

1-1-2016

Smooth Neutrosophic Topological Spaces

M. K. El-Gayyar

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nss_journal

Recommended Citation

El-Gayyar, M. K.. "Smooth Neutrosophic Topological Spaces." *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems* 12, 1 ().
https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nss_journal/vol12/iss1/8

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems* by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact amywinter@unm.edu.



Smooth Neutrosophic Topological Spaces

M. K. EL Gayyar

Physics and Mathematical Engineering Dept., Faculty of Engineering, Port-Said University, Egypt.- mohamedelgayyar@hotmail.com

Abstract. As a new branch of philosophy, the neutrosophy was presented by Smarandache in 1980. It was presented as the study of origin, nature, and scope of neutralities; as well as their interactions with different ideational spectra. The aim in this paper is to introduce

the concepts of smooth neutrosophic topological space, smooth neutrosophic cotopological space, smooth neutrosophic closure, and smooth neutrosophic interior. Furthermore, some properties of these concepts will be investigated.

Keywords: Fuzzy Sets, Neutrosophic Sets, Smooth Neutrosophic Topology, Smooth Neutrosophic Cotopology, Smooth Neutrosophic Closure, Smooth Neutrosophic Interior.

1 Introduction

In 1986, Badard [1] introduced the concept of a smooth topological space as a generalization of the classical topological spaces as well as the Chang fuzzy topology [2]. The smooth topological space was rediscovered by Ramadan [3], and El-Gayyar et al. [4]. In [5], the authors introduced the notions of smooth interior and smooth closure. In 1983 the intuitionistic fuzzy set was introduced by Atanassov [[6], [7], [8]], as a generalization of fuzzy sets in Zadeh's sense [9], where besides the degree of membership of each element there was considered a degree of non-membership. Smarandache [[10], [11], [12]], defined the notion of neutrosophic set, which is a generalization of Zadeh's fuzzy sets and Atanassov's intuitionistic fuzzy set. The words "neutrosophy" and "neutrosophic" were invented by F. Smarandache in his 1998 book. Etymologically, "neutro-sophy" (noun) [French *neutre* < Latin *neuter*, neutral, and Greek *sophia*, skill/wisdom] means knowledge of neutral thought.

While "neutrosophic" (adjective), means having the nature of, or having the characteristic of Neutrosophy.

Neutrosophic sets have been investigated by Salama et al. [[13], [14], [15]]. The purpose of this paper is to introduce the concepts of smooth neutrosophic topological space, smooth neutrosophic cotopological space, smooth neutrosophic closure, and smooth neutrosophic interior. We also investigate some of their properties.

2 PRELIMINARIES

In this section we use X to denote a nonempty set, I to denote the closed unit interval $[0, 1]$, I_0 to denote the

interval $(0, 1]$, I_1 to denote the interval $[0, 1)$, and I^X to be the set of all fuzzy subsets defined on X . By $\underline{0}$ and $\underline{1}$ we denote the characteristic functions of ϕ and X , respectively. The family of all neutrosophic sets in X will be denoted by $\mathfrak{N}(X)$.

2.1 Definition [11], [12], [15]

A neutrosophic set A (NS for short) on a nonempty set X is defined as:

$$A = \langle x, T_A(x), I_A(x), F_A(x) \rangle, x \in X$$

where $T, I, F: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$, and

$0 \leq T_A(x) + I_A(x) + F_A(x) \leq 3$ representing the degree of membership (namely $T_A(x)$), the degree of indeterminacy (namely $I_A(x)$), and the degree of non-membership (namely $F_A(x)$); for each element $x \in X$ to the set A .

2.2 Definition [13], [14], [15]

The Null (empty) neutrosophic set 0_N and the absolute (universe) neutrosophic set 1_N are defined as follows:

$$\text{Type I} : 0_N = \langle x, 0, 0, 1 \rangle, x \in X$$

$$\text{Type II} : 0_N = \langle x, 0, 1, 1 \rangle, x \in X$$

$$\text{Type I} : 1_N = \langle x, 1, 1, 0 \rangle, x \in X$$

$$\text{Type II} : 1_N = \langle x, 1, 0, 0 \rangle, x \in X$$

2.3Definition [13], [14], [15]

