

Paper Type: Mini-Review Article

TreeSoft Set vs. HyperSoft Set and Fuzzy-Extensions of TreeSoft Sets

Florentin Smarandache ^{1,*} 

¹ University of New Mexico, 705 Gurley Ave., Gallup, NM 87301, USA; smarand@unm.edu.

Received: 12 Aug 2024

Revised: 10 Sep 2024

Accepted: 03 Oct 2024

Published: 05 Oct 2024

Abstract

The TreeSoft Set is more general than the HyperSoft Set. The TreeSoft Set is a union of HyperSoft Sets. To distinguish between the levels of attributes, we use the comma notation i.e. an attribute of level k has k-1 commas in between its indexes.

Keywords: TreeSoft; HyperSoft; Fuzzy Extensions.

1 | Definitions and Examples

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a universe of discourse, and $\mathcal{H}$ a non-empty subset of $\mathcal{U}$, with $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ being the power set of $\mathcal{H}$.

Let A be a set of attributes $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n, n \geq 2$,

$$A = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\},$$

where each attribute $A_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$, is a class of sub-attributes $A_i = \{A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}, \dots, A_{i,n_i}\}$.

1.1 | HyperSoft Set

Then: $f: \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \mathcal{P}(A_2) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(A_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ is called a HyperSoft Set over $\mathcal{U}$.

1.2 | Practical Example of HyperSoft Set

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a universal set of houses, and $\mathcal{H} = \{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{10}\}$ of subset of $\mathcal{U}$, from a certain geographical zone (for example, the southwest side of the United States). And $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ is the powerset of $\mathcal{H}$.

Let's consider the set of attributes A be

$$A = \{A_1, A_2\},$$

where $A_1 = \text{size} = \{\text{Small}, \text{Big}\}$, and $A_2 = \text{Arizonian cities} = \{\text{Phoenix}, \text{Tucson}\}$.

$$F: A_1 \times A_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$$

$$F(\text{Big}, \text{Phoenix}) = \{h_1, h_3\}.$$

$$F(\text{Big}, \text{Tucson}) = \{h_5, h_7\}.$$



Corresponding Author: smarand@unm.edu



<https://doi.org/10.61356/j.hsse.2024.2396>



Licensee **HyperSoft Set Methods in Engineering**. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).

2 | Definition of TreeSoft Set

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a universe of discourse, and $\mathcal{H}$ a non-empty subset of $\mathcal{U}$, with $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ the powerset of $\mathcal{H}$.

Let A be a set of attributes (parameters, factors, etc.),

$A = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$, for integer $n \geq 1$, where $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$ are considered attributes of **the** first level (since they have one-digit indexes).

Each attribute A_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, is formed by sub-attributes:

$$A_1 = \{A_{1,1}, A_{1,2}, \dots\}$$

$$A_2 = \{A_{2,1}, A_{2,2}, \dots\}$$

.....

$$A_n = \{A_{n,1}, A_{n,2}, \dots\}$$

where the above $A_{i,j}$ are sub-attributes (or attributes of **the** second level) (since they have two-digit indexes).

Again, each sub-attribute $A_{i,j}$ is formed by sub-sub-attributes (or attributes of third level):

$$A_{i,j,k}$$

and so on, as much refinement as needed into each application, up to sub-sub-...-sub-attributes (or attributes of m -level (or having m digits into the indexes):

$$A_{i1,i2,\dots,im}$$

Therefore, a graph tree is formed, which we denote as $\text{Tree}(A)$, whose root is A (considered of level zero), then nodes of level 1, level 2, up to level m .

We call **the** leaves of the graph-tree all terminal nodes (nodes that have no descendants).

Then the TreeSoft Set is defined as $F: \mathcal{P}(\text{Tree}(A)) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$

$\text{Tree}(A)$ is the set of all nodes and leaves (from level 1 to level m) of the graph-tree, and $\mathcal{P}(\text{Tree}(A))$ is the powerset of the $\text{Tree}(A)$.

2.1 | Remark

We use comma (,) in between indexes to clearly distinguish between their levels.

