

# QUANTUM-BE ALGEBRAS

*LAVINIA CORINA CIUNGU*

Department of Mathematics

St Francis College

180 Remsen Street, Brooklyn Heights, NY 11201-4398, USA

lciungu@sfc.edu

**ABSTRACT.** We redefine the quantum-MV algebras starting from involutive BE algebras and we introduce and study the notion of quantum-BE algebras. We define the commutative quantum-BE algebras and we give a characterization of these structures. We also prove that any bounded commutative BCK algebra is a quantum-BE algebra, and give conditions for quantum-BE algebras to be bounded commutative BCK algebras. Furthermore, we prove that bounded commutative BCK algebras are both quantum-BE algebras and quantum-B algebras. Finally, we provide certain conditions for quantum-MV algebras to be MV algebras.

**Keywords:** quantum-BE algebra, commutative quantum-BE algebra, quantum-MV algebra, S-algebra, quantum-B algebra

**AMS classification (2020):** 06D35, 06F35, 03G25, 06A06

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the last decades, developing algebras related to the logical foundations of quantum mechanics became a central topic of research. Generally known as quantum structures, these algebras serve as models for the formalism of quantum mechanics. The behavior of physical systems which describe the events concerning elementary particles is different from that of physical systems observed in classical physics. Since with the classical propositional calculus these events cannot be described, the logic of quantum mechanics becomes an important tool for evaluating the propositions and propositional formulas on these systems. The many-valued logic discovered by Łukasiewicz became the foundation for fuzzy logic, and the class of quantum structures has been growing: orthomodular lattices, orthomodular posets, orthoalgebras, effect algebras, D-posets, MV algebras, BL algebras, hoops, BCK/BCI algebras. When the operations of addition and multiplication were no longer assumed to be commutative, new quantum structures appeared: pseudo-MV/BL/BCK/BCI algebras, pseudo hoops, residuated lattices, pseudo effect algebras. More detailed considerations on this topic are presented in the monograph [5] by A. Dvurečenskij and S. Pulmannová, as well as in the monograph [1] by M. Botur, I. Chajda, R. Halaš, J. Kühr and J. Paseka. These quantum structures have been generalized in two directions:

**I.** Quantum-MV algebras were introduced by R. Giuntini in [9] as non-lattice generalizations of MV algebras ([2, 3]), and they also generalize the effect algebras ([8, 7]) and the orthomodular lattices ([26, 31]). These structures were intensively studied by R. Giuntini

([10, 11, 12, 13, 14]), A. Dvurečenskij and S. Pulmannová ([5]), R. Giuntini and S. Pulmannová ([15]) and by A. Iorgulescu in [21, 22, 23, 24, 25].

**II.** Quantum-B algebras defined and investigated by W. Rump and Y.C. Yang ([33, 32]) arise from the concept of quantales, which was introduced in 1984 as a framework for quantum mechanics with a view toward non-commutative logic ([29]). Many implicational algebras studied so far (pseudo-effect algebras, residuated lattices, pseudo-MV/BL/MTL algebras, bounded non-commutative  $R\ell$ -monoids, pseudo-hoops, pseudo-BCK/BCI algebras) are quantum-B algebras. Interesting results on quantum-B algebras have been presented in [34, 35, 17, 18].

Unfortunately, there are no connections between quantum-MV algebras and quantum-B algebras; there are only particular algebras, such as MV algebras, that belong to both structures. To be able to compare certain quantum structures, it is preferable that they have the same signature, which would also allow possible generalizations of the quantum structures.

In this paper, we introduce the notion of quantum-BE algebras, by redefining the quantum-MV algebras starting from involutive BE algebras. We give a characterization of quantum-BE algebras, investigate their properties, and show that, in general, quantum-BE algebras are not quantum-B algebras. We also define the commutative quantum-BE algebras and give a characterization of these structures. Furthermore, we prove that any bounded commutative BCK algebra is a quantum BE algebra, and we give a condition for a quantum-BE algebra to be a bounded commutative BCK algebra. We prove that bounded commutative BCK algebras are both quantum-BE algebras and quantum-B algebras. We establish the connection between quantum-BE algebras and quantum-MV algebras, proving that the quantum-BE algebras are equivalent to quantum-MV algebras. We show that, in general, the quantum-MV algebras are not quantum-B algebras and, if a quantum-BE algebra is self distributive, then the corresponding quantum-MV algebra is an MV algebra. Finally, we present a connection of quantum-BE algebras with the left and right-m-BE algebras defined and studied by A. Iorgulescu in [21, 22, 23, 24, 25], and we show that the involutive m-BE algebras are equivalent to the involutive BE algebras.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we recall some basic notions and results regarding quantum-MV algebras, quantum-B algebras, and BCK algebras used in the paper.

The supplement algebras were introduced by S. Gudder in [16] and they are a common set of axioms for MV and quantum-MV algebras.

**Definition 2.1.** ([16]) A *suplement algebra* (*S-algebra, for short*) is an algebra  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  of type  $(2, 1, 0, 0)$  satisfying the following axioms, for all  $x, y, z \in X$  :

- (S<sub>1</sub>)  $x \oplus y = y \oplus x$ ;
- (S<sub>2</sub>)  $x \oplus (y \oplus z) = (x \oplus y) \oplus z$ ;
- (S<sub>3</sub>)  $x \oplus x^* = 1$ ;
- (S<sub>4</sub>)  $x \oplus 0 = x$ ;
- (S<sub>5</sub>)  $x^{**} = x$ ;
- (S<sub>6</sub>)  $0^* = 1$ ;
- (S<sub>7</sub>)  $x \oplus 1 = 1$ .

The following additional operations can be defined in a supplement algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} x \odot y &= (x^* \oplus y^*)^*, \\ x \mathbin{\&S} y &= (x \oplus y^*) \odot y, \\ x \mathbin{\cup_S} y &= (x \odot y^*) \oplus y. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously,  $(x \mathbin{\cup_S} y)^* = x^* \mathbin{\&S} y^*$  and  $(x \mathbin{\&S} y)^* = x^* \mathbin{\cup_S} y^*$ .

For all  $x, y \in X$ , we define  $\leq_S$  by  $x \leq_S y$  iff  $x = x \mathbin{\&S} y$ .

**Definition 2.2.** ([10]) An *MV algebra* is an S-algebra  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  satisfying the following axiom, for all  $x, y \in X$  :

$$(MV) (x^* \oplus y)^* \oplus y = (x \oplus y^*)^* \oplus x.$$

*Remark 2.3.* The condition (MV) is a so-called *Lukasiewicz axiom* ([5]) and it is equivalent to  $x \mathbin{\&S} y = y \mathbin{\&S} x$ , for all  $x, y \in X$ .

Indeed,  $(x^* \oplus y)^* \oplus y = ((x^* \oplus y) \odot y^*)^*$  and  $(x \oplus y^*)^* \oplus x = (y^* \oplus x)^* \oplus x = ((y^* \oplus x) \odot x^*)^*$ . It follows that  $((x^* \oplus y) \odot y^*)^* = ((y \oplus x^*) \odot x^*)^*$ , and replacing  $x$  by  $x^*$  and  $y$  by  $y^*$  we get  $((x \oplus y^*) \odot y)^* = ((y^* \oplus x) \odot x)^*$ . Hence  $(x \oplus y^*) \odot y = (y^* \oplus x) \odot x$ , that is  $x \mathbin{\&S} y = y \mathbin{\&S} x$ . As a consequence, condition (MV) is also equivalent to  $x \mathbin{\cup_S} y = y \mathbin{\cup_S} x$ , for all  $x, y \in X$ .

**Definition 2.4.** ([9]) A *quantum-MV algebra* (*QMV algebra, for short*) is an S-algebra  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  satisfying the following axiom, for all  $x, y, z \in X$  :

$$(QMV) x \oplus ((x^* \mathbin{\&S} y) \mathbin{\&S} (z \mathbin{\&S} x^*)) = (x \oplus y) \mathbin{\&S} (x \oplus z).$$

The concept of quantum-B algebras was introduced by W. Rump and Y.C. Yang in [33, 32]. The quantum-B algebras generalize many implicational algebras, such as pseudo-effect algebras, residuated lattices, pseudo-MV/BL/MTL algebras, bounded non-commutative Rℓ-monoids, pseudo-hoops, pseudo-BCK/BCI algebras.

**Definition 2.5.** ([32],[33]) A *quantum-B algebra* is a partially ordered set  $(X, \leq)$  with two binary operations  $\rightarrow$  and  $\rightsquigarrow$  satisfying the following axioms, for all  $x, y, z \in X$  :

$$\begin{aligned} (QB_1) \quad &y \rightarrow z \leq (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z); \\ (QB_2) \quad &y \rightsquigarrow z \leq (x \rightsquigarrow y) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightsquigarrow z); \\ (QB_3) \quad &y \leq z \text{ implies } x \rightarrow y \leq x \rightarrow z; \\ (QB_4) \quad &x \leq y \rightarrow z \text{ iff } y \leq x \rightsquigarrow z. \end{aligned}$$

A quantum-B algebra  $X$  is said to be *unital* if there exists an element  $u \in X$  such that  $u \rightarrow x = u \rightsquigarrow x = x$ , for all  $x \in X$ . The element  $u$  is called a *unit element* and the unit element is unique ([32]). We will refer to  $(X, \leq, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow)$  by its univers  $X$ . A quantum-B algebra  $(X, \leq, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow)$  is said to be *commutative* if  $x \rightarrow y = x \rightsquigarrow y$ , for all  $x, y \in X$ .

Starting from the systems of positive implicational calculus, weak systems of positive implicational calculus and BCI and BCK systems, in 1966 Y. Imai and K. Isèki introduced the BCK algebras. BCK algebras are also used in a dual form, with an implication  $\rightarrow$  and with one constant element 1, that is the greatest element ([28]).

