound* (or *supremum*) for psosets are defined in the same way as the corresponding notions for partially ordered sets. For a subset A of a psoset (X, \trianglelefteq) , the antisymmetry of the pseudo-order implies that if A has an infimum (resp. supremum), then it is unique, and is denoted by $\bigwedge A$ (resp. $\bigvee A$). If $A = \{a, b\}$, then we write $a \wedge b$ (called *meet*) instead of $\bigwedge \{a, b\}$ and $a \vee b$ (called *join*) instead of $\bigvee \{a, b\}$.

Definition 2.1. [20] Let (X, \trianglelefteq) be a psoset. For $x, y \in X$, we write $x \lesssim y$ if there exists a finite sequence (x_1, \dots, x_n) such that $x \trianglelefteq x_1 \trianglelefteq \dots \trianglelefteq x_n \trianglelefteq y$.

Note that the relation \lesssim is a pre-order relation, i.e., it is reflexive and transitive, but not necessarily antisymmetric. If for any $x, y \in X$, it holds that $x \lesssim y$ or $y \lesssim x$, then (X, \trianglelefteq) is called a *pseudo-chain*.

Definition 2.2. [9] A \wedge -semi-trellis (resp. \vee -semi-trellis) is a psoset (X, \trianglelefteq) such that $x \wedge y$ (resp. $x \vee y$) exists for all $x, y \in X$.

Definition 2.3. [19] A *trellis* is a poset that is both a \wedge -semi-trellis and a \vee -semi-trellis. In other words, a trellis is an algebra (X, \wedge, \vee) , where X is a nonempty set with the binary operations \wedge and \vee satisfying the following properties, for any $a, b, c \in X$:

- (i) $a \vee b = b \vee a$ and $a \wedge b = b \wedge a$ (*commutativity*);
- (ii) $a \vee (b \wedge a) = a = a \wedge (b \vee a)$ (*absorption*);
- (iii) $a \vee ((a \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge c)) = a = a \wedge ((a \vee b) \wedge (a \vee c))$ (*part-preservation*).

Theorem 2.1. [19] A set X with two commutative, absorptive, and part-preserving operations \wedge and \vee is a trellis if $a \preceq b$ is defined as $a \wedge b = a$ and/or $a \vee b = b$. The operations are also idempotent (i.e., $x \wedge x = x \vee x = x$, for any $x \in X$).

Remark 2.1. One can observe that the difference between the notions of a lattice and a trellis is that the operations \wedge and \vee are not required to be associative in the case of a trellis.

A *bounded trellis* is a trellis $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ that additionally has a smallest element denoted by 0 and a greatest element denoted by 1 satisfying $0 \preceq x \preceq 1$, for any $x \in X$. For a bounded trellis, the notation $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ is used. Also, a trellis $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ is called *complete* if every subset of X has an infimum and a supremum.

Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ and $(Y, \sqsubseteq, \sqcap, \sqcup)$ be two trellises. A mapping $\varphi : X \rightarrow Y$ is called a *homomorphism*, if it satisfies $\varphi(x \wedge y) = \varphi(x) \sqcap \varphi(y)$ and $\varphi(x \vee y) = \varphi(x) \sqcup \varphi(y)$, for any $x, y \in X$. An *isomorphism* is a bijective homomorphism.

Definition 2.4. [9] Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a trellis and $A \subseteq X$. Then

- (i) A is called a *sub-trellis* of X if $x \wedge y \in A$ and $x \vee y \in A$, for any $x, y \in A$;
- (ii) A is called a *sub-lattice* of X if is a sub-trellis and \preceq is transitive on A .

Theorem 2.2. [20] Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a trellis. The following statements are equivalent:

- (i) \preceq is transitive;
- (ii) the meet \wedge and the join \vee operations are associative;
- (iii) one of the operations meet \wedge or join \vee is associative.

Definition 2.5. [20] A trellis $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ is said to be *modular*, if $x \preceq z$ implies that $x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge z$, for any $y \in X$.

We will also use the following results.

Proposition 2.1. [19] Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a modular trellis and $x, y, z \in X$. If $x \preceq y \preceq z$, then $x \wedge z \preceq y \preceq x \vee z$.

Proposition 2.2. [19] Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded modular trellis. If $x \preceq z$ and $x \vee y = 1$, then $x \wedge y \preceq z$, for any $x, y, z \in X$.

2.2. Specific elements in a trellis

In this subsection, we present some specific elements in a trellis that will play an important role in this paper.

Definition 2.6. [20] Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a trellis. An element $\alpha \in X$ is called:

- (i) *right-transitive*, if $\alpha \preceq x \preceq y$ implies $\alpha \preceq y$, for any $x, y \in X$;
- (ii) *left-transitive*, if $x \preceq y \preceq \alpha$ implies $x \preceq \alpha$, for any $x, y \in X$;
- (iii) *middle-transitive*, if $x \preceq \alpha \preceq y$ implies $x \preceq y$, for any $x, y \in X$;
- (iv) *transitive*, if it is right-, left- and middle-transitive.

Definition 2.7. [20] Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a trellis.

- (i) A 3-tuple $(x, y, z) \in X^3$ is called \wedge -*associative* (resp. \vee -*associative*), if $(x \wedge y) \wedge z = x \wedge (y \wedge z)$ (resp. $(x \vee y) \vee z = x \vee (y \vee z)$);
- (ii) An element $\alpha \in X$ is called \wedge -*associative* (resp. \vee -*associative*), if any 3-tuple in X including α is \wedge -associative (resp. \vee -associative);
- (iii) An element $\alpha \in X$ is called *associative* if it is both \wedge - and \vee -associative.

Note that for the different notions of associative element $\alpha \in X$, due to the commutativity of the meet and the join operations it is sufficient to consider only 3-tuples of the type (α, x, y) .

The following results show the links between the above notions.

Proposition 2.3. [20] *Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a trellis. Any \wedge -associative or \vee -associative element is transitive, but the converse does not hold.*

Theorem 2.3. [20] *Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a pseudo-chain or a modular trellis. Then it holds that an element is associative if and only if it is transitive.*

3. Pseudo-triangular norms on a bounded trellis

This section is devoted to introduce the notions of pseudo-triangular norm on a bounded trellis and to investigate their various properties and to present some interesting examples in bounded trellises. These notions are inspired from triangular norms and triangular conorms on bounded lattices and bounded trellises (see, e.g., [3, 4, 12, 13, 22]). Also, we provide a construction to obtain new pseudo-t-norms on bounded trellises. In particular, we give necessary and sufficient conditions under which a pseudo-t-norm on a bounded trellis coincides with its meet (\wedge) operation.

