



On NeuroBitopological Space

Bhimraj Basumatary^{1,*}, Jeevan Krishna Khaklary² and Said Broumi^{3,4}

¹ Department of Mathematical Sciences, Bodoland University, Kokrajhar, INDIA; brbasumatary14@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5398-6078>

² Department of Mathematics, Central Institute of Technology, Kokrajhar, INDIA; jk.khaklary@cit.ac.in; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6385-1118>

³ Laboratory of Information Processing, Faculty of Science Ben M'Sik, University Hassan II, Casablanca, MOROCCO; broumisaid78@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1334-5759>

⁴Regional Center for the Professions of Education and Training, Casablanca-Settat, Morocco; broumisaid78@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1334-5759>

* Correspondence: brbasumatary14@gmail.com

Abstract

The current study shows the study of NeuroBitopological Space. In this work, the properties of NeuroBitopological Space are discussed. It is seen that many properties do not coincide with the properties of general Bitopological space. The terms NeuroInterior, NeuroClosure, and NeuroBoundary are defined with examples also their properties are observed.

Keywords: NeuroInterior, NeuroClosure, NeuroBoundary, NeuroBitopological Space.

1.Introduction

Smarandache [1, 2] proposed the neutrosophic set (NS), and after that many researchers applied it in science & technology. In recent years, there has been a surge in academic interest in neutrosophic set theory. Florentin Smarandache first defined the idea of neutro-structures and anti-structures [3, 4]. Neutrosophication of an axiom on a given set X means dividing the set X into three regions, one in which the axiom is true (we call this the degree of truth T of the axiom), one in which the axiom is indeterminate (we call this the degree of indeterminacy I of the axiom), and one in which the axiom is false (we call this the degree of falsehood F of the axiom). On the other hand Antisophication of an axiom on a given set X means to have the axiom false on the whole set X. Without using neutrosophic sets and neutrosophic numbers, the structure of neutrosophic logic has been transferred to the structure of classical algebras. MemetŞahin et al. [8] studied NeuroTopological Space (NTS) and Anti-Topological Space. Smarandache [7] studied neutroAlgebra as a generalization of partial algebra. Many researchers [11-15] studied neutroAlgebra. Basumatary et al. [21] studied some properties of NTS.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54216/IJNS.180208>

Received: November 10, 2021 Accepted: March 23, 2022

In this paper, NeuroBitopological Space is studied based on NeuroInterior, NeuroClosure, and NeuroBoundary, also its properties are learned with examples.

2. Preliminaires

Definition 2.1: [7]

TheNeutro-sophication of the Law

- (i) Let X be a non-empty set and $*$ be binary operation. For some elements $(a, b) \in (X, X)$, $(a * b) \in X$ (degree of well defined (T)) and for other elements $(x, y), (p, q) \in (X, X)$; $[x * y$ is indeterminate (degree of indeterminacy (I)), or $p * q \notin X$ (degree of outer-defined (F))], where (T, I, F) is different from $(1, 0, 0)$ that represents the Classical Law, and from $(0, 0, 1)$ that represents the AntiLaw.
- (ii) In NeuroAlgebra, the classical well-defined for $*$ binary operation is divided into three regions: degree of well-defined (T), degree of indeterminacy (I) and degree of outer-defined (F) similar to neutrosophic set and neutrosophic logic

Definition 2.2: [8]

Let X be a non-empty set, \mathfrak{S} be a collection of subsets of X . If at least one of the following conditions {i, ii, iii} is satisfied, then \mathfrak{S} is called a NeuroTopology on X and (X, \mathfrak{S}) is called a NTS.

- (i) $[\emptyset \in \mathfrak{S}, X \notin \mathfrak{S} \text{ or } X \in \mathfrak{S}, \emptyset \notin \mathfrak{S}] \text{ or } [\emptyset, X \in {}_1\mathfrak{S}]$
- (ii) For at least n elements $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n \in \mathfrak{S}$, $\bigcap_{i=1}^n p_i \in \mathfrak{S}$ and for at least n elements $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n \in \mathfrak{S}$, $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n \in \mathfrak{S}$; $[\bigcap_{i=1}^n q_i \notin \mathfrak{S} \text{ or } \bigcap_{i=1}^n r_i \in {}_1\mathfrak{S}]$. Where n is finite.
- (iii) For at least n elements $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n \in \mathfrak{S}$, $\bigcup_{i \in I} p_i \in \mathfrak{S}$ and for at least n elements $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n \in \mathfrak{S}$, $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n \in \mathfrak{S}$; $[\bigcup_{i \in I} q_i \notin \mathfrak{S} \text{ or } \bigcup_{i \in I} r_i \in {}_1\mathfrak{S}]$.

Definition 2.3: [21]

Let (X, τ) be a NTS over X and A is subset on X . Then, the NeuroInterior of A is the union of all NeuroOpen subsets of A . Clearly, NeuroInterior of A is the biggest NeuroOpen set over X which is contained in A .

