

# **Intuitionistic fuzzy implications revisited. Part 1**

**Krassimir Atanassov<sup>1</sup>, Eulalia Szmidt<sup>2</sup>, Janusz Kacprzyk<sup>2</sup>  
and Nora Angelova<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Department of Bioinformatics and Mathematical Modelling  
Institute of Biophysics and Biomedical Engineering  
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences  
Acad. G. Bonchev Str., Bl. 105, Sofia-1113, Bulgaria  
e-mail: krat@bas.bg

<sup>2</sup> Systems Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences  
ul. Newelska 6, 01-447 Warsaw, Poland  
and  
Warsaw School of Information Technology  
ul. Newelska 6, 01-447 Warsaw, Poland  
e-mails: {szmidt, kacprzyk}@ibspan.waw.pl

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics, Sofia University  
5 James Bourchier Blvd., Sofia 1164, Bulgaria  
e-mail: nora.angelova@fmi.uni-sofia.bg

**Received:** 6 March 2019

**Accepted:** 10 April 2019

**Abstract:** Definitions of two intuitionistic fuzzy implications, published during the last 15 years, are revisited. It is checked which existing by the moment intuitionistic fuzzy implications (190 in number) satisfy a well-known tautology in first order logic.

**Keywords:** Intuitionistic fuzzy implication, Intuitionistic fuzzy logic.

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 03E72.

## **1 Introduction**

In [3], 185 different intuitionistic fuzzy implications are given. After its publishing, five new implications are introduced in [2–8]. In [3], the problem for correctness of these implications is

discussed. Some criteria are shown as suitable for this problem.

The pair  $A = \langle a, b \rangle$  is called an *intuitionistic fuzzy pair*, if  $a, b, a + b \in [0, 1]$ . It is:  
a *tautology* if and only if (iff)  $a = 1$  and  $b = 0$ , and  
an *intuitionistic fuzzy tautology (IFT)* iff  $a \geq b$ .

For the implications, for example, it is obligatory that they satisfy the following condition

$$\begin{aligned}\langle 0, 1 \rangle &\rightarrow \langle 0, 1 \rangle = \langle 1, 0 \rangle, \\ \langle 0, 1 \rangle &\rightarrow \langle 1, 0 \rangle = \langle 1, 0 \rangle, \\ \langle 1, 0 \rangle &\rightarrow \langle 0, 1 \rangle = \langle 0, 1 \rangle, \\ \langle 1, 0 \rangle &\rightarrow \langle 1, 0 \rangle = \langle 1, 0 \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

i.e., they behave as standard tautologies.

In the present research, we will formulate new condition for correctness of the intuitionistic fuzzy implications.

## 2 Main results

Let  $A = \langle a, b \rangle$ , and  $B = \langle c, d \rangle$  where  $a, b, c, d, a + b, c + d \in [0, 1]$ , be intuitionistic fuzzy pairs. Initially, following [12], we must mention that two of implications from [3] coincide in spite of the fact that they have different records there. They are

$$\langle a, b \rangle \rightarrow_{40} \langle c, d \rangle = \langle 1 - \text{sg}(a + d - 1), 1 - \overline{\text{sg}}(a + d - 1) \rangle$$

and

$$\langle a, b \rangle \rightarrow_{173} \langle c, d \rangle = \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a + d - 1), \text{sg}(a + d - 1) \rangle,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\text{sg}(x) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x \leq 0 \end{cases} \\ \overline{\text{sg}}(x) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } x \leq 0 \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Really, for each variable  $x$ :

$$1 - \text{sg}(x) = \overline{\text{sg}}(x).$$

In the first part of our research, we will check which implications from [3] satisfy the well-known formula

$$((\neg\neg A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow (\neg\neg A \vee \neg A)) \rightarrow (\neg\neg A \vee \neg A) \quad (1)$$

that in first order logic (see, e.g., [11]) is a tautology.

**Theorem 1.** Implication  $\rightarrow_i$  satisfy (1) for  $i = 2, 3, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 23, 31, 32, 34, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 52, 55, 56, 57, 62, 63, 65, 68, 69, 74, 77, 83, 84, 88, 90, 97, 99, 171, 172, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 185$  as a standard tautology.