**Definition 2.6.** ([28]) A (dual) *BCK algebra* is an algebra  $(X, \rightarrow, 1)$  of type  $(2, 0)$  satisfying the following conditions, for all  $x, y, z \in X$  :

$$\begin{aligned} (BCK_1) \quad &(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow ((y \rightarrow z) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z)) = 1; \\ (BCK_2) \quad &1 \rightarrow x = x; \end{aligned}$$

- ( $BCK_3$ )  $x \rightarrow 1 = 1$ ;  
 ( $BCK_4$ )  $x \rightarrow y = 1$  and  $y \rightarrow x = 1$  imply  $x = y$ .

In this paper we use the dual BCK algebras. If  $(X, \rightarrow, 1)$  is a BCK algebra, for  $x, y \in X$  we define the relation  $\leq$  by  $x \leq y$  if and only if  $x \rightarrow y = 1$ , and  $\leq$  is a partial order on  $X$ .

**Proposition 2.7.** ([4]) *Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 1)$  be a BCK algebra. Then the following hold for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :*

- (1)  $x \leq y$  implies  $z \rightarrow x \leq z \rightarrow y$  and  $y \rightarrow z \leq x \rightarrow z$ ;
- (2)  $x \leq y \rightarrow x$ ;
- (3)  $x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z) = y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z)$ ;
- (4)  $((y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow x) \rightarrow x = y \rightarrow x$ ;
- (5)  $z \leq y \rightarrow x$  iff  $y \leq z \rightarrow x$ .

### 3. QUANTUM-BE ALGEBRAS

In this section, we redefine the quantum-MV algebras starting from involutive BE algebras and we introduce and study the notion of quantum-BE algebras. We give a characterization of quantum-BE algebras, investigate their properties, and show that, in general, quantum-BE algebras are not quantum-B algebras.

The BE algebras were introduced in [27] as algebras  $(X, \rightarrow, 1)$  of type  $(2, 0)$  satisfying the following conditions, for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :

- ( $BE_1$ )  $x \rightarrow x = 1$ ;
- ( $BE_2$ )  $x \rightarrow 1 = 1$ ;
- ( $BE_3$ )  $1 \rightarrow x = x$ ;
- ( $BE_4$ )  $x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z) = y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z)$ .

A relation “ $\leq$ ” is defined on  $X$  by  $x \leq y$  iff  $x \rightarrow y = 1$ . A BE algebra  $X$  is *bounded* if there exists  $0 \in X$  such that  $0 \leq x$ , for all  $x \in X$ . In a bounded BE algebra  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  we define  $x^* = x \rightarrow 0$ , for all  $x \in X$ . A bounded BE algebra  $X$  is called *involutive* if  $x^{**} = x$ , for any  $x \in X$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 1)$  be a BE algebra. Then the following hold for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :*

- (1)  $x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x) = 1$ ;
- (2)  $x \leq (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y$ .

*If  $X$  is bounded, then:*

- (3)  $x \rightarrow y^* = y \rightarrow x^*$ ;
- (4)  $x \leq x^{**}$ .

*If  $X$  is involutive, then:*

- (5)  $x^* \rightarrow y = y^* \rightarrow x$ ;
- (6)  $x^* \rightarrow y^* = y \rightarrow x$ ;
- (7)  $(x^* \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow z = x^* \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow z)$ .

*Proof.* (3) It follows by ( $BE_4$ ) for  $z := 0$ .

(4) It follows by (2) for  $y := 0$ .

(5) Replace  $x$  by  $x^*$  and  $y$  by  $y^*$  in (3).

(6) Replace  $y$  by  $y^*$  in (5).

(7) Using (5) and  $(BE_4)$ , we get:

$$(x^* \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow z = z^* \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y) = x^* \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow y) = x^* \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow z). \quad \square$$

In a BE algebra  $X$ , we define the additional operation:

$$x \uplus y = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y.$$

If  $X$  is involutive, we define the operation:

$$x \pitchfork y = ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^*,$$

and the relation  $\leq_Q$  by:

$$x \leq_Q y \text{ iff } x = x \pitchfork y.$$

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $X$  be an involutive BE algebra. Then the following hold for all  $x, y \in X$ :*

- (1)  $x \leq_Q y$  implies  $x = y \pitchfork x$  and  $y = x \uplus y$ ;
- (2)  $\leq_Q$  is reflexive and antisymmetric;
- (3)  $x \pitchfork y = (x^* \uplus y^*)^*$  and  $x \uplus y = (x^* \pitchfork y^*)^*$ ;
- (4)  $x \leq_Q y$  implies  $x \leq y$ ;
- (5)  $0 \leq_Q x \leq_Q 1$ ;
- (6)  $0 \pitchfork x = x \pitchfork 0 = 0$  and  $1 \pitchfork x = x \pitchfork 1 = x$ ;
- (7)  $x \pitchfork (y \pitchfork x) = y \pitchfork x$  and  $x \pitchfork (x \pitchfork y) = x \pitchfork y$ .

*Proof.* (1) If  $x \leq_Q y$ , then  $x = x \pitchfork y$ , and by  $(BE_4)$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} y \pitchfork x &= y \pitchfork (x \pitchfork y) = ((y^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^*) \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^*)^* \\ &= ((y^* \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)) \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^*)^* \\ &= (((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow y^*)) \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^*)^* \\ &= (((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^*)^* \\ &= (1 \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^*)^* = (x \pitchfork y)^{**} = x \pitchfork y = x. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we get:

$$\begin{aligned} x \uplus y &= (x \pitchfork y) \uplus y = ((x \pitchfork y) \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y \\ &= (((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y \\ &= (y^* \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)) \rightarrow y \\ &= ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow y^*)) \rightarrow y \\ &= ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow y = 1 \rightarrow y = y. \end{aligned}$$

(2) Since  $x \pitchfork x = ((x^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* = (1 \rightarrow x^*)^* = x$ ,  $\leq_Q$  is reflexive.

If  $x \leq_Q y$  and  $y \leq_Q x$ , we have  $y = y \pitchfork x = x$ , by (1). Hence  $\leq_Q$  is antisymmetric.

(3) It is obvious.

(4) If  $x \leq_Q y$ , then  $x = x \pitchfork y$ , and by Lemma 3.1 and  $(BE_4)$  we get:

$$\begin{aligned} x \rightarrow y &= (x \pitchfork y) \rightarrow y = ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* \rightarrow y \\ &= y^* \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*) = (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow y^*) \\ &= (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow 1 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $x \leq y$ .

(5),(6) follow by simple computations.

(7) Applying Lemma 3.1, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} x \pitchfork (y \pitchfork x) &= ((x^* \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x)^*) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= ((x^* \rightarrow (y^* \uplus x^*)) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= ((x^* \rightarrow ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= (((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x)^*)^* \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= (1 \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x)^*)^* = y \pitchfork x, \text{ and} \\
 x \pitchfork (x \pitchfork y) &= ((x^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^*) \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^*)^* \\
 &= ((x^* \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)) \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^*)^* \\
 &= (((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*)) \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^*)^* \\
 &= (1 \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)^*)^* = (x \pitchfork y)^{**} = x \pitchfork y. \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

A BE algebra  $X$  is said to be *self distributive* if  $x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z) = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z)$ , for all  $x, y, z \in X$  ([27, Def. 7]).

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $X$  be an involutive BE algebra. Then the following hold for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :*

- (1)  $(x \pitchfork y) \rightarrow z = (y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z)$ ;
- (2)  $z \rightarrow (x \cup y) = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y)$ ;
- (3)  $x \pitchfork y \leq x, y \leq x \cup y$ .

*If  $X$  is self distributive, then:*

- (4)  $x \pitchfork y = y \pitchfork x$  and  $x \cup y = y \cup x$ .

*Proof.* (1) Using Lemma 3.1, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (x \pitchfork y) \rightarrow z &= ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* \rightarrow z = z^* \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*) \\
 &= (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow y^*) = (y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z).
 \end{aligned}$$

(2) By  $(BE_4)$ , we have  $z \rightarrow (x \cup y) = z \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y) = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y)$ .

(3) It follows from (1) and (2) replacing  $z$  by  $x$  and  $y$ , respectively.

(4) Since  $X$  is self distributive, using  $(BE_4)$  we have:

$$(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z) = (y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z),$$

and by (1) we get:  $(x \pitchfork y) \rightarrow z = (y \pitchfork x) \rightarrow z$ . Taking  $z := 0$ , it follows that  $(x \pitchfork y)^* = (y \pitchfork x)^*$ , and replacing  $x$  by  $x^*$  and  $y$  by  $y^*$  we get  $x \pitchfork y = y \pitchfork x$ . Using Proposition 3.2(3), we have  $x \cup y = y \cup x$ .  $\square$

*Remark 3.4.* In general,  $x \leq y$  does not imply  $x \leq_Q y$ , and the operation  $\leq_Q$  is not transitive. Indeed consider the following example (see [5, Cor. 2.1.3]).

Let  $X = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$  and let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be the involutive BE algebra with  $\rightarrow$  and the corresponding operation  $\pitchfork$  given in the following tables:

| $\rightarrow$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $\pitchfork$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0             | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0            | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1             | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1            | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2             | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2            | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| 3             | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3            | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| 4             | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4            | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 5             | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5            | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6             | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6            | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

We can see that  $3 \rightarrow 2 = 1$ , hence  $3 \leq 2$ . But  $3 \pitchfork 2 = 2 \neq 3$ , that is  $3 \not\leq_Q 2$ .

We also have  $4 = 4 \pitchfork 6$  and  $6 = 6 \pitchfork 3$ , so  $4 \leq_Q 6$  and  $6 \leq_Q 3$ . But  $4 \neq 0 = 4 \pitchfork 3$ , that is  $4 \not\leq_Q 3$ . It follows that  $\leq_Q$  is not transitive.

