



ON INTERVAL-VALUED NEUTROSOPHIC FUZZY POSITIVE IMPLICATIVE IDEALS OF BCK-ALGEBRA

Satyanarayana Bavanari, Professor, Department of Mathematics, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna Nagar-522 510, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India E-mail: drbsn63@yahoo.co.in

Anjaneyulu Naik Kalavath, Bhuvanewari Dhanala, Research Scholar, Department of Mathematics, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna Nagar-522 510, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India. E-mail: nelu.fuzzy@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The primary objective of this research is to extend the notion of interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy sets (IVNFS's) to positive implicative ideals (PII's) in BCK-algebra ($BCK - \mathcal{A}$), thereby introducing interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy positive implicative ideals (IVNFPII's) of BCK-algebra and we establish relationships between interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy ideals, interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy implicative ideals, interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy commutative ideals & interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy positive implicative ideals of BCK-algebra and also investigating their fundamental properties.

Keywords: BCK-algebra($BCK - \mathcal{A}$), Interval-Valued Neutrosophic Fuzzy Sets, Fuzzy Positive Implicative Ideals, Interval-Valued Fuzzy Positive Implicative Ideals, Neutrosophic Interval-Valued Fuzzy Positive Implicative Ideals.

MSC: 03E72, 06F35, 03G25

I. Introduction

BCI/BCK-algebra is a structure of Universal algebras. BCI/BCK-algebraic system developed by Iseki [7, 8] in 1966, 1978, further extends Imai & Iseki [6]. In 1976, Iseki & Tanaka [9] developed the ideal theory of BCK-algebra. The notion of fuzzy set introduced by Zadeh [14] in 1965, which contained the degree of truth membership value and applied to many Mathematical fields. Xi [13] applied the concept of fuzzy sets to BCK-algebra. Meng et. al., [10] introduced the concept of implicative and positive implicative ideals of BCK-algebras, and several researchers investigated further properties of fuzzy BCK-algebra. Atanassov's [5] introduced new idea of IFS's which contained the degree of membership and the degree of non-membership. Atanassov and Gargov [4] developed the concept of IVNFS's as a combination of IFS's and IVFS's. Neutrosophic logic and sets introduced by Smarandache [12]. In 2017 Satyanarayana et.al., [11] introduced the concept of interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy positive implicative ideals (IVIFPII's) in BCK-algebras and investigated some related properties. The authors [1] recently, studied interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy hyper BCK-ideals & implicative hyper BCK-ideals of Hyper BCK-algebras and also we [2, 3] are contributed research on interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy implicative & commutative ideals of BCK-algebras and also in this work generalized to n-fold logic within the context of BCK-algebras. We inspired in this manner to develop interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy positive implicative ideal of BCK-algebra.

In this research, we introduce the notion of interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy positive implicative ideals (IVNFPII's) in BCK-algebra ($BCK - \mathcal{A}$), to establish relationships among interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy (implicative, commutative and positive implicative) ideals of BCK-algebra and examine their fundamental properties.

For the sake of brevity, we employ the following abbreviations in this paper:

- ✓ $BCK - \mathcal{A}$ (or) $\mathfrak{A}$: BCK-algebra
- ✓ IVIFS : interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy set
- ✓ IVIFI : interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy ideals
- ✓ IVIFPII : interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy positive implicative ideals

- ✓ NFSA : neutrosophic fuzzy sub-algebra
- ✓ NFI : neutrosophic fuzzy ideals
- ✓ IVNFS : interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy set
- ✓ IVNFI : interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy ideals
- ✓ IVNFII : interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy implicative ideals
- ✓ IVNFPPI : interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy positive implicative ideals
- ✓ IVNFCI : interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy commutative ideals

II. Preliminaries

Subsequent section, we employed a brief overview of the basic notions required for this study. For the remainder of this paper, $\mathfrak{U}$ will refer to a $BC\mathcal{K} - \mathcal{A}$, unless a different meaning is explicitly stated.