For example, A_{12} is an attribute of the first level (has no comma between indexes) being part of the attributes

$$A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{10}, A_{11}, A_{12}, A_{13}, \dots;$$

while $A_{1,2}$ is an attribute of **the** second level (or sub-attribute) [has one comma between indexes], being part of the sub-attributes:

$$A_{1,1}, A_{1,2}, A_{1,3}, \dots$$

Therefore $A_{i,j} \neq A_{ij}$ and similarly for all k -levels of attributes.

2.2 | Property

An attribute of level k has $k-1$ commas in between indexes.

Example: $A_{2,11,4}$ is an attribute of level 3 (has 2 commas in between indexes).

3 | Fuzzy Extensions of the TreeSoft Set

Let's denote by $d^\circ(h)$ the fuzzy (or fuzzy extension, such as Intuitionistic Fuzzy Set, Inconsistent Intuitionistic Fuzzy Set (Picture Fuzzy Set, Ternary Fuzzy Set), Pythagorean Fuzzy Set (Atanassov's Intuitionistic Fuzzy Set of the second type), q-Rung Orthopair Fuzzy Set, Spherical Fuzzy Set, n-HyperSpherical Fuzzy Set, etc.) degree of appurtenance of the element h concerning the set it belongs to.

$$F: \mathcal{P}(\text{Tree}(A)) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{d^\circ(h)}).$$

For any subset $\alpha \in \text{Tree}(A)$, one has $F(\alpha) = (h_{i(d^\circ(h_i))}, h_i \in \mathcal{H})$.

From the previous [Example 2.2.](#),

$$F(\text{Big, Phoenix}) = \{h_1(0.7, 0.4, 0.3), h_3(0.6, 0.2, 0.3)\}$$

$$F(\text{Big, Tucson}) = \{h_5(0.1, 0.8, 0.3), h_7(0.9, 0.0, 0.5)\}$$

A Neutrosophic TreeSoft Set:

$$F(\text{Big, Arizona}) =$$

$$= \{h_1(0.7, 0.4, 0.3), h_3(0.6, 0.2, 0.3), h_5(0.1, 0.8, 0.3), h_7(0.9, 0.0, 0.5)\}.$$

$$F(\text{Big, Phoenix}) = \{h_1(0.8), h_3(0.5)\},$$

$$F(\text{Big, Tucson}) = \{h_5(0.2), h_7(0.6)\},$$

A Fuzzy TreeSoft Set:

$$F(\text{Big, Arizona}) = \{b_1(0.8), b_3(0.5), b_5(0.2), b_7(0.6)\}.$$

The first set is formed by the nodes of level 1, the second set by the nodes of level 2, the third set by the nodes of level 3, and so on, and the last set is formed by the nodes of level m .

4 | Practical Example of TreeSoft Set of Level 3 [3]




Figure 1. A TreeSoft Set of Level 3.

Assume a town has many houses.

This is a classical tree, whose:

Level 0 (the root) is the node: Attributes;

Level 1 is formed by the nodes: Size, Location;

Level 2 is formed by the nodes: Small, Big, Arizona, and California;

Level 3 is formed by the nodes: Phoenix, Tucson.

Let's consider $H = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{10}\}$ be a set of houses, and $P(H)$ the powerset of H .

And the set of first-level Attributes: $A = \{A_1, A_2\}$, where $A_1 = \text{Size}$, $A_2 = \text{Location}$.

Then $A_1 = \{A_{1,1}, A_{1,2}\} = \{\text{Small}, \text{Big}\}$ second-level attributes, and

$A_2 = \{A_{2,1}, A_{2,2}\} = \{\text{Arizona}, \text{California}\}$ as American states, also second-level attributes.

Further on, $A_{2,2} = \{A_{2,1,1}, A_{2,1,2}\} = \{\text{Phoenix}, \text{Tucson}\}$ as Arizonian cities, as third-level attributes.

Let's assume that the function F gets the following values:

$$F(\text{Big}, \text{Arizona}, \text{Phoenix}) = \{b_1, b_3\}$$

$$F(\text{Big}, \text{Arizona}, \text{Tucson}) = \{b_5, b_7\}$$

$$F(\text{Big}, \text{Arizona}) = \text{all big houses from both cities, Phoenix and Tucson} =$$

$$= F(\text{Big}, \text{Arizona}, \text{Phoenix}) \cup F(\text{Big}, \text{Arizona}, \text{Tucson}) =$$

$$= \{b_1, b_3, b_5, b_7\}.$$

5 | Theorem

In general, the TreeSoft Set is a union of HyperSoft Sets.

