

Operators on Single-Valued Neutrosophic Oversets, Neutrosophic Undersets, and Neutrosophic Offsets

Florentin Smarandache

University of New Mexico
Mathematics & Science Department
705 Gurley Ave., Gallup, NM 87301, USA
Email: smarand@unm.edu

Received 25 June 2016; accepted 30 June 2016

Abstract. We have defined *Neutrosophic Over-/Under-/Off-Set and Logic* for the first time in 1995 and published in 2007. During 1995-2016 we presented them to various national and international conferences and seminars. These new notions are totally different from other sets/logics/probabilities.

We extended the neutrosophic set respectively to *Neutrosophic Over* {when some neutrosophic component is > 1 }, to *Neutrosophic Under* {when some neutrosophic component is < 0 }, and to *Neutrosophic Off* {when some neutrosophic components are off the interval $[0, 1]$, i.e. some neutrosophic component > 1 and other neutrosophic component < 0 }.

This is no surprise since our real-world has numerous examples and applications of over-/under-/off-neutrosophic components.

Keywords. neutrosophic overset, neutrosophic underset, neutrosophic offset, neutrosophic over logic, neutrosophic under logic, neutrosophic off logic, neutrosophic over probability, neutrosophic under probability, neutrosophic off probability, over membership (membership degree > 1), under membership (membership degree < 0), off membership (membership degree off the interval $[0, 1]$).

AMS Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 03E72, 94D05

1. Introduction

In the classical set and logic theories, in the fuzzy set and logic, and in intuitionistic fuzzy set and logic, the degree of membership and degree of non-membership have to belong to, or be included in, the interval $[0, 1]$. Similarly, in the classical probability and in imprecise probability the probability of an event has to belong to, or respectively be included in, the interval $[0, 1]$.

Yet, we have observed and presented to many conferences and seminars around the globe {see [12]-[33]} and published {see [1]-[8]} that in our real world there are many cases when the degree of membership is greater than 1. The set, which has elements whose membership is over 1, we called it *Overset*.

Even worst, we observed elements whose membership with respect to a set is under 0, and we called it *Underset*.

In general, a set that has elements whose membership is above 1 and elements whose membership is below 0, we called it *Offset* (i.e. there are elements whose memberships are off (over and under) the interval $[0, 1]$).

2. Example of over membership and under membership

In a given company a full-time employer works 40 hours per week. Let's consider the last week period.

Helen worked part-time, only 30 hours, and the other 10 hours she was absent without payment; hence, her membership degree was $30/40 = 0.75 < 1$.

John worked full-time, 40 hours, so he had the membership degree $40/40 = 1$, with respect to this company.

But George worked overtime 5 hours, so his membership degree was $(40+5)/40 = 45/40 = 1.125 > 1$. Thus, we need to make distinction between employees who work overtime, and those who work full-time or part-time. That's why we need to associate a degree of membership strictly greater than 1 to the overtime workers.

Now, another employee, Jane, was absent without pay for the whole week, so her degree of membership was $0/40 = 0$.

Yet, Richard, who was also hired as a full-time, not only didn't come to work last week at all (0 worked hours), but he produced, by accidentally starting a devastating fire, much damage to the company, which was estimated at a value half of his salary (i.e. as he would have gotten for working 20 hours that week). Therefore, his membership degree has to be less than Jane's (since Jane produced no damage). Whence, Richard's degree of membership, with respect to this company, was $-20/40 = -0.50 < 0$.

Consequently, we need to make distinction between employees who produce damage, and those who produce profit, or produce neither damage nor profit to the company.

Therefore, the membership degrees > 1 and < 0 are real in our world, so we have to take them into consideration.

Then, similarly, the Neutrosophic Logic/Measure/Probability/Statistics etc. were extended to respectively *Neutrosophic Over-/Under/Off-Logic, -Measure, -Probability, -Statistics* etc. [Smarandache, 2007].

3. Definition of single-valued neutrosophic overset

Let U be a universe of discourse and the neutrosophic set $A_1 \subset U$.

Let $T(x)$, $I(x)$, $F(x)$ be the functions that describe the degrees of membership, indeterminate-membership, and nonmembership respectively, of a generic element $x \in U$, with respect to the neutrosophic set A_1 :

$$T(x), I(x), F(x) : U \rightarrow [0, \Omega]$$

where $0 < 1 < \Omega$, and Ω is called overlimit.

