[Neutrosophic Sets and Systems](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nss_journal)

Volume 46 Article 17

10-7-2021

NEUTROSOPHIC d-IDEAL OF NEUTROSOPHIC d-ALGEBRA

Suman Das

Ali Khalid Hasan

Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, Vol. 46, 2021
University of New Mexico

NEUTROSOPHIC *d*-IDEAL OF NEUTROSOPHIC *d*-ALGEBRA

Suman Das[1,*] and Ali Khalid Hasan[2]

[1]Department of Mathematics, Tripura University, Agartala, 799022, Tripura, India.

[2]Directorate General of Education in Karbala province, Ministry of Education, Iraq.

***Correspondence:** sumandas18843@gmail.com

Abstract: In this article, we introduce the concept of neutrosophic *d*-ideal of neutrosophic *d*-algebra. Also we have studied several properties of them. We also furnish some suitable examples.

Keywords: *Fuzzy Set*; *Intuitionistic Fuzzy Set*; *Neutrosophic Set*; *d-Algebra*; *d-Ideal*; *d-Sub-Algebra*.

1. Introduction:

The concept of *BCK* algebra and *BCI* algebra are introduced by Imai & Iseki [18]. Thereafter, Negger & Kim [23] introduced the *d*-algebra as a generalization of *BCK* algebra. Negger et al. [22] discussed the ideal theory in *d*-algebra. In the year 1965, Zadeh introduced the idea of fuzzy set [26]. Thereafter, Atanassov introduced the notion of intuitionistic fuzzy set [1], which is the natural generalization of fuzzy set. Later on, Jun et al. [20] applied the notion of intuitionistic fuzzy set on *d*-algebra. Afterwards, the notion of intuitionistic fuzzy *d*-ideal of *d*-algebra was introduced by Hasan [16] in 2017. Thereafter, the concept of intuitionistic fuzzy *d*-filter was introduced by Hasan [17] in 2020. The concept of neutrosophic set was introduced by Smarandache [24]. In this article, we procure the notion of neutrosophic *d*-algebra and neutrosophic *d*-ideal by extending the notion of intuitionistic fuzzy *d*-ideal of *d*-algebra.

Research gap: No investigation on neutrosophic *d*-algebra and neutrosophic *d*-ideal has been reported in the recent literature.

Motivation: To fill the research gap, we introduce the neutrosophic *d*-algebra and neutrosophic *d*-ideal.

The rest of the paper is designed as follows:

In section-2, we recall *d*-algebra, *d*-ideal, fuzzy *d*-algebra, fuzzy *d*-ideal, intuitionistic fuzzy *d*-algebra, intuitionistic fuzzy *d*-ideal. In section-3, we introduce the notion of neutrosophic *d*-algebra, neutrosophic *d*-ideal, and the proofs of some propositions, theorems on neutrosophic *d*-algebra, and neutrosophic *d*-ideal. In section-4, we give the conclusions of work done in this paper.

2. Preliminaries and Some Results:

Definition 2.1.[17] Assume that W be a non-empty set and 0 be a constant. Then, W with a binary operation $*$ is called a d-algebra if it satisfies the following three axioms:

(*i*) $c*c=0$, $\forall c\in W$

(*ii*) $0*c=0$, $\forall c\in W$

(*iii*) $c*d=0$ and $d*c=0\Rightarrow c=d$, $\forall c, d\in W$.

We will refer to $c*d$ by cd. And $c\leq d$ iff $cd=0$.

Definition 2.2.[17] A d-algebra W is called commutative if $c(cd)=d(dc)$, $\forall c, d\in W$, and $d(dc)$ is denoted by $(c\wedge d)$.

Definition 2.3.[17] A d-algebra W is called bounded if there exist $a\in W$ such that $c\leq a$ for all $c\in W$, i.e. $ca=0$, $\forall c\in W$.

Definition 2.4.[17] Let W be a d-algebra with binary operator $*$ and $A\subseteq W$. Then, A is said to be a d-sub-algebra of W, if $c, d\in A\Rightarrow cd\in A$.