**Definition 3.5.** An involutive BE algebra  $X$  is called a *quantum-BE algebra* (*QBE algebra*, for short) if it satisfies the following axiom for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :

(QBE)  $x \rightarrow ((x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork (z \pitchfork x)) = (x \rightarrow y) \pitchfork (x \rightarrow z)$ .

**Proposition 3.6.** *In any quantum-BE algebra  $X$ , the following holds for all  $x, y \in X$ :  
( $QBE_1$ )  $x \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y) = x \rightarrow y$ .*

*Proof.* Using (QBE) and Proposition 3.2(7), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} x \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y) &= 1 \pitchfork (x \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)) = (x \rightarrow 1) \pitchfork (x \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y)) \\ &= x \rightarrow ((x \pitchfork 1) \pitchfork ((x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork x)) = x \rightarrow (x \pitchfork ((x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork x)) \\ &= x \rightarrow ((x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork x) = x \rightarrow ((x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork (1 \pitchfork x)) \\ &= (x \rightarrow y) \pitchfork (x \rightarrow 1) = (x \rightarrow y) \pitchfork 1 = x \rightarrow y. \end{aligned}$$

(Replacing  $y$  by  $x \pitchfork y$  in Proposition 3.2(7), we have  $x \pitchfork ((x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork x) = (x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork x$ .  $\square$ )

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $X$  be an involutive BE algebra satisfying property ( $QBE_1$ ). Then the following holds for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :*

$$(x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork (z \pitchfork x) = y \pitchfork (z \pitchfork x).$$

*Proof.* Using ( $QBE_1$ ) and ( $BE_4$ ), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} (x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork (z \pitchfork x) &= (((x \pitchfork y)^* \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= (((x \pitchfork y)^* \rightarrow (z^* \cup x^*)) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= (((x \pitchfork y)^* \rightarrow ((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= (((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow ((x \pitchfork y)^* \rightarrow x^*)) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= (((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y))) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= (((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= (((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow x^*)) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= ((y^* \rightarrow ((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= ((y^* \rightarrow (z^* \cup x^*)) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= ((y^* \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\ &= y \pitchfork (z \pitchfork x). \end{aligned}$$

(By ( $QBE_1$ ),  $x \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y) = x \rightarrow y$ , and by ( $BE_4$ ),  $(z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow x^*) = y^* \rightarrow ((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*) = y^* \rightarrow (z^* \cup x^*)$ ).  $\square$ )

**Corollary 3.8.** *In any quantum-BE algebra  $X$  the following holds for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :  
( $QBE_2$ )  $x \rightarrow (y \pitchfork (z \pitchfork x)) = (x \rightarrow y) \pitchfork (x \rightarrow z)$ .*

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let  $X$  be an involutive BE algebra. Then condition (QBE) is equivalent to conditions ( $QBE_1$ ) and ( $QBE_2$ ).*

*Proof.* If  $X$  satisfies (QBE), then ( $QBE_1$ ) and ( $QBE_2$ ) follow by Proposition 3.6 and Corollary 3.8. Conversely, let  $X$  be an involutive BE algebra satisfying conditions ( $QBE_1$ ) and ( $QBE_2$ ). By ( $QBE_1$ ), using Proposition 3.7 we get  $(x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork (z \pitchfork x) = y \pitchfork (z \pitchfork x)$ . Applying ( $QBE_2$ ), we get  $x \rightarrow ((x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork (z \pitchfork x)) = x \rightarrow (y \pitchfork (z \pitchfork x)) = (x \rightarrow y) \pitchfork (x \rightarrow z)$ , that is (QBE).  $\square$

**Proposition 3.10.** *Let  $X$  be a quantum-BE algebra. The following hold for all  $x, y \in X$ :*

- (1)  $x \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x) = x \rightarrow y$ ;
- (2)  $x \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$  and  $x \leq_Q y \rightarrow x$ ;
- (3)  $x \rightarrow y = 0$  iff  $x = 1$  and  $y = 0$ ;
- (4)  $(x \rightarrow y)^* \pitchfork x = (x \rightarrow y)^*$ ;
- (5)  $(x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork y = x \pitchfork y$ ;
- (6)  $x \pitchfork y \leq_Q y \leq_Q x \cup y$ ;
- (7)  $x \cup (y \pitchfork x) = x$ ;
- (8)  $x \pitchfork (y \cup x) = x$ ;

- (9)  $(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x) = x$ ;  
 (10)  $(x \cup y) \rightarrow y = x \rightarrow y$ ;  
 (11)  $(x \cup y) \cup y = x \cup y$ ;  
 (12)  $x \leq y$  iff  $y \pitchfork x = x$ .

*Proof.* (1) Applying (QBE) and Proposition 3.2(7), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} x \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x) &= x \rightarrow (x \pitchfork (y \pitchfork x)) = x \rightarrow ((x \pitchfork 1) \pitchfork (y \pitchfork x)) \\ &= (x \rightarrow 1) \pitchfork (x \rightarrow y) = 1 \pitchfork (x \rightarrow y) = x \rightarrow y. \end{aligned}$$

(2) By (QBE) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} x \pitchfork (x^* \rightarrow y) &= x^{**} \pitchfork (x^* \rightarrow y) = (x^* \rightarrow 0) \pitchfork (x^* \rightarrow y) \\ &= x^* \rightarrow ((x^* \pitchfork 0) \pitchfork (y \pitchfork x^*)) \\ &= x^* \rightarrow (0 \pitchfork (y \pitchfork x^*)) = x^* \rightarrow 0 = x^{**} = x. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $x \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$ . It follows that  $x \leq_Q y^* \rightarrow x$ , and replacing  $y$  by  $y^*$  we get  $x \leq_Q y \rightarrow x$ .

(3) If  $x \rightarrow y = 0$ , then by (2),  $x^* \leq_Q x \rightarrow y = 0$ , and using Proposition 3.2(4) we get  $x^* \leq 0$ , so  $x^* = 0$ , that is  $x = 1$ . It follows that  $1 \rightarrow y = 0$ , hence  $y = 0$ . Conversely,  $x = 1$  and  $y = 0$  implies  $x \rightarrow y = 0$ .

(4) Taking into consideration Lemma 3.1 and (1), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} (x \rightarrow y)^* \pitchfork x &= (((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* \\ &= (((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* \\ &= (x \rightarrow ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \\ &= (x \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x))^* \\ &= (x \rightarrow y)^*. \end{aligned}$$

(5) Using (4) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork y &= ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* \pitchfork y \\ &= (y \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^*)^* \pitchfork y \\ &= (y \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^*)^* \\ &= ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* \\ &= x \pitchfork y. \end{aligned}$$

(6) By (5),  $x \pitchfork y \leq_Q y$ . Using (2), we get  $y \leq_Q (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y = x \cup y$ .

(7) By (2) and (1), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} x &= x^{**} = (x^*)^* = (x^* \pitchfork (x \rightarrow y))^* = x \cup (x \rightarrow y)^* \\ &= (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* \\ &= (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* \\ &= (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x^*)^* \\ &= (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* \\ &= (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x) \\ &= (x \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x)) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x) \\ &= x \cup (y \pitchfork x). \end{aligned}$$

(8) Applying (7), we have:

$$x \pitchfork (y \cup x) = (x^* \cup (y \cup x)^*)^* = (x^* \cup (y^* \pitchfork x^*))^* = (x^*)^* = x.$$

(9) Using (1) and (7), we get:

$$(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x) = (x \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x)) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x) = x \cup (y \pitchfork x) = x.$$

(10) Applying (1) we get:

$$(x \cup y) \rightarrow y = y^* \rightarrow (x \cup y)^* = y^* \rightarrow (x^* \pitchfork y^*) = y^* \rightarrow x^* = x \rightarrow y.$$

(11) Using (10) we have:



$$(x \uplus y) \uplus y = ((x \uplus y) \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y = x \uplus y.$$

(12) If  $x \leq y$ , then  $x \rightarrow y = 1$  and we have  $y \pitchfork x = ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* = ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x^*)^* = (1 \rightarrow x^*)^* = (x^*)^* = x$ . Conversely, if  $y \pitchfork x = x$ , using (1) we get  $x \rightarrow y = x \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x) = x \rightarrow x = 1$ , hence  $x \leq y$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.11.** *Let  $X$  be a quantum-BE algebra. If  $x, y \in X$  such that  $x \leq_Q y$ , then the following hold for any  $z \in X$ :*

- (1)  $y = y \uplus x$ ;
- (2)  $y^* \leq_Q x^*$ ;
- (3)  $y \rightarrow z \leq_Q x \rightarrow z$ ;
- (4)  $z \rightarrow x \leq_Q z \rightarrow y$ ;
- (5)  $x \pitchfork z \leq_Q y \pitchfork z$ ;
- (6)  $x \uplus z \leq_Q y \uplus z$ .

*Proof.* (1) From  $x \leq_Q y$  we have  $x = x \pitchfork y$  and by Proposition 3.10(7),  $y = y \uplus (x \pitchfork y) = y \uplus x$ .

(2) Using (1), we get  $y = y \uplus x$ , so that  $y^* = (y \uplus x)^* = y^* \pitchfork x^*$ . Hence  $y^* \leq_Q x^*$ .

(3)  $x \leq_Q y$  implies  $x = x \pitchfork y$ . Since by Proposition 3.10(2),  $y \rightarrow z \leq_Q (y \rightarrow z)^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x)^*$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (y \rightarrow z) \pitchfork (x \rightarrow z) &= (y \rightarrow z) \pitchfork ((x \pitchfork y) \rightarrow z) \\ &= (y \rightarrow z) \pitchfork (((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* \rightarrow z) \\ &= (y \rightarrow z) \pitchfork (z^* \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)) \\ &= (y \rightarrow z) \pitchfork ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow y^*)) \\ &= (y \rightarrow z) \pitchfork ((y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z)) \\ &= (y \rightarrow z) \pitchfork ((y \rightarrow z)^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x)^*) \\ &= y \rightarrow z. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $y \rightarrow z \leq_Q x \rightarrow z$ .

