16<sup>th</sup> Int. Conf. on IFSs, Sofia, 9–10 Sept. 2012 Notes on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets Vol. 18, 2012, No. 3, 30–38

# On the intuitionistic fuzzy sets with metric type relation between the membership and non-membership functions

**Peter Vassilev** 

Bioinformatics and Mathematical Modelling Department Institute of Biophysics and Biomedical Engineering Bulgarian Academy of Sciences 105 Acad. G. Bonchev Str., Sofia 1113, Bulgaria e-mail: peter.vassilev@gmail.com

Abstract: In the paper the so-called  $d_{\varphi}$ -intuitionistic fuzzy set  $(d_{\varphi}\text{-}IFS)$ , over the non-empty universe E, are considered for the case when  $d_{\varphi}$  is  $\mathcal{R}^2$ -metric induced by an arbitrary fixed absolute normalized  $\mathcal{R}^2$ -norm  $\varphi$ . It is proved that there exists a bijective isomorphism between the class of all such sets and the class of all intuitionistic fuzzy sets over E.

**Keywords:** Intuitionistic fuzzy set, *d*-intuitionistic fuzzy set,  $d_{\varphi}$ -intuitionistic fuzzy set, Norm, Absolute norm, Normalized norm, Absolute normalized norm, Injection, Surjection, Bijection, Isomorphism

AMS Classification: 03E72.

#### **1** Basic definitions

The following definition (in another form) is contained in [1]:

**Definition 1.** Let  $A \subset E$  and  $\mu_A : E \to [0,1]$  and  $\nu_A : E \to [0,1]$  are mappings such that for any  $x \in E$  the inequality

$$\mu_A(x) + \nu_A(x) \le 1$$

holds. The set

$$\tilde{A} = \{ \langle x, \mu_A(x), \nu_A(x) \rangle | x \in E \}$$

is called intuitionistic fuzzy set (or Atanassov set) over E.

The mappings  $\mu_A$  and  $\nu_A$  are called membership and non-membership function, respectively. The map  $\pi_A : E \to [0, 1]$ , that for  $x \in E$  is introduced by

$$\pi_A(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 - \mu_A(x) - \nu_A(x),$$

is called hesitancy function.

The class of all intuitionistic fuzzy sets over E is denoted by IFS(E).

**Definition 2.** An  $\mathcal{R}^2$ -norm  $\varphi$  is called normalized norm if the equality

$$\varphi((1,0)) = \varphi((0,1)) = 1$$

holds. The class of all normalized  $\mathcal{R}^2$ -norms is denoted by  $N_2$ .

**Definition 3.** An  $\mathcal{R}^2$ -norm  $\varphi$  is called absolute norm if for any  $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{R}^2$  the equality

$$\varphi((\mu,\nu)) = \varphi((|\mu|,|\nu|))$$

holds. The class of all absolute normalized  $\mathcal{R}^2$ -norms is denoted by  $AN_2$ .

Let  $\varphi \in N_2$ . Then  $\varphi$  induced  $\mathcal{R}^2$ -metric  $d_{\varphi}$  by the formula

$$d_{\varphi}((\mu_1,\nu_1),(\mu_2,\nu_2)) = \varphi((|\mu_1-\mu_2|,|\nu_1-\nu_2|)).$$

Let d is  $\mathcal{R}^2$ -metric. In [8], for the first time, the notion d-intuitionistic fuzzy set (d-IFS) over E was introduced. Below we give the following

**Definition 4.** Let  $\varphi \in N_2$ ,  $A \subset E$  and  $\mu_A : E \to [0,1]$  and  $\nu_A : E \to [0,1]$  are mappings such that for any  $x \in E$  the inequality

$$\varphi((\mu_A(x),\nu_A(x))) \le 1$$

holds. The set

$$\hat{A} = \{ \langle x, \mu_A(x), \nu_A(x) \rangle | x \in E \}$$

is called  $d_{\varphi}$ -intuitionistic fuzzy set  $(d_{\varphi}$ -*IFS*) over E. The mappings  $\mu_A$  and  $\nu_A$  are called membership and non-membership function, respectively. The map  $\pi_A : E \to [0, 1]$ , that for  $x \in E$  is introduced by

$$\pi_A(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 - \varphi((\mu_A(x), \nu_A(x))),$$

is called hesitancy function.