Definition 2.5.[16] Let W be a d-algebra with binary operator $*$ and a constant 0. Then, $D\subseteq W$ is called a d-ideal of W if it satisfies the following:

(*i*) $a*b\in D$ and $b\in D\Rightarrow a\in D$;

(*ii*) $a\in D$ and $b\in W\Rightarrow a*b\in D$.

Definition 2.6.[15] Let $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c)):c\in W\}$ be a fuzzy set over a d-algebra W. Then, A is called a fuzzy d-algebra if $T_Y(cd)\geq \min\{T_Y(c), T_Y(d)\}$, for all $c, d\in W$.

Definition 2.7.[15] An fuzzy set $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ over a d-algebra W is called the fuzzy d-ideal if it satisfies the following inequalities:

(*i*) $T_Y(c)\geq \min\{T_Y(cd), T_Y(d)\}$;

(*iii*) $T_Y(cd)\geq T_Y(c)$, for all $c, d\in W$.

Definition 2.8.[14] Let $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ be an intuitionistic fuzzy set over a d-algebra W. Then, A is called an intuitionistic fuzzy d-algebra if it satisfies the followings:

(*i*) $T_Y(cd)\geq \min\{T_Y(c), T_Y(d)\}$;

(*ii*) $F_Y(cd)\leq \max\{F_Y(c), F_Y(d)\}$;

where $c, d\in W$.

Proposition 2.1.[14] Every intuitionistic fuzzy d-algebra $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ of W satisfies the following inequalities:

(*i*) $T_Y(0)\geq T_Y(c)$, for all $c\in W$;

(*ii*) $F_Y(0)\leq F_Y(c)$, for all $c\in W$.

Definition 2.9.[10] An intuitionistic fuzzy set $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ over a d-algebra W is called the intuitionistic fuzzy d-ideal if it satisfies the following inequalities:

(*i*) $T_Y(c)\geq \min\{T_Y(cd), T_Y(d)\}$;

(*ii*) $F_Y(c)\leq \max\{F_Y(cd), F_Y(d)\}$;

(*iii*) $T_Y(cd)\geq T_Y(c)$;

(*iv*) $F_Y(cd)\geq F_Y(c)$; for all $c, d\in Y$.

Proposition 2.2.[10] Let Y={(c,$T_Y(c)$,$F_Y(c)$): $c\in W$} be an intuitionistic fuzzy d-ideal over a d-algebra W. Then, the following inequalities hold:

$T_Y(0)\geq T_Y(c)$, $F_Y(0)\leq F_Y(c)$, for all $c\in W$.

Definition 2.10.[18] A neutrosophic set over a universal set W is defined as follows:

H = {(y, $T_H(y)$, $I_H(y)$, $F_H(y)$): $y\in W$}, where $T_H(y)$, $I_H(y)$ and $F_H(y)$ ($\in]^{-}0,1^{+}[$) are the truth, indeterminacy and false membership value of y and $^{-}0 \leq T_H(y) + I_H(y) + F_H(y) \leq 3^{+}$.

Definition 2.11.[18] The neutrosophic whole set (1_N) and neutrosophic null set (0_N) over a universal set W is defined as follows:

(i) 1_N={(y,1,0,0): $y\in W$}.

(ii) 0_N ={(y,0,0,1): $y\in W$}.

Definition 2.12.[18] Assume that H={(y, $T_H(y)$, $I_H(y)$, $F_H(y)$):$y\in W$} and K={(y, $T_K(y)$, $I_K(y)$, $F_K(y)$):$y\in W$} are any two neutrosophic sets over X. Then,

(i) $H\cup K$= {(y,$T_H(y)\vee T_K(y)$, $I_H(y)\wedge I_K(y)$, $F_H(y)\wedge F_K(y)$): $y\in W$};

(ii) $H\cap K$= {(y, $T_H(y)\wedge T_K(y)$, $I_H(y)\vee I_K(y)$, $F_H(y)\vee F_K(y)$): $y\in W$};

(iii) H^c = {(y, 1-$T_H(y)$, 1-$I_H(y)$, 1-$F_H(y)$): $y\in W$};

(iv) $H\subseteq K \Leftrightarrow T_H(y)\leq T_K(y)$, $I_H(y)\geq I_K(y)$, $F_H(y)\geq F_K(y)$, for each $y\in W$.