3.1. Binary operations on trellises

In this subsection, we present some basic definitions and properties of binary operations on a poset or trellis. Some of them are adopted from the corresponding notions on a poset or lattice (see, e.g., [8, 11, 21]). A binary operation F on a poset (X, \preceq) is called:

- (i) *commutative*, if $F(x, y) = F(y, x)$, for any $x, y \in X$;
- (ii) *associative*, if $F(x, F(y, z)) = F(F(x, y), z)$, for any $x, y, z \in X$;
- (iii) *idempotent*, if $F(x, x) = x$, for any $x \in X$;
- (iv) *increasing*, if $x \preceq y$ implies $F(x, z) \preceq F(y, z)$, for any $z \in X$.

An element $e \in X$ is called a *neutral element* of F , if $F(e, x) = F(x, e) = x$, for any $x \in X$.

A binary operation F on a trellis $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ is called:

- (i) *conjunctive*, if $F(x, y) \preceq x \wedge y$, for any $x, y \in X$;
- (ii) *disjunctive*, if $x \vee y \preceq F(x, y)$, for any $x, y \in X$.

Remark 3.1. Consider a trellis $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$. Then the meet \wedge (resp. join \vee) is conjunctive (resp. disjunctive).

Notation 3.1. [22] Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a trellis. We denote by:

- (i) X^{tr} : the set of all transitive elements of X ;
- (ii) $X^{\wedge\text{-ass}}$: the set of all \wedge -associative elements of X ;
- (iii) $X^{\vee\text{-ass}}$: the set of all \vee -associative elements of X ;
- (iv) X^{ass} : the set of all associative elements of X ;
- (v) X^{dis} : the set of all distributive elements of X .

Notation 3.2. Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a trellis, $A \in X$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$, for any $n \geq 1$. If $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \cap A \neq \emptyset$, then we said that $[x_1, \dots, x_n] \in A$.

The following proposition is immediate.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a trellis. Then it holds that*

- (i) $x \preceq y$ implies $x \wedge z \preceq y \wedge z$ and $z \wedge x \preceq z \wedge y$, for any $([x, y] \in X^{\text{tr}}$ and $z \in X)$;
- (ii) $x \preceq y$ implies $x \vee z \preceq y \vee z$ and $z \vee x \preceq z \vee y$, for any $([x, y] \in X^{\text{tr}}$ and $z \in X)$;

- (iii) $(x \wedge y) \wedge z = x \wedge (y \wedge z)$, for any $([x, y, z] \in X^{\wedge-ass}$ or $[x, y, z] \in X^{\wedge-ass}$);
- (iv) $(x \vee y) \vee z = x \vee (y \vee z)$, for any $([x, y, z] \in X^{\wedge-ass}$ or $[x, y, z] \in X^{\vee-ass}$).

Next, we extend the increasingness and associativity properties of the meet and the join operations on bounded trellises and leads the following definition.

Definition 3.1. Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a trellis and F a binary operation on X .

- (i) F is called weakly-increasing if it satisfies:

$$x \preceq y \Rightarrow F(x, z) \preceq F(y, z), \text{ for any } ([x, y] \in X^{\text{tr}} \text{ and } z \in X);$$

- (ii) F is weakly-associative if it satisfies:

$$F(x, F(y, z)) = F(F(x, y), z), \text{ for any } ([x, y, z] \in X^{\wedge-ass} \text{ or } [x, y, z] \in X^{\vee-ass}).$$

Next, we illustrate the previous definition weakly-increasing and weakly-associative operations on a bounded trellis.

Example 3.1. Let $(X = \{0, a, b, c, 1\}, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a trellis given by the Hasse diagram in Figure 2 and F, G two binary operations defined by the following tables:

$F(x, y)$	0	a	b	c	1
0	a	a	b	c	1
a	b	b	c	c	1
b	b	b	c	c	1
c	c	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1

$G(x, y)$	0	a	b	c	1
0	0	0	0	0	0
a	0	a	b	c	1
b	0	a	c	c	1
c	0	0	1	b	c
1	0	a	c	c	1

One easily verifies that F is weakly-increasing and G is weakly-associative.




Figure 2: Hasse diagram of the trellis $(X = \{0, a, b, c, 1\}, \preceq)$.

3.2. Triangular norms on bounded trellises

In this subsection, we introduce the notion of triangular norm and on a bounded trellis and we present some illustrative examples.

Definition 3.2. [22] Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis. A binary operation $T : X^2 \rightarrow X$ is called a triangular norm (t-norm, for short), if it is commutative, increasing, associative and has 1 as neutral element, i.e., $T(1, x) = x$, for any $x \in X$.

Analogously, we define a triangular conorm on a bounded trellis.

Definition 3.3. [22] Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis. A binary operation $S : X^2 \rightarrow X$ is called a pseudo-triangular conorm (pseudo-t-conorm, for short), if it is commutative, increasing, associative and has 0 as neutral element, i.e., $S(0, x) = x$, for any $x \in X$.

Example 3.2. Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis and T_D a binary operation defined on X as follow:

$$T_D(x, y) = \begin{cases} x \wedge y & \text{if } x = 1 \text{ or } y = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and } S_D(x, y) = \begin{cases} x \vee y & \text{if } x = 0 \text{ or } y = 0, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

One easily verifies that T_D is the smallest t-norm and S_D is the greatest t-conorm on X .

Example 3.3. Let $(X = \{0, a, b, c, 1\}, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a bounded trellis given by the Hasse-type diagram in Figure 2 and T a binary operation defined by the following table:

$T(x, y)$	0	a	b	c	1
0	0	0	0	0	0
a	0	0	0	0	a
b	0	0	b	b	b
c	0	0	b	c	c
1	0	a	b	c	1

One easily verifies that T is a t-norm on X such that $T_D \triangleleft T$.

Example 3.4. [22] Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis such that for any $i \in Coatom(X)$ and $j \in Atom(X)$, the binary operations T_i and S_j defined as:

$$T_i(x, y) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } (x, y) = (i, i), \\ T_D(x, y) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

is a t-norm on X . Moreover, $T_D \triangleleft T_i$.