The class of all  $d_{\varphi}$ -intuitionistic fuzzy sets over E is denoted by  $d_{\varphi}$ -IFS(E).

**Definition 5.** By  $\Psi_2$  is denoted the class of all convex functions  $\psi \in C[0,1]$  that for  $t \in [0,1]$  satisfy the condition

$$\max(1-t,t) \le \psi(t) \le 1.$$

### 2 Introduction

The class  $AN_2$  is well studied but yet still being investigated. For example, one may see: [3–7,9]. Here we must note that for the  $\mathcal{R}^2$ -norm

$$\varphi((\mu,\nu)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\mu - t\nu|$$

we have  $\varphi \in N_2$  but  $\varphi \notin AN_2$ , since  $\varphi((1, -1)) = 2 \neq 1 = \varphi((|1|, |-1|))$ .

The fundamental result for the class  $AN_2$  is given by Bonsall and Duncan [2, p. 37, Lemma 3]. Below we give in the following form:

**Theorem 1.** There exists a bijection between  $AN_2$  and  $\Psi_2$ . Moreover, for any  $\psi \in \Psi_2$  there exist a unique  $\varphi \in AN_2$  such that

$$(\forall t \in [0,1])(\psi(t) = \varphi((1-t,t)))$$
 (1)

and for any  $\varphi \in AN_2$  there exists a unique  $\psi \in \Psi_2$ , such that for  $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  we have

$$\varphi((\mu,\nu)) = \begin{cases} (|\mu|+|\nu|)\psi\left(\frac{|\nu|}{|\mu|+|\nu|}\right), & \text{if } (\mu,\nu) \neq (0,0) \\ 0, & \text{if } (\mu,\nu) = (0,0). \end{cases}$$
(2)

#### 3 Main result

The following is the main result of the paper, showing the connection between  $d_{\varphi}$ -IFS(E) and IFS(E).

**Theorem 2.** Let  $\varphi \in AN_2$ . Then there exists a bijective isomorphism between  $d_{\varphi}$ -IFS(E) and IFS(E).

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi \in AN_2$  be a fixed norm,  $\psi \in \Psi_2$  be given by (1) and let  $T_{\varphi}$  be the mapping which juxtaposes to the set

$$A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle x, \mu(x), \nu(x) \rangle | x \in E \} \in d_{\varphi} \text{-IFS}(E)$$

the set B, that is given by

$$B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle x, \mu^*(x), \nu^*(x) \rangle | x \in E \},\$$

where:

$$\mu^*(x) = \begin{cases} \mu(x)\psi\left(\frac{\nu(x)}{\mu(x)+\nu(x)}\right), & \text{if } \mu(x)+\nu(x) > 0\\ 0, & \text{if } \mu(x)+\nu(x) = 0 \end{cases}$$
(3)

$$\nu^{*}(x) = \begin{cases} \nu(x)\psi\left(\frac{\nu(x)}{\mu(x)+\nu(x)}\right), & \text{if } \mu(x)+\nu(x) > 0\\ 0, & \text{if } \mu(x)+\nu(x) = 0. \end{cases}$$
(4)

We will show that  $T_{\varphi}$  is a bijective isomorphism between  $d_{\varphi}$ -IFS(E) and IFS(E). First we must establish that  $B \in \text{IFS}(E)$ . The condition  $A \in d_{\varphi}$ -IFS(E) implies:

$$(\forall x \in E)(\varphi((\mu(x), \nu(x))) \le 1).$$
(5)

From (2), (3) and (4) it follows

$$\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x) = \begin{cases} (\mu(x) + \nu(x))\psi\left(\frac{\nu(x)}{\mu(x) + \nu(x)}\right), & \text{if } \mu(x) + \nu(x) > 0\\ 0, & \text{if } \mu(x) + \nu(x) = 0 \end{cases} = \\ \varphi((\mu(x), \nu(x))) \le 1. \end{cases}$$

Hence  $B \in IFS(E)$ .