3. Neutrosophic d-Algebra and Neutrosophic d-Ideal:

Definition 3.1. Let Y={(c,$T_Y(c)$,$I_Y(c)$,$F_Y(c)$): $c\in W$} be an neutrosophic set over a d-algebra W. Then, A is called a neutrosophic d-algebra if it satisfies the followings:

(i) $T_Y(c*d)\geq \min\{T_Y(c), T_Y(d)\}$;

(ii) $I_Y(c*d)\leq \max\{I_Y(c), I_Y(d)\}$;

(iii) $F_Y(c*d)\leq \max\{F_Y(c), F_Y(d)\}$;

where c, $d\in W$.

Example 3.1. Take $W=\{0,c,d,w\}$ with the following table

$\star$	0	c	d	w
0	0	0	0	0
c	c	0	0	c
d	d	d	0	0
w	w	w	d	0

Note that if we define

$T_Y(a)=\begin{cases}0.2 & if\, a=0,c\\ 0.02 & if\, a=d,w\end{cases}$, $I_Y(a)=\begin{cases}0.09 & if\, a=0,c\\ 0.8 & if\, a=d,w\end{cases}$ and $F_Y(a)=\begin{cases}0.05 & if\, a=0,c\\ 0.7 & if\, a=d,w\end{cases}$

So we can show easily that $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ is a neutrosophic d-algebra

Proposition 3.1. Every neutrosophic d-algebra Y={(c,$T_Y(c)$,$I_Y(c)$,$F_Y(c)$): $c\in W$} of W satisfies the following inequalities:

(i) $T_Y(0)\geq T_Y(c)$, for all $c\in W$;

(ii) $I_Y(0)\leq I_Y(c)$, for all $c\in W$;

(*iii*) $F_Y(0) \leq F_Y(c)$, for all $c \in W$.

Proof. Assume that $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c \in W\}$ be a neutrosophic *d*-algebra of *W*. Let $c \in W$. Then

(*i*) $T_Y(0)= T_Y(c*c) \geq \min\{ T_Y(c), T_Y(c)\}= T_Y(c)$, (using definition 2.1. & 3.1.)

(*ii*) $I_Y(0)= I_Y(c*c) \leq \max\{ I_Y(c), I_Y(c)\}= I_Y(c)$, (using definition 2.1. & 3.1.)

(*iii*) $F_Y(0)= F_Y(c*c) \leq \max\{ F_Y(c), F_Y(c)\}= F_Y(c)$, (using definition 2.1. & 3.1.)

Theorem 3.1. Let $\{Y_i: i \in \Delta\}$ be the family of neutrosophic *d*-algebra of *W*. Then, $\bigcap_{i\in\Delta} Y_i$ is a neutrosophic *d*-algebra of *W*.

Proof. Assume that $\{Y_i: i \in \Delta\}$ be the family of neutrosophic *d*-algebra of *W*. Now, $\bigcap_{i\in\Delta} Y_i=\{(c,\wedge T_{Y_i}(c),\vee I_{Y_i}(c),\vee F_{Y_i}(c)): c \in W\}$. Let $c, d \in W$. Then,

(*i*) $\wedge T_{Y_i}(c*d) \geq \wedge \min\{T_{Y_i}(c), T_{Y_i}(d)\}= \min\{\wedge T_{Y_i}(c),\wedge T_{Y_i}(d)\}$

$\Rightarrow \wedge T_{Y_i}(c*d) \geq \min\{\wedge T_{Y_i}(c),\wedge T_{Y_i}(d)\}$;

(*ii*) $\vee I_{Y_i}(c*d) \leq \vee \max\{I_{Y_i}(c), I_{Y_i}(d)\}= \max\{\vee I_{Y_i}(c),\wedge I_{Y_i}(d)\}$

$\Rightarrow \vee I_{Y_i}(c*d) \leq \max\{\vee I_{Y_i}(c),\wedge I_{Y_i}(d)\}$;

(*iii*) $\vee F_{Y_i}(c*d) \leq \vee \max\{F_{Y_i}(c), F_{Y_i}(d)\}= \max\{\vee F_{Y_i}(c),\wedge F_{Y_i}(d)\}$

$\Rightarrow \vee F_{Y_i}(c*d) \leq \max\{\vee F_{Y_i}(c),\wedge F_{Y_i}(d)\}$;

Therefore, $\bigcap_{i\in\Delta} Y_i$ is also a neutrosophic *d*-algebra of *W*.