*Proof.* We will check Theorem 1 for  $i = 2$ . The remaining checks are analogous. The implication  $\rightarrow_2$  and the negation  $\neg_2$ , generated by it, have the forms (see [3]):

$$A \rightarrow_2 B = \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a - c), d \text{sg}(a - c) \rangle,$$

where  $B = \langle c, d \rangle$  and

$$\neg_2 A = \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a), \text{sg}(a) \rangle.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\equiv ((\neg_2 \neg_2 A \rightarrow_2 A) \rightarrow_2 (\neg_2 \neg_2 A \vee \neg_2 A)) \rightarrow_2 (\neg_2 \neg_2 A \vee \neg_2 A) \\ &= ((\neg_2 \neg_2 \langle a, b \rangle \rightarrow_2 \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_2 (\neg_2 \neg_2 \langle a, b \rangle \vee \neg_2 \langle a, b \rangle)) \rightarrow_2 (\neg_2 \neg_2 \langle a, b \rangle \vee \neg_2 \langle a, b \rangle) \\ &= ((\neg_2 \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a), \text{sg}(a) \rangle \rightarrow_2 \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_2 (\neg_2 \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a), \text{sg}(a) \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a), \text{sg}(a) \rangle)) \\ &\quad \rightarrow_2 (\neg_2 \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a), \text{sg}(a) \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a), \text{sg}(a) \rangle) \\ &= ((\langle \overline{\text{sg}}(\overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \text{sg}(\overline{\text{sg}}(a)) \rangle \rightarrow_2 \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_2 (\langle \overline{\text{sg}}(\overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \text{sg}(\overline{\text{sg}}(a)) \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a), \text{sg}(a) \rangle)) \\ &\quad \rightarrow_2 (\langle \overline{\text{sg}}(\overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \text{sg}(\overline{\text{sg}}(a)) \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a), \text{sg}(a) \rangle) \\ &= ((\langle \text{sg}(a), 1 - \text{sg}(a) \rangle \rightarrow_2 \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_2 (\langle \text{sg}(a), 1 - \text{sg}(a) \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a), \text{sg}(a) \rangle)) \\ &\quad \rightarrow_2 (\langle \text{sg}(a), 1 - \text{sg}(a) \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(a), \text{sg}(a) \rangle) \\ &= (\langle \overline{\text{sg}}(\text{sg}(a) - a), b \text{sg}(\text{sg}(a) - a) \rangle \rightarrow_2 \langle \max(\text{sg}(a), \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \min(1 - \text{sg}(a), \text{sg}(a)) \rangle) \\ &\quad \rightarrow_2 \langle \max(\text{sg}(a), \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \min(1 - \text{sg}(a), \text{sg}(a)) \rangle \\ &= (\langle \overline{\text{sg}}(\text{sg}(a) - a), b \text{sg}(\text{sg}(a) - a) \rangle \rightarrow_2 \langle \max(\text{sg}(a), \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \min(1 - \text{sg}(a), \text{sg}(a)) \rangle) \\ &\quad \rightarrow_2 \langle \max(\text{sg}(a), \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \min(1 - \text{sg}(a), \text{sg}(a)) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

If  $a = 0$ , then  $\text{sg}(a) = 0$ ,  $\overline{\text{sg}}(a) = 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= (\langle \overline{\text{sg}}(0), b \text{sg}(0) \rangle \rightarrow \langle \max(0, 1), \min(1, 0) \rangle) \rightarrow \langle \max(0, 1), \min(1, 0) \rangle \\ &= (\langle 1, 0 \rangle \rightarrow \langle 1, 0 \rangle) \rightarrow \langle 1, 0 \rangle \\ &= \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - 1), 0 \cdot \text{sg}(1 - 1) \rangle \rightarrow \langle 1, 0 \rangle \\ &= \langle 1, 0 \rangle \rightarrow \langle 1, 0 \rangle \\ &= \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - 1), 0 \cdot \text{sg}(1 - 1) \rangle = \langle 1, 0 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $Z$  is a tautology.  $\square$

Now, we will give an example in which, e.g., implication

$$A \rightarrow_{12} B = \langle \max(b, c), 1 - \max(b, c) \rangle$$

and the negation

$$\neg_{10} A = \langle b, 1 - b \rangle$$

generated by it, do not satisfy (1).