A neutrosophic set A is a subset of a neutrosophic set B , ($A \subseteq B$), may be defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TypeI} & : A \subseteq B \Leftrightarrow T_A(x) \leq T_B(x), \\ & \quad I_A(x) \leq I_B(x), F_A(x) \geq F_B(x), \quad \forall x \in X \\ \text{TypeII} & : A \subseteq B \Leftrightarrow T_A(x) \leq T_B(x), \\ & \quad I_A(x) \geq I_B(x), F_A(x) \geq F_B(x), \quad \forall x \in X \end{aligned}$$

2.4Definition [13], [14], [15]

The Complement of a neutrosophic set A , denoted by $\text{co}A$, is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TypeI} & : \text{co}A = \langle x, F_A(x), 1 - I_A(x), T_A(x) \rangle \\ \text{TypeII} & : \text{co}A = \langle x, 1 - T_A(x), 1 - I_A(x), 1 - F_A(x) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

2.5Definition [13], [14], [15]

Let $A, B \in \mathcal{N}(X)$ then:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TypeI} & : A \cup B = \langle x, \max(T_A(x), T_B(x)), \\ & \quad \max(I_A(x), I_B(x)), \min(F_A(x), F_B(x)) \rangle \\ \text{TypeII} & : A \cup B = \langle x, \max(T_A(x), T_B(x)), \\ & \quad \min(I_A(x), I_B(x)), \min(F_A(x), F_B(x)) \rangle \\ \text{TypeI} & : A \cap B = \langle x, \min(T_A(x), T_B(x)), \\ & \quad \min(I_A(x), I_B(x)), \max(F_A(x), F_B(x)) \rangle \\ \text{TypeII} & : A \cap B = \langle x, \min(T_A(x), T_B(x)), \\ & \quad \max(I_A(x), I_B(x)), \max(F_A(x), F_B(x)) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} []A & = \langle x, T_A(x), I_A(x), 1 - T_A(x) \rangle \\ \langle \rangle A & = \langle x, 1 - F_A(x), I_A(x), F_A(x) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

2.6Definition [13], [14], [15]

Let $\{A_i\}, i \in J$ be an arbitrary family of neutrosophic sets, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TypeI} & : \bigcup_{i \in J} A_i = \left\langle x, \sup_{i \in J} T_{A_i}(x), \sup_{i \in J} I_{A_i}(x), \inf_{i \in J} F_{A_i}(x) \right\rangle \\ \text{TypeII} & : \bigcup_{i \in J} A_i = \left\langle x, \sup_{i \in J} T_{A_i}(x), \inf_{i \in J} I_{A_i}(x), \inf_{i \in J} F_{A_i}(x) \right\rangle \\ \text{TypeI} & : \bigcap_{i \in J} A_i = \left\langle x, \inf_{i \in J} T_{A_i}(x), \inf_{i \in J} I_{A_i}(x), \sup_{i \in J} F_{A_i}(x) \right\rangle \\ \text{TypeII} & : \bigcap_{i \in J} A_i = \left\langle x, \inf_{i \in J} T_{A_i}(x), \sup_{i \in J} I_{A_i}(x), \sup_{i \in J} F_{A_i}(x) \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

2.7Definition [13], [14], [15]

The difference between two neutrosophic sets A and B defined as $A \setminus B = A \cap \text{co}B$.

2.8Definition [13], [14]

Every intuitionistic set A on X is NS having the form $A = \langle x, T_A(x), 1 - (T_A(x) + F_A(x)), F_A(x) \rangle$, and every fuzzy set A on X is NS having the form $A = \langle x, T_A(x), 0, 1 - T_A(x) \rangle, x \in X$.

2.9Definition [5]

Let Y be a subset of X and $A \in I^X$; the restriction of A on Y is denoted by $A|_Y$. For each $B \in I^Y$, the extension of B on X , denoted by B_X , is defined by:

$$B_X = \begin{cases} B(x) & \text{if } x \in A \\ 0.5 & \text{if } X - Y \end{cases}$$

2.10Definition [1],[3]

A smooth topological space (STS, for short) is an ordered pair (X, τ) where X is a nonempty set and $\tau : I^X \rightarrow I$ is a mapping satisfying the following properties:

- (O1) $\tau(0) = \tau(1) = 1$
- (O2) $\forall A_1, A_2 \in I^X, \tau(A_1 \cap A_2) \geq \tau(A_1) \wedge \tau(A_2)$
- (O3) $\forall A_i, i \in J, \tau(\bigcup_{i \in J} A_i) \geq \bigwedge_{i \in J} \tau(A_i)$

2.11Definition [1],[3]