Notation 3.3. Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a bounded trellis. We denote by:

- (i) $\mathcal{AO}_1(X)$: the class (or the set) of all t-norms on X ;
- (ii) $\mathcal{AO}_0(X)$: the class (or the set) of all t-conorms on X .

Remark 3.2. In a bounded trellis $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ which has not a structure of a bounded lattice, there is not exist any idempotent t-norm on X .

3.3. Pseudo-triangular norms on bounded trellises

In this subsection, we introduce the notions of pseudo-triangular norms on bounded trellises and present some illustrative examples.

Problem 3.1. Remark 3.2 leads to research a new pseudo triangular norms on bounded trellises as t-norms on bounded lattices including the meet operation of bounded trellises. In particular, an idempotent pseudo triangular norms on bounded trellises. Moreover, the pseudo triangular norms on bounded trellises extends triangular norms on bounded lattices.

Definition 3.4. Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis. A binary operation $T : X^2 \rightarrow X$ is called a pseudo-triangular norm (pseudo-t-norm, for short), if it is commutative, weakly-increasing, weakly-associative and has 1 as neutral element, i.e., $T(1, x) = x$, for any $x \in X$.

Analogously, we define a pseudo-triangular conorm on a bounded trellis.

Definition 3.5. Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis. A binary operation $S : X^2 \rightarrow X$ is called a pseudo-triangular conorm (pseudo-t-conorm, for short), if it is commutative, weakly-increasing, weakly-associative and has 0 as neutral element, i.e., $S(0, x) = x$, for any $x \in X$.

Next, we give some examples of pseudo-t-norms and pseudo-t-conorms bounded trellises.

Example 3.5. Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a bounded trellis. It holds that

- (i) \wedge is a pseudo-t-norm on X ;
- (ii) \vee is a pseudo-t-conorm on X ;
- (iii) The binary operations T_D (resp. S_D) defined in Example 3.2 is a pseudo-t-norm (resp. pseudo-t-conorm).

Notation 3.4. Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a bounded trellis. We denote by:

- (i) $\mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$: the class (or the set) of all pseudo-t-norms on X ;

(ii) $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_0(X)$: the class (or the set) of all pseudo-t-conorms on X .

Remark 3.3. (i) $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$ (resp. $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_0(X)$) extends the class of all t-norms (resp. the class of all t-conorms) on the bounded trellis X .

(ii) In general, one can easily observe that $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_e(X) \subseteq \mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_e(X)$, for any $e \in \{0, 1\}$.

3.4. Properties of pseudo-triangular norms on bounded trellises

In this subsection, we investigate some properties of $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$ and $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_0(X)$.

The following Proposition shows the duality between the two classes $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$ and $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_0(X)$. We recall that for a given bounded trellis $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$, its dual bounded trellis is defined as $(X^*, \preceq^*, \wedge^*, \vee^*, 0^*, 1^*)$, where $X^* = X$, $x \preceq^* y$ if and only if $y \preceq x$, $0^* = 1$ and $1^* = 0$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis and F a binary operation on X . Then the following implications hold:*

- (i) *If $F \in \mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$, then $F \in \mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_0(X^*)$;*
- (ii) *If $F \in \mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_0(X)$, then $F \in \mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_1(X^*)$.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

Proposition 3.3. *Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis. The following implications hold:*

- (i) *Any element of $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$ is conjunctive;*
- (ii) *Any element of $\mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_0(X)$ is disjunctive.*

Proof. (i) Let $T \in \mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$ and $x, y \in X$. Since $1 \in X^{tr}$ and T is weakly-increasing and commutative, it follows that $T(x, y) \preceq T(1, y)$ and $T(x, y) \preceq T(x, 1)$. The fact that 1 is the neutral element of T implies that $T(x, y) \preceq y$ and $T(x, y) \preceq x$. Thus, $T(x, y) \preceq x \wedge y$. Therefore, T is conjunctive.

(ii) The proof is dual to that of (i). □

Proposition 3.4. *Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis and F a binary operation on X . Then the following implications hold:*

- (i) *If $F \in \mathcal{W}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$, then $F(x, 0) = 0$, for any $x \in X$;*

(ii) If $F \in \mathcal{WAO}_0(X)$, then $F(x, 1) = 1$, for any $x \in X$.

Proof.

(i) Suppose that $F \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$ and $x \in X$. Since $1 \in X^{tr}$, $x \trianglelefteq 1$ and F is weakly-increasing, it follows that $F(x, 0) \trianglelefteq F(1, 0) = 0$. Thus, $F(x, 0) = 0$, for any $x \in X$.

(ii) The proof is dual to that of (i).

□

Remark 3.4. If the cardinal of X is greater than 1 (i.e., $|X| > 1$), then

$$\mathcal{WAO}_0(X) \cap \mathcal{WAO}_1(X) = \emptyset.$$

3.5. Psoiset structures of $\mathcal{WAO}_0(X)$ and $\mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$

In this subsection, we discuss the bounded psoiset structures of $\mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$ and $\mathcal{WAO}_0(X)$.

For any $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{WAO}_e(X)$, we define:

$$F_1 \trianglelefteq_{\mathcal{WAO}} F_2 \text{ if and only if } F_1(x, y) \trianglelefteq F_2(x, y), \text{ for any } x, y \in X.$$

The following result is a natural generalization to that of triangular norms in the trellis setting[22].

Proposition 3.5. *Let $(X, \trianglelefteq_X, \wedge_X, \vee_X, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis. Then it holds that:*

- (i) $T_D \trianglelefteq_{\mathcal{WAO}} F \trianglelefteq_{\mathcal{WAO}} \wedge$, for any $F \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$;
- (ii) $\vee \trianglelefteq_{\mathcal{WAO}} F \trianglelefteq_{\mathcal{WAO}} S_D$, for any $F \in \mathcal{WAO}_0(X)$.

Proof. (i) On the one hand, Proposition 3.3 guarantees that $F \trianglelefteq_{\mathcal{WAO}} \wedge$, for any $F \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$. On the other hand, $T_D(x, y) = 0 \trianglelefteq T(x, y)$, for any $(x, y) \in (X \setminus \{1\})^2$. If $x = 1$ (resp. $y = 1$), it holds that $T_D(1, y) = y = F(1, y)$ (resp. $T_D(x, 1) = x = F(x, 1)$). Hence, $T_D(x, y) \trianglelefteq F(x, y)$, for any $x, y \in X$. Thus, $T_D \trianglelefteq_{\mathcal{WAO}} F \trianglelefteq_{\mathcal{WAO}} \wedge$, for any $F \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$.