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
Z &\equiv ((\neg_4 \neg_4 A \rightarrow_{12} A) \rightarrow_{12} (\neg_4 \neg_4 A \vee \neg_4 A)) \rightarrow_{12} (\neg_4 \neg_4 A \vee \neg_{12} A) \\
&= ((\neg_4 \neg_4 \langle a, b \rangle \rightarrow_{12} \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_{12} (\neg_4 \neg_4 \langle a, b \rangle \vee \neg_4 \langle a, b \rangle)) \\
&\quad \rightarrow_{12} (\neg_4 \neg_4 \langle a, b \rangle \vee \neg_4 \langle a, b \rangle) \\
&= ((\neg_4 \langle b, 1 - b \rangle \rightarrow_{12} \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_{12} (\neg_4 \langle b, 1 - b \rangle \vee \langle b, 1 - b \rangle)) \rightarrow_{12} (\neg_4 \langle b, 1 - b \rangle \vee \langle b, 1 - b \rangle) \\
&= ((\langle 1 - b, b \rangle \rightarrow_{12} \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_{12} (\langle 1 - b, b \rangle \vee \langle b, 1 - b \rangle)) \rightarrow_{12} (\langle 1 - b, b \rangle \vee \langle b, 1 - b \rangle) \\
&= (\langle \max(a, b), 1 - \max(a, b) \rangle \rightarrow_{12} \langle \max(b, 1 - b), \min(b, 1 - b) \rangle) \\
&\quad \rightarrow_{12} \langle \max(b, 1 - b), \min(b, 1 - b) \rangle \\
&= (\langle \max(1 - \max(a, b), \max(b, 1 - b)), 1 - \max(1 - \max(a, b), \max(b, 1 - b)) \rangle \\
&\quad \rightarrow_{12} \langle \max(b, 1 - b), \min(b, 1 - b) \rangle) \\
&= (\langle \max(\min(1 - a, 1 - b), \max(b, 1 - b)), 1 - \max(\min(1 - a, 1 - b), \max(b, 1 - b)) \rangle \\
&\quad \rightarrow_{12} \langle \max(b, 1 - b), \min(b, 1 - b) \rangle)
\end{aligned}$$

(because, for  $a, b, a + b \in [0, 1]$ :  $\min(1 - a, 1 - b) \leq 1 - b \leq \max(b, 1 - b)$ )

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \langle \max(b, 1 - b), 1 - \max(b, 1 - b) \rangle \rightarrow_{12} \langle \max(b, 1 - b), \min(b, 1 - b) \rangle \\
&= \langle \max(1 - \max(b, 1 - b), \max(b, 1 - b)), 1 - \max(1 - \max(b, 1 - b), \max(b, 1 - b)) \rangle \\
&= \langle \max(\min(b, 1 - b), \max(b, 1 - b)), 1 - \max(\min(b, 1 - b), \max(b, 1 - b)) \rangle \\
&\quad = \langle \max(b, 1 - b), 1 - \max(b, 1 - b) \rangle \\
&\quad = \langle \max(b, 1 - b), \min(b, 1 - b) \rangle \neq \langle 1, 0 \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

for  $0 \leq b < 1$ , i.e., (1) is not a tautology.

**Theorem 2.** Implication  $\rightarrow_i$  satisfies (1) for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 141, 146, 147, 148, 151, 158, 159, 160, 161, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185$  as IFT.

*Proof.* We will check Theorem 2 for  $i = 1$ . The remaining checks are analogous. The implication  $\rightarrow_1$  and the negation  $\neg_1$  generated by it, have the forms (see [3]):

