



Available online at <http://scik.org>

J. Math. Comput. Sci. 9 (2019), No. 2, 131-145

<https://doi.org/10.28919/jmcs/3855>

ISSN: 1927-5307

***L*-FUZZY CLOSURE OPERATORS AND *L*-FUZZY COTOPOLOGIES**

JU-MOK OH, YONG CHAN KIM*

Department of Mathematics, Gangneung-Wonju National University, Gangneung 210-702, Korea

Copyright © 2019 the authors. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract. In this paper, we investigate *L*-fuzzy closure operators and *L*-fuzzy cotopologies in a complete residuated lattice. Also, we study the categorical relationship between *L*-fuzzy closure spaces and *L*-fuzzy cotopological space. Finally, we give their examples.

Keywords: complete residuated lattice; *L*-fuzzy closure space; *L*-fuzzy cotopological space.

2000 AMS Subject Classification: 54A40, 03E72, 03G10, 06A15.

1. Introduction

Hájek [7] introduced a complete residuated lattice which is an algebraic structure for many valued logic. Bělohlávek [2] investigated information systems and decision rules in complete residuated lattices. Höhle [8] introduced *L*-fuzzy topological structure with algebraic structure $L(\text{cqm}, \text{quantales}, MV\text{-algebra})$.

* Corresponding author

E-mail address: yck@gwnu.ac.kr

Received August 20, 2018

Fuzzy topological structures were extended and applied in many directions [3-6, 8-12]. Fang and Yue [6] studied the relationship between L -fuzzy closure systems and L -fuzzy topological spaces from a category viewpoint for a complete residuated lattice L .

We investigate L -fuzzy closure operators and L -fuzzy cotopologies in a complete residuated lattice. Also, we study the categorical relationship between L -fuzzy closure spaces and L -fuzzy cotopological space. Moreover, there exists the Galois correspondence between L -fuzzy cotopological spaces and L -fuzzy closure spaces. In particular, we give their examples.

2. Preliminaries

Definition 2.1. [2,7,8] An algebra $(L, \wedge, \vee, \odot, \rightarrow, \perp, \top)$ is called a complete residuated lattice if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (L1) $(L, \leq, \vee, \wedge, \perp, \top)$ is a complete lattice with the greatest element \top and the least element \perp ;
- (L2) (L, \odot, \top) is a commutative monoid;
- (L3) $x \odot y \leq z$ iff $x \leq y \rightarrow z$ for $x, y, z \in L$.

In this paper, we assume that $L = (L, \vee, \wedge, \odot, \rightarrow, \perp, \top)$ be a complete residuated lattice which is defined by $x \oplus y = x^* \rightarrow y$, $x^* = x \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma 2.2. [2,7,8] For each $x, y, z, x_i, y_i, w \in L$, we have the following properties.

- (1) $1 \rightarrow x = x$, $0 \odot x = 0$ and $x \rightarrow 0 = x^*$,
- (2) If $y \leq z$, then $x \odot y \leq x \odot z$, $x \oplus y \leq x \oplus z$, $x \rightarrow y \leq x \rightarrow z$ and $z \rightarrow x \leq y \rightarrow x$.
- (3) $x \odot y \leq x \wedge y \leq x \vee y \leq x \oplus y$,
- (4) $(\bigvee_i y_i)^* = \bigwedge_i y_i^*$,
- (5) $x \odot (\bigwedge_i y_i) \leq \bigwedge_i (x \odot y_i)$,
- (6) $x \oplus (\bigwedge_i y_i) = \bigwedge_i (x \oplus y_i)$,
- (7) $x \rightarrow (\bigwedge_i y_i) = \bigwedge_i (x \rightarrow y_i)$,
- (8) $(\bigvee_i x_i) \rightarrow y = \bigwedge_i (x_i \rightarrow y)$,
- (9) $x \rightarrow (\bigvee_i y_i) \geq \bigvee_i (x \rightarrow y_i)$,
- (10) $(\bigwedge_i x_i) \rightarrow y \geq \bigvee_i (x_i \rightarrow y)$,

- (11) $(x \odot y) \rightarrow z = x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z) = y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z)$,
 (12) $x \odot (x \rightarrow y) \leq y$ and $x \rightarrow y \leq (y \rightarrow z) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z)$,
 (13) $x \leq x^{**}$ and $x \rightarrow y \leq y^* \rightarrow x^*$,
 (14) $(x \rightarrow y) \odot (z \rightarrow w) \leq (x \odot z) \rightarrow (y \odot w)$,
 (15) $x \rightarrow y \leq (x \odot z) \rightarrow (y \odot z)$ and $(x \rightarrow y) \odot (y \rightarrow z) \leq x \rightarrow z$,

For $\alpha \in L, \lambda \in L^X$, we denote $(\alpha \rightarrow \lambda), (\alpha \odot \lambda), \alpha_X \in L^X$ as $(\alpha \rightarrow \lambda)(x) = \alpha \rightarrow \lambda(x)$, $(\alpha \odot \lambda)(x) = \alpha \odot \lambda(x)$, $\alpha_X(x) = \alpha$.