Second, we will prove that  $T_{\varphi}$  is injection.

Let us assume the opposite. Then there would exist mappings  $\mu_i : E \to [0,1], \nu_i : E \to [0,1], i = 1, 2$ , such that:

$$(\mu_1, \nu_1) \neq (\mu_2, \nu_2);$$
 (6)

$$(\mu_1^*, \nu_1^*) = (\mu_2^*, \nu_2^*) \tag{7}$$

Obviously, (6) means that the following condition holds:

 $(i_1)$  There exists  $x_0 \in E$ , such that at least one of the equalities:

$$\mu_1(x_0) = \mu_2(x_0); \ \nu_1(x_0) = \nu_2(x_0)$$

is violated.

On the other hand, (7) means that for any  $x \in E$  it is fulfilled:

$$\mu_1^*(x) = \mu_2^*(x); \ \nu_1^*(x) = \nu_2^*(x).$$

In particular:

$$\mu_1^*(x_0) = \mu_2^*(x_0); \ \nu_1^*(x_0) = \nu_2^*(x_0).$$
(8)

For  $x_0$  we have

 $(i_2)$  At least one of the equalities:

$$\mu_1(x_0) + \nu_1(x_0) = 0$$
;  $\mu_2(x_0) + \nu_2(x_0) = 0$ ,

is violated.

The assumption that  $(i_2)$  is not true, yields:

$$\mu_1(x_0) = \nu_1(x_0) = \mu_2(x_0) = \nu_2(x_0) = 0,$$

which contradicts to  $(i_1)$ .

Therefore, because of  $(i_2)$ , there are only three possible cases:

(I)  $\mu_1(x_0) + \nu_1(x_0) > 0 \& \mu_2(x_0) + \nu_2(x_0) = 0;$ 

(II)  $\mu_1(x_0) + \nu_1(x_0) = 0 \& \mu_2(x_0) + \nu_2(x_0) > 0;$ (III)  $\mu_1(x_0) + \nu_1(x_0) > 0 \& \mu_2(x_0) + \nu_2(x_0) > 0.$ 

Let (I) hold. Then

$$\mu_2(x_0) = \nu_2(x_0) = 0$$

From (3) and (4) with:  $\mu = \mu_2$ ;  $\mu^* = \mu_2^*$ ;  $\nu = \nu_2$ ;  $\nu^* = \nu_2^*$ ;  $x = x_0$ , it follows:

$$\mu_2^*(x_0) = \nu_2^*(x_0) = 0.$$

The above equalities and (8) yield:

$$\mu_1^*(x_0) = \mu_2^*(x_0) = 0; \ \nu_1^*(x_0) = \nu_2^*(x_0).$$
(9)

Definition 5 provides

(*i*<sub>3</sub>) 
$$(\forall t \in [0, 1])(\psi(t) > 0).$$

Putting  $\mu = \mu_1$ ;  $\mu^* = \mu_1^*$ ;  $\nu = \nu_1$ ;  $\nu^* = \nu_1^*$ ;  $x = x_0$  in (3) and (4), from (9) and  $(i_3)$  we obtain

$$\mu_1(x_0) = \nu_1(x_0) = 0.$$

But the last contradicts to (I).

In the same manner the case (II) leads us to contradiction.

Let (III) hold. We put:

$$\psi\left(\frac{\nu_1(x_0)}{\mu_1(x_0) + \nu_1(x_0)}\right) = z; \ \psi\left(\frac{\nu_2(x_0)}{\mu_2(x_0) + \nu_2(x_0)}\right) = -w.$$
(10)