(4) By (1),  $x \leq_Q y$  implies  $y = y \uplus x$ . Since by Proposition 3.10(2),  $z \rightarrow x \leq_Q (z \rightarrow x)^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x)^*$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (z \rightarrow x) \pitchfork (z \rightarrow y) &= (z \rightarrow x) \pitchfork (z \rightarrow (y \uplus x)) \\ &= (z \rightarrow x) \pitchfork (z \rightarrow ((y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow x)) \\ &= (z \rightarrow x) \pitchfork ((y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow x)) \\ &= (z \rightarrow x) \pitchfork ((z \rightarrow x)^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x)^*) \\ &= z \rightarrow x. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $z \rightarrow x \leq_Q z \rightarrow y$ .

(5) From  $x \leq_Q y$  we have  $y^* \leq_Q x^*$ . By (3) we get  $x^* \rightarrow z^* \leq_Q y^* \rightarrow z^*$  and  $(y^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^* \leq_Q (x^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*$ . It follows that  $((x^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*)^* \leq_Q ((y^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*)^*$ , that is  $x \pitchfork z \leq_Q y \pitchfork z$ .

(6) By (3), we have  $y \rightarrow z \leq_Q x \rightarrow z$  and  $(x \rightarrow z) \rightarrow z \leq_Q (y \rightarrow z) \rightarrow z$ . Hence  $x \uplus z \leq_Q y \uplus z$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.12.** *Let  $X$  be a quantum-BE algebra. Then the following hold, for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :*

- (1)  $(x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork (y \pitchfork z) = (x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork z$ ;
- (2)  $\leq_Q$  is transitive;
- (3)  $x \uplus y \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$ ;
- (4)  $(x^* \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^* = x^* \rightarrow y$ ;
- (5)  $(x \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x)^* = x \rightarrow y$ ;

- (6)  $(y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y) = x \rightarrow y$ ;  
 (7)  $(x \rightarrow y) \cup (y \rightarrow x) = 1$ ;  
 (8)  $(z \cap x) \rightarrow (y \cap x) = (z \cap x) \rightarrow y$ .

*Proof.* (1) Applying Propositions 3.3(1) and 3.10(6), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (x \cap y) \cap (y \cap z) &= (((x \cap y)^* \rightarrow (y \cap z)^*) \rightarrow (y \cap z)^*)^* \\
 &= (((x \cap y)^* \rightarrow (y^* \cup z^*)) \rightarrow (y^* \cup z^*))^* \\
 &= (((x \cap y)^* \rightarrow ((y^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*)) \rightarrow ((y^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*))^* \\
 &= (((y^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow ((x \cap y)^* \rightarrow z^*)) \rightarrow ((y^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*))^* \\
 &= (((x \cap y)^* \rightarrow z^*) \cap (y^* \rightarrow z^*)) \rightarrow z^*)^* \\
 &= (((x \cap y)^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*)^* \\
 &= (x \cap y) \cap z.
 \end{aligned}$$

(Denoting by  $a = (x \cap y) \rightarrow z^*$ ,  $b = y^* \rightarrow z^*$ ,  $c = z^*$ , by Proposition 3.3(1) we have  $(b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow c) = (a \cap b) \rightarrow c$ . It follows that:

$$((y^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow ((x \cap y)^* \rightarrow z^*)) \rightarrow ((y^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*) = (((x \cap y)^* \rightarrow z^*) \cap (y^* \rightarrow z^*)) \rightarrow z^*.$$

By Proposition 3.10(6),  $x \cap y \leq_Q y$ , so that  $y^* \leq_Q (x \cap y)^*$ . Hence, by Proposition 3.11(3),  $(x \cap y)^* \rightarrow z^* \leq_Q y^* \rightarrow z^*$ , that is  $((x \cap y)^* \rightarrow z^*) \cap (y^* \rightarrow z^*) = (x \cap y)^* \rightarrow z^*$ .

(2) If  $x \leq_Q y$  and  $y \leq_Q z$ , then  $x = x \cap y$  and  $y = y \cap z$ . Applying (1), we get  $x = (x \cap y) \cap (y \cap z) = (x \cap y) \cap z = x \cap z$ , that is  $x \leq_Q z$ . We conclude that  $\leq_Q$  is transitive.

(3) Since  $x^* \leq_Q x \rightarrow y$ , we have  $(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$ , that is  $x \cup y \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$ .

(4) By  $(QBE_1)$  we have  $y^* \rightarrow x = y^* \rightarrow (y^* \cap x)$ . Using Lemma 3.1(5),(6) and Propositions 3.10(2), 3.11(1) we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (x^* \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^* &= (y^* \rightarrow x)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^* \\
 &= (y^* \rightarrow (y^* \cap x))^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^* \\
 &= (x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow (y^* \cap x)) \\
 &= y^* \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (y^* \cap x)) \\
 &= y^* \rightarrow ((y^* \cap x)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \\
 &= y^* \rightarrow ((y \cup x^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \\
 &= y^* \rightarrow (((y \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \\
 &= y^* \rightarrow (((x \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \\
 &= y^* \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \\
 &= y^* \rightarrow (x \cup (x \rightarrow y^*)^*) \\
 &= y^* \rightarrow x = x^* \rightarrow y.
 \end{aligned}$$

(By Proposition 3.10(2),  $x^* \leq_Q x \rightarrow y^*$ , so  $(x \rightarrow y^*)^* \leq_Q x$ . Using Proposition 3.11(1) we get  $x = x \cup (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$ ).

(5) It follows from (4) replacing  $x$  by  $x^*$  and using Lemma 3.1(5),(6).

(6) It follows from (5) and Lemma 3.1(6).

(7) Applying (6), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (x \rightarrow y) \cup (y \rightarrow x) &= ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x)) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x) \\
 &= (y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x) = 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

(8) Applying Lemma 3.1,  $(BE_4)$  and Proposition 3.10(1), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (z \cap x) \rightarrow (y \cap x) &= ((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* \rightarrow (y \cap x) \\
 &= (y \cap x)^* \rightarrow ((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*) \\
 &= (z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow ((y \cap x)^* \rightarrow x^*) \\
 &= (z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow (y \cap x))
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= (z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y) \\
 &= (z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow x^*) \\
 &= y^* \rightarrow ((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*) \\
 &= ((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* \rightarrow y \\
 &= (z \bowtie x) \rightarrow y. \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

**Corollary 3.13.** *If  $X$  is a quantum-BE algebra, then  $\leq_Q$  is a partial order on  $X$ .*

*Proof.* It follows by Propositions 3.2(2) and 3.12(2). □

**Example 3.14.** *The involutive BE algebra from Example 3.4 is not a quantum-BE algebra. Indeed,  $2 \rightarrow ((2 \bowtie 0) \bowtie (6 \bowtie 0)) = 2 \neq 3 = (2 \rightarrow 0) \bowtie (2 \rightarrow 6)$ , thus axiom (QBE) is not satisfied.*

*Remark 3.15.* As we can see in the next example, in general the quantum-BE algebras are not quantum-B algebras. We will prove in the next section that the commutative quantum-BE algebras are quantum-B algebras.

**Example 3.16.** *Let  $X = \{0, a, b, c, 1\}$  and let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be the involutive BE algebra with  $\rightarrow$  and the corresponding operation  $\bowtie$  given in the following tables:*

|               |   |   |   |   |   |           |   |   |   |   |   |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\rightarrow$ | 0 | a | b | c | 1 | $\bowtie$ | 0 | a | b | c | 1 |
| 0             | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a             | b | 1 | a | 1 | 1 | a         | 0 | a | b | c | a |
| b             | a | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | b         | 0 | b | b | c | b |
| c             | c | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | c         | 0 | a | b | c | c |
| 1             | 0 | a | b | c | 1 | 1         | 0 | a | b | c | 1 |

*Then  $X$  is a quantum-BE algebra. We can see that  $c \leq b$ , but  $a \rightarrow c = 1 \not\leq a = a \rightarrow b$ , hence axiom (QB<sub>2</sub>) is not satisfied. It follows that  $X$  is not a quantum-B algebra.*

#### 4. COMMUTATIVE QUANTUM-BE ALGEBRAS

Since the commutativity plays an important role in the study of quantum-BE algebras, we define the commutative quantum-BE algebras and we give a characterization of these structures. We give a condition for a quantum-BE algebra to be a bounded commutative BCK algebra, and we prove that a bounded commutative BCK algebra is both a quantum-BE algebra and a quantum-B algebra.

The commutative BE algebras have been defined and studied in [36].

**Definition 4.1.** A BE algebra  $X$  is called *commutative* if it satisfies the following axiom for all  $x, y \in X$ :

(Comm)  $x \cup y = y \cup x$ .

By Proposition 3.3, a self distributive involutive BE algebra is commutative.

**Proposition 4.2.** *If  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a bounded commutative BE algebra, then the following hold for all  $x, y \in X$ :*

- (1)  $X$  is involutive;
- (2)  $x \bowtie y = y \bowtie x$ ;

- (3)  $x \leq y$  implies  $x \leq_Q y$ ;  
 (4)  $\leq$  is transitive.

*Proof.* (3) If  $x \leq y$ , then  $x \rightarrow y = 1$  and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} x \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! y &= ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* = ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*)^* = (x \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow x^*)^*)^* \\ &= (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*)^* = (x \rightarrow 1^*)^* = x^{**} = x. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $x \leq_Q y$ .