Definition 2.3.[2,7,8] Let X be a set. A mapping $R : X \times X \rightarrow L$ is called an L -partial order if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (E1) reflexive if $R(x, x) = \top$ for all $x \in X$,
 (E2) transitive if $R(x, y) \odot R(y, z) \leq R(x, z)$, for all $x, y, z \in X$,
 (E3) antisymmetric if $R(x, y) = R(y, x) = \top$, then $x = y$.

Lemma 2.4. [2,5,10] For a given set X , define a binary mapping $S : L^X \times L^X \rightarrow L$ by

$$S(\lambda, \mu) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\lambda(x) \rightarrow \mu(x)).$$

Then, for each $\lambda, \mu, \rho, \nu \in L^X$, and $\alpha \in L$, the following properties hold.

- (1) S is an L -partial order on L^X .
 (2) $\lambda \leq \mu$ iff $S(\lambda, \mu) \geq \top$,
 (3) If $\lambda \leq \mu$, then $S(\rho, \lambda) \leq S(\rho, \mu)$ and $S(\lambda, \rho) \geq S(\mu, \rho)$,
 (4) $S(\lambda, \mu) \odot S(\nu, \rho) \leq S(\lambda \odot \nu, \mu \odot \rho)$ and $S(\lambda, \mu) \odot S(\nu, \rho) \leq S(\lambda \oplus \nu, \mu \oplus \rho)$,
 (5) $S(\mu, \rho) \leq S(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow S(\lambda, \rho)$ and $S(\mu, \rho) \leq S(\rho, \lambda) \rightarrow S(\mu, \lambda)$,
 (6) $\alpha \odot S(\mu, \rho) \leq S(\alpha \rightarrow \mu, \rho)$,
 (7) $\bigvee_{\mu \in L^X} (S(\mu, \rho) \odot S(\lambda, \mu)) = S(\lambda, \rho)$.
 (8) If $\phi : X \rightarrow Y$ is a map, then for $\lambda, \mu \in L^X$ and $\rho, \nu \in L^Y$,

$$S(\lambda, \mu) \leq S(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda), \phi^{\rightarrow}(\mu)),$$

$$S(\rho, \nu) \leq S(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\rho), \phi^{\leftarrow}(\nu)),$$

and the equalities hold if ϕ is bijective.

Definition 2.5. [6,8] A map $\mathcal{F} : L^X \rightarrow L$ is called an L -fuzzy cotopology on X if it satisfies the following conditions:

$$(F1) \quad \mathcal{F}(\perp_X) = \mathcal{F}(\top_X) = \top,$$

$$(F2) \quad \mathcal{F}(\lambda \oplus \mu) \geq \mathcal{F}(\lambda) \odot \mathcal{F}(\mu), \quad \forall \lambda, \mu \in L^X,$$

$$(F3) \quad \mathcal{F}(\bigwedge_i \lambda_i) \geq \bigwedge_i \mathcal{F}(\lambda_i), \quad \forall \{\lambda_i\}_{i \in \Gamma} \subseteq L^X.$$

The pair (X, \mathcal{F}) is called an L -fuzzy cotopological space. An L -fuzzy cotopological space is called enriched if

$$(R) \quad \mathcal{F}(\alpha \rightarrow \lambda) \geq \mathcal{F}(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in L^X \text{ and } \alpha \in L.$$

Let (X, \mathcal{F}_1) and (Y, \mathcal{F}_2) be two L -fuzzy cotopological spaces. A mapping $\phi : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be L -fuzzy continuous iff for each $\lambda \in L^Y$, $\mathcal{F}_2(\lambda) \leq \mathcal{F}_1(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda))$.

Remark 2.6. A set $\mathfrak{S} \subset L^X$ is called an L -cotopology on X if (t1) $\perp_X, \top_X \in \mathfrak{S}$, (t2) $(\lambda \oplus \mu) \in \mathfrak{S}$, for each $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{S}$, (t3) $\bigwedge_i \lambda_i \in \mathfrak{S}$, for all $\lambda_i \in \mathfrak{S}$. An L -cotopology \mathfrak{S} is called enriched if $\alpha \rightarrow \lambda \in \mathfrak{S}$, for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $\alpha \in L$.