(ii) The proof is dual to that of (i).

□

In a bounded Trellis $(X, \preceq_X, \wedge_X, \vee_X, 0, 1)$, the structures $(\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_1(X), \preceq_{\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}}, T_D, \wedge)$ and $(\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_0(X), \preceq_{\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}}, \vee, S_D)$ are bounded psosets.

Remark 3.5. The bounded psosets $(\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_1(X), \preceq_{\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}}, T_D, \wedge)$ and $(\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_0(X), \preceq_{\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}}, \vee, S_D)$ are not necessary bounded trellises, since the meet (resp. the join) of any two elements is not necessary an element of $\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$ or $\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_0(X)$.

The following proposition shows a case when an element of $\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$ (resp. an element of $\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_0(X)$) coincides with the meet (resp. the join) operation. It is particular case of the weaker types of increasing binary operations on a bounded trellis that coincide with the meet (resp. the join) operation.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a bounded trellis and F a binary operation on X . The following statements hold:*

- (i) *If $F \in \mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$, idempotent and satisfying $F(x \wedge y, x \wedge y) \preceq F(x, y)$, for any $x, y \in X$, then F is the meet (\wedge) operation of X ;*
- (ii) *If $F \in \mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_0(X)$, idempotent and satisfying $F(x, y) \preceq F(x \vee y, x \vee y)$, for any $x, y \in X$, then F is the join (\vee) operation of X .*

Proof. (i) On the one hand, since $F \in \mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$ which means that F is conjunctive, it holds that $F(x, y) \preceq x \wedge y$, for any $x, y \in X$. On the other hand, the fact that F is idempotent and satisfying $F(x \wedge y, x \wedge y) \preceq F(x, y)$, for any $x, y \in X$ implies that $x \wedge y = F(x \wedge y, x \wedge y) \preceq F(x, y)$. Thus, F is the meet operation (\wedge) of X .

(ii) The proof is dual to that of (i).

□

Remark 3.6. The converse of the above Proposition 3.6 is immediate.

4. Constructions of some elements of $\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_0(X)$ and $\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$

In this section, we construct some elements of $\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_1(X)$ and $\mathcal{WA}\mathcal{O}_0(X)$ on bounded trellises.

Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis and $e \in X$. Let T_e and S_e two binary operations on X defined as follows:

$$T_e(x, y) = \begin{cases} x \wedge y & \text{if } x = 1 \text{ or } y = 1; \\ (x \wedge y) \wedge e & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

and

$$S_e(x, y) = \begin{cases} x \vee y & \text{if } x = 0 \text{ or } y = 0; \\ (x \vee y) \vee e & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 4.1. In general, T_e (resp. S_e) is not necessarily an element of $\mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$ (resp. $\mathcal{WAO}_0(X)$). Indeed, let $(X = \{0, a, b, c, d, e, f, 1\}, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis given by the Hasse diagram in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Hasse diagram of the trellis $(X = \{0, a, b, c, d, e, f, 1\}, \preceq)$.

Sitting $x = f$ and $y = d$, then $x \preceq y$ and $(x, y) \in (X^{tr})^2$. Since $T_e(f, c) = (f \wedge c) \wedge e = a \not\preceq T_e(d, c) = (d \wedge c) \wedge e = 0$, it follows that T_e is not weakly-increasing. Therefore, $T_e \notin \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$.

In view of remark 4.1, we give sufficient conditions under which the binary operation T_e is an element of $\mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis. The following implications hold:*

- (i) *If $e \in X^{\wedge-ass}$, then $T_e \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$;*
- (ii) *If $e \in X^{\vee-ass}$, then $S_e \in \mathcal{WAO}_0(X)$.*

Proof. We only give the proof of (i), as the proof of (ii) is similar. One easily verifies that T_e is commutative and satisfies the boundary condition. Now, let $(x, y) \in X \times X^{tr}$ such that $x \preceq y$ and $z \in X$. Then we discuss the following two possible cases:

- (i) If $z = 1$, then $T_e(x, z) = x \leq y = T_e(y, z)$.
- (ii) If $z \neq 1$, then we have three possible cases:
 - (i) If $x = 1$, then $y = 1$ and $T_e(x, z) = z \leq z = T_e(y, z)$.
 - (ii) If $x \neq 1$ and $y = 1$, then the fact that $e \in X^{\wedge-ass}$ implies that $T_e(x, z) = (x \wedge z) \wedge e = (x \wedge e) \wedge z \leq z = T_e(y, z)$. Thus, $T_e(x, z) \leq T_e(y, z)$.
 - (iii) If $y \neq 1$, then $T_e(x, z) = (x \wedge z) \wedge e$ and $T_e(y, z) = (y \wedge z) \wedge e$. Since $x \leq y$ and $y \in X^{tr}$, it follows that $x \wedge z \leq y \wedge z$. The fact that $e \in X^{\wedge-ass}$ implies $(x \wedge z) \wedge e \leq (y \wedge z) \wedge e$. Thus, $T_e(x, z) \leq T_e(y, z)$.

Therefore, T_e is weakly-increasing.

Now, we prove that T_e is weakly-associative. Let $x, y, z \in X$ such that $[x, y, z] \in X^{\wedge-ass}$. Since $e \in X^{\wedge-ass}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
T_e(x, T_e(y, z)) &= (x \wedge ((y \wedge z) \wedge e)) \wedge e \\
&= ((x \wedge (y \wedge z)) \wedge e) \wedge e \\
&= (((x \wedge y) \wedge z) \wedge e) \wedge e \\
&= (((x \wedge y) \wedge e) \wedge z) \wedge e \\
&= (T_e(x, y) \wedge z) \wedge e \\
&= T_e(T_e(x, y), z).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, T_e is weakly-associative. Therefore, $T_e \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$. □

Remark 4.2. Particular cases: since $0, 1 \in X^{\wedge-ass}$, we recognize that

- (i) $T_0 = T_D$ and $T_1 = \wedge$;
- (ii) $S_0 = \vee$ and $S_1 = S_D$.