Definition 2.1.[8] Let $\mathfrak{U}$ be a ($\neq \emptyset$) set with “ δ ” be a binary operation and “ 0 ” be a constant. Then $(\mathfrak{U}, \delta, 0)$ is said to be a $BC\mathcal{K} - \mathcal{A}$, if it fulfill the listed properties

$$(BC\mathcal{K}1) ((f \delta g) \delta (f \delta h)) \delta (h \delta g) = 0,$$

$$(BC\mathcal{K}2) (f \delta (f \delta g)) \delta g = 0,$$

$$(BC\mathcal{K}3) f \delta f = 0,$$

$$(BC\mathcal{K}4) 0 \delta f = 0,$$

$$(BC\mathcal{K}5) f \delta g = 0 \text{ and } g \delta f = 0 \Rightarrow f = g, \text{ for any } f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}.$$

On the set $\mathfrak{U}$, we introduce “ $\leq$ ” is a binary relation, defined as listed:

$$f \leq g \Leftrightarrow f \delta g = 0.$$

In a $BC\mathcal{K} - \mathcal{A} (\mathfrak{U}, \delta, 0)$, we have the listed holds true:

$$(P1) f \delta 0 = f,$$

$$(P2) f \delta g \leq f,$$

$$(P3) (f \delta g) \delta h = (f \delta h) \delta g,$$

$$(P4) (f \delta h) \delta (g \delta h) \leq f \delta g,$$

$$(P5) f \delta (f \delta (f \delta g)) = f \delta g,$$

$$(P6) f \leq g \Rightarrow f \delta h \leq g \delta h \text{ and } h \delta g \leq h \delta f,$$

$$(P7) f \delta g \leq h \Rightarrow f \delta h \leq g, \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}.$$

A $BC\mathcal{K} - \mathcal{A}$ is called a positive implicative, if $(f \delta g) \delta h = (f \delta h) \delta (g \delta h)$, for all $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}$.

A ($\neq \emptyset$) sub-set $\mathfrak{S}$ of $\mathfrak{U}$ is said to be a sub-algebra of $\mathfrak{U}$, if $f \delta g \in \mathfrak{S}$, when-ever $f, g \in \mathfrak{S}$,

an ideal of $\mathfrak{U}$, if $(\mathfrak{S}_1) 0 \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $(\mathfrak{S}_2) f \delta g$ and $g \in \mathfrak{S} \Rightarrow f \in \mathfrak{S}, \forall f, g \in \mathfrak{U}$,

an implicative ideal, if $(\mathfrak{S}_1)$ and $(\mathfrak{S}_3) (f \delta (g \delta f)) \delta h \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $h \in \mathfrak{S}$ implies that $f \in \mathfrak{S}$,

for all $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}$

Positive implicative ideal, if $(\mathfrak{S}_1)$ and $(\mathfrak{S}_4) (f \delta g) \delta h \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $g \delta h \in \mathfrak{S} \Rightarrow f \delta h \in \mathfrak{S}$,

for all $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}$.

An IVIFS “ $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ ” over $\mathfrak{U}$ is an object having the form $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = \left\{ (f, \xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f), \widetilde{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f)) : f \in \mathfrak{U} \right\}$, where

$\xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}} : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}[0,1]$, and $\widetilde{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}} : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}[0,1]$, the intervals $\xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f)$ and $\widetilde{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f)$ denotes the intervals of truth membership degree, and falsity membership degree of the element f to the set $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$,

where $\xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f) = [\xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}^-(f), \xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}^+(f)]$, and $\widetilde{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f) = [\omega_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}^-(f), \omega_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}^+(f)]$, for all $f \in \mathfrak{U}$ with

the condition $[0,0] \leq \xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f) + \widetilde{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f) \leq [1,1]$, for all $f \in \mathfrak{U}$, here $\mathbb{A}[0,1]$ is the set of all closed sub-intervals of $[0,1]$.

An IVNFS “ $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ ” over $\mathfrak{U}$ is an object having the form $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = \left\{ (f, \xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f), \zeta_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f), \widetilde{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f)) : f \in \mathfrak{U} \right\}$,

where $\xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}} : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}[0,1]$, $\zeta_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}} : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}[0,1]$ and $\widetilde{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}} : \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}[0,1]$, the intervals $\xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f)$, $\widetilde{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f)$ represents same as on above and $\zeta_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f)$ represents indeterminate membership degree of the element f to the set $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$, here $\xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f) = [\xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}^-(f), \xi_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}^+(f)]$, $\zeta_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f) = [\zeta_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}^-(f), \zeta_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}^+(f)]$ and $\widetilde{\omega}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}(f) = [\omega_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}^-(f), \omega_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}}^+(f)]$, for all

$f \in \mathfrak{A}$ with the condition $[0, 0] \leq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) + \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) + \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \leq [1, 1]$, for all $f \in \mathfrak{A}$. Our convenience, we use the symbol $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$, here $\mathbb{A}[0, 1]$ represents same as above one.