3. L -fuzzy closure spaces and L -fuzzy cotopological spaces

Lemma 3.1. Let L be a complete residuated lattice. Define $x \oplus y = x^* \rightarrow y$.

$$(1) \quad (x \rightarrow y) \oplus (z \rightarrow w) \leq (x \odot z) \rightarrow (y \oplus w).$$

$$(2) \quad (x \rightarrow y) \odot (z \rightarrow w) \leq (x \oplus z) \rightarrow (y \oplus w).$$

Proof. (1) Since $(x \odot y^*)^* = x \rightarrow y^{**} \geq x \rightarrow y$, then $x \odot y^* \leq (x \rightarrow y)^*$.

$$\begin{aligned} & [(x \rightarrow y) \oplus (z \rightarrow w)] \odot (x \odot z) \odot y^* \\ &= [(x \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow (z \rightarrow w)] \odot (x \odot y^*) \odot z \\ &\leq [(x \rightarrow y)^* \rightarrow (z \rightarrow w)] \odot (x \rightarrow y)^* \odot z \\ &\leq (z \rightarrow w) \odot z \leq w \end{aligned}$$

Hence $[(x \rightarrow y) \oplus (z \rightarrow w)] \odot (x \odot z) \odot y^* \leq w$ iff $[(x \rightarrow y) \oplus (z \rightarrow w)] \odot (x \odot z) \leq y \oplus w$ iff $[(x \rightarrow y) \oplus (z \rightarrow w)] \leq (x \odot z) \rightarrow (y \oplus w)$.

(2)

$$\begin{aligned}
& [(x \rightarrow y) \odot (z \rightarrow w)] \odot (x \oplus z) \odot y^* \\
& \leq [(y^* \rightarrow x^*) \odot (z \rightarrow w)] \odot (x^* \rightarrow z) \odot y^* \\
& \leq x^* \odot (z \rightarrow w) \odot (x^* \rightarrow z) \leq (z \rightarrow w) \odot z \leq w
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $[(x \rightarrow y) \odot (z \rightarrow w)] \odot (x \oplus z) \odot y^* \leq w$ iff $[(x \rightarrow y) \odot (z \rightarrow w)] \odot (x \oplus z) \leq y \oplus w$ iff $[(x \rightarrow y) \odot (z \rightarrow w)] \leq (x \oplus z) \rightarrow (y \oplus w)$.

Definition 3.1. A map $\mathcal{C} : L^X \rightarrow L^X$ is called an L -fuzzy closure operator if it satisfies the following conditions:

$$(C1) \mathcal{C}(\perp_X) = \perp_X,$$

$$(C2) \text{ for } \lambda \in L^X, \lambda \leq \mathcal{C}(\lambda),$$

$$(C3) \text{ if } \lambda \leq \mu, \mathcal{C}(\lambda) \leq \mathcal{C}(\mu),$$

$$(C4) \text{ for all } \lambda, \mu \in L^X, \mathcal{C}(\lambda \oplus \mu) \leq \mathcal{C}(\lambda) \oplus \mathcal{C}(\mu).$$

The pair (X, \mathcal{C}) is called an L -fuzzy closure space.

An L -fuzzy closure space is called stratified if

$$(R) \mathcal{C}(\alpha \rightarrow \lambda) \leq \alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\lambda) \text{ for all } \lambda \in L^X \text{ and } \alpha \in L.$$

Let (X, \mathcal{C}_1) and (Y, \mathcal{C}_2) be two L -fuzzy closure spaces. A mapping $\phi : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be C -map if $\phi^\rightarrow(\mathcal{C}_1(\lambda)) \leq \mathcal{C}_2(\phi^\rightarrow(\lambda))$ for each $\lambda \in L^X$.