A smooth cotopology is defined as a mapping $\mathfrak{T} : I^X \rightarrow I$ which satisfies:

- (C1) $\mathfrak{I}(\underline{0}) = \mathfrak{I}(\underline{1}) = 1$
- (C2) $\forall B_1, B_2 \in I^X, \mathfrak{I}(B_1 \cup B_2) \geq \mathfrak{I}(B_1) \wedge \mathfrak{I}(B_2)$
- (C3) $\forall A_i, i \in J, \mathfrak{I}(\bigcap_{i \in J} B_i) \geq \bigwedge_{i \in J} \mathfrak{I}(B_i)$

3. Smooth Neutrosophic Topological spaces

we will define two types of smooth neutrosophic topological spaces, a smooth neutrosophic topological space (SNTS, for short) take the form $(X, \tau^T, \tau^I, \tau^F)$ and the mappings $\tau^T, \tau^I, \tau^F : I^X \rightarrow I$ represent the degree of openness, the degree of indeterminacy, and the degree of non-openness respectively.

3.1 Smooth Neutrosophic Topological spaces of type I

In this part we will consider the definitions of type I.

3.1.1 Definition

A smooth neutrosophic topology (τ^T, τ^I, τ^F) of type I satisfying the following axioms:

- (SNOI₁) $\tau^T(\underline{0}) = \tau^I(\underline{0}) = \tau^T(\underline{1}) = \tau^I(\underline{1}) = 1,$
and $\tau^F(\underline{0}) = \tau^F(\underline{1}) = 0$
- (SNOI₂) $\forall A_1, A_2 \in I^X,$
 $\tau^T(A_1 \cap A_2) \geq \tau^T(A_1) \wedge \tau^T(A_2),$
 $\tau^I(A_1 \cap A_2) \geq \tau^I(A_1) \wedge \tau^I(A_2),$ and
 $\tau^F(A_1 \cap A_2) \leq \tau^F(A_1) \vee \tau^F(A_2)$
- (SNOI₃) $\forall A_i \in I^X, i \in J, \tau^T(\bigcup_{i \in J} A_i) \geq \bigwedge_{i \in J} \tau^T(A_i),$
 $\tau^I(\bigcup_{i \in J} A_i) \geq \bigwedge_{i \in J} \tau^I(A_i),$ and
 $\tau^F(\bigcup_{i \in J} A_i) \leq \bigvee_{i \in J} \tau^F(A_i)$

3.1.2 Definition

Let $\mathfrak{I}^T, \mathfrak{I}^I, \mathfrak{I}^F : I^X \rightarrow I$ be mappings satisfying the following axioms:

- (SNCI₁) $\mathfrak{I}^T(\underline{0}) = \mathfrak{I}^I(\underline{0}) = \mathfrak{I}^T(\underline{1}) = \mathfrak{I}^I(\underline{1}) = 1,$
and $\mathfrak{I}^F(\underline{0}) = \mathfrak{I}^F(\underline{1}) = 0$
- (SNCI₂) $\forall B_1, B_2 \in I^X,$
 $\mathfrak{I}^T(B_1 \cup B_2) \geq \mathfrak{I}^T(B_1) \wedge \mathfrak{I}^T(B_2),$
 $\mathfrak{I}^I(B_1 \cup B_2) \geq \mathfrak{I}^I(B_1) \wedge \mathfrak{I}^I(B_2),$ and
 $\mathfrak{I}^F(B_1 \cup B_2) \leq \mathfrak{I}^F(B_1) \vee \mathfrak{I}^F(B_2)$
- (SNCI₃) $\forall B_i \in I^X, i \in J, \mathfrak{I}^T(\bigcap_{i \in J} B_i) \geq \bigwedge_{i \in J} \mathfrak{I}^T(B_i),$
 $\mathfrak{I}^I(\bigcap_{i \in J} B_i) \geq \bigwedge_{i \in J} \mathfrak{I}^I(B_i),$ and
 $\mathfrak{I}^F(\bigcap_{i \in J} B_i) \leq \bigvee_{i \in J} \mathfrak{I}^F(B_i)$

The triple $(\mathfrak{I}^T, \mathfrak{I}^I, \mathfrak{I}^F)$ is a smooth neutrosophic cotopology of type I, $\mathfrak{I}^T, \mathfrak{I}^I, \mathfrak{I}^F$ represent the degree of closedness, the degree of indeterminacy, and the degree of non-closedness respectively.