Theorem 3.3. If $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c \in W\}$ is a neutrosophic *d*-algebra of *W*, then the sets $W_T=\{c \in W: T_Y(c)=T_Y(0)\}$, $W_I=\{c \in W: I_Y(c)=I_Y(0)\}$, and $W_F=\{c \in W: F_Y(c)=F_Y(0)\}$ are *d*-sub-algebras of *W*.

Proof. Assume that $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c \in W\}$ be a neutrosophic *d*-algebra of *W*. Given $W_T=\{c \in W: T_Y(c)=T_Y(0)\}$, $W_I=\{c \in W: I_Y(c)=I_Y(0)\}$, and $W_F=\{c \in W: F_Y(c)=F_Y(0)\}$. Let $c, d \in W_T$. Therefore, $T_Y(c)=T_Y(0)$, $T_Y(d)=T_Y(0)$. Now by definition 2.1, $T_Y(c*d) \geq \min\{T_Y(c), T_Y(d)\}= \min\{T_Y(0), T_Y(0)\}=T_Y(0)$, i.e. $T_Y(c*d) \geq T_Y(0)$. Again from proposition 3.1, it is clear that $T_Y(0) \leq T_Y(c*d)$. Therefore $T_Y(c*d)= T_Y(0)$. This implies that $c*d \in W_T$. Hence $c, d \in W_T \Rightarrow c*d \in W_T$. Therefore the set $W_T=\{c \in W: T_Y(c)=T_Y(0)\}$ is a *d*-sub-algebra of *W*.

Similarly we can easily show that $W_I=\{c \in W: I_Y(c)=I_Y(0)\}$ and $W_F=\{c \in W: F_Y(c)=F_Y(0)\}$ are *d*-sub-algebras of *W*.

Definition 3.2. Assume that $Y = \{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c \in W\}$ be a neutrosophic set over *W*. Then, the sets $W(T_Y,\alpha)=\{c \in W:T_Y(c) \geq \alpha\}$, $W(I_Y,\alpha)=\{c \in W:I_Y(c) \leq \alpha\}$, $W(F_Y,\alpha)=\{c \in W:F_Y(c) \leq \alpha\}$ are respectively called *T*-level α-cut, *I*-level α-cut, *F*-level α-cut of *Y*.

Theorem 3.4. Assume that $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)):c \in W\}$ be a neutrosophic *d*-algebra of *W*. Then, for any $\alpha \in [0,1]$, the *T*-level α-cut, *I*-level α-cut, *F*-level α-cut of *Y* are *d*-sub-algebra of *W*.

Proof. Assume that $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)):c \in W\}$ be a neutrosophic *d*-algebra of *W*. Then, *T*-level α-cut of $Y= W(T_Y,\alpha)=\{c \in W:T_Y(c) \geq \alpha\}$, *I*-level α-cut of $Y= W(I_Y,\alpha)=\{c \in W:I_Y(c) \leq \alpha\}$, and *F*-level α-cut of $Y= W(F_Y,\alpha)=\{c \in W:F_Y(c) \leq \alpha\}$.

Let $c, d \in W(T_Y,\alpha)$. Therefore, $T_Y(c) \geq \alpha$, $T_Y(d) \geq \alpha$. Now $T_Y(c*d) \geq \min\{ T_Y(c), T_Y(d)\} \geq \min\{ \alpha, \alpha\} \geq \alpha$. This implies, $c*d \in W(T_Y,\alpha)$. Hence, $c, d \in W(T_Y,\alpha) \Rightarrow c*d \in W(T_Y,\alpha)$. Therefore, $W(T_Y,\alpha)$ i.e. *T*-level α-cut of *Y* is a *d*-sub-algebra of *W*.

Similarly, we can easily show that *I*-level α-cut, *F*-level α-cut of *Y* are *d*-sub-algebra of *W*.