Definition 2.4:[21]

Let (X, τ) be a NTS over X and A is subset on X . Then, the NeuroClosure of A is the intersection of all NeuroClosed super sets of A . Clearly, NeuroClosure of A is the smallest NeuroClosed set over X conatining A .

3. Results

Definition 3.1.

Let X be a non-empty set endowed with two NeuroTopologies T_1 and T_2 . Then (X, T_1, T_2) is called a NeuroBitopological space (NBS). In this entire paper, we expressed (X, T_1, T_2) with \mathfrak{S} .

Example 3.1.

Let $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $T_1 = \{\emptyset, \{3\}, \{1, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}$ and $T_2 = \{\emptyset, \{4\}, \{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}$

For T_1 : i) $\emptyset \in T_1, X \notin T_1$

ii) $\{3\} \cap \{1, 2, 3\} = \{3\} \in T_1$; $\{3\} \cap \{1, 4\} = \emptyset \in T_1$ but $\{1, 4\} \cap \{1, 2, 3\} = \{1\} \notin T_1$

iii) $\{3\} \cup \{1, 2, 3\} = \{1, 2, 3\} \in T_1$ but $\{3\} \cup \{1, 4\} = \{1, 3, 4\} \notin T_1$

For T_2 : i) $\emptyset \in T_2, X \notin T_2$

ii) $\{4\} \cap \{1, 2\} = \emptyset \in T_2$; but $\{1, 2\} \cap \{2, 3\} = \{2\} \notin T_2$

iii) $\{1, 2\} \cup \{2, 3\} = \{1, 2, 3\} \in T_2$ but $\{4\} \cup \{1, 2\} = \{1, 2, 4\} \notin T_2$.

Thus, it can be observed that T_1 and T_2 are both NeuroTopologies on X . Therefore, (X, T_1, T_2) is a NeuroBitopological space. It may be noted that a NeuroBitopological (X, T_1, T_2) is not a general bitopological

space (GBS) because T_1 and T_2 are not topologies on X . Thus, a NBS is a different thing altogether and it will be seen that a NBS can be derived from any GBS. It can be seen from the following two theorems.

Proposition 3.1.

If \mathfrak{S} be a GBS then $(X, T_1 - \emptyset, T_2 - \emptyset)$ be a NBS.

Proof: Since the empty set is excluded from the two topologies, they are no longer general topologies but NTSs.

Proposition 3.2.

If \mathfrak{S} be a GBS then $(X, T_1 - X, T_2 - X)$ be a NBS.

Proof: Since the whole set is excluded from the two topologies, they are no longer general topologies but NTSs and hence the proved.

Definition 3.2.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS, then the NeuroInterior of a subset A of X is defined as:

$$T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) = T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A)).$$

Example 3.2.

Let $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$, $T_1 = \{\emptyset, \{a, b\}, \{c, d\}\}$ and $T_2 = \{\emptyset, \{b\}, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{c, d\}\}$. Then, clearly T_1 and T_2 are NTSs on X . So, (X, T_1, T_2) is a NBS.

Let $A = \{b, c, d\}$. Then we have, $T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) = T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A))$
 $= T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(\{b, c, d\}))$
 $= T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(\{b\} \cup \{b, c\} \cup \{c, d\})$
 $= T_1 - \text{NeuInt}\{b, c, d\}$
 $= \{c, d\}.$

Proposition 3.3.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS, then $T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \subseteq A$.

Proof: Let $x \in T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A)$

$$\Rightarrow x \in T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A))$$

$$\Rightarrow x \in T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(B) \text{ where, } B = T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \subseteq A$$

$$\Rightarrow x \in B \subseteq A$$

$$\Rightarrow x \in A$$

Hence, $T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \subseteq A$.

But the converse is not true as shown in the example below:

Example 3.3.

Let $X = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $T_1 = \{\emptyset, \{2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}\}$ and $T_2 = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\}$. Then, (X, T_1, T_2) is a NBS. Let, $A = \{2, 3\}$.

Then, we have $T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) = T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(\{2, 3\})) = T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(\{2, 3\}) = \{2\}$

This shows that $T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \subseteq A$ but $A \not\subseteq T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A)$.

So, $T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \neq A$.

Proposition 3.4.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS, and $A \subseteq B$, then $T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \subseteq T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(B)$.

Proof: Let $x \in T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A)$

$$\Rightarrow x \in T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A))$$

$$\Rightarrow x \in T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(B)) \text{ since } A \subseteq B$$

$$\Rightarrow x \in T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(B)$$

Hence, $x \in T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \Rightarrow x \in T_1 T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(B)$.

Proposition 3.5.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS, then $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A \cap B) \subseteq T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \cap T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(B)$.

Proposition 3.6.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS, then $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \cup T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(B) \subseteq T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A \cup B)$

Proof: We have $A \subseteq A \cup B \Rightarrow T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \subseteq T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A \cup B)$.