Lemma 3.2. Let $\mathcal{C} : L^X \rightarrow L^X$ a map. The following statement are equivalent.

$$(1) \text{ For all } \lambda, \mu \in L^X, S(\lambda, \mu) \leq S(\mathcal{C}(\lambda), \mathcal{C}(\mu)).$$

$$(2) \text{ If } \lambda \leq \mu, \text{ then } \mathcal{C}(\lambda) \leq \mathcal{C}(\mu) \text{ and } \mathcal{C}(\alpha \odot \rho) \geq \alpha \odot \mathcal{C}(\rho) \text{ for all } \lambda \in L^X \text{ and } \alpha \in L.$$

$$(3) \text{ If } \lambda \leq \mu, \text{ then } \mathcal{C}(\lambda) \leq \mathcal{C}(\mu) \text{ and } \mathcal{C}(\alpha \rightarrow \rho) \leq \alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\rho) \text{ for all } \lambda \in L^X \text{ and } \alpha \in L.$$

Proof. (1) (\Rightarrow) (2). If $\lambda \leq \mu$, then $\top = S(\lambda, \mu) \leq S(\mathcal{C}(\lambda), \mathcal{C}(\mu))$. Hence $\mathcal{C}(\lambda) \leq \mathcal{C}(\mu)$. Put $\mu = \alpha \odot \lambda$. Then $S(\lambda, \alpha \odot \lambda) = \alpha \leq S(\mathcal{C}(\lambda), \mathcal{C}(\alpha \odot \lambda))$. Hence $\alpha \odot \mathcal{C}(\lambda) \leq \mathcal{C}(\alpha \odot \lambda)$.

$$(2) (\Rightarrow) (3). \text{ Since } \alpha \odot \mathcal{C}(\alpha \rightarrow \lambda) \leq \mathcal{C}(\alpha \odot (\alpha \rightarrow \lambda)) \leq \mathcal{C}(\lambda), \mathcal{C}(\alpha \rightarrow \lambda) \leq \alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\lambda).$$

(3) (\Rightarrow) (1). Since $S(\lambda, \mu) \odot \lambda \leq \mu$ iff $\lambda \leq S(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \mu$, $\mathcal{C}(\lambda) \leq \mathcal{C}(S(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \mu) \leq S(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mu)$. Hence $S(\lambda, \mu) \leq S(\mathcal{C}(\lambda), \mathcal{C}(\mu))$.

Theorem 3.3. Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be an L -fuzzy cotopological space. Define a map $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}} : L^X \rightarrow L^X$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda) = \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} (\mathcal{F}(\mu) \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \mu))$$

Then $(X, \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}})$ is a stratified L -fuzzy closure space.

Proof. (C1) $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\perp_X) = \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} (\mathcal{F}(\mu) \rightarrow (S(\perp_X, \mu) \rightarrow \mu)) \leq \mathcal{F}(\perp_X) \rightarrow (S(\perp_X, \perp_X) \rightarrow \perp_X) = \perp_X$.

(C2), we have $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda) \geq \lambda$ for each $\lambda \in L^X$ from:

$$\begin{aligned} S(\lambda, \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda)) &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\lambda(x) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda)(x)) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\lambda(x) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} (\mathcal{F}(\mu) \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \mu(x))) \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} \left((\mathcal{F}(\mu) \odot S(\lambda, \mu) \odot \lambda(x)) \rightarrow \mu(x) \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} \left((\mathcal{F}(\mu) \odot S(\lambda, \mu)) \rightarrow (\lambda(x) \rightarrow \mu(x)) \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} \left((\mathcal{F}(\mu) \odot S(\lambda, \mu)) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\lambda(x) \rightarrow \mu(x)) \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} \left((\mathcal{F}(\mu) \odot S(\lambda, \mu)) \rightarrow S(\lambda, \mu) \right) \geq \top. \end{aligned}$$

(C3) and, by Lemma 3.2, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is stratified from

$$S(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda), \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu)) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda)(x) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu)(x))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigwedge_{\rho \in L^X} (\mathcal{F}(\rho) \odot S(\lambda, \rho) \rightarrow \rho(x)) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{v \in L^X} (\mathcal{F}(v) \odot S(\mu, v) \rightarrow v(x)) \right) \\
&\geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} \bigwedge_{\rho \in L^X} \left((\mathcal{F}(\rho) \odot S(\lambda, \rho) \rightarrow \rho(x)) \rightarrow ((\mathcal{F}(\rho) \odot S(\mu, \rho) \rightarrow \rho(x))) \right) \\
&\geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} \bigwedge_{\rho \in L^X} \left(\mathcal{F}(\rho) \odot S(\mu, \rho) \rightarrow (\mathcal{F}(\rho) \odot S(\lambda, \rho)) \right) \text{ (by Lemma 2.2 (12))} \\
&\geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} \bigwedge_{\rho \in L^X} \left(S(\mu, \rho) \rightarrow S(\lambda, \rho) \right) \geq S(\lambda, \mu). \text{ (by Lemma 2.4(5))}
\end{aligned}$$