Proposition 4.2. Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, \leq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded modular trellis and the binary operations Z and Z^* defined as follows:

$$Z(x, y) = \begin{cases} x \wedge y & \text{if } x \vee y = 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad Z^*(x, y) = \begin{cases} x \vee y & \text{if } x \wedge y = 0; \\ 1 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

Then, $Z \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$ and $Z^* \in \mathcal{WAO}_0(X)$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Z^* . One easily verifies that T_Z is commutative and satisfies the boundary conditions. Now, let $(x, y) \in X \times X^{tr}$ such that $x \leq y$. Then we discuss the following two possible cases:

- (i) If $T_Z(x, z) = 0$, then $T_Z(x, z) = 0 \leq T_Z(y, z)$, for any $z \in X$.

- (ii) If $T_Z(x, z) = x \wedge z$, then $x \vee z = 1$. Proposition 3.1 guarantees that $x \vee z \trianglelefteq y \vee z$, for any $z \in X$. Thus, $y \vee z = 1$ and $T_Z(y, z) = y \wedge z$. Since $y \in X^{lr}$, it holds that $T_Z(x, z) = x \wedge z \trianglelefteq y \wedge z = T_Z(y, z)$, for any $z \in X$.

Hence, T_Z is weakly-increasing. Now, we prove that T_Z is weakly-associative. Let $x, y, z \in X$ such that $[x, y, z] \in X^\wedge$. On the one hand, we have that

$$T_Z(x, T_Z(y, z)) = \begin{cases} x \wedge y \wedge z & \text{if } y \vee z = 1 \text{ and } x \vee (y \wedge z) = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, it holds that

$$T_Z(T_Z(x, y), z) = \begin{cases} x \wedge y \wedge z & \text{if } x \vee y = 1 \text{ and } z \vee (x \wedge y) = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We will show that $y \vee z = 1$ and $x \vee (y \wedge z) = 1$ implies $x \vee y = 1$ and $z \vee (x \wedge y) = 1$. The proof of the converse implication is similar. Firstly, since $y \trianglelefteq x \vee y$ and $y \vee z = 1$. Proposition 2.1 guarantees that $y \wedge z \trianglelefteq x \vee y$. Thus, $1 = x \vee (y \wedge z) \trianglelefteq x \vee y$. Hence, $x \vee y = 1$. Secondly, since $x \vee (y \wedge z) = 1$, it holds that $y = y \wedge (x \vee (y \wedge z))$. The fact that \mathbb{X} is modular implies that $y = y \wedge (x \vee (y \wedge z)) = (x \wedge y) \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \wedge y) \vee z \wedge y$. Thus, $y \trianglelefteq (x \wedge y) \vee z$. On the other hand, since $z \trianglelefteq (x \wedge y) \vee z$, it follows that $y \vee z \trianglelefteq (x \wedge y) \vee z$. Hence, $(x \wedge y) \vee z = 1$. Since $[x, y, z] \in X^\wedge$, it holds that $x \wedge (y \wedge z) = (x \wedge y) \wedge z$. Hence, T_Z is weakly-associative. Therefore, T_Z is a pseudo-t-norm on X (i.e., $Z \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$). \square

In the following result, we propose a new ordinal sum construction of $\mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$ and $\mathcal{WAO}_0(X)$ on bounded trellises according to [6]. We start by the following immediate proposition.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $(X, \trianglelefteq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a trellis and $a, b \in X^{ass}$ such that $a \trianglelefteq b$. The following subintervals of X defined as:*

$$[a, b] = \{x \in X \mid a \trianglelefteq x \trianglelefteq b\},$$

$$(a, b) = \{x \in X \mid a \triangleleft x \trianglelefteq b\},$$

$$[a, b) = \{x \in X \mid a \trianglelefteq x \triangleleft b\},$$

$$(a, b) = \{x \in X \mid a \triangleleft x \triangleleft b\},$$

are subtrellises of X .

Theorem 4.1. *Let $(X, \trianglelefteq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis and $a \in X^{ass} \setminus \{0, 1\}$. If $V : [a, 1]^2 \rightarrow [a, 1]$ an element of $\mathcal{WAO}_1([a, 1])$ and $W : [0, a]^2 \rightarrow [0, a]$ an element of $\mathcal{WAO}_0([0, a])$, then the binary operations $T : X^2 \rightarrow X$ and $S : X^2 \rightarrow X$ defined as follows:*

$$T(x, y) = \begin{cases} x \wedge y & \text{if } x = 1 \text{ or } y = 1; \\ V(x, y) & \text{if } x, y \in [a, 1]; \\ x \wedge y \wedge a & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

and

$$S(x, y) = \begin{cases} x \vee y & \text{if } x = 0 \text{ or } y = 0; \\ W(x, y) & \text{if } x, y \in (0, a]; \\ x \vee y \vee a & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

are elements of $\mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$ and $\mathcal{WAO}_0(X)$, respectively.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of S . One easily verifies that T is commutative and satisfies the boundary conditions. Now, let $x, y \in X \times X^{lr}$ such that $x \preceq y$. Then we discuss the following possible cases:

- (i) If $x = 1$ or $z = 1$, then $T(x, z) = T(y, z)$.
- (ii) If $x, z \in [a, 1)$, then, also $a \preceq y$ and $T(x, z) = V(x, z) \preceq V(y, z) = T(y, z)$.
- (iii) If $x \notin [a, 1)$ and $z \in [a, 1)$, it holds that $T(x, z) = x \wedge a$ and we have three possible cases:
 - (i) If $y = 1$, then $T(y, z) = z$. Since $a \in X^{ass}$, then $T(x, z) = x \wedge a \preceq z = T(y, z)$.
 - (ii) If $y \in [a, 1)$, then $T(y, z) = V(y, z) \in [a, 1)$. Since, $a \in X^{ass}$, it follows that $T(x, z) = x \wedge a \preceq V(y, z) = T(y, z)$.
 - (iii) If $y \notin [a, 1)$, then $T(y, z) = y \wedge a$. Since $a \in X^{ass}$, then it follows that $T(x, z) = x \wedge a \preceq y \wedge a = T(y, z)$.
- (iv) If $x \notin [a, 1)$ and $z \notin [a, 1)$, then $T(x, z) = x \wedge z \wedge a$ and $T(y, z) = y \wedge z \wedge a$. Thus, Proposition 4.1 guarantees that $T(x, z) = x \wedge z \wedge a \preceq y \wedge z \wedge a = T(y, z)$.