From (3), for:  $\mu = \mu_1$ ;  $\nu = \nu_1$ ;  $\mu^* = \mu_1^*$ ;  $x = x_0$ , we obtain

$$\mu_1^*(x_0) = \mu_1(x_0)z \tag{11}$$

and for:  $\mu = \mu_2$ ;  $\nu = \nu_2$ ;  $\mu^* = \mu_2^*$ ;  $x = x_0$ , we obtain

$$\mu_2^*(x_0) = -\mu_2(x_0)w. \tag{12}$$

From (4), for:  $\mu = \mu_1$ ;  $\nu = \nu_1$ ;  $\nu^* = \nu_1^*$ ;  $x = x_0$ , we obtain

$$\nu_1^*(x_0) = \nu_1(x_0)z \tag{13}$$

and for:  $\mu = \mu_2$ ;  $\nu = \nu_2$ ;  $\nu^* = \nu_2^*$ ;  $x = x_0$ , we obtain

$$\nu_2^*(x_0) = -\nu_2(x_0)w. \tag{14}$$

Then, because of (8) we get the following linear homogeneous system with unknowns z and w:

$$\begin{cases} \mu_1(x_0)z + \mu_2(x_0)w = 0\\ \nu_1(x_0)z + \nu_2(x_0)w = 0. \end{cases}$$
(15)

Now  $(i_3)$  and (10) imply  $z \neq 0$  and  $w \neq 0$ , i.e. the linear homogeneous system has a non-trivial soslution. Then, because of the well known result of the linear algebra, the determinant:

$$\Delta = \begin{vmatrix} \mu_1(x_0) & \mu_2(x_0) \\ \nu_1(x_0) & \nu_2(x_0) \end{vmatrix}$$

equals to 0.

This means that the vector-columns of  $\Delta$  are linearly dependent. Then, due to (III), these vectors are different from the zero-vector. Hence, there exists a real number  $k \neq 0$ , such that:

$$\mu_2(x_0) = k\mu_1(x_0); \ \nu_2(x_0) = k\nu_1(x_0).$$

The last two equalities imply:

$$\psi\left(\frac{\nu_2(x_0)}{\mu_2(x_0)+\nu_2(x_0)}\right) = \psi\left(\frac{k\nu_1(x_0)}{k\mu_1(x_0)+k\nu_1(x_0)}\right) = \psi\left(\frac{\nu_1(x_0)}{\mu_1(x_0)+\nu_1(x_0)}\right).$$

The above equalities and (10) yield -w = z. Hence, from (11)-(14), we obtain:

$$\mu_1^*(x_0) = z\mu_1(x_0); \ \mu_2^*(x_0) = z\mu_2(x_0); \ \nu_1^*(x_0) = z\nu_1(x_0); \ \nu_2^*(x_0) = z\nu_2(x_0).$$

The last equalities and (8) yield:

$$z\mu_1(x_0) = z\mu_2(x_0); \ z\nu_1(x_0) = z\nu_2(x_0).$$

Hence:

$$\mu_1(x_0) = \mu_2(x_0); \ \nu_1(x_0) = \nu_2(x_0),$$

since  $z \neq 0$ . But the last contradicts to  $(i_1)$ , and therefore to (6).

Thus, we proved that  $T_{\varphi}$  is injection.

Third, we will prove that  $T_{\varphi}$  is surjection.

Let  $B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle x, \mu^*(x), \nu^*(x) \rangle | x \in E \} \in \text{IFS}(E)$ . For any  $x \in E$  we put:

$$\mu(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mu^*(x)}{\psi(\frac{\nu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)})}, & \text{if } \mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x) > 0\\ 0, & \text{if } \mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x) = 0; \end{cases}$$
(16)

$$\nu(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\nu^*(x)}{\psi(\frac{\nu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)})}, & \text{if } \mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x) > 0\\ 0, & \text{if } \mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x) = 0. \end{cases}$$
(17)

We will show that:

$$\mu: E \to [0,1]; \nu: E \to [0,1].$$
(18)

Let  $x \in E$  is such that  $\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x) = 0$ . Then (16) and (17) imply:  $\mu(x) = 0$  and  $\nu(x) = 0$ , i.e.  $\mu(x), \nu(x) \in [0, 1]$ .