3.1.3 Example

Let $X = \{a, b\}$. Define the mappings

$\tau^T, \tau^I, \tau^F : I^X \rightarrow I$ as:

$$\tau^T(A) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A = \underline{0} \\ 1 & \text{if } A = \underline{1} \\ \min(A(a), A(b)) & \text{if } A \text{ is neither } \underline{0} \text{ nor } \underline{1} \end{cases}$$

$$\tau^I(A) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A = \underline{0} \\ 1 & \text{if } A = \underline{1} \\ 0.5 & \text{if } A \text{ is neither } \underline{0} \text{ nor } \underline{1} \end{cases}$$

$$\tau^F(A) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A = \underline{0} \\ 0 & \text{if } A = \underline{1} \\ \max(A(a), A(b)) & \text{if } A \text{ is neither } \underline{0} \text{ nor } \underline{1} \end{cases}$$

Then $(X, \tau^T, \tau^I, \tau^F)$ is a smooth neutrosophic topological space on X .

3.1.4 Proposition

Let (τ^T, τ^I, τ^F) and $(\mathfrak{I}^T, \mathfrak{I}^I, \mathfrak{I}^F)$ be a smooth neutrosophic topology and a smooth neutrosophic cotopology, respectively, and let $A \in I^X,$

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T(A) &= \mathfrak{S}^T(\text{co}A), \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I(A) = \mathfrak{S}^I(\text{co}A), \\ \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F(A) &= \mathfrak{S}^F(\text{co}A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A) = \tau^T(\text{co}A), \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A) &= \tau^I(\text{co}A), \text{ and } \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A) = \tau^F(\text{co}A), \text{ then} \end{aligned}$$

(1) $(\tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T, \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I, \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F)$ and $(\mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F)$ are a smooth neutrosophic topology and a smooth neutrosophic cotopology, respectively.

$$(2) \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T = \tau^T, \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I = \tau^I, \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F = \tau^F,$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T}^T = \mathfrak{S}^T, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I}^I = \mathfrak{S}^I, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F}^F = \mathfrak{S}^F,$$

Proof

$$(1) (a) \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T(\underline{0}) = \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T(\underline{1}) = \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I(\underline{0}) = \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I(\underline{1}) = 1, \text{ and } \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F(\underline{0}) = \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F(\underline{1}) = 0$$

$$(b) \forall A_1, A_2 \in I^X, \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T(A_1 \cap A_2) = \mathfrak{S}^T(\text{co}(A_1 \cap A_2)) = \mathfrak{S}^T(\text{co}A_1 \cup \text{co}A_2) \geq \mathfrak{S}^T(\text{co}A_1) \wedge \mathfrak{S}^T(\text{co}A_2) = \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T(A_1) \wedge \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T(A_2)$$

,similarly, $\forall A_1, A_2 \in I^X,$

$$\tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I(A_1 \cap A_2) \geq \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I(A_1) \wedge \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I(A_2), \text{ and}$$

$$\tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F(A_1 \cap A_2) \leq \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F(A_1) \vee \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F(A_2)$$

$$(c) \forall A_i \in I^X, i \in J, \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T(\bigcup_{i \in J} A_i) = \mathfrak{S}^T(\text{co} \bigcup_{i \in J} A_i) = \mathfrak{S}^T(\bigcap_{i \in J} \text{co}A_i) \geq \bigwedge_{i \in J} \mathfrak{S}^T(\text{co}A_i) = \bigwedge_{i \in J} \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T(A_i)$$

,similarly, $\forall A_i \in I^X, i \in J,$

$$\tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I(\bigcup_{i \in J} A_i) \geq \bigwedge_{i \in J} \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I(A_i), \text{ and}$$

$$\tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F(\bigcup_{i \in J} A_i) \leq \bigvee_{i \in J} \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F(A_i). \text{ Hence, } (\tau_{\mathfrak{S}^T}^T, \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^I}^I, \tau_{\mathfrak{S}^F}^F)$$

is a smooth neutrosophic topology. Similarly, we can prove that $(\mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F)$ is a smooth neutrosophic cotopology.

(2) the proof is straightforward.

3.1.5 Proposition

M. K. EL Gayyar , Smooth Neutrosophic Topological Spaces

Let $\{(\tau_i^T, \tau_i^I, \tau_i^F)\}_{i \in J}$ be a family of smooth neutrosophic topologies on X . Then their intersection $\bigcap_{i \in J} (\tau_i^T, \tau_i^I, \tau_i^F)$ is a smooth neutrosophic topology.