Hence, T is weakly-increasing. Next, we prove that T is weakly-associative. Let $x, y, z \in X$ such that $[x, y, z] \in X^\wedge$. The proof is split into all possible cases.

- (i) If $x, y \in [a, 1)$, then we have two cases:

- (a) If $z \in [a, 1)$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} T(x, T(y, z)) &= T(x, V(y, z)) \\ &= V(x, V(y, z)) \\ &= V(V(x, y), z) \\ &= T(V(x, y), z) \\ &= T(T(x, y), z). \end{aligned}$$

- (b) If $z \in X \setminus [a, 1)$, then:

$$\begin{aligned}
T(x, T(y, z)) &= T(x, y \wedge z \wedge a) \\
&= x \wedge (y \wedge z \wedge a) \wedge a \\
&= z \wedge a \quad (\text{car, } a \in X^{ass}) \\
&= V(x, y) \wedge z \wedge a \\
&= T(V(x, y), z) \\
&= T(T(x, y), z).
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) If $x \in [a, 1)$ and $y \in X \setminus [a, 1)$, then we have two cases:

- (a) If $z \in [a, 1)$, then this case have been studied in (i.b).
- (b) If $z \in X \setminus [a, 1)$, then:

$$\begin{aligned}
T(x, T(y, z)) &= T(x, y \wedge z \wedge a) \\
&= x \wedge (y \wedge z \wedge a) \wedge a \\
&= (x \wedge y \wedge a) \wedge z \wedge a \quad (\text{car, } a \in X^{ass}) \\
&= T(x \wedge y \wedge a, z) \\
&= T(T(x, y), z).
\end{aligned}$$

(iii) If $x, y \in X \setminus [a, 1)$, then we have two cases:

- (a) If $z \in [a, 1)$, then this case have been studied in (ii.b).
- (b) If $z \in X \setminus [a, 1)$, then:

$$\begin{aligned}
T(x, T(y, z)) &= T(x, y \wedge z \wedge a) \\
&= x \wedge y \wedge z \wedge a \\
&= T(x \wedge y \wedge a, z) \\
&= T(T(x, y), z).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, T is weakly-associative on X . Therefore, $T \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$. □

One easily Observes that T and S on a bounded trellis considered in Theorem 4.1 can be described as follows:

$$T(x, y) = \begin{cases} V(x, y) & \text{if } (x, y) \in [a, 1)^2; \\ y \wedge a & \text{if } x \in [a, 1), y \parallel a; \\ x \wedge a & \text{if } y \in [a, 1), x \parallel a; \\ x \wedge y \wedge a & \text{if } x \parallel a, y \parallel a; \\ x \wedge y & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

and

$$S(x, y) = \begin{cases} W(x, y) & \text{if } (x, y) \in (0, a]^2; \\ y \vee a & \text{if } x \in (0, a], y \parallel a; \\ x \vee a & \text{if } y \in (0, a], x \parallel a; \\ x \vee y \vee a & \text{if } x \parallel a, y \parallel a; \\ x \vee y & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, we get T and S by the next figures:

$y \parallel a$	$x \wedge y$	$y \wedge a$	$(x \wedge y) \wedge a$
1	$x \wedge y$	$V(x, y)$	$x \wedge a$
a	$x \wedge y$	$x \wedge y$	$x \wedge y$
0	a	1	$x \parallel a$

5. T-distributivity on a bounded trellis

In this section, we introduce the notion of F -distributivity for an arbitrary binary operation F on a bounded trellis and we determine a relationship between t-norms and pseudo-t-norms. Moreover, we characterize pseudo-t-norms (resp. pseudo-t-conorms) on a bounded trellis with respect to the F -distributivity.

Definition 5.1. Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis and F_1 and F_2 two binary operations on X . If $F_1(x, F_2(y, z)) = F_2(F_1(x, y), F_1(x, z))$, for any $x, y, z \in X$ where at least one of the elements y, z is not 1 or not 0 (i.e., $(0, 0) \neq (y, z)$ and $(1, 1) \neq (y, z)$), then F_1 is distributive over F_2 (F_1 is F_2 -distributive, for short).

Proposition 5.1. Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis and T^* is a pseudo-t-norm on X . If T^* is T -distributive, for any $T \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$, then $T^* \in \mathcal{AO}_1(X)$.

Proof. Let $x, y \in X$ such that $x \preceq y$. The fact that the meet operation (\wedge) is a pseudo-t-norm on X implies that $T^*(x, z) \wedge T^*(y, z) = T^*(x \wedge y, z) = T^*(x, z)$. Thus, T^* is increasing. Now, we prove that T^* is associative. Since T^* is a pseudo-t-norm on X and increasing, it holds that $T^*(x, T^*(y, z)) = T^*(T^*(x, y), T^*(x, z)) \preceq T^*(T^*(x, y), z)$ and $T^*(T^*(x, y), z) = T^*(T^*(x, z), T^*(y, z)) \preceq T^*(x, T^*(y, z))$, for any $x, y, z \in X$.

Thus, $T^*(x, T^*(y, z)) = T^*(T^*(x, y), z)$, for any $x, y, z \in X$. Hence, T^* is associative. Since T^* is commutative and has 1 as a neutral element, it follows that T^* is a t-norm on X . \square

In the following proposition, we give a T -distributive t-norm, for any pseudo-t-norm T on bounded trellis.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ be a bounded trellis. Then the smallest pseudo-t-norm (t -norm) T_D is T -distributive, for any $T \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$.*

Proof. Let T be an arbitrary pseudo-t-norm on X . We must show that the equality

$$T_D(x, T(y, z)) = T(T_D(x, y), T_D(x, z))$$

holds for every element x, y, z of X such that $y \neq 1$ or $z \neq 1$. Suppose that $z \neq 1$. Then we discuss the following two possible cases:

- (i) If $x = 1$, then $T_D(x, T(y, z)) = T(y, z) = T(T_D(x, y), T_D(x, z))$.
- (ii) If $x \neq 1$, we have two possible cases:
 - (i) If $y = 1$, then $T_D(x, T(y, z)) = T_D(x, z) = 0$ and $T(T_D(x, y), T_D(x, z)) = T(x, 0)$. Proposition 3.4 guarantees that $T(x, 0) = 0$, for any $x \in X$. Then the equality is holds.
 - (ii) If $y \neq 1$, then $T(y, z) \preceq y \preceq 1$ and $y \neq 1$, for any pseudo-t-norm T . Thus, $T(y, z) \neq 1$. Hence, $T_D(x, T(y, z)) = 0$ and $T(T_D(x, y), T_D(x, z)) = T(0, 0) = 0$.