Definition 3.3. An neutrosophic set $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)):c\in W\}$ over a d-algebra W is called a neutrosophic d-ideal if it satisfies the following inequalities:

(*i*) $T_Y(c)\geq\min\{T_Y(cd), T_Y(d)\}$;

(*ii*) $F_Y(c)\leq\max\{F_Y(cd), F_Y(d)\}$;

(*iii*) $I_Y(c)\leq\max\{I_Y(cd), I_Y(d)\}$;

(*iv*) $T_Y(cd)\geq T_Y(c)$;

(*v*) $F_Y(cd)\geq F_Y(c)$;

(*vi*) $I_Y(cd)\geq I_Y(c)$, for all c, $d\in Y$.

Example 3.2. Take $W=\{0,c,d,w\}$ with the following table

⋆	0	c	d
0	0	0	0
c	d	0	d
d	c	c	0

Note that if we define

$T_Y(a)=\begin{cases}0.9 & if a=0\\ 0.01 & if a=c,d\end{cases}$, $I_Y(a)=\begin{cases}0.1 & if a=0\\ 0.5 & if a=\text{c},d\end{cases}$ and $F_Y(a)=\begin{cases}0.2 & if a=0\\ 0.6 & if a=c,d\end{cases}$

Then $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ is a neutrosophic d-ideal of d-algebra

Proposition 3.2. If $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ is a neutrosophic d-ideal of W, then $T_Y(0)\geq T_Y(c)$, $I_Y(0)\leq I_Y(c)$, $F_Y(0)\leq F_Y(c)$, for all $c\in W$.

Proof. Assume that $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ is a neutrosophic d-ideal of W, and c be any arbitrary element of W. Since $T_Y(c*c)\geq T_Y(c)$, so $T_Y(0)\geq T_Y(c)$. Similarly, since $I_Y(c*c)\leq I_Y(c)$, so $I_Y(0)\leq I_Y(c)$. Again, since $F_Y(c*c)\leq F_Y(c)$, so $F_Y(0)\leq F_Y(c)$.

Theorem 3.6. Assume that $Y=\{(x,T_Y(x),I_Y(x),F_Y(x)):x\in W\}$ is a neutrosophic d-ideal of W. If $x*y\leq z$, then $T_Y(x)\geq\min\{T_Y(y), T_Y(z)\}$, $I_Y(x)\leq\max\{I_Y(y), I_Y(z)\}$, $F_Y(x)\leq\max\{F_Y(y), F_Y(z)\}$.

Proof. Assume that $Y=\{(x,T_Y(x),I_Y(x),F_Y(x)):x\in W\}$ be an neutrosophic d-ideal of W. Let x, y, z be any three element of W such that $x*y\leq z$. Then by definition 2.1, $(x*y)*z=0$.

Now, $T_Y(x)\geq\min\{T_Y(x*y), T_Y(y)\}\geq\min\{\min\{T_Y((x*y)*z), T_Y(z)\}, T_Y(y)\}=\min\{\min\{T_Y(0),T_Y(z)\}, T_Y(y)\}\geq\min\{T_Y(z), T_Y(y)\}$. Therefore, $T_Y(x)\geq\min\{T_Y(y), T_Y(z)\}$.

Now, $I_Y(x)\leq\max\{I_Y(x*y), I_Y(y)\}\leq\max\{\max\{I_Y((x*y)*z), I_Y(z)\}, I_Y(y)\}=\max\{\max\{I_Y(0),I_Y(z)\}, I_Y(y)\}\leq\max\{I_Y(z), I_Y(y)\}$. Therefore, $I_Y(x)\leq\max\{I_Y(y), I_Y(z)\}$.

Again, $F_Y(x)\leq\max\{F_Y(x*y), F_Y(y)\}\leq\max\{\max\{F_Y((x*y)*z), F_Y(z)\}, F_Y(y)\}=\max\{\max\{F_Y(0),F_Y(z)\}, F_Y(y)\}\leq\max\{F_Y(z), F_Y(y)\}$. Therefore, $F_Y(x)\leq\max\{F_Y(y), F_Y(z)\}$.

Theorem 3.7. Assume that $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ is a neutrosophic d-ideal of W. If $x\leq z$, then $T_Y(x)\geq T_Y(z)$, $I_Y(x)\leq I_Y(z)$, $F_Y(x)\leq F_Y(z)$.

