

Intuitionistic fuzzy implications revisited. Part 1

Krassimir Atanassov¹, Eulalia Szmidt², Janusz Kacprzyk²
and Nora Angelova³

¹ 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

² 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

³ 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 [1], 185 different intuitionistic fuzzy implications are given. After its publishing, five new implications are introduced in [2–8]. In [1], 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 [10], we must mention that two of implications from [1] 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 [1] 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., [9]) 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 [1]):

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

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

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

Therefore, Z is a tautology. □

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

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

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 [1]):

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

where B is defined above and

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

Let

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

Therefore, Z is an IFT. □

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 [1]) 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-b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a))), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)))) \rangle, \\
&\quad \min(1 - \min(1-b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(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}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)))) \rangle, \\
&\quad \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \langle \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)) \rangle), \\
&\min(1 - \min(1 - \min(1-b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)))) \rangle, \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(\overline{\text{sg}}(b), \overline{\text{sg}}(1-b)))) \rangle).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we check the value of

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

If $b = 0$, then

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

If $b = 1$, then

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

If $0 < b < 1$, then

$$Y_1 = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a))), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(0, 0))), \overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \max(0, 0)))$$

$$Y_1 = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a))), \overline{\text{sg}}(0)), \overline{\text{sg}}(1))$$

$$Y_1 = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a))), 1), 0)$$

$$Y_1 = \max(\overline{\text{sg}}(1 - (1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a)))), 0)$$

$$Y_1 = \overline{\text{sg}}(\min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a))).$$

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

$$Y_2 = \min(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a))), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(0, 0)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(0, 0)))$$

$$= \min(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a))), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(0, 0)), \overline{\text{sg}}(\max(0, 0)))$$

$$= \min(1 - \min(1 - \min(1 - b, \overline{\text{sg}}(a))), \overline{\text{sg}}(0), \overline{\text{sg}}(0))$$

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

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

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

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

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

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

$$= \langle 0, 1 - b \rangle$$

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.

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] Atanassov, K. (2017). *Intuitionistic Fuzzy Logics*. Springer, Cham.
- [2] 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.
- [3] Atanassov, K., Ribagin, S., Doukowska, L., & Atanassova, V. (2017). Intuitionistic fuzzy implication \rightarrow_{190} . *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 23 (4), 79–83.
- [4] 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.
- [5] Atanassov, K., Szmidt, E., & Kacprzyk, J. (2017). Intuitionistic fuzzy implication \rightarrow_{188} . *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 23 (1), 6–13.
- [6] Atanassov, K., Szmidt, E., & Kacprzyk, J. (2017). Intuitionistic fuzzy implication \rightarrow_{187} . *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 23 (2), 37–43.
- [7] Atanassov, K., Szmidt, E., & Angelova, N. (2017). Properties of the intuitionistic fuzzy implication \rightarrow_{187} . *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 23 (3), 3–8.
- [8] Atanassova, L. (2017). Intuitionistic fuzzy implication \rightarrow_{189} . *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 23 (1), 14–20.
- [9] Mendelson, E. (1964). *Introduction to Mathematical Logic*, Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.
- [10] Vassilev, P., Ribagin, S., & Kacprzyk, J. (2018) A remark on intuitionistic fuzzy implications. *Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets*, 24 (2), 1–7.