Proposition 2.2.[10] In $\mathfrak{A}$, the listed are holds, for all $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}$,

- i. $((f \circ h) \circ h) \circ (g \circ h) \leq (f \circ g) \circ h$
- ii. $(f \circ h) \circ (f \circ (f \circ h)) = (f \circ h) \circ h$
- iii. $((f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))) \circ (g \circ (f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f)))) \leq f \circ g$.

Definition 2.3.[8] An Interval-Valued Intuitionistic (IVIFS) $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ is an Interval-Valued Intuitionistic Fuzzy Positive Implicative ideal (IVIFPII) of $\mathfrak{A}$, if it fulfills

- (IVIFPI₁) $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f)$, and $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f)$,
- (IVIFPI₂) $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h) \geq \min\{\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \circ h)\}$,
- (IVIFPI₃) $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h) \leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \circ h)\}$, for all $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Definition 2.4.[3] An Interval-Valued Neutrosophic Fuzzy Set (IVNFS) $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ is an Interval-Valued Neutrosophic Fuzzy Ideal (IVNFI) of $\mathfrak{A}$, if it satisfies

- (IVNFI₁) $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f)$, $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \geq \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f)$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f)$,
- (IVNFI₂) $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \geq \min\{\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g)\}$,
- (IVNFI₃) $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \geq \min\{\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g), \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g)\}$,
- (IVNFI₄) $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g)\}$, for all $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Definition 2.5.[2] An interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy set (IVNFS) $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ is an Interval-Valued Neutrosophic Fuzzy Implicative Ideal (IVNFII) of $\mathfrak{A}$, if it fulfills

- (IVNFII₁) $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f)$, $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \geq \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f)$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f)$,
- (IVNFII₂) $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \geq \min\{\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ (g \circ f)) \circ h), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h)\}$,
- (IVNFII₃) $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \geq \min\{\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ (g \circ f)) \circ h), \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h)\}$,
- (IVNFII₄) $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ (g \circ f)) \circ h), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h)\}$, for all $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Definition 2.6.[2]. An interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy set (IVNFS) $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ is an Interval-Valued Neutrosophic Fuzzy Commutative Ideal (IVNFCI) of $\mathfrak{A}$, if it fulfills

- (IVNFCI₁) $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f)$, $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \geq \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f)$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f)$,
- (IVNFCI₂) $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))) \geq \min\{\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h)\}$,
- (IVNFCI₃) $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))) \geq \min\{\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h)\}$,
- (IVNFCI₄) $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))) \leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h)\}$, for all $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Theorem 2.7.[2] Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be an interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy ideal (IVNFI) of $\mathfrak{A}$, if $f \leq g$ in $\mathfrak{A}$, then $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g)$, $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \geq \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g)$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g)$, i.e., $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}$, $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}$ are reversing order and preserving order.

Theorem 2.8.[2] An interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy subalgebra (IVNFSA) $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is a neutrosophic fuzzy ideal (NFI) of $\mathfrak{A} \Leftrightarrow$ for $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}$, $f \circ g \leq h \Rightarrow \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \geq \min\{\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h)\}$, $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \geq \min\{\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g), \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h)\}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h)\}$.

Theorem 2.9.[2] Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be an interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy ideal (IVNFI) of $\mathfrak{A}$. Then listed are interchangeable.

- i. $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy implicative ideal (IVNFII) of $\mathfrak{A}$.
- ii. $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ f))$, $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \geq \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ f))$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ f))$, $\forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}$.
- iii. $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ f))$, $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ f))$ and

$$\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ f)), \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Theorem 2.10.[2] Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be an Implicative BCK-algebra; then every interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy ideals (IVNFI) of $\mathfrak{A}$ is an interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy implicative ideals (IVNFII) of $\mathfrak{A}$.

III. Interval-Valued Neutrosophic Fuzzy Positive Implicative Ideals in BCK-algebra

In this section we developed the concept of interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy positive implicative ideals (IVNFPII) in $\mathfrak{A}$ and also proved their related definition, counter examples and theorems.