Proof

The proof is a straightforward result of both definition(2.6) and difintion (3.1.1).

3.1.6 Definition

Let (τ^T, τ^I, τ^F) be a smooth neutrosophic topology of type I, and $A \in I^X$. Then the smooth neutrosophic closure of A , denoted by \bar{A} is defined by:

$$\bar{A} = \begin{cases} A & , (\mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A)) = (1,1,0) \\ \bigcap \{H : H \in I^X, A \subseteq H, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(H) > \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A), \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(H) > \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(H) < \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A)\} , \\ (\mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A)) \neq (1,1,0) \end{cases}$$

3.1.7 Proposition

Let (τ^T, τ^I, τ^F) be a smooth neutrosophic topology on X , and $A, B \in I^X$. Then

$$(1) \underline{0} = \bar{\underline{0}}, \underline{1} = \bar{\underline{1}}$$

$$(2) A \subseteq \bar{A}$$

$$(3) \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(\bar{A}) \geq \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(\bar{A}) \geq \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A), \text{ and}$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(\bar{A}) \leq \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A), \forall A \in I^X$$

$$(4) B \subseteq A, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A) \geq \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(B), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A) \geq \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(B)$$

$$\text{and } \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A) \leq \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(B) \Rightarrow \bar{B} \subseteq \bar{A}, \forall A, B \in I^X$$

(5) $\overline{\overline{A}} \subseteq \overline{A}$

this family contains A , hence, $\overline{B} \subseteq A = \overline{A}$

(6) $\overline{A} \cap \overline{B} \subseteq \overline{A \cup B}$

(c) if $B \neq \overline{B}$, and $A \neq \overline{A}$

Proof

From definition (3.1.6) every element in the family \overline{A} will be an element in the family \overline{B} , hence $\overline{B} \subseteq \overline{A}$.

(1) Obvious

(5) From (2), (3) and the definition (3.1.6) we have

(2) Directly from definition (3.1.6)

$$\overline{\overline{A}} \subseteq \overline{A}.$$

(3) (a) if $A = \overline{A}$, the proof is straightforward.

(b) if $A \neq \overline{A}$, we have from the definition (3.1.2) and the

(6) (a) if $A = \overline{A}$, and $B = \overline{B}$, then

definition (3.1.6):

$$\overline{A \cup B} = A \cup B \supseteq A \cap B = \overline{A} \cap \overline{B}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(\overline{A}) &= \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(\cap\{H : H \in I^X, A \subseteq H, \\ \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(H) &> \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(A), \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(H) > \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(A), \\ \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(H) < \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(A)\}) &\geq \wedge\{\mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(H) : H \in I^X, A \subseteq H, \text{ we} \\ \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(H) > \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(A), \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(H) > \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(A), \\ \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(H) < \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(A)\} &\geq \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(A) \end{aligned}$$

(b) if $A = \overline{A}$, $B \neq \overline{B}$, and $\overline{A \cup B} \neq A \cup B$,

from (4) $\overline{B} \subseteq \overline{A \cup B}$, hence $\overline{A} \cap \overline{B} \subseteq \overline{A \cup B}$

can prove that $\mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(\overline{A}) \geq \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(A)$ in a similar way.

(c) if $A = \overline{A}$, $B \neq \overline{B}$, and $\overline{A \cup B} = A \cup B$,

then $\overline{A} \subseteq \overline{A \cup B}$, hence $\overline{A} \cap \overline{B} \subseteq \overline{A \cup B}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(\overline{A}) &= \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(\cap\{H : H \in I^X, A \subseteq H, \\ \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(H) > \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(A), \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(H) > \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(A), \\ \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(H) < \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(A)\}) &\leq \vee\{\mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(H) : H \in I^X, A \subseteq H, \\ \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(H) > \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(A), \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(H) > \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(A), \\ \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(H) < \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(A)\} &\leq \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(A) \end{aligned}$$

(d) if $A \neq \overline{A}$, $B = \overline{B}$, and $\overline{A \cup B} \neq A \cup B$, similar to(6b)

(e) if $A \neq \overline{A}$, $B = \overline{B}$, and $\overline{A \cup B} = A \cup B$, similar to(6c)

(f) if $A \neq \overline{A}$, $B \neq \overline{B}$, and $\overline{A \cup B} = A \cup B$, it follows from(4)that $\overline{A} \subseteq \overline{A \cup B}$, hence $\overline{A} \cap \overline{B} \subseteq \overline{A \cup B}$.