(4) Let  $x \leq y$  and  $y \leq z$ , that is  $x \rightarrow y = 1$  and  $y \rightarrow z = 1$ . Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} x \rightarrow z &= x \rightarrow (1 \rightarrow z) = x \rightarrow ((y \rightarrow z) \rightarrow z) = x \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y) \\ &= (z \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y) = (z \rightarrow y) \rightarrow 1 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $x \leq z$ , that is  $\leq$  is transitive.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.3.** *If  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a bounded commutative BE algebra, then  $\leq_Q = \leq$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.2(4),  $x \leq_Q y$  implies  $x \leq y$ . According to Proposition 4.2(3),  $x \leq y$  implies  $x \leq_Q y$ . Hence  $\leq_Q = \leq$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.4.** *If  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a commutative quantum-BE algebra, then  $(X, \rightarrow, 1)$  is a unital quantum-B algebra.*

*Proof.* According to [36, Cor. 3.5], any commutative BE algebra is a (commutative) BCK algebra. By [33, Cor. of Prop. 12], any BCK algebra is a unital (commutative) quantum-B algebra (see also [32, Ex. 3.2]).  $\square$

**Corollary 4.5.** *If  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a self distributive quantum-BE algebra, then  $(X, \rightarrow, 1)$  is a unital quantum-B algebra.*

**Example 4.6.** *Let  $X = \{0, a, b, c, 1\}$  and consider the operations  $\rightarrow$  and  $\mathbin{\&}\! \! \!$  given in the following tables:*

|               |   |   |   |   |   |                        |   |   |   |   |   |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\rightarrow$ | 0 | a | b | c | 1 | $\mathbin{\&}\! \! \!$ | 0 | a | b | c | 1 |
| 0             | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0                      | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a             | b | 1 | c | a | 1 | a                      | 0 | a | b | c | a |
| b             | a | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | b                      | 0 | b | b | b | b |
| c             | c | 1 | a | 1 | 1 | c                      | 0 | c | b | c | c |
| 1             | 0 | a | b | c | 1 | 1                      | 0 | a | b | c | 1 |

*Then  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a commutative quantum-BE algebra, and  $(X, \rightarrow, 1)$  is a commutative quantum-B algebra.*

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be a commutative quantum-BE algebra. Then the following hold for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :*

- (1)  $(y \mathbin{\cup}\! \! \! x) \rightarrow y = x \rightarrow y$ ;
- (2)  $x \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! (x \mathbin{\cup}\! \! \! y) = x$ ;
- (3)  $(y \mathbin{\cup}\! \! \! x) \mathbin{\cup}\! \! \! y = x \mathbin{\cup}\! \! \! y$ ;
- (4)  $(x \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! y) \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! z = y \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! (x \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! z)$ .

*Proof.* (1),(2),(3) follow applying the commutativity in Proposition 3.10(10),(8),(11), respectively.

(4) By commutativity and Proposition 3.12(1),(8), we have:

$$(x \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! y) \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! z = (y \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! x) \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! z = (y \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! x) \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! (x \mathbin{\&}\! \! \! z)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= (((y \pitchfork x)^* \rightarrow (x \pitchfork z)^*) \rightarrow (x \pitchfork z)^*)^* \\
 &= ((z \pitchfork x) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x)) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\
 &= (((z \pitchfork x) \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\
 &= ((y^* \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*) \rightarrow (z \pitchfork x)^*)^* \\
 &= y \pitchfork (z \pitchfork x) = y \pitchfork (x \pitchfork z). \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be a quantum-BE algebra. The following are equivalent:*

- (a)  $X$  is commutative;
- (b)  $x \rightarrow y = (y \cup x) \rightarrow y$  and  $x \leq_Q x \cup y$ , for all  $x, y \in X$ .

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) It follows by Proposition 4.7(1),(2).

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) By (b) we have  $x \rightarrow y = (y \cup x) \rightarrow y$ , hence  $(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y = ((y \cup x) \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y$ . It follows that  $x \cup y = (y \cup x) \cup y$ , and similarly  $y \cup x = (x \cup y) \cup x$ . Replacing  $x$  by  $x \cup y$  and  $y$  by  $x$  in  $x \leq_Q x \cup y$  from (b), we get  $x \cup y \leq_Q (x \cup y) \cup x = y \cup x$ , and similarly  $y \cup x \leq_Q (y \cup x) \cup y = x \cup y$ . Since  $\leq_Q$  is antisymmetric, we get  $x \cup y = y \cup x$ , that is  $X$  is commutative.  $\square$

As we already mentioned, any commutative BE algebra is a commutative BCK algebra, and obviously, a bounded commutative BCK algebra is involutive. Moreover, by [36, Prop. 2.5] any BCK algebra is a BE algebra.

**Proposition 4.9.** *Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be a bounded commutative BCK algebra. The following hold for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :*

- (1)  $x \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y) = x \rightarrow y$  and  $x \rightarrow ((x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork x) = x \rightarrow y$ ;
- (2)  $x \pitchfork (x^* \rightarrow y) = x$ ;
- (3)  $(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y) = x$ ;
- (4)  $(z \pitchfork x) \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x) = (z \pitchfork x) \rightarrow y$ ;
- (5)  $(x \rightarrow y)^* \pitchfork x = (x \rightarrow y)^*$ ;
- (6)  $(x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork y = x \pitchfork y$ ;
- (7)  $x \pitchfork y \leq_Q y \leq_Q x \cup y$ ;
- (8)  $(x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork (y \pitchfork z) = (x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork z$ ;
- (9)  $(x \pitchfork y) \pitchfork z = y \pitchfork (x \pitchfork z)$ .

*Proof.* (1) Applying Proposition 2.7(4), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 x \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y) &= (x \pitchfork y)^* \rightarrow x^* = ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow x^* \\
 &= ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^* = y^* \rightarrow x^* = x \rightarrow y.
 \end{aligned}$$

By commutativity we also have  $x \rightarrow (y \pitchfork x) = x \rightarrow y$ , and replacing  $y$  by  $x \pitchfork y$  we get the second identity.

(2) From  $0 \leq y$  we get  $x^* \rightarrow 0 \leq x^* \rightarrow y$ , hence  $x \leq x^* \rightarrow y$ . By Corollary 4.3,  $x \leq_Q x^* \rightarrow y$ , so that  $x \pitchfork (x^* \rightarrow y) = x$ .

(3) Replacing  $x$  by  $x^*$  in (2), we have  $x^* \pitchfork (x \rightarrow y) = x^*$ , and we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \pitchfork y) &= (x \pitchfork y)^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* \\
 &= ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* \\
 &= ((y^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* \\
 &= ((x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* \\
 &= (x \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^*) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* \\
 &= x \cup (x \rightarrow y)^* = (x^* \pitchfork (x \rightarrow y))^* = (x^*)^* = x.
 \end{aligned}$$

(4),(5) follow similar to the proof of Propositions 3.12(8) and 3.10(4), respectively, using

Lemma 3.1,  $(BE_4)$  and (1).

(6) Similar to the proof of Proposition 3.10(5), using (5).

(7) By (6),  $x \mathbin{\frown} y \leq_Q y$ . Applying (2),  $y \leq_Q y^* \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)^* = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y = x \mathbin{\cup} y$ .

(8) Similar to the proof of Proposition 3.12(1), using Proposition 3.3(1) and (7).

(9) Applying (8) and (4), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (x \mathbin{\frown} y) \mathbin{\frown} z &= (y \mathbin{\frown} x) \mathbin{\frown} z = (y \mathbin{\frown} x) \mathbin{\frown} (x \mathbin{\frown} z) \\
 &= (((y \mathbin{\frown} x)^* \rightarrow (x \mathbin{\frown} z)^*) \rightarrow (x \mathbin{\frown} z)^*)^* \\
 &= (((x \mathbin{\frown} z) \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\frown} x)) \rightarrow (x \mathbin{\frown} z)^*)^* \\
 &= (((z \mathbin{\frown} x) \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\frown} x)) \rightarrow (z \mathbin{\frown} x)^*)^* \\
 &= (((z \mathbin{\frown} x) \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (z \mathbin{\frown} x)^*)^* \\
 &= ((y^* \rightarrow (z \mathbin{\frown} x)^*) \rightarrow (z \mathbin{\frown} x)^*)^* \\
 &= y \mathbin{\frown} (z \mathbin{\frown} x). \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be a bounded commutative BCK algebra. The following hold for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :*

- (1)  $x \leq_Q y$  implies  $z \rightarrow x \leq_Q z \rightarrow y$ ,  $y \rightarrow z \leq_Q x \rightarrow z$  and  $y^* \leq_Q x^*$ ;
- (2)  $x \leq_Q y$  and  $x \leq_Q z$  imply  $x \leq_Q y \mathbin{\frown} z$ ;
- (3)  $y \leq_Q x$  and  $z \leq_Q x$  imply  $y \mathbin{\cup} z \leq_Q x$ ;
- (4)  $x \leq_Q y$  implies  $x \mathbin{\cup} z \leq_Q y \mathbin{\cup} z$  and  $x \mathbin{\frown} z \leq_Q y \mathbin{\frown} z$ .

*Proof.* (1) Since by Corollary 4.3,  $\leq_Q = \leq$ , then  $x \leq_Q y$  implies  $x \rightarrow y = 1$ , and we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (z \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y) &= (x^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow z^*) \\
 &= y^* \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*) \\
 &= y^* \rightarrow ((z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow x^*) \\
 &= (z^* \rightarrow x^*) \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow x^*) \\
 &= (x \rightarrow z) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y) = (x \rightarrow z) \rightarrow 1 = 1,
 \end{aligned}$$

hence  $z \rightarrow x \leq z \rightarrow y$ , so that  $z \rightarrow x \leq_Q z \rightarrow y$ . For the second inequality we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (y \rightarrow z) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z) &= x \rightarrow ((y \rightarrow z) \rightarrow z) = x \rightarrow ((z \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y) \\
 &= (z \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y) = (z \rightarrow y) \rightarrow 1 = 1,
 \end{aligned}$$

thus  $y \rightarrow z \leq x \rightarrow z$ , that is  $y \rightarrow z \leq_Q x \rightarrow z$ . Taking  $z := 0$  in the second inequality we get  $y^* \leq_Q x^*$ .