Definition 3.1. An interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy set (IVNFS) $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ is an interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy positive implicative ideals (IVNFPII) of $\mathfrak{A}$, if it fulfills

$$(IVNFPI_1) \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f), \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \geq \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \text{ and } \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f),$$

$$(IVNFPI_2) \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h) \geq \min\{\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \circ h)\},$$

$$(IVNFPI_3) \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h) \geq \min\{\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \circ h)\},$$

$$(IVNFPI_4) \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h) \leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \circ h)\}, \text{ for all } f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Example 3.2. Consider $\mathfrak{A} = \{0, q_1, q_2, q_3\}$ in which “ $\circ$ ” is defined in the listed Cayley table

$\circ$	0	q_1	q_2	q_3
0	0	0	0	0
q_1	q_1	0	q_1	0
q_2	q_2	q_2	0	0
q_3	q_3	q_2	q_1	0

Then $(\mathfrak{A}, \circ, 0)$ is a $BC\mathcal{K} - \mathcal{A}$. Define an IVNFS $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ by

$$\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{l}_0, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_1) = \tilde{l}_1, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_2) = \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_3) = \tilde{l}_2, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{r}_0, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_1) = \tilde{r}_1,$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_2) = \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_3) = \tilde{r}_2 \text{ and } \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{n}_0, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_1) = \tilde{n}_1, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_2) = \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_3) = \tilde{n}_2,$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{l}_0 > \tilde{l}_1 > \tilde{l}_2, \tilde{r}_0 > \tilde{r}_1 > \tilde{r}_2 \text{ and } \tilde{n}_0 < \tilde{n}_1 < \tilde{n}_2 \text{ and } [0, 0] \leq \tilde{l}_i + \tilde{r}_i + \tilde{n}_i \leq [1, 1]$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2$. Then $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Theorem 3.3. An interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy positive implicative ideals (IVNFPII) $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ must be an interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy ideals (IVNFI).

In general, converse of Theorem 3.3 may not be hold good, see the below counter example.

Example 3.4. Consider $\mathfrak{A} = \{0, q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4\}$ with the Cayley table below

$\circ$	0	q_1	q_2	q_3	q_4
0	0	0	0	0	0
q_1	q_1	0	q_1	0	0
q_2	q_2	q_2	0	0	0
q_3	q_3	q_3	q_3	0	0
q_4	q_4	q_4	q_4	q_3	0

Define an IVNFS $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ by

$$\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{l}_0, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_1) = \tilde{l}_1, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_2) = \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_3) = \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_4) = \tilde{l}_2,$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{r}_0, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_1) = \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_2) = \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_3) = \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_4) = \tilde{r}_2 \text{ and}$$

$$\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{n}_0, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_1) = \tilde{n}_1, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_2) = \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_3) = \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_4) = \tilde{n}_2,$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{l}_0 > \tilde{l}_1 > \tilde{l}_2, \tilde{r}_0 > \tilde{r}_1 > \tilde{r}_2 \text{ and } \tilde{n}_0 < \tilde{n}_1 < \tilde{n}_2 \text{ and } [0, 0] \leq \tilde{l}_i + \tilde{r}_i + \tilde{n}_i \leq [1, 1], \text{ for } i = 0, 1, 2.$$

Simple calculations gives that $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$, but it is not an IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{A}$, because

$$\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_4 \circ q_3) = \tilde{l}_2 < \tilde{l}_0 = \min\{\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((q_4 \circ q_3) \circ q_3), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_3 \circ q_3)\},$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_4 \circ q_3) = \tilde{r}_2 < \tilde{r}_0 = \min\{\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}((q_4 \circ q_3) \circ q_3), \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_3 \circ q_3)\} \text{ and}$$

$$\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_4 \circ q_3) = \tilde{n}_2 > \tilde{n}_0 = \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((q_4 \circ q_3) \circ q_3), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(q_3 \circ q_3)\}.$$

Theorem 3.5. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be an IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{A}$, then $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}$, $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}$ are order reversing and preserving.

Proof: This theorem proof follows from Definition 3.1 & Theorem 2.7.

Theorem 3.6. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is positive implicative BCK-algebra (PI-BCK- $\mathfrak{A}$), then an IVNFI must be an IVNFPII.

Proof: Follows from Theorem 2.10.

Proposition 3.7. Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$. Then

$$\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \geq \min\{\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(h \circ g)\},$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \geq \min\{\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h \circ g)\} \text{ and}$$

$$\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h \circ g)\}, \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Proposition 3.8. Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$, then $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{A} \Leftrightarrow$

$$\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \geq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ g), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ g) \text{ and } \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ g),$$

$$\forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Theorem 3.9. Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$. Then

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}) \text{ is an IVNFPII of } \mathfrak{A} \Leftrightarrow \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) = \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ g),$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) = \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ g) \text{ and } \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) = \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ g), \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Theorem 3.10. Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$. Then

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}) \text{ is an IVNFCI of } \mathfrak{A} \Leftrightarrow \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))) = \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g),$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))) = \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \text{ and } \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))) = \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g), \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Theorem 3.11. An IVNFI $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ is an IVNFII $\Leftrightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ is both an IVNFCI and an IVNFPII.