$$A \rightarrow_1 B = \langle \max(b, \min(a, c)), \min(a, d) \rangle,$$

where  $B$  is defined above and

$$\neg_1 A = \langle b, a \rangle.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
Z &\equiv ((\neg_1 \neg_1 A \rightarrow_1 A) \rightarrow_1 (\neg_1 \neg_1 A \vee \neg_1 A)) \rightarrow_1 (\neg_1 \neg_1 A \vee \neg_1 A) \\
&= ((\neg_1 \neg_1 \langle a, b \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_1 (\neg_1 \neg_1 \langle a, b \rangle \vee \neg_1 \langle a, b \rangle)) \\
&\quad \rightarrow_1 (\neg_1 \neg_1 \langle a, b \rangle \vee \neg_1 \langle a, b \rangle) \\
&= ((\neg_1 \langle b, a \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_1 (\neg_1 \langle b, a \rangle \vee \langle b, a \rangle)) \\
&\quad \rightarrow_1 (\neg_1 \langle b, a \rangle \vee \langle b, a \rangle) \\
&= ((\langle a, b \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_1 (\langle a, b \rangle \vee \langle b, a \rangle)) \\
&\quad \rightarrow_1 (\langle a, b \rangle \vee \langle b, a \rangle) \\
&= (\langle \max(b, \min(a, a)), \min(a, b) \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle \max(a, b), \min(a, b) \rangle) \rightarrow_1 \langle \max(a, b), \min(a, b) \rangle \\
&= (\langle \max(a, b), \min(a, b) \rangle \rightarrow_1 \langle \max(a, b), \min(a, b) \rangle) \rightarrow_1 \langle \max(a, b), \min(a, b) \rangle \\
&= (\langle \max(\min(a, b), \min(\max(a, b), \max(a, b))), \min(\max(a, b), \min(a, b)) \rangle) \\
&\quad \rightarrow_1 \langle \max(a, b), \min(a, b) \rangle \\
&= \langle \max(\min(\max(a, b), \min(a, b)), \\
&\quad \min(\max(\min(a, b), \min(\max(a, b), \max(a, b))), \max(a, b))), \\
&\quad \min(\max(\min(a, b), \min(\max(a, b), \max(a, b))), \min(a, b)) \rangle \\
&= \langle \max(\min(a, b), \min(\max(\min(a, b), \max(a, b)), \max(a, b))), \\
&\quad \min(\max(\min(a, b), \max(a, b)), \min(a, b)) \rangle \\
&= \langle \max(\min(a, b), \max(a, b)), \min(\max(a, b), \min(a, b)) \rangle \\
&= \langle \max(a, b), \min(a, b) \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $Z$  is an IFT.  $\square$

Now, we will give an example in which, e.g., the implication

$$A \rightarrow_{60} B = \langle \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - c)), \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(c)) \rangle$$

and the negation, generated by it

$$\neg_{10} A = \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - b), 1 - b \rangle$$

(see [3]) do not satisfy (1).

$$\begin{aligned}
Z &\equiv ((\neg_{10} \neg_{10} A \rightarrow_{60} A) \rightarrow_{60} (\neg_{10} \neg_{10} A \vee \neg_{10} A)) \rightarrow_{60} (\neg_{10} \neg_{10} A \vee \neg_{10} A) \\
&= ((\neg_{10} \neg_{10} \langle a, b \rangle \rightarrow_{60} \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_{60} (\neg_{10} \neg_{10} \langle a, b \rangle \vee \neg_{10} \langle a, b \rangle)) \\
&\quad \rightarrow_{60} (\neg_{10} \neg_{10} \langle a, b \rangle \vee \neg_{10} \langle a, b \rangle)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& = ((\neg_{10} \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle \rightarrow_{60} \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_{60} (\neg_{10} \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle)) \\
& \quad \rightarrow_{60} (\neg_{10} \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle) \\
& = ((\neg_{10} \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle \rightarrow_{60} \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_{60} (\neg_{10} \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle)) \\
& \quad \rightarrow_{60} (\neg_{10} \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle) \\
& = ((\langle \overline{\text{sg}}(b), b \rangle \rightarrow_{60} \langle a, b \rangle) \rightarrow_{60} (\langle \overline{\text{sg}}(b), b \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle)) \\
& \quad \rightarrow_{60} (\langle \overline{\text{sg}}(b), b \rangle \vee \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), 1-b \rangle) \\
& = (\langle \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1-b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-a)), \min(1-b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)) \rangle \rightarrow_{60} \langle \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)), \min(b, 1-b) \rangle) \\
& \quad \rightarrow_{60} (\langle \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)), \min(b, 1-b) \rangle) \\
& = \langle \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b))), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)))) , \\
& \quad \min(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)))))) \\
& \quad \rightarrow_{60} \langle \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)), \min(b, 1-b) \rangle \\
& = \langle \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b))))), \\
& \quad \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \langle \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)) \rangle), \\
& \quad \min(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)))), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)))) \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we check the value of

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_1 & \equiv \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b))))), \\
& \quad \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b))).
\end{aligned}$$

If  $b = 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_1 & = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(1, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(1, 0)))), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \max(1, 0))) \\
& = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \overline{\text{sg}}(a), \overline{\text{sg}}(1))), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - 1)) \\
& = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \overline{\text{sg}}(a), 0)), 1) \\
& = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - 0), 1) = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