Therefore, T_D is T -distributive, for any $T \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$. \square

Proposition 5.3. *Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis, T a pseudo-t-norm and T^* is a t-norm on X . If T is T^* -distributive, then $T \preceq_{\mathcal{WAO}} T^*$ (i.e., T is weaker than T^*).*

Proof. Let $x, y \in X$, then $T(x, y) = T(T^*(x, 1), y) = T^*(T(x, y), T(1, y)) = T^*(T(x, y), y)$. Since T^* is a t-norm, it holds that $T^*(T(x, y), y) \preceq T^*(x, y)$. Thus $T(x, y) \preceq_{\mathcal{WAO}} T^*(x, y)$, for any $x, y \in X$. Hence, T is weaker than T^* . \square

Proposition 5.4. *Let $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis and T^* is a t-norm on X . If T is T^* -distributive, for any $T \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$, then $T^* = \wedge$. Moreover, $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ is a lattice.*

Proof. Let an arbitrary pseudo-t-norm T and T^* is a t-norm on X , then Proposition 5.3 guarantees that $T \preceq_{\mathcal{WAO}} T^*$. Suppose that $T = \wedge$, then $\wedge \preceq_{\mathcal{WAO}} T^*$. Since T^* is conjunctive, it holds that $\wedge = T^*$. Thus, \wedge is associative. Hence, $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee)$ is a lattice. \square

Proposition 5.5. *Let $(X, \trianglelefteq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis, T is a pseudo-t-norm and S is a pseudo-t-conorm on X . The following implications hold:*

- (i) *If S is T -distributive, then T is idempotent;*
- (ii) *If T is S -distributive, then S is idempotent.*

Proof.

- (i) Since T is pseudo-t-norm and S is pseudo-t-conorm on X , it follows that $x = S(x, 0) = S(x, T(0, 0)) = T(S(x, 0), S(x, 0)) = T(x, x)$, for any $x \in X$. Thus, T is idempotent.
- (ii) The proof is similar to that of (i).

□

Proposition 5.5 leads to the following corollary.

Corollary 5.1. *Let $(X, \trianglelefteq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$ be a bounded trellis, T is a pseudo-t-norm and S is a pseudo-t-conorm on X . Then it holds that:*

- (i) *If S is T -distributive and T satisfying $T(x \wedge y, x \wedge y) \trianglelefteq T(x, y)$, for any $x, y \in X$, then $T = \wedge$.*
- (ii) *If T is S -distributive and S satisfying $S(x \vee y, x \vee y) \trianglelefteq S(x, y)$, for any $x, y \in X$, then $S = \vee$.*

6. Relationship among $\mathcal{WAO}_e(X)$ and isomorphisms on bounded trellises

In this section, we conjugate elements of $\mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$ (resp. elements of $\mathcal{WAO}_0(X)$) and an isomorphism map on a bounded trellis X . First, we start by the following proposition.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $(X_1, \trianglelefteq_1, \wedge_1, \vee_1)$, $(X_2, \trianglelefteq_2, \wedge_2, \vee_2)$ be two trellises and $\rho : X_1 \longrightarrow X_2$ an isomorphism. Then $\rho(X_1^{tr}) \subseteq X_2^{tr}$.*

Proof. Let $x, y \in X_2$ and $z \in \rho(X_1^{tr})$ such that $x \trianglelefteq_2 y \trianglelefteq_2 z$. Then there exist $x', y' \in X_1$ and $z' \in X_1^{tr}$ such that $\rho(x') \trianglelefteq_2 \rho(y') \trianglelefteq_2 \rho(z')$. From the increasingness of ρ^{-1} , it holds that $x' \trianglelefteq_1 y' \trianglelefteq_1 z'$. The fact that $z' \in X_1^{tr}$ implies that $x' \trianglelefteq_1 z'$, i.e., $x' \wedge_1 z' = x'$. Since ρ is homomorphism; it follows that $\rho(x') \wedge_2 \rho(z') = \rho(x' \wedge_1 z') = \rho(x')$. Hence, $\rho(x') \trianglelefteq_2 \rho(z')$, i.e., $x \trianglelefteq_2 z$. Thus, $z \in X_2^{tr}$. Therefore, $\rho(X_1^{tr}) \subseteq X_2^{tr}$. □

Proposition 6.2. *Let $(X_1, \preceq_1, \wedge_1, \vee_1)$, $(X_2, \preceq_2, \wedge_2, \vee_2)$ be two trellises and $\rho : X_1 \longrightarrow X_2$ an isomorphism. Then $[x, y, z] \in X_1^{\wedge_1}$ (resp. $[x, y, z] \in X_1^{\vee_1}$) if and only if $[\rho(x), \rho(y), \rho(z)] \in X_2^{\wedge_2}$ (resp. $[\rho(x), \rho(y), \rho(z)] \in X_2^{\vee_2}$).*

Proof. Let $x, y, z \in X_1$ such that $[x, y, z] \in X_1^{\wedge_1}$. Since ρ is an isomorphism, then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x) \wedge_2 (\rho(y) \wedge_2 \rho(z)) &= \rho(x) \wedge_2 \rho(y \wedge_1 z) \\ &= \rho(x \wedge_1 (y \wedge_1 z)) \\ &= \rho((x \wedge_1 y) \wedge_1 z) \\ &= \rho(x \wedge_1 y) \wedge_2 \rho(z) \\ &= (\rho(x) \wedge_2 \rho(y)) \wedge_2 \rho(z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $[\rho(x), \rho(y), \rho(z)] \in X_2^{\wedge_2}$. In a similar way, we prove that $[x, y, z] \in X_1^{\vee_1}$ if and only if $[\rho(x), \rho(y), \rho(z)] \in X_2^{\vee_2}$. \square

Proposition 6.3. *$(X_1, \preceq_1, \wedge_1, \vee_1, 0_1, 1_1)$, $(X_2, \preceq_2, \wedge_2, \vee_2, 0_2, 1_2)$ be two bounded trellises, $T \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X_2)$ and $\rho : X_1 \longrightarrow X_2$ an isomorphism. Then the binary operation T^ρ defined by:*

$$T^\rho(x, y) = \rho^{-1}(T(\rho(x), \rho(y))), \text{ for any } x, y \in X_1,$$

is an element of $\mathcal{WAO}_1(X_1)$.