Proof: Suppose that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFII of $\mathfrak{A}$. By (2.2(i) and 2.8), we have

$$\min\{\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \circ h)\} \leq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ h) \circ h)$$

$$= \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ h) \circ (f \circ (f \circ h))) \quad (\text{by 2.2(ii)})$$

$$= \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h) \quad (\text{by 2.9(iii)})$$

$$\min\{\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \circ h)\} \leq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ h) \circ h)$$

$$= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ h) \circ (f \circ (f \circ h))) \quad (\text{by 2.2(ii)})$$

$$= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h) \quad (\text{by 2.9(iii)})$$

and

$$\max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \circ h)\} \geq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ h) \circ h)$$

$$= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ h) \circ (f \circ (f \circ h))) \quad (\text{by 2.2(ii)})$$

$$= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h) \quad (\text{by 2.9(iii)})$$

$$\text{Hence, } \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h) \geq \min\{\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \circ h)\},$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h) \geq \min\{\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \circ h)\} \text{ and}$$

$$\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ h) \leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \circ h)\}, \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Therefore, $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{A}$.

And by Theorem's 2.7, 2.9(iii) and 2.2(iii), we get

$$\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \leq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))) \circ (g \circ (f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f)))) = \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))),$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \leq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))) \circ (g \circ (f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f)))) = \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))) \text{ and}$$

$$\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \geq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))) \circ (g \circ (f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f)))) = \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ (g \circ (g \circ f))).$$

It follows that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFCI of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Conversely, assume that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is both IVNFPII and IVNFCI of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Since, $(g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f) \leq f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f), \forall f, g \in \mathfrak{A}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &\geq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)), \\ \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &\geq \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \text{ and} \\ \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &\leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)).\end{aligned}$$

Using, Theorem 3.8[2], we get

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &= \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)), \\ \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &= \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \text{ and} \\ \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)).\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &\leq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)), \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \leq \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \text{ and} \\ \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &\geq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)).....(i)\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $f \text{ } \text{ } g \leq f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } g) &\geq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)), \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } g) \geq \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) \text{ and} \\ \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } g) &\leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)).\end{aligned}$$

Since, $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFCI of $\mathfrak{A}$, then by Theorem 3.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } g) &= \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))), \\ \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } g) &= \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))) \text{ and} \\ \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } g) &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &= \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))), \\ \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &= \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))) \text{ and} \\ \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))).....(ii)\end{aligned}$$

Combining, (i), (ii) and $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be a NFI of $\mathfrak{A}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &\leq \min\{\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))\} \leq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f), \\ \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &\leq \min\{\zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))), \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))\} \leq \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \text{ and} \\ \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f)) &\geq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(g \text{ } \text{ } (g \text{ } \text{ } f))\} \geq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f).\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.9, $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFII of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Theorem 3.12. Let $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be an IVNFS in $\mathfrak{A}$ defined by

$$\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\gamma}_0, & \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{S} \\ \tilde{\gamma}_1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\delta}_0, & \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{S} \\ \tilde{\delta}_1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ and } \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\sigma}_0, & \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{S} \\ \tilde{\sigma}_1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$\forall f \in \mathfrak{A}$, where $0 \leq \tilde{\gamma}_1 < \tilde{\gamma}_0, 0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_1 < \tilde{\delta}_0, 0 \leq \tilde{\sigma}_0 < \tilde{\sigma}_1$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_i + \tilde{\delta}_i + \tilde{\sigma}_i \leq \tilde{1}$, where $\tilde{\gamma}_i = [\gamma_i^-, \gamma_i^+], \tilde{\delta}_i = [\delta_i^-, \delta_i^+], \tilde{\sigma}_i = [\sigma_i^-, \sigma_i^+]$ for $i = 0, 1$. Then the listed conditions are interchangeable:

i. $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFII of $\mathfrak{A}$.

ii. $\mathfrak{S}$ is an II of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Corollary 3.13. Let $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be a NFS in $\mathfrak{A}$ defined by

$$\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{S} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{S} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ and } \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{S} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$\forall f \in \mathfrak{A}$. Then the listed conditions are interchangeable:

i. $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFII of $\mathfrak{A}$.

ii. $\mathfrak{S}$ is an II of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Theorem 3.14. $\mathfrak{A}$ is implicative $\Leftrightarrow$ every IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$ is an IVNFII.

Proof: Suppose that $\mathfrak{A}$ is an implicative-BCK-A(I- $\mathcal{BCK}$ - $\mathcal{A}$).