(2) Since  $x \leq_Q y$  and  $x \leq_Q z$ , we have  $x = x \mathbin{\frown} y$  and  $x = x \mathbin{\frown} z$ . Using Proposition 4.9(8) we get  $x \mathbin{\frown} (y \mathbin{\frown} z) = (x \mathbin{\frown} y) \mathbin{\frown} (y \mathbin{\frown} z) = (x \mathbin{\frown} y) \mathbin{\frown} z = x \mathbin{\frown} z = x$ , hence  $x \leq_Q y \mathbin{\frown} z$ .

(3) From hypothesis we get  $x^* \leq_Q y^*$  and  $x^* \leq_Q z^*$ . Using (2) we get  $x^* \leq_Q y^* \mathbin{\frown} z^* = (y \mathbin{\cup} z)^*$ , hence  $y \mathbin{\cup} z \leq_Q x$ .

(4) Applying (1), from  $x \leq_Q y$  we get  $y \rightarrow z \leq_Q x \rightarrow z$  and  $(x \rightarrow z) \rightarrow z \leq_Q (y \rightarrow z) \rightarrow z$ , that is  $x \mathbin{\cup} z \leq_Q y \mathbin{\cup} z$ . Moreover  $x \leq_Q y$  implies  $y^* \leq_Q x^*$ , so that  $x^* \rightarrow z^* \leq_Q y^* \rightarrow z^*$  and  $(y^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^* \leq_Q (x^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*$ . It follows that  $((x^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*)^* \leq_Q ((y^* \rightarrow z^*) \rightarrow z^*)^*$ , hence  $x \mathbin{\frown} z \leq_Q y \mathbin{\frown} z$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.11.** *Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be a bounded commutative BCK algebra. The following holds for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :*

$$x \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\frown} z) = (x \rightarrow y) \mathbin{\frown} (x \rightarrow z).$$

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be a bounded commutative BCK algebra and let  $x, y, z \in X$ . Since  $X$  is a bounded commutative BE algebra, by Corollary 4.3 we have  $\leq_Q = \leq$ . Using Propositions 4.10 and 2.7(5), for any  $u \in X$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 u \leq_Q x \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\frown} z) &\text{ iff } u \leq_Q (y \mathbin{\frown} z)^* \rightarrow x^* \text{ iff } u \leq_Q (y^* \mathbin{\cup} z^*) \rightarrow x^* \\
 &\text{ iff } y^* \mathbin{\cup} z^* \leq_Q u \rightarrow x^* \text{ iff } y^* \leq_Q u \rightarrow x^* \text{ and } z^* \leq_Q u \rightarrow x^* \\
 &\text{ iff } u \leq_Q y^* \rightarrow x^* = x \rightarrow y \text{ and } u \leq_Q z^* \rightarrow x^* = x \rightarrow z \\
 &\text{ iff } u \leq_Q (x \rightarrow y) \mathbin{\frown} (x \rightarrow z).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since in BCK algebras the relation  $\leq$  is a partial order, we conclude that  $x \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\frown} z) = (x \rightarrow y) \mathbin{\frown} (x \rightarrow z)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.12.** *Any bounded commutative BCK algebra  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a quantum-BE algebra.*

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be a bounded commutative BCK algebra and let  $x, y, z \in X$ . Using Proposition 4.9(8),(9),(1) and Proposition 4.11, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 x \rightarrow ((x \mathbin{\frown} y) \mathbin{\frown} (z \mathbin{\frown} x)) &= x \rightarrow ((y \mathbin{\frown} x) \mathbin{\frown} (x \mathbin{\frown} z)) = x \rightarrow ((y \mathbin{\frown} x) \mathbin{\frown} z) \\
 &= x \rightarrow (x \mathbin{\frown} (y \mathbin{\frown} z)) = x \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\frown} z) \\
 &= (x \rightarrow y) \mathbin{\frown} (x \rightarrow z).
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that axiom  $(QBE)$  is satisfied, hence  $X$  is a quantum-BE algebra.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.13.** *A quantum-BE algebra  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a bounded commutative BCK algebra if and only if, for all  $x, y \in X$ ,  $x \leq y$  implies  $x \leq_Q y$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be a bounded commutative BCK algebra and let  $x, y, z \in X$ . According to Proposition 4.12,  $X$  is a quantum-BE algebra. If  $x \leq y$ , by Proposition 3.10(12) and by commutativity we have  $x = y \mathbin{\frown} x = x \mathbin{\frown} y$ , hence  $x \leq_Q y$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $X$  is a quantum-BE algebra such that for all  $x, y \in X$ ,  $x \leq y$  implies  $x \leq_Q y$ . Using  $(BE_4)$  and  $(QBE_1)$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (x \mathbin{\frown} y) \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\frown} x) &= (y \mathbin{\frown} x)^* \rightarrow (x \mathbin{\frown} y)^* = (y \mathbin{\frown} x)^* \rightarrow ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*) \\
 &= (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow ((y \mathbin{\frown} x)^* \rightarrow y^*) = (y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow (y \mathbin{\frown} x)) \\
 &= (y \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow x) = 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $x \mathbin{\frown} y \leq y \mathbin{\frown} x$ , hence  $x \mathbin{\frown} y \leq_Q y \mathbin{\frown} x$ , and similarly  $y \mathbin{\frown} x \leq_Q x \mathbin{\frown} y$ . Since  $\leq_Q$  is antisymmetric, we get  $x \mathbin{\frown} y = y \mathbin{\frown} x$ , that is  $X$  is a bounded commutative BCK algebra.  $\square$

## 5. CONNECTION WITH QUANTUM-MV ALGEBRAS

In this section, we establish the connection between quantum-BE algebras and quantum-MV algebras, and we prove that the two quantum structures are equivalent. We show that, in general, the quantum-MV algebras are not quantum-B algebras and, and we prove that in the case of a self distributive quantum-BE algebra the corresponding quantum-MV algebra is an MV algebra. We deduce certain properties of quantum-MV algebras, and we give conditions for a quantum-QMV algebra to be an MV algebra. A connection between quantum-BE algebras and the left and right-m-BE algebras is established, and it is shown that the involutive m-BE algebras are equivalent to the involutive BE algebras.

Given an involutive BE algebra  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$ , we define the operations  $\oplus, \odot$  by  $x \oplus y = x^* \rightarrow y$  and  $x \odot y = (x^* \oplus y^*)^* = (x \rightarrow y^*)^*$ , for all  $x, y \in X$ . Conversely, in any S-algebra  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  the operation  $\rightarrow$  can be defined as  $x \rightarrow y = x^* \oplus y$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** *The class of involutive BE algebras is equivalent to the class of S-algebras.*

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be an involutive BE algebra and let  $x \oplus y = x^* \rightarrow y$ , for all  $x, y \in X$ . We check axioms  $(S_1)$ - $(S_7)$ .  $(S_1)$  follows by Lemma 3.1(1), replacing  $x$  and  $y$  by  $x^*$  and  $y^*$ , respectively. Applying successively  $(BE_4)$  and Lemma 3.1(5),(6), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} x \oplus (y \oplus z) &= x^* \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow z) = y^* \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow z) = y^* \rightarrow (z^* \rightarrow x) \\ &= z^* \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow x) = z^* \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow y) \\ &= (x^* \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow z = (x \oplus y) \oplus z, \end{aligned}$$

hence  $(S_2)$  is satisfied. Axioms  $(S_3)$ - $(S_7)$  follow from the definition of  $\oplus$  and properties of involutive BE algebras, hence  $(X \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  is an S-algebra.

Conversely, let  $(X \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  be an S-algebra and let  $x \rightarrow y = x^* \oplus y$ , for all  $x, y \in X$ . Obviously, by  $(S_5)$ ,  $X$  is involutive. By  $(S_3)$ ,  $x^* \oplus x = 1$ , so that  $x \rightarrow x = 1$ , that is  $(BE_1)$ . From  $(S_7)$ ,  $x^* \oplus 1 = 1$ , hence  $x \rightarrow 1 = 1$ , so that  $(BE_3)$  is satisfied. Using  $(S_4)$ , we have  $0 \oplus x = x \oplus 0 = 1$ , thus  $0^* \rightarrow x = 1 \rightarrow x = x$ , and  $(S_3)$  is also verified. Finally, applying  $(S_2)$  and  $(S_1)$  we get:

$$\begin{aligned} x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z) &= x^* \oplus (y^* \oplus z) = (x^* \oplus y^*) \oplus z \\ &= (y^* \oplus x^*) \oplus z = y^* \oplus (x^* \oplus z) \\ &= y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z), \end{aligned}$$

hence  $(BE_4)$  is satisfied. It follows that  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is an involutive BE algebra.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.2.**  $\mathfrak{m}_S \equiv \mathfrak{m}$ ,  $\mathfrak{u}_S \equiv \mathfrak{u}$  and  $\leq_S \equiv \leq$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  be an S-algebra. For any  $x, y \in X$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} x \mathfrak{m}_S y &= (x \oplus y^*) \odot y = ((x^* \rightarrow y^*)^* \oplus y^*)^* = ((x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow y^*)^* = x \mathfrak{m} y, \\ x \mathfrak{u}_S y &= (x \odot y^*) \oplus y = (x^* \oplus y)^* \oplus y = (x \rightarrow y)^* \oplus y = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow y = x \mathfrak{u} y, \\ x \leq_S y &\text{ iff } x = x \mathfrak{m}_S y \text{ iff } x = x \mathfrak{m} y \text{ iff } x \leq_Q y. \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 5.3.** *The class of quantum-MV algebras is equivalent to the class of quantum-BE algebras.*