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a universe of discourse, $\mathcal{H}$ a non-empty subset of $\mathcal{U}$, and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ the powerset of $\mathcal{H}$.

Let $A = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$, $n \geq 2$, be a set of attributes of first-level.

Then, $A_i = \{A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}, \dots, A_{i,n_i}\}$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, is a set of attributes of the second level.

Similarly, $A_{i,j} = \{A_{i,j,1}, A_{i,j,2}, \dots, A_{i,j,n_{ij}}\}$, for all i, j , a set of attributes of third level.

$A_{i,j,k} = \{A_{i,j,k,1}, A_{i,j,k,2}, \dots, A_{i,j,k,n_{ijk}}\}$ attributes of the third level (sub-sub-attributes).

Up to attributes of level m :

$$A_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m} = \{A_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m, 1}, A_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m, 2}, \dots, A_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m, n_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_m}}\}$$

where $A, A_i, A_{ij}, A_{ijk}, \dots, A_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m}$ generate a Tree of m levels, denoted as $\text{Tree}(A)$, and $\mathcal{P}(\text{Tree}(A))$ is the powerset of the $\text{Tree}(A)$.

All as in [Definition 3](#).

$F: \mathcal{P}(\text{Tree}(A)) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ is the TreeSoft Set.

The powerset of $\text{Tree}(A)$ is formed by elements that are nodes or leaves of the $\text{Tree}(A)$.

The leaves are okay, as in the HyperSoft Set, while a node is replaced by the union of all leaves that descend from it.

In the previous Example 5, if one takes the node Arizona, that is equivalent with (and replaced by) Phoenix and Tucson:

$$\text{ARIZONA} = \{\text{Phoenix}, \text{Tucson}\} \text{ or } \text{Phoenix} \cup \text{Tucson}.$$

If the node is LOCATION, then it is equivalent to, and replaced by {Phoenix, Tucson, California}.

The HyperSoft Set works with the leaves only.

But, because each node, no matter its level, is equivalent to the union of leaves that descend from it, one gets that the TreeSoft Set is equal to a union of HyperSoft Sets.

Therefore, the TreeSoft Set is more general than the HyperSoft Set, and it is a union of HyperSoft Sets.

Coming back to the previous example, we have:

HyperSoft Sets

$f(\text{Big, Phoenix}) = \{h_1, h_3\}$, meaning big houses in Phoenix.

$f(\text{Big, Tucson}) = \{h_5, h_7\}$, meaning big houses in Tucson.

TreeSoft Set

$f(\text{Big, Arizona}) = f(\text{Big, \{Phoenix, Tucson\}}) =$

$= f(\text{Big, Phoenix}) \cup f(\text{Big, Tucson}) = \{h_1, h_3\} \cup \{h_5, h_7\} = \{h_1, h_3, h_5, h_7\}.$

6 | Conclusion

The TreeSoft Set is equivalent to a union of HyperSoft Sets.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Dr. Nivetha Martin, Assistant Professor at the Department of Mathematics, Arul Anandar College (Autonomous), Karu Mathur, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India, for her many and interesting questions and discussions on the extensions of soft sets and decision making.

Data Availability

The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to the privacy-preserving nature of the data but are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest in the research.

Ethical Approval

This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

References

- [1] F. Smarandache, Extension of Soft Set to Hypersoft Set, and then to Plithogenic Hypersoft Set, Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, vol. 22, 2018, pp. 168-170 DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.2159754; <http://fs.unm.edu/NSS/ExtensionOfSoftSetToHypersoftSet.pdf>
- [2] Florentin Smarandache, Extension of Soft Set to Hypersoft Set, and then to Plithogenic Hypersoft Set (revisited), Octagon Mathematical Magazine, vol. 27, no. 1, April 2019, pp. 413-418

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The perspectives, opinions, and data shared in all publications are the sole responsibility of the individual authors and contributors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of Sciences Force or the editorial team. Sciences Force and the editorial team disclaim any liability for potential harm to individuals or property resulting from the ideas, methods, instructions, or products referenced in the content.