Assume that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$, then for any $s, t, v \in [0, 1]$, $\mathcal{U}(\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}; \tilde{s})$, $\mathcal{U}(\zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}; \tilde{t})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}; \tilde{v})$ are either empty (or) ideals of $\mathfrak{A}$. And so for any $\tilde{s}, \tilde{t}, \tilde{v} \in \mathbb{A}[0, 1]$, $\mathcal{U}(\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}; \tilde{s})$, $\mathcal{U}(\zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}; \tilde{t})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}; \tilde{v})$ are either empty (or) II's of $\mathfrak{A}$. By Theorem 3.12[2], we have $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFII of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Conversely, suppose that in an implicative BCK-algebra, every IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$ is an IVNFII.

Let $\mathfrak{S}$ be an ideal of $\mathfrak{A}$. NFS $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ defined by

$$\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\gamma}_0, & \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{S} \\ \tilde{\gamma}_1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\delta}_0, & \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{S} \\ \tilde{\delta}_1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ and } \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\sigma}_0, & \text{if } f \in \mathfrak{S} \\ \tilde{\sigma}_1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$\forall f \in \mathfrak{A}$, where $0 \leq \tilde{\gamma}_1 < \tilde{\gamma}_0$, $0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_1 < \tilde{\delta}_0$, $0 \leq \tilde{\sigma}_1 < \tilde{\sigma}_0$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_i + \tilde{\delta}_i + \tilde{\sigma}_i \leq \tilde{1}$,

where $\tilde{\gamma}_i = [\gamma_i^-, \gamma_i^+]$, $\tilde{\delta}_i = [\delta_i^-, \delta_i^+]$, $\tilde{\sigma}_i = [\sigma_i^-, \sigma_i^+]$ for $i = 0, 1$.

It is easy to see that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$. By converse hypothesis,

$\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFII of $\mathfrak{A}$. We have $\mathfrak{S}$ is an implicative ideal of $\mathfrak{A}$.

This shows that every ideal of $\mathfrak{A}$ is an implicative ideal of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Corollary 3.15. For a $\mathcal{BCK} - \mathcal{A}$ the listed conditions are interchangeable :

i. $\mathfrak{A}$ is implicative.

ii. Every ideal of $\mathfrak{A}$ is implicative.

iii. Every IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$ is an IVNFII.

iv. Every IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$ is both an IVNFCI and IVNFPII.

Similarly, we can prove the cases of IVNFCI and IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{A}$. We omit the proof.

Theorem 3.16. If $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$ with the listed conditions hold

$$\text{i. } \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \geq \min \{ \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(h) \},$$

$$\text{ii. } \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \geq \min \{ \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(h) \},$$

$$\text{iii. } \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \leq \max \{ \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h) \}, \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Then $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Proof: Assume that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{A}$, with the following conditions.

$$\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \geq \min \{ \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(h) \},$$

$$\zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \geq \min \{ \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(h) \} \text{ and}$$

$$\widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f \circ g) \leq \max \{ \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h), \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(h) \}, \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Using (P3) and (P4), we have

$$(((f \circ h) \circ h) \circ (g \circ h)) \leq (f \circ h) \circ g = (f \circ g) \circ h, \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Hence, by Theorem 3.6, we get,

$$\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(((f \circ h) \circ h) \circ (g \circ h)) \geq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h),$$

$$\zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(((f \circ h) \circ h) \circ (g \circ h)) \geq \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h) \text{ and}$$

$$\widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(((f \circ h) \circ h) \circ (g \circ h)) \leq \widetilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \circ g) \circ h).$$

It follows from hypothesis, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) &\geq \min\left\{\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}\left(\left((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ \mathfrak{h}\right) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\right), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\right\} \\ &\geq \min\{\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h}), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\}, \\ \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) &\geq \min\left\{\zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}\left(\left((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ \mathfrak{h}\right) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\right), \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\right\} \\ &\geq \min\{\zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h}), \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) &\leq \max\left\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}\left(\left((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ \mathfrak{h}\right) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\right), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\right\} \\ &\leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h}), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\}, \forall \mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h} \in \mathfrak{U}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{U}$.

Theorem 3.17. Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{U}$, then $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{U} \Leftrightarrow$

- i. $\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) \geq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h})$,
- ii. $\zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) \geq \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h})$ and
- iii. $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h})$, $\forall \mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h} \in \mathfrak{U}$.