(C4)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda) \oplus \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu) \\
&= \bigwedge_{\rho \in L^X} (\mathcal{F}(\rho) \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \rho) \rightarrow \rho)) \oplus \bigwedge_{v \in L^X} (\mathcal{F}(v) \rightarrow (S(\mu, v) \rightarrow v)) \\
&\text{(by Lemma 3.1(1))} \\
&= \bigwedge_{\rho \in L^X} \bigwedge_{v \in L^X} \left((\mathcal{F}(\rho) \odot S(\lambda, \rho) \rightarrow \rho) \oplus (\mathcal{F}(v) \odot S(\mu, v) \rightarrow v) \right) \\
&= \bigwedge_{\rho, v \in L^X} \left(\mathcal{F}(\rho) \odot \mathcal{F}(v) \odot S(\lambda, \rho) \odot S(\mu, v) \rightarrow (\rho \oplus v) \right) \\
&\geq \bigwedge_{\rho, v \in L^X} \left(\mathcal{F}(\rho \odot v) \odot S(\lambda \oplus \mu, (\rho \oplus v)) \rightarrow (\rho \oplus v) \right) \\
&\text{(by Lemma 2.4(4))} \\
&\geq \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda \oplus \mu).
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.4. Let (X, \mathfrak{S}) be an L -cotopological space. Define a map $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}} : L^X \rightarrow L^X$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\lambda) = \bigwedge \{ \mu \in L^X \mid \lambda \leq \mu, \mu \in \mathfrak{S} \}.$$

Then $(X, \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}})$ is an L -fuzzy closure space. Moreover, if (X, \mathfrak{S}) is enriched, $(X, \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}})$ is stratified.

Corollary 3.4. Let (X, \mathfrak{S}) be an L -cotopological space. Define $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}} : L^X \rightarrow L^X$ by

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\lambda) = \bigwedge_{\rho \in \mathfrak{S}} (S(\lambda, \rho) \rightarrow \rho).$$

Then the following properties hold.

- (1) $(X, \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}})$ is an L -fuzzy closure space.
- (2) If (X, \mathfrak{S}) is enriched, then $(X, \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}})$ is a stratified L -fuzzy closure space.
- (3) $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}}(\lambda) \geq \bigwedge \{\mu \mid \lambda \leq \mu, \mu \in \mathfrak{S}\}$,
- (4) If (X, \mathfrak{S}) is enriched, then the equality in (3) holds.

Theorem 3.5. Let (X, \mathcal{C}) be an L -fuzzy closure space. Define a map $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}} : L^X \rightarrow L$ by:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda) = S(\mathcal{C}(\lambda), \lambda).$$

Then,

- (1) $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is an L -fuzzy cotopology on X .
- (2) If \mathcal{C} is stratified, then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is an enriched L -fuzzy cotopology.
- (3) $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}} \geq \mathcal{C}$.
- (4) If $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)) = \mathcal{C}(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in L^X$, then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)) = \top$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}} \leq \mathcal{C}$.
- (5) If \mathcal{F} is an L -fuzzy cotopology on X , then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{F}} \geq \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. (F1)

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\top_X) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}(\top_X) \rightarrow \top_X(x)) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\perp_X(x) \rightarrow \perp_X(x)) = \top,$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\perp_X) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}(\perp_X) \rightarrow \perp_X(x)) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\top_X(x) \rightarrow \top_X(x)) = \top.$$

(F2) By Lemma 3.1(1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda \oplus \mu) &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}((\lambda \oplus \mu))(x) \rightarrow (\lambda \oplus \mu)(x)) \\ &\geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}(\lambda)(x) \oplus \mathcal{C}(\mu)(x) \rightarrow \lambda(x) \oplus \mu(x)) \\ &\geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}(\lambda)(x) \rightarrow \lambda(x)) \odot \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}(\mu)(x) \rightarrow \mu(x)) \\ &= \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda) \odot \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

(F3) By Lemma 2.2(8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\bigwedge_i \lambda_i) &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}(\bigwedge_i \lambda_i)(x) \rightarrow \bigwedge_i \lambda_i(x)) \\
&\geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\bigwedge_i \mathcal{C}(\lambda_i)(x) \rightarrow \bigwedge_i \lambda_i(x)) \\
&\geq \bigwedge_i \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}(\lambda_i)(x) \rightarrow \lambda_i(x)) = \bigwedge_i \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda_i).
\end{aligned}$$

(2) By Lemma 2.2 (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\alpha \rightarrow \lambda) &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}(\alpha \rightarrow \lambda)(x) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \lambda)(x)) \\
&\geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} ((\alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\lambda)(x)) \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \lambda(x))) \\
&\geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}(\lambda)(x) \rightarrow \lambda(x)) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