A Single-Valued Neutrosophic Overset A_1 is defined as:

$$A_1 = \{(x, \langle T(x), I(x), F(x) \rangle), x \in U\},$$

Operators on Single-Valued Neutrosophic Oversets, Neutrosophic Undersets, and Neutrosophic Offsets

such that there exists at least one element in A_1 that has at least one neutrosophic component that is > 1 , and no element has neutrosophic components that are < 0 .

For **example**: $A_1 = \{(x_1, \langle 1.3, 0.5, 0.1 \rangle), (x_2, \langle 0.2, 1.1, 0.2 \rangle)\}$, since $T(x_1) = 1.3 > 1$, $I(x_2) = 1.1 > 0$, and no neutrosophic component is < 0 .

Also $O_2 = \{(a, \langle 0.3, -0.1, 1.1 \rangle)\}$, since $I(a) = -0.1 < 0$ and $F(a) = 1.1 > 1$.

4. Definition of single-valued neutrosophic underset

Let U be a universe of discourse and the neutrosophic set $A_2 \subset U$.

Let $T(x)$, $I(x)$, $F(x)$ be the functions that describe the degrees of membership, indeterminate-membership, and nonmembership respectively, of a generic element $x \in U$, with respect to the neutrosophic set A_2 :

$$T(x), I(x), F(x) : U \rightarrow [\Psi, 1]$$

where $\Psi < 0 < 1$, and Ψ is called underlimit.

A Single-Valued Neutrosophic Underset A_2 is defined as:

$$A_2 = \{(x, \langle T(x), I(x), F(x) \rangle), x \in U\},$$

such that there exists at least one element in A_2 that has at least one neutrosophic component that is < 0 , and no element has neutrosophic components that are > 1 .

For **example**: $A_2 = \{(x_1, \langle -0.4, 0.5, 0.3 \rangle), (x_2, \langle 0.2, 0.5, -0.2 \rangle)\}$, since $T(x_1) = -0.4 < 0$, $F(x_2) = -0.2 < 0$, and no neutrosophic component is > 1 .

5. Definition of single-valued neutrosophic offset

Let U be a universe of discourse and the neutrosophic set $A_3 \subset U$.

Let $T(x)$, $I(x)$, $F(x)$ be the functions that describe the degrees of membership, indeterminate-membership, and nonmembership respectively, of a generic element $x \in U$, with respect to the set A_3 :

$$T(x), I(x), F(x) : U \rightarrow [\Psi, \Omega]$$

where $\Psi < 0 < 1 < \Omega$, and Ψ is called under limit, while Ω is called overlimit.

A Single-Valued Neutrosophic Offset A_3 is defined as:

$$A_3 = \{(x, \langle T(x), I(x), F(x) \rangle), x \in U\},$$

such that there exist some elements in A_3 that have at least one neutrosophic component that is > 1 , and at least another neutrosophic component that is < 0 .

For **examples**: $A_3 = \{(x_1, \langle 1.2, 0.4, 0.1 \rangle), (x_2, \langle 0.2, 0.3, -0.7 \rangle)\}$, since $T(x_1) = 1.2 > 1$ and $F(x_2) = -0.7 < 0$.

Also, $B_3 = \{(a, \langle 0.3, -0.1, 1.1 \rangle)\}$, since $I(a) = -0.1 < 0$ and $F(a) = 1.1 > 1$.

6. Neutrosophic overset / underset / offset operators

Let U be a universe of discourse and $A = \{(x, \langle T_A(x), I_A(x), F_A(x) \rangle), x \in U\}$ and $B = \{(x, \langle T_B(x), I_B(x), F_B(x) \rangle), x \in U\}$ be two single-valued neutrosophic oversets / undersets / offsets.

$$T_A(x), I_A(x), F_A(x), T_B(x), I_B(x), F_B(x) : U \rightarrow [\Psi, \Omega]$$

where $\Psi \leq 0 < 1 \leq \Omega$, and Ψ is called underlimit, while Ω is called overlimit.

We take the inequality sign \leq instead of $<$ on both extremes above, in order to comprise all three cases: overset {when $\Psi = 0$, and $1 < \Omega$ }, underset {when $\Psi < 0$, and $1 = \Omega$ }, and offset {when $\Psi < 0$, and $1 < \Omega$ }.

Neutrosophic Overset / Underset / Offset Union.

Then $A \cup B = \{(x, \langle \max\{T_A(x), T_B(x)\}, \min\{I_A(x), I_B(x)\}, \min\{F_A(x), F_B(x)\} \rangle), x \in U\}$

Neutrosophic Overset / Underset / Offset Intersection.