Proof. Assume that $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),I_Y(c),F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ is a neutrosophic d-ideal of W. Also let x, z be any two element of W such that $x\leq z$. Then by the definition 2.1, $x*z=0$.

Now, $T_Y(x)\geq\min\{T_Y(x*z),T_Y(z)\}=\min\{T_Y(0),T_Y(z)\}, T_Y(z)\}=T_Y(z)$. Therefore, $T_Y(x)\geq T_Y(z)$.

Now, $I_Y(x)\leq\max\{I_Y(x*z),I_Y(z)\}=\max\{I_Y(0),I_Y(z)\}, I_Y(z)\}=I_Y(z)$. Therefore, $I_Y(x)\leq I_Y(z)$.

Now, $F_Y(x)\leq \max\{F_Y(x*z),F_Y(z)\}= \max\{F_Y(0),F_Y(z)\}, F_Y(z)\}=F_Y(z)$. Therefore, $F_Y(x)\leq F_Y(z)$.

Theorem 3.10. If $\{D_i: i\in\Delta\}$ be the collection of neutrosophic d-ideals of d-algebra W, then $\bigcap_{i\in\Delta} D_i$ is also a neutrosophic d-ideal of d-algebra W.

Proof. Assume that $\{D_i: i\in\Delta\}$ be the collection of neutrosophic d-ideals of d-algebra W. We have $\bigcap_{i\in\Delta} D_i= \{(c,\wedge T_{Y_i}(c),\vee I_{Y_i}(c),\vee F_{Y_i}(c)): c\in W\}$.

Now $\wedge T_{Y_i}(c)\geq \wedge\{\min\{T_{Y_i}(c*d),T_{Y_i}(d)\}\} \geq \min\{\wedge T_{Y_i}(c*d), \wedge T_{Y_i}(d)\}$,

$\vee I_{Y_i}(c)\leq \vee\{\max\{I_{Y_i}(c*d),I_{Y_i}(d)\}\} \leq \max\{\vee I_{Y_i}(c*d), \vee I_{Y_i}(d)\}$,

and $\vee I_{Y_i}(c)\leq \vee\{\max\{I_{Y_i}(c*d),I_{Y_i}(d)\}\} \leq \max\{\vee I_{Y_i}(c*d), \vee I_{Y_i}(d)\}$.

Since $T_{Y_i}(c*d)\geq T_{Y_i}(c)$, $I_{Y_i}(c*d)\leq I_{Y_i}(c)$, $I_{Y_i}(c*d)\leq I_{Y_i}(c)$, for all i, we have $\wedge T_{Y_i}(c*d) \geq \wedge T_{Y_i}(c)$, $\vee I_{Y_i}(c*d) \leq \vee I_{Y_i}(c)$, $\vee I_{Y_i}(c*d) \leq \vee I_{Y_i}(c)$, for all i. Hence $\bigcap_{i\in\Delta} D_i= \{(c,\wedge T_{Y_i}(c),\vee I_{Y_i}(c),\vee F_{Y_i}(c)): c\in W\}$ is a neutrosophic d-ideal of W.

Theorem 3.11. A neutrosophic set $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),F_Y(c),I_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ is neutrosophic d-ideal of d-algebra W if and only if the corresponding fuzzy set $\{(c,T_Y(c)): c\in W\}$, $\{(c,1\text{-}I_Y(c)): c\in W\}$, $\{(c,1\text{-}F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ are fuzzy d-ideal of W.

Proof. Assume that $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),F_Y(c),I_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ be a neutrosophic d-ideal of W. Therefore for all $c,d\in W$, $T_Y(c)\geq \min\{T_Y(cd), T_Y(d)\}$; $T_Y(cd)\geq T_Y(c)$; $I_Y(c)\leq \max\{I_Y(cd), I_Y(d)\}$; $I_Y(cd)\leq I_Y(c)$; $F_Y(c)\leq \max\{F_Y(cd), F_Y(d)\}$; $F_Y(cd)\leq F_Y(c)$.

Since for all c, $d\in W$, $T_Y(c)\geq \min\{T_Y(cd), T_Y(d)\}$; $T_Y(cd)\geq T_Y(c)$, so the fuzzy set $\{(c,T_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ is a fuzzy d-ideal of W.