(4) (a) if $B = \overline{B}$, then $A = \overline{A}$ and $\overline{B} \subseteq \overline{A}$.

(b) if $B \neq \overline{B}$, and $A = \overline{A}$

(g) if $A \neq \overline{A}$, $B \neq \overline{B}$, and $\overline{A \cup B} \neq A \cup B$

$$\overline{B} = \cap\{H : H \in I^X, B \subseteq H, \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(H) > \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^T(B),$$

$$\mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(H) > \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^I(B), \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(H) < \mathfrak{I}_{\tau}^F(B)\},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{A \cup B} &= \cap \{H : H \in I^X, A \cup B \subseteq H, \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(H) &> \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A \cup B), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(H) > \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A \cup B), \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(H) &< \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A \cup B)\} \\ &\supseteq \cap \{H : H \in I^X, A \cup B \subseteq H, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(H) > \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A) \wedge \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(B), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(H) &> \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A) \wedge \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(B), \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(H) &< \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A) \vee \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(B)\} \\ &= \cap \{H : H \in I^X, A \subseteq H, B \subseteq H, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(H) > \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A) \\ \text{or } \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(H) &> \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(B), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(H) > \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A) \text{ or} \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(H) &> \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(B), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(H) < \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A) \text{ or} \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(H) &< \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(B)\} \\ &\supseteq \cap [\{H : H \in I^X, A \subseteq H, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(H) > \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A), \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(H) &> \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(H) < \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A)\} \cup \\ \{H : H \in I^X, B \subseteq H, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(H) &> \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(B), \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(H) &> \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(B), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(H) < \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(B)\}] \\ &= [\cap \{H : H \in I^X, A \subseteq H, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(H) > \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A), \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(H) &> \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(H) < \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A)\}] \cap \\ [\cap \{H : H \in I^X, B \subseteq H, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(H) &> \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(B), \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(H) &> \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(B), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(H) < \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(B)\}] \\ &= \overline{A} \cap \overline{B} \end{aligned}$$

3.1.8 Definition

Let (τ^T, τ^I, τ^F) be a smooth neutrosophic topology of type I, and $A \in I^X$. Then the smooth neutrosophic interior of A , denoted by A° is defined by:

$$A^\circ = \begin{cases} A & , (\tau^T(A), \tau^I(A), \tau^F(A)) = (1,1,0) \\ \cup \{H : H \in I^X, H \subseteq A, \tau^T(H) > \tau^T(A), \\ \tau^I(H) > \tau^I(A), \tau^F(H) < \tau^F(A)\} , \\ (\tau^T(A), \tau^I(A), \tau^F(A)) \neq (1,1,0) \end{cases}$$

3.1.9 Proposition

Let (τ^T, τ^I, τ^F) be a smooth neutrosophic topology on X , and $A, B \in I^X$. Then

- (1) $\underline{0} = \underline{0}^\circ, \underline{1} = \underline{1}^\circ$
- (2) $A^\circ \subseteq A$
- (3) $\tau^T(A^\circ) \geq \tau^T(A), \tau^I(A^\circ) \geq \tau^I(A)$, and $\tau^F(A^\circ) \leq \tau^F(A), \forall A \in I^X$
- (4) $B \subseteq A, \tau^T(B) \geq \tau^T(A), \tau^I(B) \geq \tau^I(A)$ and $\tau^F(B) \leq \tau^F(A) \Rightarrow B^\circ \subseteq A^\circ, \forall A, B \in I^X$
- (5) $(A^\circ)^\circ \subseteq A^\circ$
- (6) $(A \cap B)^\circ \subseteq A^\circ \cup B^\circ$

Proof

Similar to the procedure used to prove Proposition (3.1.7)

3.2. Smooth Neutrosophic Topological spaces of type II

In this part we will consider the definitions of type II. In a similar way as in type I, we can state the following definitions and propositions. The proofs of the propositions

of type II, will be similar to the proofs of the propositions

in type I.