(3)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}}(\lambda)(x) &= \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} (\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mu) \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \mu(x))) \\
&= \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} (S(\mathcal{C}(\mu), \mu) \odot S(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \mu(x)) \\
&\quad \text{(by the definition of } \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}} \text{)} \\
&\geq \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} (S(\mathcal{C}(\mu), \mu) \odot S(\mathcal{C}(\lambda), \mathcal{C}(\mu)) \rightarrow \mu(x)) \\
&\geq \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} (S(\mathcal{C}(\lambda), \mu) \rightarrow \mu(x)) \text{ (by Lemma 2.4(3))} \\
&\geq \mathcal{C}(\lambda)(x).
\end{aligned}$$

(4) By (C2), $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)) \geq \mathcal{C}(\lambda)$.

Hence $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)) = \mathcal{C}(\lambda)$. Thus, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)) = \top$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}}(\lambda)(x) &= \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} (\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mu) \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \mu(x))) \\ &\leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)) \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \mathcal{C}(\lambda)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\lambda)(x)) \\ &\quad \text{(by the definition of } \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}) \\ &= \mathcal{C}(\lambda)(x). \end{aligned}$$

(5)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}}(\lambda) &= S(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda), \lambda) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} (\mathcal{F}(\mu) \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \mu)) \rightarrow \lambda(x) \right) \\ &\geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left((\mathcal{F}(\lambda) \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \lambda) \rightarrow \lambda)) \rightarrow \lambda(x) \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left((\mathcal{F}(\lambda) \rightarrow \lambda(x)) \rightarrow \lambda(x) \right) \\ &\geq \mathcal{F}(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.6. Let (X, \mathcal{C}) be an L -fuzzy closure space. Define a subset $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{C}} \subset L^X$ by:

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{C}} = \{\lambda \in L^X \mid \mathcal{C}(\lambda) = \lambda\}.$$

Then, $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is an L -cotopology on X with $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{C}}} \geq \mathcal{C}$. If \mathcal{C} is stratified, then $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is an enriched L -cotopology.

Theorem 3.7 Let (X, \mathcal{F}_X) and (Y, \mathcal{F}_Y) be L -fuzzy cotopological spaces and $\phi : X \rightarrow Y$ be a map. Then

(1) For each $\lambda \in L^X$,

$$\bigwedge_{v \in L^Y} (\mathcal{F}_Y(v) \rightarrow (\mathcal{F}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(v)) \leq S(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_X}(\lambda)), \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_Y}(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda))))$$

(2) If a mapping $\phi : (X, \mathcal{F}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{F}_Y)$ is continuous, then $\phi : (X, \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_X}) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_Y})$ is a C-map.

Proof. (1)

$$\begin{aligned} & S(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_X}(\lambda)), \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_Y}(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda))) \\ &= \bigwedge_{y \in Y} (\phi^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_X}(\lambda))(y) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_Y}(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda))(y)) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\phi^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_X}(\lambda))(\phi(x)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_Y}(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda))(\phi(x))) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_X}(\lambda)(x) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_Y}(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda))(\phi(x))) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigwedge_{\rho \in L^X} ((\mathcal{F}_X(\rho) \odot S(\lambda, \rho) \rightarrow \rho(x)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \rightarrow \bigwedge_{v \in L^Y} ((\mathcal{F}_Y(v) \odot S(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda), v) \rightarrow v(\phi(x)))) \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigwedge_{v \in L^Y} ((\mathcal{F}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(v)) \odot S(\lambda, \phi^{\leftarrow}(v)) \rightarrow \phi^{\leftarrow}(v)(x)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \rightarrow \bigwedge_{v \in L^Y} ((\mathcal{F}_Y(v) \odot S(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda), v) \rightarrow v(\phi(x)))) \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigwedge_{v \in L^Y} \left((\mathcal{F}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(v)) \odot S(\lambda, \phi^{\leftarrow}(v)) \rightarrow \phi^{\leftarrow}(v)(x)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \rightarrow ((\mathcal{F}_Y(v) \odot S(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda), v) \rightarrow v(\phi(x)))) \right) \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(\bigwedge_{v \in L^Y} \left((\mathcal{F}_Y(v) \odot S(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda), v) \rightarrow (\mathcal{F}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(v)) \odot S(\lambda, \phi^{\leftarrow}(v)))) \right) \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{v \in L^Y} (\mathcal{F}_Y(v) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(v))) \end{aligned}$$

(2) Since $\mathcal{F}_Y(v) \leq \mathcal{F}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(v))$, by (1), $\phi^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_X}(\lambda)) \leq \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_Y}(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda))$.