If  $b = 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_1 & = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(0, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1), \overline{\text{sg}}(0))))), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1), \overline{\text{sg}}(0)))) \\
& = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(0, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(0, 1)))), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \max(0, 1))) \\
& = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(0, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(1))), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - 1)) \\
& = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - 0, 0)), 1) \\
& = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1), 1) = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

If  $0 < b < 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(0, 0)))), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \max(0, 0))) \\ Y_1 &= \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(0))), \overline{\text{sg}}(1)) \\ Y_1 &= \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), 1)), 0) \\ Y_1 &= \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - (1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)))), 0) \\ Y_1 &= \overline{\text{sg}}(\min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a))). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$Y_2 \equiv \min(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - b)))), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - b)))).$$

For  $b = 0, 1$  we can see immediately that  $Y_2 = 0$ .

If  $0 < b < 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} Y_2 &= \min(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(0, 0)))), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(0, 0))) \\ &= \min(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(0, 0)))), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(0, 0))) \\ &= \min(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(0)), \overline{\text{sg}}(0)) \\ &= \min(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), 1), 1) \\ &= \min(1 - (1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a))), 1) \\ &= \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$Z = \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(\min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a))), \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)) \rangle.$$

If  $a = 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(\min(1 - b, 1)), \min(1 - b, 1) \rangle \\ &= \langle \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - b), 1 - b \rangle \\ &= \langle 0, 1 - b \rangle \end{aligned}$$

that for  $0 < b < 1$  is not an IFT. So, we have shown that Theorem 2 is not valid for  $\rightarrow_{60}$ .

### 3 Conclusion

In the second part of the present research, we will determine which intuitionistic fuzzy implications satisfy two other tautologies in first order logic.

**Open Problem:** In [2] six Cartesian products are defined (the last of them was published in [1]). For which indices  $i$  and  $j$  the  $i$ -th implication and  $j$ -th Cartesian product satisfies equality

$$(A \rightarrow_i B) \times_j C = (A \times_j C) \rightarrow_i (B \times_j C)$$

for every three IFSs  $A, B, C$ ?

## Acknowledgements

This work has been partially supported by the Bulgarian National Science Fund under Grant Ref. No. DN-02-10/2016 “New Instruments for Knowledge Discovery from Data, and their Modelling”

## References

- [1] Andonov, V. (2008). On some properties of one Cartesian product over intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 14 (1), 12–19.
- [2] Atanassov, K. (2012). *On Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets Theory*, Springer, Berlin.
- [3] Atanassov, K. (2017). *Intuitionistic Fuzzy Logics*. Springer, Cham.
- [4] Atanassov, K., Angelova, N., Szmidt, E., & Kacprzyk, J. (2016). Properties of the intuitionistic fuzzy implication  $\rightarrow_{186}$ . *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 22 (4), 6–12.
- [5] Atanassov, K., Ribagin, S., Doukovska, L., & Atanassova, V. (2017). Intuitionistic fuzzy implication  $\rightarrow_{190}$ . *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 23 (4), 79–83.
- [6] Atanassov, K., Szmidt, E., & Kacprzyk, J. (2016). New Fodor’s type of intuitionistic fuzzy implication and negation. *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 22 (3), 1–8.
- [7] Atanassov, K., Szmidt, E., & Kacprzyk, J. (2017). Intuitionistic fuzzy implication  $\rightarrow_{188}$ . *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 23 (1), 6–13.
- [8] Atanassov, K., Szmidt, E., & Kacprzyk, J. (2017). Intuitionistic fuzzy implication  $\rightarrow_{187}$ . *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 23 (2), 37–43.
- [9] Atanassov, K., Szmidt, E., & Angelova, N. (2017). Properties of the intuitionistic fuzzy implication  $\rightarrow_{187}$ . *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 23 (3), 3–8.
- [10] Atanassova, L. (2017). Intuitionistic fuzzy implication  $\rightarrow_{189}$ . *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 23 (1), 14–20.
- [11] Mendelson, E. (1964). *Introduction to Mathematical Logic*, Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.
- [12] Vassilev, P., Ribagin, S., & Kacprzyk, J. (2018) A remark on intuitionistic fuzzy implications. *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 24 (2), 1–7.