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  be an S-algebra. We prove that axiom (QMV) is equivalent to axiom (QBE). Replacing  $x$  by  $x^*$  in (QMV), we get:

$x^* \oplus ((x \mathfrak{m} y) \mathfrak{m} (z \mathfrak{m} x)) = (x^* \oplus y) \mathfrak{m} (x^* \oplus y)$  iff  $x \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \mathfrak{m} (z \rightarrow x)) = (x \rightarrow y) \mathfrak{m} (x \rightarrow z)$ , that is (QMV)  $\equiv$  (QBE). It follows that the class of quantum-MV algebras is equivalent to the class of quantum-BE algebras.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.4.** *In general, the quantum-MV algebras are not quantum-B algebras.*

*Proof.* It follows by Theorem 5.3 and Remark 3.15.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.5.** *Axiom (QMV) is equivalent to axioms:*

$$\begin{aligned} (QMV_1) \quad &x \oplus (x^* \mathfrak{m} y) = x \oplus y; \\ (QMV_2) \quad &x \oplus (y \mathfrak{m} (z \mathfrak{m} z^*)) = (x \oplus y) \mathfrak{m} (x \oplus z). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Similar to the proof of Theorem 5.3, we prove that  $(QMV_1) \equiv (QBE_1)$  and  $(QMV_2) \equiv (QBE_2)$ . Applying Theorem 3.9, the proof is complete.  $\square$

*Remarks 5.6.* (1) D. Mundici proved in [30] that MV algebras are equivalent to bounded commutative BCK algebras (see also [20]). According to Proposition 4.12, the bounded commutative BCK algebras are quantum-BE algebras, and by Theorem 5.3 the quantum-BE algebras are equivalent to quantum-MV algebras. It follows that any MV algebra is a quantum-MV



algebra (for a directly proof see [5, Ex. 2.3.14]).

(2) Every orthomodular lattice  $(L, \vee, \wedge, ', 0, 1)$  determines a QMV algebra by taking  $\oplus$  as the supremum  $\vee$  and  $*$  as the orthocomplement  $'$  ([5, Th. 2.3.9]).

As we can see in the next example, there exist QMV algebras which are not MV algebras.

**Example 5.7.** Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be the QBE algebra from Example 3.16 and let  $\oplus$  and  $*$  be the operations derived from  $\rightarrow$ .

|          |   |   |   |   |   |     |       |
|----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| $\oplus$ | 0 | a | b | c | 1 | $x$ | $x^*$ |
| 0        | 0 | a | b | c | 1 | 0   | 1     |
| a        | a | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | a   | b     |
| b        | b | 1 | a | 1 | 1 | b   | a     |
| c        | c | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | c   | c     |
| 1        | 0 | a | b | c | 1 | 1   | 0     |

Then  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  is a QMV algebra. Since  $(a^* \oplus c)^* \oplus c = c \neq a = (a \oplus c^*)^* \oplus a$ , then  $X$  is not an MV algebra.

**Example 5.8.** Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be the QBE algebra from Example 4.6 and let  $\oplus$  and  $*$  be the operations derived from  $\rightarrow$ .

|          |   |   |   |   |   |     |       |
|----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| $\oplus$ | 0 | a | b | c | 1 | $x$ | $x^*$ |
| 0        | 0 | a | b | c | 1 | 0   | 1     |
| a        | a | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | a   | b     |
| b        | b | 1 | c | 1 | 1 | b   | a     |
| c        | c | 1 | a | 1 | 1 | c   | c     |
| 1        | 0 | a | b | c | 1 | 1   | 0     |

Then  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  is a QMV algebra which is an MV algebra.

**Proposition 5.9.** Let  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  be a QBE algebra such that  $X$  is a self distributive BE algebra. Then the QMV algebra  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  is an MV algebra.

*Proof.* According to Proposition 3.3(4),  $x \frown y = y \frown x$ , for all  $x, y \in X$ . Taking into consideration Remark 2.3, it follows that  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  is an MV algebra.  $\square$

Due to Theorem 5.3, certain properties proved in [9, 5] for QMV algebras, as well as new properties can be deduced from properties of QBE algebras.

**Proposition 5.10.** Let  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  be a QMV algebra. Then the following hold for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :

- (1)  $x \oplus (x^* \frown y) = x \oplus y$ ;
- (2)  $x \oplus (y \frown x^*) = x \oplus y$ ;
- (3)  $x \odot y \leq_Q x \leq_Q x \oplus y$ ;
- (4)  $x \oplus y = 0$  iff  $x = y = 0$ ;
- (5)  $x \frown (x \oplus y) = x$ ;
- (6)  $x \oplus (y \frown (z \frown x^*)) = (x \oplus y) \frown (x \oplus z)$ ;
- (7)  $x \oplus y \oplus (x \odot y) = x \oplus y$ ;
- (8)  $x^* \oplus y \uplus (y^* \oplus x) = 1$ ;
- (9)  $(z \frown x)^* \oplus (y \frown x) = (z \frown x)^* \oplus y$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows replacing  $x$  by  $x^*$  and  $x^* \rightarrow y$  by  $x \oplus y$  in  $(QBE_1)$ , Proposition 3.10(1),(2)+(4),(3),(2),  $(QBE_2)$  and Proposition 3.12(4),(7),(8), respectively.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.11.** *Let  $X$  be a quantum-MV algebra. If  $x, y \in X$  such that  $x \leq_Q y$ , then the following hold for any  $z \in X$ :*

- (1)  $x \oplus z \leq_Q y \oplus z$ ;
- (2)  $x \odot z \leq_Q y \odot z$ .

*Proof.* (1) By Proposition 3.11,  $x \leq_Q y$  implies  $y^* \leq_Q x^*$  and  $x^* \rightarrow z \leq_Q y^* \rightarrow z$ . It follows that  $x \oplus z \leq_Q y \oplus z$ .

(2) Since  $y^* \leq_Q x^*$ , using (1) we get  $y^* \oplus z^* \leq_Q x^* \oplus z^*$ , so that  $(x^* \oplus z^*)^* \leq_Q (y^* \oplus z^*)^*$ . Hence  $x \odot z \leq_Q y \odot z$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.12.** *A quantum-MV algebra  $X$  is an MV algebra if and only if, for all  $x, y \in X$ ,  $x \leq y$  implies  $x \leq_Q y$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Theorems 4.13, 5.3 and Remarks 5.6(1).  $\square$

**Theorem 5.13.** *If a quantum-MV algebra  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  satisfies the following conditions for all  $x, y \in X$ :*

$$x \pitchfork (x \uplus y) = x \text{ and } (y^* \pitchfork x) \oplus y = x \oplus y,$$

*then  $X$  is an MV algebra.*

*Proof.* From  $(y^* \pitchfork x) \oplus y = x \oplus y$  we get  $x^* \rightarrow y = (y \uplus x^*) \rightarrow y$ , and replacing  $x$  by  $x^*$ , we have  $x \rightarrow y = (y \uplus x) \rightarrow y$ . Since  $x \pitchfork (x \uplus y) = x$  is equivalent to  $x \leq_Q x \uplus y$ , applying Theorem 4.8 it follows that  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a commutative quantum-BE algebra. Hence  $X$  is a commutative BCK algebra, so that  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  is an MV algebra.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.14.** *If a quantum-MV algebra  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  satisfies the following condition for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :*

$$x \oplus (y \oplus z) = (x^* \odot y) \oplus (x \oplus z),$$

*then  $X$  is an MV algebra.*

*Proof.* The identity  $x \oplus (y \oplus z) = (x^* \odot y) \oplus (x \oplus z)$  is equivalent to  $x \oplus (y \oplus z) = (x \oplus y^*)^* \oplus (x \oplus z)$ , and we get  $x^* \rightarrow (y^* \rightarrow z) = (x^* \rightarrow y^*)^* \oplus (x^* \rightarrow z) = (x^* \rightarrow y^*) \rightarrow (x^* \rightarrow z)$ , for all  $x, y, z \in X$ . Replacing  $x$  by  $x^*$  and  $y$  by  $y^*$  we have  $x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z) = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z)$ . Hence  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a self distributive BE algebra, so that by Proposition 3.3,  $X$  is commutative. Applying Theorem 4.8, it follows that  $(X, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a commutative quantum-BE algebra. Thus it is a commutative BCK algebra, so that  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  is an MV algebra.  $\square$

*Remark 5.15.* If  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$  is an MV algebra, then we define the operations  $x \vee y = (x \oplus y) \odot x^* = (y \oplus x) \odot y^*$  and  $x \wedge y = x \odot (y \oplus x^*) = y \odot (x \oplus y^*)$ , where  $x \odot y = (x^* \oplus y^*)^*$ . It is well known that  $(X, \vee, \wedge, 0, 1)$  is the lattice structure of  $(X, \oplus, *, 0, 1)$ .

One can easily prove that  $x \vee y = x \uplus y$  and  $x \wedge y = x \pitchfork y$ , for all  $x, y \in X$ .

Taking into consideration the equivalence between MV algebras and bounded commutative BCK algebras (Remarks 5.6(1)), certain properties of MV algebras can be deduced from Propositions 4.9, 4.10, 4.11.