Theorem 3.8 Let (X, \mathcal{C}_X) and (Y, \mathcal{C}_Y) be fuzzy closure spaces and $\phi : X \rightarrow Y$ be a map. Then

(1) $S(\mathcal{C}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda)), \phi^{\leftarrow}(\mathcal{C}_Y(\lambda))) \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}_Y}(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}_X}(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda))$ for each $\lambda \in L^Y$.

(2) If a mapping $\phi : (X, \mathcal{C}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{C}_Y)$ is an C -map, then $\phi : (X, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}_X}) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}_Y})$ is continuous.

Proof. (1) By Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}_Y}(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}_X}(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda)) \\ &= \bigwedge_{y \in Y} (\mathcal{C}_Y(\lambda)(y) \rightarrow \lambda(y)) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda))(x) \rightarrow \phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda)(x)) \\ &\geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\phi^{\leftarrow}(\mathcal{C}_Y(\lambda))(x) \rightarrow \phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda)(x)) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda))(x) \rightarrow \phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda)(x)) \\ &\geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} (\mathcal{C}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda))(x) \rightarrow \phi^{\leftarrow}(\mathcal{C}_Y(\lambda))(x)) \end{aligned}$$

(2) Let $\phi^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{C}_X(\lambda)) \leq \mathcal{C}_Y(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\lambda))$. Then, put $\lambda = \phi^{\leftarrow}(\mu)$,

$$\mathcal{C}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\mu)) \leq \phi^{\leftarrow}(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{C}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\mu)))) \leq \phi^{\leftarrow}(\mathcal{C}_Y(\phi^{\rightarrow}(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\mu)))) \leq \phi^{\leftarrow}(\mathcal{C}_Y(\mu)).$$

Thus, by (1), if $\mathcal{C}_X(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda)) \leq \phi^{\leftarrow}(\mathcal{C}_Y(\lambda))$, then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}_Y}(\lambda) \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}_X}(\phi^{\leftarrow}(\lambda))$.

Example 3.9. Let $(L = [0, 1], \odot, \rightarrow)$ be a complete residuated lattice defined by

$$x \odot y = (x + y - 1) \vee 0, \quad x \rightarrow y = (1 - x + y) \wedge 1.$$

$$x \oplus y = (x + y) \wedge 1, \quad x^* = 1 - x.$$

Let $X = \{x, y, z\}$ be a set and $\rho, \rho \oplus \rho \in L^X$ such that

$$\rho(x) = 0.4, \rho(y) = 0.8, \rho(z) = 0.7,$$

$$\rho \oplus \rho(x) = 0.8, \rho \oplus \rho(y) = 1, \rho \oplus \rho(z) = 1.$$

(1) We define an L -fuzzy cotopology $\mathcal{F} : L^X \rightarrow L$ as follows

$$\mathcal{F}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \lambda = 1_X, \lambda = 0_X, \\ 0.6, & \text{if } \lambda = \rho, \\ 0.3, & \text{if } \lambda = \rho \oplus \rho, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From Theorem 3.3, we obtain an L -fuzzy closure operator $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}} : L^X \rightarrow L^X$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda) &= \bigwedge_{\mu \in L^X} (\mathcal{F}(\mu) \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \mu)) \\ &= (S(\lambda, 0_X) \rightarrow 0_X) \wedge (0.6 \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \rho) \rightarrow \rho)) \wedge (0.3 \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \rho \oplus \rho) \rightarrow \rho \oplus \rho)). \end{aligned}$$

For $\lambda_1 = (0.9, 0.4, 0.2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda_1) &= (S(\lambda, 0_X) \rightarrow 0_X) \wedge (0.6 \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \rho) \rightarrow \rho)) \\ &\quad \wedge (0.3 \rightarrow (S(\lambda, \rho \oplus \rho) \rightarrow \rho \oplus \rho)) = (0.9, 0.9, 0.9) \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}}(\lambda_1) = S(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}(\lambda_1), \lambda_1) = 0.3 \geq \mathcal{F}(\lambda_1) = 0.$$

(2) We define an L -fuzzy closure operator $\mathcal{C} : L^X \rightarrow L^X$ as follows

$$\mathcal{C}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 0_X, & \text{if } \lambda = 0_X, \\ \rho, & \text{if } 0_X \neq \lambda \leq \rho, \\ \rho \oplus \rho, & \text{if } \rho \not\leq \lambda \leq \rho \oplus \rho, \\ 1_X, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