3.2.1 Definition

A smooth neutrosophic topology (τ^T, τ^I, τ^F) of type II satisfying the following axioms:

- (SNOII₁) $\tau^T(\underline{0}) = \tau^T(\underline{1}) = 1$, and $\tau^I(\underline{0}) = \tau^I(\underline{1}) = \tau^F(\underline{0}) = \tau^F(\underline{1}) = 0$
- (SNOII₂) $\forall A_1, A_2 \in I^X$, $\tau^T(A_1 \cap A_2) \geq \tau^T(A_1) \wedge \tau^T(A_2)$, $\tau^I(A_1 \cap A_2) \leq \tau^I(A_1) \vee \tau^I(A_2)$, and $\tau^F(A_1 \cap A_2) \leq \tau^F(A_1) \vee \tau^F(A_2)$
- (SNOII₃) $\forall A_i \in I^X, i \in J, \tau^T(\bigcup_{i \in J} A_i) \geq \bigwedge_{i \in J} \tau^T(A_i)$, $\tau^I(\bigcup_{i \in J} A_i) \leq \bigvee_{i \in J} \tau^I(A_i)$, and $\tau^F(\bigcup_{i \in J} A_i) \leq \bigvee_{i \in J} \tau^F(A_i)$

3.2.2 Definition

Let $\mathfrak{S}^T, \mathfrak{S}^I, \mathfrak{S}^F : I^X \rightarrow I$ be mappings satisfying the following axioms:

- (SNCII₁) $\mathfrak{S}^T(\underline{0}) = \mathfrak{S}^T(\underline{1}) = 1$, and $\mathfrak{S}^I(\underline{0}) = \mathfrak{S}^I(\underline{1}) = \mathfrak{S}^F(\underline{0}) = \mathfrak{S}^F(\underline{1}) = 0$
- (SNCII₂) $\forall B_1, B_2 \in I^X$, $\mathfrak{S}^T(B_1 \cup B_2) \geq \mathfrak{S}^T(B_1) \wedge \mathfrak{S}^T(B_2)$, $\mathfrak{S}^I(B_1 \cup B_2) \leq \mathfrak{S}^I(B_1) \vee \mathfrak{S}^I(B_2)$, and $\mathfrak{S}^F(B_1 \cup B_2) \leq \mathfrak{S}^F(B_1) \vee \mathfrak{S}^F(B_2)$
- (SNCII₃) $\forall B_i \in I^X, i \in J, \mathfrak{S}^T(\bigcap_{i \in J} B_i) \geq \bigwedge_{i \in J} \mathfrak{S}^T(B_i)$, $\mathfrak{S}^I(\bigcap_{i \in J} B_i) \leq \bigvee_{i \in J} \mathfrak{S}^I(B_i)$, and $\mathfrak{S}^F(\bigcap_{i \in J} B_i) \leq \bigvee_{i \in J} \mathfrak{S}^F(B_i)$

The triple $(\mathfrak{S}^T, \mathfrak{S}^I, \mathfrak{S}^F)$ is a smooth neutrosophic cotopology of type II, $\mathfrak{S}^T, \mathfrak{S}^I, \mathfrak{S}^F$ represent the degree of closedness, the degree of indeterminacy, and the degree of non-closedness respectively.

3.2.3 Example

Let $X = \{a, b\}$. Define the mappings

$$\tau^T, \tau^I, \tau^F : I^X \rightarrow I \text{ as:}$$

$$\tau^T(A) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A = \underline{0} \\ 1 & \text{if } A = \underline{1} \\ \min(A(a), A(b)) & \text{if } A \text{ is neither } \underline{0} \text{ nor } \underline{1} \end{cases}$$

$$\tau^I(A) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A = \underline{0} \\ 0 & \text{if } A = \underline{1} \\ 0.5 & \text{if } A \text{ is neither } \underline{0} \text{ nor } \underline{1} \end{cases}$$

$$\tau^F(A) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A = \underline{0} \\ 0 & \text{if } A = \underline{1} \\ \max(A(a), A(b)) & \text{if } A \text{ is neither } \underline{0} \text{ nor } \underline{1} \end{cases}$$

Then $(X, \tau^T, \tau^I, \tau^F)$ is a smooth neutrosophic topological space on X .

Note that: The Propositions (3.1.4) and (3.1.5) are satisfied for type II.