Now, for all c, $d\in W$,

$I_Y(c) \leq \max\{I_Y(cd), I_Y(d)\} \Rightarrow 1\text{-}I_Y(c)\geq \min\{1\text{-}I_Y(cd), 1\text{-}I_Y(d)\}$;

$I_Y(cd) \leq I_Y(c) \Rightarrow 1\text{-}I_Y(cd) \geq 1\text{-}I_Y(c)$;

Therefore, the fuzzy set $\{(c,1\text{-}I_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ is a fuzzy d-ideal of W.

Again, for all c, $d\in W$,

$F_Y(c)\leq \max\{F_Y(cd), F_Y(d)\} \Rightarrow 1\text{-}F_Y(c)\geq \min\{1\text{-}F_Y(cd), 1\text{-}F_Y(d)\}$;

$F_Y(cd)\leq F_Y(c) \Rightarrow 1\text{-}F_Y(cd)\geq 1\text{-}F_Y(c)$;

Therefore, the fuzzy set $\{(c,1\text{-}F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ is a fuzzy d-ideal of W.

Hence for an neutrosophic d-ideal $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),F_Y(c),I_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ of W, the corresponding fuzzy sets $\{(c,T_Y(c)): c\in W\}$, $\{(c,1\text{-}I_Y(c)): c\in W\}$, $\{(c,1\text{-}F_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ are fuzzy d-ideal of W.

Theorem 3.12. If a neutrosophic set $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),F_Y(c),I_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ is neutrosophic d-ideal of d-algebra W, then the sets $W(T_Y)=\{c\in W: T_Y(c)=T_Y(0)\}$, $W(I_Y)=\{c\in W: I_Y(c)=I_Y(0)\}$, and $W(F_Y)=\{c\in W: F_Y(c)=F_Y(0)\}$ are d-ideal of W.

Proof. Assume that $Y=\{(c,T_Y(c),F_Y(c),I_Y(c)): c\in W\}$ be a neutrosophic d-ideal of a d-algebra W.

Let $a*b\in W(T_Y)$ and $b\in W(T_Y)$. Therefore, $T_Y(a*b)=T_Y(0)$ and $T_Y(b)=T_Y(0)$. Since Y is a neutrosophic d-ideal of a d-algebra W, so $T_Y(a)\geq \min\{T_Y(a*b), T_Y(b)\}= \min\{ T_Y(0), T_Y(0)\}= T_Y(0)$. This implies that $T_Y(a)\geq T_Y(0)$. Again by proposition 3.2, it is clear that $T_Y(0)\geq T_Y(a)$. Hence $T_Y(a)=T_Y(0)$, i.e. $a\in W(T_Y)$. Therefore, $a*b\in W(T_Y)$ and $b\in W(T_Y)\Rightarrow a\in W(T_Y)$.

Again let $a\in W(T_Y)$ and $b\in W$. Therefore, $T_Y(a)=T_Y(0)$. Since Y is a neutrosophic d-ideal of a d-algebra W, so $T_Y(a*b)\geq T_Y(a)=T_Y(0)$. This implies that $T_Y(a*b)\geq T_Y(0)$. From proposition 3.2, it is clear that $T_Y(0)\geq$

$T_Y(a*b)$. Hence $T_Y(a*b)=T_Y(0)$, i.e. $a*b\in W(T_Y)$. Therefore, $a\in W(T_Y)$ and $b\in W \Rightarrow a*b\in W(T_Y)$. Hence the set $W(T_Y)=\{c\in W: T_Y(c)=T_Y(0)\}$ is a d-ideal of W.

Similarly we can show that, the sets $W(I_Y)=\{c\in W: I_Y(c)=I_Y(0)\}$, and $W(F_Y)=\{c\in W: F_Y(c)=F_Y(0)\}$ are d-ideal of W.

5. Conclusions:

In this article, we introduce the notion of neutrosophic d-ideals of d-algebra. Further we have investigated different properties and study some relations on neutrosophic d-algebra. By defining neutrosophic d-algebra, neutrosophic d-ideals, we prove some propositions, theorems on neutrosophic d-algebra and d-ideal.

In the future, we hope that many new notions namely neutrosophic d-filter, neutrosophic d-topology can be introduce based on these notions of neutrosophic d-algebra.