\mathcal{C} is not stratified because

$$\mathcal{C}(0.9 \rightarrow \rho) = \mathcal{C}((0.5, 0.9, 0.8)) = (0.8, 1, 1) \not\leq 0.9 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\rho) = (0.5, 0.9, 0.8).$$

From Theorem 3.5, we obtain an L -fuzzy cotopology $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}} : L^X \rightarrow L$ as follows

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 1_X, & \text{if } \lambda = 1_X, \\ S(\rho, \lambda), & \text{if } 0_X \neq \lambda \leq \rho, \\ S(\rho \oplus \rho, \lambda), & \text{if } \rho \not\leq \lambda \leq \rho \oplus \rho, \\ S(1_X, \lambda), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Definition 3.10. [1] Suppose that $F : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, $G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ are concrete functors. The pair (F, G) is called a *Galois correspondence* between \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} if for each $Y \in \mathcal{C}$, $id_Y : F \circ G(Y) \rightarrow Y$ is a \mathcal{C} -morphism, and for each $X \in \mathcal{D}$, $id_X : X \rightarrow G \circ F(X)$ is a \mathcal{D} -morphism.

If (F, G) is a Galois correspondence, then it is easy to check that F is a left adjoint of G , or equivalently that G is a right adjoint of F .

Let **FC** be denote the category of L -fuzzy closure spaces and C-maps for morphisms.

Let **FCTS** be denote the category of L -fuzzy cotopological spaces and continuous mappings for morphisms.

Theorem 3.12. (1) $\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{FC} \rightarrow \mathbf{FCTS}$ defined as $\mathbf{F}(X, C_X) = (X, \mathcal{F}_{C_X})$ is a functor.

(2) $\mathbf{G} : \mathbf{FCTS} \rightarrow \mathbf{FC}$ defined as $\mathbf{G}(X, \mathcal{F}_X) = (X, C_{\mathcal{F}_X})$ is a functor.

(3) The pair (\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G}) is a Galois correspondence between **FC** and **FCTS**.

Proof. (1) and (2) are follows from Theorems 3.8(2) and 3.7(2), respectively.

(3) By Theorem 3.5(5), if (X, \mathcal{F}_X) is an L -fuzzy cotopology, then $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{G}(X, \mathcal{F}_X)) = (X, \mathcal{F}_{C_{\mathcal{F}_X}}) \geq (X, \mathcal{F}_X)$. Hence, the identity map $id_X : (X, \mathcal{F}_{C_{\mathcal{F}_X}}) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{G}(X, \mathcal{F}_X)) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{F}_X)$ is a continuous map. Moreover, if (X, C_X) is an L -fuzzy closure space, by Theorem 3.5(3), $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{F}(X, C_X)) = (X, C_{\mathcal{F}_{C_X}}) \geq (X, C_X)$. Hence the identity map $id_X : (X, C_X) \rightarrow \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{F}(X, C_X)) = \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{F}(X, C_X))$ is a C-map. Therefore (\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G}) is a Galois correspondence.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Adámek, H. Herrlich, G.E. Strecker, *Abstract and Concrete Categories*, Wiley, New York, 1990.
- [2] R. Bělohlávek, *Fuzzy Relational Systems*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, New York, 2002.
- [3] J. Fang, The relationship between L -ordered convergence structures and strong L -topologies, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.*, **161** (2010), 2923-2944.
- [4] J. Fang, I -fuzzy Alexandrov topologies and specialization orders, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.*, 128 (2007) 2359-2374.
- [5] J. Fang, The relationship between L -ordered convergence structures and strong L -topologies, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.*, 161 (2010) 2923-2944.
- [6] J. Fang, Y. Yue, L -fuzzy closure systems *Fuzzy Sets Syst.*, 161 (2010) 1242-1252.

- [7] P. Hájek, *Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1998.
- [8] U. Höhle, S.E. Rodabaugh, *Mathematics of Fuzzy Sets: Logic, topology, and Measure Theory*, The Handbooks of Fuzzy Sets Series 3, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, 1999.
- [9] T. Kubiak, *On fuzzy topologies*, Ph.D. Thesis, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland, 1985.
- [10] H. Lai, D. Zhang, Fuzzy preorder and fuzzy topology, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.*, 157(2006) 1865-1885.
- [11] S.E. Rodabaugh, E.P. Klement, *Topological and Algebraic Structures in Fuzzy Sets*, The Handbook of Recent Developments in the Mathematics of Fuzzy Sets, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, Dordrecht, London, 2003.
- [12] A. Šostak, On a fuzzy topological structure, *Suppl. Rend Circ. Matem. Palermo*, Ser. II [11] (1985), 125-186.