Then $A \cap B = \{(x, \langle \min\{T_A(x), T_B(x)\}, \max\{I_A(x), I_B(x)\}, \max\{F_A(x), F_B(x)\} \rangle), x \in U\}$

Neutrosophic Overset / Underset / Offset Complement.

The complement of the neutrosophic set A is

$\complement(A) = \{(x, \langle F_A(x), \Psi + \Omega - I_A(x), T_A(x) \rangle), x \in U\}$.

7. Conclusion

The membership degrees over 1 (over membership), or below 0 (undermembership) are part of our real world, so they deserve more study in the future. The neutrosophic over set / under set / off set together with neutrosophic over logic / under logic / off logic and especially neutrosophic over probability / under probability / and off probability have many applications in technology, social science, economics and so on that the readers may be interested in exploring.

REFERENCES

1. F.Smarandache, *A Unifying Field in Logics: Neutrosophic Logic. Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Probability and Statistics*, ProQuest Info & Learning, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, pp. 92-93, 2007, <http://fs.gallup.unm.edu/ebook-neutrosophics6.pdf> ; first edition reviewed in ZentralblattfürMathematik (Berlin, Germany): <https://zbmath.org/?q=an:01273000>.
2. *Neutrosophy* at the University of New Mexico’s website: <http://fs.gallup.unm.edu/neutrosophy.htm>
3. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, international journal, in UNM website: <http://fs.gallup.unm.edu/NSS>; and <http://fs.gallup.unm.edu/NSS/NSSNeutrosophicArticles.htm>
4. F.Smarandache, *Neutrosophic Set – A Generalization of the Intuitionistic Fuzzy Set*; various versions of this article were published as follows:
 - a. in *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, Vol. 24, No. 3, 287-297, 2005;
 - b. in *Proceedings of 2006 IEEE International Conference on Granular Computing*, edited by Yan-Qing Zhang and Tsau Young Lin, Georgia State University, Atlanta, USA, pp. 38-42, 2006;
 - c. in *Journal of Defense Resources Management*, Brasov, Romania, No. 1, 107-116, 2010.
 - d. as *A Geometric Interpretation of the Neutrosophic Set – A Generalization of the Intuitionistic Fuzzy Set*, in *Proceedings of the 2011 IEEE International Conference on Granular Computing*, edited by Tzung-Pei Hong, Yasuo Kudo,

Operators on Single-Valued Neutrosophic Oversets, Neutrosophic Undersets, and
Neutrosophic Offsets

Mineichi Kudo, Tsau-Young Lin, Been-ChianChien, Shyue-Liang Wang,
Masahiro Inuiguchi, GuiLong Liu, IEEE Computer Society, National University
of Kaohsiung, Taiwan, 602-606, 8-10 November 2011;
<http://fs.gallup.unm.edu/IFS-generalized.pdf>

5. F.Smarandache, *Degree of Dependence and Independence of the (Sub) Components of Fuzzy Set and Neutrosophic Set*, Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 11 (2016) 95-97.
6. F.Smarandache, *Vietnam Veteran în Stiința Neutrosofice*, instantaneous photo-video diary, Editura Mingir, Suceava, 2016.
7. F.Smarandache, *Neutrosophic OverSet Applied in Physics*, 69th Annual Gaseous Electronics Conference, Bochum, Germany [through American Physical Society (APS)], October 10, 2016 - Friday, October 14, 2016. Abstract submitted on 12 April 2016.
8. D. P. Popescu, *Să nu ne sfîim să gîndim diferit - de vorbă cu prof. univ. dr. Florentin Smarandache*, Revista "Observatorul", Toronto, Canada, Tuesday, June 21, 2016,
<http://www.observatorul.com/default.asp?action=articleviewdetail&ID=15698>
9. F. Smarandache, *Symbolic Neutrosophic Theory*, Europa Nova, Bruxelles, 194 p., 2015;
<http://fs.gallup.unm.edu/SymbolicNeutrosophicTheory.pdf>
10. F.Smarandache, *Introduction to Neutrosophic Measure, Neutrosophic Integral, and Neutrosophic Probability*, Sitech, 2003;
<http://fs.gallup.unm.edu/NeutrosophicMeasureIntegralProbability.pdf>
11. F.Smarandache, *Introduction to Neutrosophic Statistics*, Sitech Craiova, 123 pages, 2014, <http://fs.gallup.unm.edu/NeutrosophicStatistics.pdf>