References:

1. Atanassov, K. T. (1986). Intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *Fuzzy sets and Systems*, 35, 87-96.
2. Coker, D. (1997). An introduction to intuitionistic fuzzy topological spaces. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 88, 81-89.
3. Das, S. (2021). Neutrosophic Supra Simply Open Set and Neutrosophic Supra Simply Compact Space. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 43, 105-113.
4. Das, S., Das, R., Granados, C., & Mukherjee, A. (2021). Pentapartitioned Neutrosophic *Q*-Ideals of *Q*-Algebra. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 41, 52-63.
5. Das, S., Das, R., & Tripathy, B. C. (2020). Multi criteria group decision making model using single-valued neutrosophic set. *LogForum*, 16(3), 421-429.
6. Das, S., Shil, B., & Tripathy, B. C. (2021). Tangent Similarity Measure Based MADM-Strategy under SVPNS-Environment. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 43, 93-104.
7. Das, R., Smarandache, F. & Tripathy, B. C. (2020). Neutrosophic fuzzy matrices and some algebraic operation. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 32, 401-409.
8. Das, S., & Pramanik, S. (2020). Generalized neutrosophic b-open sets in neutrosophic topological space. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 35, 522-530.
9. Das, S., & Pramanik, S. (2020). Neutrosophic Φ-open sets and neutrosophic Φ-continuous functions. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 38, 355-367.
10. Das, S., & Pramanik, S. (2020). Neutrosophic simply soft open set in neutrosophic soft topological space. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 38, 235-243.
11. Das, R. & Tripathy B. C. (2020). Neutrosophic multiset topological space. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 35, 142-152.
12. Das, S., & Tripathy, B. C. (2020). Pairwise neutrosophic-*b*-open set in neutrosophic bitopological spaces. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 38, 135-144.

13. Das, S., & Tripathy, B. C. (2021). Neutrosophic simply *b*-open set in neutrosophic topological spaces. *Iraqi Journal of Science*, In Press.
14. Das, S., & Tripathy, B. C. Pentapartitioned Neutrosophic Topological Space. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, In Press.
15. Granados, C., Das, S., & Tripathy, B. C. On I_3-convergence, I^*_3-convergence and I_3-Cauchy sequences in fuzzy normed spaces. *Transactions of A. Razmadze Mathematical Institute*, In press.
16. Hasan, A. K. (2017). On intuitionistic fuzzy *d*-ideal of *d*-algebra. *Journal University of Kerbala*, 15(1), 161-169.
17. Hasan, A. K. (2020). Intuitionistic fuzzy *d*-filter of *d*-algebra. *Journal of mechanics of continua and mathematical sciences*, 15(6), 360-370.
18. Iami, Y., & Iseki, K. (1966). On Axiom System of Propositional Calculi XIV. *Proceedings of the Japan Academy*, 42, 19-20.
19. Iseki, K. (1966). An algebra Relation with Propositional Calculus. *Proceedings of the Japan Academy*, 42, 26-29.
20. Jun, Y. B., Kim, H. S, & Yoo, D. S. (e-2006). Intuitionistic fuzzy *d*-algebra. *Scientiae Mathematicae Japonicae Online*, 1289-1297.
21. Jun, Y. B., Neggers, J., & Kim, H. S. (2000). Fuzzy *d*-ideals of *d*-algebras. *Journal of Fuzzy Mathematics*, 8(1), 123-130.
22. Neggers, J., Jun, Y. B., & Kim, H. S. (1999). On *d*-ideals in *d*-algebras. *Mathematica Slovaca*, 49(3), 243-251.
23. Neggers, J., & Kim, H. S. (1999). On *d*-algebra. *Mathematica Slovaca*, 49(1), 19-26.
24. Smarandache, F. (2005). Neutrosophic set: a generalization of the intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 24, 287-297.
25. Tripathy, B. C., & Das, S. (2021). Pairwise Neutrosophic *b*-Continuous Function in Neutrosophic Bitopological Spaces. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 43, 82-92.
26. Zadeh, L. A. (1965). Fuzzy set, *Information And Control*, 8, 338-353.

Received: May 4, 2021. Accepted: October 1, 2021