Proof: Assume that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{U}$ and fulfills the below conditions

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) &\geq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h}), \\ \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) &\geq \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h}) \text{ and} \\ \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) &\leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h}), \forall \mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h} \in \mathfrak{U}.\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Hence, } \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) &\geq \min\{\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\} \\ &\geq \min\{\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h}), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\}, \\ \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) &\geq \min\{\zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})), \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\} \\ &\geq \min\{\zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h}), \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) &\leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\} \\ &\leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h}), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})\}, \forall \mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h} \in \mathfrak{U}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{U}$.

Conversely, suppose that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{U} \Rightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}, \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFI of $\mathfrak{U}$. Let $\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h} \in \mathfrak{U}$ be such that $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{f} \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})$ and $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}$,

since, $((\mathfrak{f} \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) \circ (\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g})) \leq \mathfrak{g} \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{p} \circ \mathfrak{q}) &= \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}\left(\left((\mathfrak{f} \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) \circ (\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g})\right) \circ \mathfrak{h}\right) \\ &\geq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) \\ &= \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \quad [\text{By } (BCK1), (BCK3) \text{ and } (\mathcal{P}3)]\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{and so, } \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) &= \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) \circ \mathfrak{h}) \\ &= \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{p} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \\ &\geq \min\{\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{p} \circ \mathfrak{q}), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{p} \circ \mathfrak{h})\} \\ &\geq \min\{\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(0), \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{p} \circ \mathfrak{h})\} \\ &= \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{p} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \\ &= \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{h}) \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) \geq \xi_{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g}) \circ \mathfrak{h})$, $\forall \mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h} \in \mathfrak{U}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{p} \circ \mathfrak{q}) &= \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}\left(\left((\mathfrak{f} \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h})) \circ (\mathfrak{f} \circ \mathfrak{g})\right) \circ \mathfrak{h}\right) \\ &\geq \zeta_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{g} \circ (\mathfrak{g} \circ \mathfrak{h}))\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \quad [\text{By } (BC\mathcal{K}1), (BC\mathcal{K}3) \text{ and } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 \text{and so, } \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) &= \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \\
 &= \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(p \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \\
 &\geq \min\{\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}((p \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} q) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h), \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(p \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)\} \\
 &\geq \min\{\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0), \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(p \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)\} \\
 &= \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(p \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \\
 &= \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h).
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \geq \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h), \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((p \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} q) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \\
 &\leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \\
 &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) \quad [\text{By } (BC\mathcal{K}1), (BC\mathcal{K}3) \text{ and } (\mathcal{P}3)]
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{and so, } \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \\
 &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(p \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \\
 &\leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((p \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} q) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(p \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)\} \\
 &\leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(p \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)\} \\
 &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(p \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \\
 &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h).
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h), \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}$.

Therefore, $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) &\geq \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \text{ and} \\
 \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) &\leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h), \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.18. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ be an IVNFS of $\mathfrak{U}$. Then $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an IVNFPPII of $\mathfrak{U} \Leftrightarrow$ the nonempty upper $\tilde{s}$ -level cut $\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}; \tilde{s})$, the nonempty upper $\tilde{t}$ -level cut $\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}; \tilde{t})$ and the nonempty lower $\tilde{v}$ -level cut $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}; \tilde{v})$ are PII's of $\mathfrak{U}$, for any $\tilde{s}, \tilde{t}, \tilde{v} \in [0, 1]$.

Note: (i) $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{\mathfrak{K}}(0) \Rightarrow \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{K}}(0), \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{K}}(0), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{K}}(0)$.

(ii) $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} \subseteq \tilde{\mathfrak{K}} \Rightarrow \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{K}}(f), \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{K}}(f), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{K}}(f), \forall f \in \mathfrak{U}$.

Theorem 3.19. (Extension property for an interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy positive implicative ideal (IVNFPPII))

Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{K}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{K}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{K}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{K}})$ be two IVNFI's of $\mathfrak{U}$ such that $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{\mathfrak{K}}(0)$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} \subseteq \tilde{\mathfrak{K}}$. If $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}$ is an IVNFPPII of $\mathfrak{U}$, then so is $\tilde{\mathfrak{K}}$.