Let  $x \in E$  is such that  $\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x) > 0$ . Then (16) and (17) yield:

$$\mu(x) = \frac{\mu^*(x)}{\psi\left(\frac{\nu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}\right)}; \ \nu(x) = \frac{\nu^*(x)}{\psi\left(\frac{\nu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}\right)} \ . \tag{19}$$

We put

$$t = \frac{\nu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}.$$

Since  $\psi \in \Psi_2$ , then Definition 5 implies:

$$\psi\left(\frac{\nu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}\right) = \psi(t) \ge \max(t, 1 - t) = \max\left(\frac{\nu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}, \frac{\mu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}\right).$$

The last and (19) imply that (18) will be proved if the following inequalities hold:

$$\mu^*(x) \le \max\left(\frac{\nu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}, \frac{\mu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}\right)$$
$$\nu^*(x) \le \max\left(\frac{\nu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}, \frac{\mu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}\right).$$

But these inequalities follow from the inequality

$$\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x) \le 1,$$
(20)

which is true, since  $B \in IFS(E)$ .

We will prove that  $\mu(x)$  and  $\nu(x)$ , given by (16) and (17), satisfy (5).

According to (2) we have

$$\varphi(\mu(x),\nu(x)) = \begin{cases} (\mu(x) + \nu(x))\psi\left(\frac{\nu(x)}{\mu(x) + \nu(x)}\right), & \text{if } \mu(x) + \nu(x) > 0\\ 0, & \text{if } \mu(x) + \nu(x) = 0. \end{cases}$$
(21)

Equalities (16), (17) and  $(i_3)$  imply that

 $\mu(x)+\nu(x)=0 \text{ if and only if } \mu^*(x)+\nu^*(x)=0.$ 

From the last it follows that (21) may be rewritten as

$$\varphi(\mu(x),\nu(x)) = \begin{cases} (\mu(x)+\nu(x))\psi\left(\frac{\nu(x)}{\mu(x)+\nu(x)}\right), \text{ if } \mu^*(x)+\nu^*(x)>0\\ 0, \text{ if } \mu^*(x)+\nu^*(x)=0. \end{cases}$$
(22)

Let  $x \in E$  is such that  $\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x) = 0$ . Then  $\mu(x) + \nu(x) = 0$ . Hence:  $\mu(x) = 0$ ;  $\nu(x) = 0$  and  $\varphi(\mu(x), \nu(x)) = 0$ , i.e. (5) holds.

Let  $x \in E$  is such that  $\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x) > 0$ . Then (16), (17) and (22) yield

$$\varphi(\mu(x),\nu(x)) = \frac{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}{\psi\left(\frac{\nu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x)}\right)}\psi\left(\frac{\nu(x)}{\mu(x) + \nu(x)}\right).$$
(23)

Equalities (16) and (17) imply

$$\psi\left(\frac{\nu(x)}{\mu(x) + \nu(x)}\right) = \psi\left(\frac{\frac{\nu^{*}(x)}{\psi\left(\frac{\nu^{*}(x)}{\mu^{*}(x) + \nu^{*}(x)}\right)}}{\frac{\mu^{*}(x)}{\psi\left(\frac{\nu^{*}(x)}{\mu^{*}(x) + \nu^{*}(x)}\right)} + \frac{\nu^{*}(x)}{\psi\left(\frac{\nu^{*}(x)}{\mu^{*}(x) + \nu^{*}(x)}\right)}}\right).$$

Hence (because of  $(i_3)$ )

$$\psi\left(\frac{\nu(x)}{\mu(x)+\nu(x)}\right) = \psi\left(\frac{\nu^*(x)}{\mu^*(x)+\nu^*(x)}\right).$$
(24)

Equalities (23) and (24) yield

$$\varphi(\mu(x),\nu(x)) = \mu^*(x) + \nu^*(x).$$

The last equality and (20) immediately prove (5).

Let  $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle x, \mu(x), \nu(x) \rangle | x \in E \}$ . From the proved (5) and (18) it follows:  $A \in d_{\varphi}$ -IFS(E). Equalities (3), (4) and (24) immediately yield

$$T_{\varphi}(A) = B.$$

Hence:  $T_{\varphi}$  is surjection. Therefore,  $T_{\varphi}$  is bijection. Theorem 2 is proved.