Proof. One easily verifies that T^ρ is commutative and satisfies the boundary condition. Now, let $(x, y) \in X_1 \times X_1^{\text{tr}}$ such that $x \preceq_1 y$. Proposition 6.1 assures that $\rho(y) \in X_2^{\text{tr}}$. Since T is weakly-increasing, it holds that $T(\rho(x), \rho(z)) \preceq_2 T(\rho(y), \rho(z))$, for any $z \in X_1$. The fact that ρ^{-1} is increasing on X_2 implies that $\rho^{-1}(T(\rho(x), \rho(z))) \preceq_1 \rho^{-1}(T(\rho(y), \rho(z)))$, for any $z \in X_1$, i.e., $T^\rho(x, z) \preceq_1 T^\rho(y, z)$, for any $z \in X_1$. Hence, T^ρ is weakly-increasing on X_1 . Next, we prove that T^ρ is weakly-associative. Let $x, y, z \in X_1$ such that $[x, y, z] \in X_1^{\wedge_1}$. Proposition 6.2 assures that $(\rho(x), \rho(y), \rho(z)) \in X_2^{\wedge_2}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} T^\rho(T^\rho(x, y), z) &= \rho^{-1}(T(\rho(T^\rho(x, y)), \rho(z))) \\ &= \rho^{-1}(T(\rho(\rho^{-1}(T(\rho(x), \rho(y))))), \rho(z))) \\ &= \rho^{-1}(T(T(\rho(x), \rho(y)), \rho(z))) \\ &= \rho^{-1}(T(\rho(x), T(\rho(y), \rho(z)))) \\ &= \rho^{-1}(T(\rho(x), \rho(\rho^{-1}(T(\rho(y), \rho(z))))) \\ &= \rho^{-1}(T(\rho(x), \rho(T^\rho(y, z)))) \\ &= T^\rho(x, T^\rho(y, z)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, T^ρ is weakly-associative on X_1 . Therefore, $T^\rho \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X_1)$. \square

Notice that in a bounded trellis $(X, \preceq, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$, the identity map Id_X of X (i.e., $Id_X(x) = x$, for any $x \in X$) is an isomorphism (automorphism). Then $T^{Id_X} = T$, for any $T \in \mathcal{WAO}_1(X)$.

Dually, we have the following result for the elements of $\mathcal{WAO}_0(X)$.

Proposition 6.4. $(X_1, \preceq_1, \wedge_1, \vee_1, 0_1, 1_1)$, $(X_2, \preceq_2, \wedge_2, \vee_2, 0_2, 1_2)$ be two bounded trellises, $S \in \mathcal{WAO}_0(X_2)$ and $\rho : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ an isomorphism. Then the binary operation S^ρ defined by:

$$S^\rho(x, y) = \rho^{-1}(S(\rho(x), \rho(y))), \text{ for any } x, y \in X_1,$$

is an element of $\mathcal{WAO}_0(X_1)$.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we have studied the notion of pseudo-triangular norms on a bounded trellis and provided some examples. Further, we have provided some new class of pseudo-triangular norms and some characterisation. We intend that this study open the door of different applications of trellis structure in various areas using pseudo-triangular norms.

References

References

- [1] B. Bede, Fuzzy clustering, In Mathematics of Fuzzy Sets and Fuzzy Logic, Springer, 2013, pp. 213–219.
- [2] B. C. Bedregal, H. S. Santos and R. Callejas-Bedregal, T-norms on bounded lattices: t-norm morphisms and operators, IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems, 2006, pp. 22–28.
- [3] B. De Baets and R. Mesiar, Triangular norms on product lattices, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 104(1) (1999) 61–75.
- [4] G. De Cooman and E. E. Kerre, Order norms on bounded partially ordered sets, The Journal of Fuzzy Mathematics 2 (1994) 281–310.
- [5] D. S. Dummit and R. M. Foote, Abstract algebra, Wiley Hoboken, 2004.
- [6] Ü. Ertuğrul, F. Karaçal and R. Mesiar, Modified ordinal sums of triangular norms and triangular conorms on bounded lattices, International Journal of Intelligent Systems 30(7) (2015) 807–817.

- [7] E. Fried, Tournaments and non-associative lattices, *Ann. Univ. Sci. Budapest, Sect. Math* 13 (1970) 151–164.
- [8] E. Fried and G. Grätzer, Some examples of weakly associative lattices, In *Colloquium Mathematicae* 27 (1973) 215–221.
- [9] K. Gladstien, A characterization of complete trellises of finite length, *algebra universalis* 3(1) (1973) 341–344.
- [10] R. Halaš and J. Pócs, On the clone of aggregation functions on bounded lattices, *Information Sciences* 329 (2016) 381–389.
- [11] F. Karaçal, On the direct decomposability of strong negations and *s*-implication operators on product lattices, *Information Sciences* 176(20) (2006) 3011–3025.
- [12] F. Karacal and R. Mesiar, Aggregation functions on bounded lattices, *International Journal of General Systems* 46(1) (2017) 37–51.
- [13] E. P. Klement and R. Mesiar, *Logical, algebraic, analytic and probabilistic aspects of triangular norms*, Elsevier, 2005.
- [14] B. Kolman R. C. Busby and S. Ross, *Discrete mathematical structures*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1995.
- [15] R. Lidl and G. Pilz, *Applied abstract algebra*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [16] S. Ray, Representation of a boolean algebra by its triangular norms, *Mathware & soft computing* 4(1) (1997) 63–68.
- [17] S. Roman, *Lattices and ordered sets*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [18] B. schweizer and A. sklar, *probabilistic metric spaces*, Courier Corporation, 2011.
- [19] H. Skala, Trellis theory, *Algebra Universalis* 1(1) (1971) 218–233.
- [20] H. Skala, *Trellis theory*, American Mathematical Soc., 1972.
- [21] M. Yettou, A. Amroune and L. Zedam, A binary operation-based representation of a lattice, *Kybernetika* 55(2) (2019) 252–272.
- [22] A. Mehenni, *Algebraic operations on ordered structures*, PHD Thesis, 2022