3.2.4 Definition

Let (τ^T, τ^I, τ^F) be a smooth neutrosophic topology of type II, and $A \in I^X$. Then the smooth neutrosophic closure of A , denoted by \bar{A} is defined by:

$$\bar{A} = \begin{cases} A, (\mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A)) = (1, 1, 0) \\ \cap \{H : H \in I^X, A \subseteq H, \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(H) > \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A), \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(H) < \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(H) < \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A)\}, \\ (\mathfrak{S}_{\tau^T}^T(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^I}^I(A), \mathfrak{S}_{\tau^F}^F(A)) \neq (1, 1, 0) \end{cases}$$

Also, the smooth neutrosophic interior of A , denoted by A° is defined by:

$$A^\circ = \begin{cases} A, (\tau^T(A), \tau^I(A), \tau^F(A)) = (1, 1, 0) \\ \cup \{H : H \in I^X, H \subseteq A, \tau^T(H) > \tau^T(A), \\ \tau^I(H) < \tau^I(A), \tau^F(H) < \tau^F(A)\}, \\ (\tau^T(A), \tau^I(A), \tau^F(A)) \neq (1, 1, 0) \end{cases}$$

Note That: the Propositions (3.1.7) and (3.1.9) are satisfied for type II.

4. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, the concepts of smooth neutrosophic topological structures were introduced. In two different types we've presented the concepts of smooth neutrosophic topological space, smooth neutrosophic cotopological space, smooth neutrosophic closure, and smooth neutrosophic interior. Due to unawareness of the behaviour of the degree of indeterminacy, we've chosen for τ^I to act like τ^T in the first type, while in the second type we preferred that τ^T behaves like τ^F . Therefore, the definitions given above can also be modified in several ways depending on the behaviour of τ^I . Moreover, as a consequence of our choices of the performance of τ^I , one can see that: In typeI, both τ^T and τ^I defined in (3.1.1) with their conditions are smooth topologies; while in typeII, only τ^T defined in (3.2.1) with its conditions is a smooth topology.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my worm thanks to Prof. Dr. E. E. Kerre for his valuable discussions and to Prof. Dr. A. A. Ramadan, who introduced me to the world of smooth structures. We thank Prof. Dr. Florentine Smarandache [Department of Mathematics, University of New Mexico, USA], Prof. Dr. Ahmed Salama [Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Faculty of Sciences, Port Said University, Egypt] for helping us to understand neutrosophic approach.

References

- [1] R. Badard, Smooth axiomatics, 1st IFSA Congress, Palma de Mallorca, 1986.
- [2] C. Chang, Fuzzy topological spaces, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 24 (1968) 182 – 193.
- [3] A. Ramadan, Smooth topological spaces, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 48 (1992) 371 – 375.
- [4] M. El-Gayyar, E. Kerre, A. Ramadan, On smooth topological spaces ii: separation axioms, Fuzzy Sets Syst. 119 (2001) 495 – 504.
- [5] M. El-Gayyar, E. Kerre, A. Ramadan, Almost compactness and near compactness in smooth topological spaces, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 62 (1994) 193 – 202.
- [6] K. T. Atanassov, Intuitionistic fuzzy sets: past, present and future, Proc. of the Third Conf. of the European Society for Fuzzy Logic and Technology EUSFLAT 2003, Zittau (2003)12 – 19.
- [7] K. T. Atanassov, Intuitionistic fuzzy sets, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 20 (1986) 87 – 96.
- [8] C. Cornelis, K. T. Atanassov, E. E. Kerre, Intuitionistic fuzzy sets and interval-valued fuzzy sets: A critical comparison, Proc. EUSFLAT03 (2003) 159 – 163.
- [9] L. A. Zadeh, Fuzzy sets, Inform. and Control 8 (1965) 338 – 353.
- [10] F. Smarandache, Neutrosophy and neutrosophic logic, in: First International Conference on Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Logic, Set, Probability, and Statistics, University of New Mexico, Gallup, NM 87301, USA.
- [11] F. Smarandache, A Unifying Field in Logics: Neutrosophic Logic. Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic crisp Set, Neutrosophic Probability, American Research Press, 1999.
- [12] F. Smarandache, Neutrosophic set, a generalization of the intuitionistic fuzzy sets, Inter. J. Pure Appl. Math., 24 (2005) 287 – 297.
- [13] A. A. Salama, S. Alblawi, generalized neutrosophic set and generalized neutrosophic topological spaces, Journal Computer Sci. Engineering 2 (2012) 129 – 132.
- [14] A. A. Salama, F. Smarandache, S. Alblawi, New neutrosophic crisp topological concepts, Neutrosophic Sets and Systems 2 (2014) 50 – 54.
- [15] A.A. Salama and Florentin Smarandache, Neutrosophic crisp set theory, Educational Publisher, Columbus, (2015).USA

Received: February 3, 2016. Accepted: June 20, 2016.