A. Iorgulescu and M. Kinyon defined and studied in [25] the notion of *right-m-BE algebras* as algebras  $(X, \oplus, *, 0)$  of type  $(2, 1, 0)$  satisfying the following properties: (SU)  $0 \oplus x = x = x \oplus 0$ ;

(Scomm)  $x \oplus y = y \oplus x$ ; (Sass)  $x \oplus (y \oplus z) = (x \oplus y) \oplus z$ ; (m-L<sup>R</sup>)  $x \oplus 1 = 1$ ; (m-Re<sup>R</sup>)  $x \oplus x^* = 1$ . A right-m-BE algebra  $X$  is involutive if it satisfies condition (DN)  $(x^*)^* = x$ , for all  $x \in X$ . In an involutive right-m-BE algebra the following operations are defined, for all  $x, y \in X$ :

$$\begin{aligned} x \odot y &= (x^* \oplus y^*)^* \text{ (obviously, } x \oplus y = (x^* \odot y^*)^*), \\ x \wedge_m^M y &= (x^* \odot y)^* \odot y = y \odot (y \odot x^*)^*, \\ x \vee_m^M y &= (x^* \wedge_m^M y^*)^*, \\ x \leq_M^M y &\text{ iff } x = x \wedge_m^M y. \end{aligned}$$

A *right-quantum-MV algebra*, or a *right-QMV algebra* for short, is an involutive right-m-BE algebra satisfying the following axiom, for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :

$$(Sqm\vee) \quad x \oplus [(x^* \wedge_m^M y) \wedge_m^M (z \wedge_m^M x^*)] = (x \oplus y) \wedge_m^M (x \oplus z).$$

Dually, a *left-m-BE algebra* is an algebra  $(X, \odot, *, 1)$  of type  $(2, 1, 0)$  satisfying the following properties: (PU)  $1 \odot x = x = x \odot 1$ ; (Pcomm)  $x \odot y = y \odot x$ ; (Pass)  $x \odot (y \odot z) = (x \odot y) \odot z$ ; (m-L)  $x \odot 0 = 0$ ; (m-Re)  $x \odot x^* = 0$ . A *left-quantum-MV algebra*, or a *left-QMV algebra* for short, is an involutive left-m-BE algebra satisfying the following axiom, for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :

$$(Pqm\vee) \quad x \odot [(x^* \vee_m^M y) \vee_m^M (z \vee_m^M x^*)] = (x \odot y) \vee_m^M (x \odot z).$$

According to [25, Prop. 3.11], the conditions (Sqm $\vee$ ) and (Pqm $\vee$ ) are equivalent. The left and right-quantum-MV algebras were intensively studied by A. Iorgulescu in [21, 22, 23, 24, 25]. Using [21, Th. 9.1] one can show that the involutive m-BE algebras are equivalent to the involutive BE algebras, so that certain results from the above mentioned papers can be deduced from the results proved in this paper for quantum-BE algebras.

## 6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We defined and investigated the quantum-BE algebras and the commutative quantum-BE algebras. We proved that any bounded commutative BCK algebra is both a quantum-BE algebra and a quantum-B algebra, and gave a condition for a quantum-BE algebra to be a bounded commutative BCK algebra.

The notions of ideals and filters in quantum-MV algebras have been defined and studied in [9, 15, 5]. A nonempty subset  $I$  of a QMV algebra  $X$  is an *ideal* (or a *q-ideal*) of  $X$  if it satisfies the conditions: (I<sub>1</sub>)  $x \in I, y \in X \Rightarrow x \odot y \in I$ , (I<sub>2</sub>)  $x, y \in I \Rightarrow x \oplus y \in I$ . An ideal  $I$  is a *p-ideal* if  $x \in I, y \in X \Rightarrow x \circ y \in I$ . A subset  $F \subseteq X$  is a *filter* of  $X$  if it satisfies the following conditions: (F<sub>1</sub>)  $x, y \in F \Rightarrow x \odot y \in F$ , (F<sub>2</sub>)  $x \in F, x \leq_Q y \Rightarrow y \in F$ .

The notion of a *first meander* of a subset  $F \subseteq X$  was defined in [6] as the set:

$$F^1 = \{x \in X \mid x \oplus y \in F \Rightarrow y \in F\}.$$

It was proved in [6] that the first meander of an ideal in  $X$  is a filter, and the first meander of a filter is an ideal.

As another direction of research, one can define and study the ideals and filters in QBE algebras, as well as the first meander of a subset in QBE algebras.

## Funding

The author declares that no funds, grants, or other support were received during the preparation of this manuscript.

## Competing interests

The author has no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Botur, I. Chajda, R. Halaš, J. Kühr, J. Paseka, *Algebraic Methods in Quantum Logic*, Univ. Palacky, Olomouc, 2014.
- [2] C.C. Chang, *Algebraic analysis of many valued logics*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **88**(1958), 467–490.
- [3] R. Cignoli, I.M.L. D’Ottaviano, D. Mundici, *Algebraic Foundations of Many-Valued Reasoning*, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2000.
- [4] L.C. Ciungu, *Non-commutative Multiple-Valued Logic Algebras*, Springer, Cham, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London, 2014.
- [5] A. Dvurečenskij, S. Pulmannová, *New trends in Quantum Structures*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Ister Science, Bratislava, 2000.
- [6] A. Dvurečenskij, S. Pulmannová, S. Salvati, *Meanders in orthoposets and QMV algebras*, Demonstratio Mathematica **34**(2001), 1–12.
- [7] A. Dvurečenskij, T. Vetterlein, *Pseudoeffect algebras. I. Basic properties*, Inter. J. Theor. Phys. **40**(2001), 685–701.
- [8] D.J. Foulis, M.K. Bennett, *Effect algebras and unsharp quantum logics*, Found. Phys. **24**(1994), 1325–1346.
- [9] R. Giuntini, *Quasilinear QMV algebras*, Inter. J. Theor. Phys. **34**(1995), 1397–1407.
- [10] R. Giuntini, *Quantum MV-algebras*, Studia Logica **56**(1996), 393–417.
- [11] R. Giuntini, *Axiomatizing Quantum MV-algebras*, Mathware and Soft Comput. **4**(1997), 23–39.
- [12] R. Giuntini, *Quantum MV-algebras and commutativity*, Inter. J. Theor. Phys. **37**(1998), 65–74.
- [13] R. Giuntini, *An independent axiomatization of quantum MV algebras*. In: C. Carola, A. Rossi (eds.), *The Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2000, pp. 233–249.
- [14] R. Giuntini, *Weakly linear quantum MV-algebras*, Algebra Universalis **53**(2005), 45–72.
- [15] R. Giuntini, S. Pulmannová, *Ideals and congruences in effect algebras and QMV-algebras*, Comm. Algebra **28**(2000), 1567–1592.
- [16] S. Gudder, *Total extension of effect algebras*, Found. Phys. Letters **8**(1995), 243–252.
- [17] S.W. Han, X.T. Xu, F. Qin, *The unitality of quantum B-algebras*, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **57**(2018), 1582–1590.
- [18] S. Han, R. Wang, X. Xu, *The injective hull of quantum B-algebras*, Fuzzy Sets Syst. **369**(2019), 114–121.
- [19] Y. Imai, K. Iséki, *On axiom systems of propositional calculi. XIV*. Proc. Japan Acad. **42**, 19–22, (1966)
- [20] A. Iorgulescu, *Classes of pseudo-BCK algebras - Part I*, J. Mult.-Valued Logic Soft Comput. **12**(2006), 71–130.
- [21] A. Iorgulescu, *Algebras of logic vs. algebras*, In Adrian Rezus, editor, *Contemporary Logic and Computing*, Vol. 1 of Landscapes in Logic, pages 15–258, Colloge Publications, 2020.
- [22] A. Iorgulescu, *On quantum-MV algebras - Part I: The orthomodular algebras*, Sci. Ann. Comput. Sci. **31**(2)(2021), 163–221.
- [23] A. Iorgulescu, *On Quantum-MV algebras - Part II: Orthomodular lattices, softlattices and widelattices*, Transactions on Fuzzy Sets and Systems **1**(2022), 1–41.
- [24] A. Iorgulescu, *On quantum-MV algebras - Part III: The properties (m-Pabs-i) and (WNMm)*, Sci. Math. Jpn. **35**(e-2022), Article 4.
- [25] A. Iorgulescu, M. Kinyon, *Putting Quantum-MV algebras on the map*, Sci. Math. Jpn. **34**(e-2021), Article 10.
- [26] G. Kalmbach, *Orthomodular Lattices*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, Academic Press, Vol. 8, New York, 1983.
- [27] H.S. Kim, Y.H. Kim, *On BE-algebras*, Sci. Math. Jpn. **66**(2007), 113–116.
- [28] K.H. Kim, Y.H. Yon, *Dual BCK-algebra and MV-algebra*, Sci. Math. Jpn. **66**(2007), 247–254.
- [29] C.J. Mulvey, &, In: *Second Topology Conference*, Taormina, April 47, 1984, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo Suppl. **12**(1986), 99–104.

- [30] D. Mundici, *MV-algebras are categorically equivalent to bounded commutative BCK-algebras*, Math. Japonica, **6**(1986), 889–894.
- [31] P. Pták, S. Pulmannová, *Orthomodular Structures as Quantum Logics*, VEDA and Kluwer Acad. Publ., Bratislava and Dordrecht, 1991.
- [32] W. Rump, *Quantum B-algebras*, Cen. Eur. J. Math. **11**(2013), 1881–1899.
- [33] W. Rump, Y.C. Yang, *Non-commutative logic algebras and algebraic quantales*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **165**(2014), 759–785.
- [34] W. Rump, *The completion of a quantum B-algebra*, Cah. Topol. Géom. Différ. Catég. **57**(2016), 203–228.
- [35] W. Rump, *Quantum B-algebras: their omnipresence in algebraic logic and beyond*, Soft Comput. **21**(2017), 2521–2529.
- [36] A. Walendziak, *On commutative BE-algebras*, Sci. Math. Jpn. **69**(2009), 281–284.