**Remark 1.** From the proof of Theorem 2 it is seen that  $T_{\varphi}$  is injection also for the case:  $\varphi \in N \setminus AN_2$ . But in this case it is not guaranteed that  $T_{\varphi}$  is surjection. The last means that for  $\varphi \in N \setminus AN_2$  it is not certain (in the general case) that  $T_{\varphi}$  is bijection.

From the proof of Theorem 2 we obtain the following

**Corollary 1.** The mappings  $T_{\varphi}$  and  $T_{\varphi}^{-1}$  admit the representations:

$$T_{\varphi}\langle\mu(x),\nu(x)\rangle = \begin{cases} \langle \frac{\mu(x)\varphi((\mu(x),\nu(x)))}{\mu(x)+\nu(x)}, \frac{\nu(x)\varphi((\mu(x),\nu(x)))}{\mu(x)+\nu(x)} \rangle, & \text{if } \mu(x) + \nu(x) \neq 0\\ \langle 0,0 \rangle, & \text{if } \mu(x) = \nu(x) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are the membership and non-membership functions of an element from the class  $d_{\varphi}$ -IFS(E);

$$T_{\varphi}^{-1}\langle\mu(x),\nu(x)\rangle = \begin{cases} \langle\mu(x)\frac{\mu(x)+\nu(x)}{\varphi((\mu(x),\nu(x)))},\nu(x)\frac{\mu(x)+\nu(x)}{\varphi((\mu(x),\nu(x)))}\rangle, & \text{if } \mu(x)+\nu(x) > 0\\ \langle 0,0\rangle, & \text{if } \mu(x) = \nu(x) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are the membership and non-membership functions of an element from the class IFS(*E*).

Another Corollary from Theorem 2 is:

**Theorem 3.** Let  $\varphi, \varphi^* \in AN_2$ . Then the mapping  $T_{\varphi,\varphi^*} : d_{\varphi}$ -IFS $(E) \to d_{\varphi^*}$ -IFS(E), which is given by

$$T_{\varphi,\varphi^*} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} T_{\varphi^*}^{-1} T_{\varphi}$$

is a bijective isomorphism between  $d_{\varphi}$ -IFS(E) and  $d_{\varphi}$ \*-IFS(E).

## Acknowledgements

The author is grateful for the support provided by the National Science Fund of Bulgaria under grants DID-02-29/2009 and DMU-03-38/2011.

### References

- [1] Atanassov, K. Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets. Springer Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1999.
- [2] Bonsall, F., J. Duncan. Numerical Ranges II, London Math. Soc., Lecture Notes Ser., Vol. 10, 1973.
- [3] Kato, M., T. Tamura. Weakly nearly uniform smoothness and worth property of  $\Psi$ -direct sums of Banach spaces. *Comment. Math. Prace Mat.*, Vol. 46, 2006, 113–129
- [4] Mitani K., K. Saito, T. Suzuki. Smoothness of absolute norms on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , J. Convex Anal. Vol. 10, 2003, 89–107.
- [5] Saito, K.-S., M. Kato, Y. Takahashi. Absolute norms on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , J. Math. Anal. Appl., Vol. 252, 2000, 879–905.
- [6] Suzuki, T., A. Yamano, M. Kato. The James Constant of 2-Dimensional Lorentz Sequence Spaces. Bull. Kyushu Inst. Tech. Pure Appl. Math. Vol. 53, 2006, 15–24
- [7] Takahashi, Y., M. Kato, K.-S. Saito. Strict convexity of absolute norms on C<sup>2</sup> and direct sums of Banach spaces, J. Inequal. Appl. Vol. 7, 2002, 179–186.
- [8] Vassilev, P. A Metric Approach To Fuzzy Sets And Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets. *Proc. of. First Int. Workshop on IFSs, GNs, KE*, Sept. 2006, 31–38.
- [9] Zuo, Z. The Ptolemy constant of absolute normalized norms on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, 2012, 2012:107