Proof: Assume that $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{M}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ is an IVNFPPII of $\mathfrak{U}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{K}}(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \\
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{K}}(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \quad [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{K}}(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \quad [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 &\geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \quad [\because \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}} \subseteq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{K}}] \\
 &\geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \\
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \quad [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)]
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right) [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}(0). \quad [\text{By } (\mathcal{BCK}3) \text{ and Supposition}]
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (IVNFI1) and (IVNFI2) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) &\geq \min \left\{ \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right\} \\
 &\geq \min \{ \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}(0), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \} \\
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h), \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)$, for any $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right) \\
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right) [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right) [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 &\geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right) [\because \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}} \subseteq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}] \\
 &\geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h \right) \\
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h \right) [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right) [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}(0). \quad [\text{By } (\mathcal{BCK}3) \text{ and Supposition}]
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (IVNFI1) and (IVNFI3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) &\geq \min \left\{ \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right\} \\
 &\geq \min \{ \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}(0), \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \} \\
 &= \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h), \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \geq \tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)$, for any $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{U}$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{R}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right) \\
 &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{R}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right) [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{R}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right) [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 &\leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right) [\because \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}} \subseteq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{R}}] \\
 &\leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h \right) \\
 &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h \right) [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right) [\text{By } (\mathcal{P}3)] \\
 &= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{M}}(0) = \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{R}}(0). \quad [\text{By } (\mathcal{BCK}3) \text{ and Supposition}]
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (IVNFI1) and (IVNFI4) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \\
 &\leq \max \left\{ \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{R}} \left(((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} ((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{R}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \right\}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \max\{\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{K}}(0), \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{K}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)\}$$

$$= \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{K}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h), \forall f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Hence, $\tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{K}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} (g \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)) \leq \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{K}}((f \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} g) \mathbin{\dot{\vee}} h)$, for any $f, g, h \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Therefore, $\tilde{\mathfrak{K}} = (\tilde{\xi}_{\mathfrak{K}}, \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathfrak{K}}, \tilde{\omega}_{\mathfrak{K}})$ is an IVNFPII of $\mathfrak{A}$.

IV. Conclusion

In this research we successfully discussed the primary notion of interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy positive implicative ideals (PII) in $\mathfrak{A}$. Further, we discussed the relationships between interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy ideals (IVNFI), interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy implicative ideals (IVNFII), interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy commutative ideals (IVNFCI), and interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy positive implicative ideals (IVNFPII) of $\mathfrak{A}$, then we given some counter examples and also investigated their fundamental concepts.

Acknowledgments

The research of Anjaneyulu Naik Kalavath was supported by the National Fellowship and Scholarship for Higher Education of ST Students with the Agreement no.11019/07/2018-Sch(Award No-202223-NFST-AND-00689) Government of India Ministry of Tribal Affairs.

References

- [1] Anjaneyulu Naik. K.; Bhuvaneswari. D.; Satyanarayana. B. On interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy hyper BCK-ideals and implicative hyper BCK-ideals of Hyper BCK-Algebras, Industrial Engineering Journal 2025, 54(2)(1), 48-66.
- [2] Anjaneyulu Naik. K.; Satyanarayana. B.; Bhuvaneswari. D. On interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy (implicative & commutative) ideals of BCK-Algebras (Accepted for Springer Proceedings).
- [3] Anjaneyulu Naik. K.; Satyanarayana. B.; Bhuvaneswari. D. On interval-valued neutrosophic fuzzy n-fold (implicative & commutative) ideals of BCK-Algebras (communicated).
- [4] Atanassov. K. T.; Gargov. G. Interval valued intuitionistic fuzzy sets, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 1989, 31, 343-349.
- [5] Atanassov. K. T. Intuitionistic fuzzy sets, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 1986, 20, 87-96.
- [6] Imai. Y.; Iseki, K. On axioms systems of proposition calculi XIV, Proc. Japan Acad 1996, 19-22.
- [7] Iseki, K. An algebra related with propositional calculi, Proc. Japan Academy 1966, 42, 26-29.
- [8] Iseki. K.; Tanaka, S. An introduction to the theory of BCK-algebras, Math. Japan 1978, 23, 1-26.
- [9] Iseki. K.; Tanaka, S. Ideal theory of BCK-algebras, Math. Japanica 1976, 21, 351-366.
- [10] Meng. J.; Jun. Y.B.; Kim. H.S. Fuzzy implicative ideals of BCK-algebras, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 1997, 89(2), 243-248.
- [11] Satyanarayana. B.; Krishna. L.; Durga Prasad. R. On interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy positive implicative ideals of BCK-Algebras, Aryabhata journal of Mathematics & Informatics 2017, 9(2), 353-362.
- [12] Smarandache. F. A. Unifying Field in Logics: Neutrosophic Logic. Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Probability; American Research Press: Rehoboth, NM, USA 1999.
- [13] Xi. O.G. Fuzzy BCK-algebra, Math. Japan 1991, 36, 935-942.
- [14] Zadeh. L. A. Fuzzy sets, Inform. Control 1965, 8, 338-353.