Also, $B \subseteq A \cup B \Rightarrow T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(B) \subseteq T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A \cup B)$

Therefore, $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \cup T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(B) \subseteq T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A \cup B)$.

Remark 3.1.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS, then $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \neq T_2T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(A)$.

Example 3.4.

Let $X = \{1,2,3,4\}$, $T_1 = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{1,2\}, \{2,3\}, \{1,2,4\}\}$ and $T_2 = \{\emptyset, \{2\}, \{1,3\}, \{2,3\}, \{2,4\}, \{1,2,3\}\}$. Let $A = \{1,2\}$.

Then, $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) = T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A))$

$$= T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(\{1,2\})) = T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(\{2\}) = \emptyset.$$

And, $T_2T_1 - \text{Int}(A) = T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(A)) = T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(\{1,2\}))$

$$= T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(\{1,2\}) = \{2\}$$

Therefore, $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) \neq T_2T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(A)$.

Remark 3.2.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS, then $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) = T_2T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(A)$ if $T_1 = T_2$.

Remark 3.3.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS, then $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A)) \neq T_1T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(A)$.

Example 3.5.

Let $X = \{1,2,3,4\}$, $T_1 = \{\emptyset, \{2\}, \{1,3\}, \{2,3\}, \{2,4\}, \{1,2,3\}\}$ and $T_2 = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{1,2\}, \{2,3\}, \{1,2,4\}\}$.

Let $A = \{1,2\}$.

Then, $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A) = T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A))$

$$= T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(\{1,2\})) = T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(\{1,2\}) = \{2\}$$

Now, $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A)) = T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(\{2\})$

$$= T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(\{2\})) = T_1 - \text{NeuInt}(\emptyset) = \emptyset.$$

Remark 3.4.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS, then $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A)) = T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A)$ if $T_1 = T_2$.

Definition 3.3.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS and $A \subset X$. The intersection of all $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuroClosed}$ supersets of A is called the $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuroClosure}$ of A and denoted by $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A)$ and will be evaluated as $T_1 - \text{NeuCl}(T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A))$.

Remark 3.5.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS and $A \subset X$. Then, $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A) \neq T_2T_1 - \text{NeuCl}(A)$.

Example 3.6.

Let $X = \{1,2,3,4\}$, $T_1 = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{1,2\}, \{1,3\}, \{1,2,4\}\}$ and $T_2 = \{\emptyset, \{2\}, \{2,3\}, \{3,4\}, \{1,2,3\}\}$.

The $T_1 - \text{NeuroClosed}$ sets are: $X, \{2,3,4\}, \{3,4\}, \{2,4\}, \{3\}$

And, the $T_2 - \text{NeuroClosed}$ sets are: $X, \{1,3,4\}, \{1,4\}, \{1,2\}, \{4\}$

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54216/IJNS.180208>

Received: November 10, 2021 Accepted: March 23, 2022

Let $A = \{3,4\}$.

Then, $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A) = T_1 - \text{NeuCl}(T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A)) = T_1 - \text{NeuCl}(T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(\{3,4\})) = T_1 - \text{NeuCl}(\{1,3,4\}) = X$

And, $T_2T_1 - \text{NeuCl}(A) = T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(T_1 - \text{NeuCl}(\{3,4\})) = T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(\{2,3,4\} \cap \{3,4\}) = T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(\{3,4\}) = \{1,3,4\} \neq X$

Therefore, $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A) \neq T_2T_1 - \text{NeuCl}(A)$.

Proposition 3.7.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS and $A \subset X$. If A is $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuroClosed}$ set, then $A \subset T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A)$.

Proof: From the definition of $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A)$ it is clear that $A \subset T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A)$ since $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A)$ is the intersection of all supersets of A , which will obviously contain A .

Proposition 3.8.

If $A \subset B$, then $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A) \subset T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(B)$.

Proof: By Proposition 3.7, $B \subset T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(B)$ and $A \subset B$, so $A \subset T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(B)$ which gives $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A) \subset T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(B)$.

Proposition 3.9.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS and $A, B \subset X$. Then $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A \cup B) \subset T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A) \cup T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(B)$.

Proposition 3.10.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS and $A, B \subset X$. Then $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A \cap B) \subset T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A) \cap T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(B)$.

Proof: We have: $A \cap B \subset A$ and $A \cap B \subset B$

Therefore, $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A \cap B) \subset T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A)$ and $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A \cap B) \subset T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(B)$

Hence, $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A \cap B) \subset T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A) \cap T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(B)$.

Proposition 3.11.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS and $A \subset X$. Then $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A)) = T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A)$ if A is $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuroClosed}$.

Proof: If A is $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuroClosed}$, then A is the smallest NeuroClosed set containing A , so $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A) = A$.

Therefore, $T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A)) = T_1T_2 - \text{NeuCl}(A)$.

Proposition 3.12.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS and $A \subset X$, then the NeuroInterior of A is equal to the complement of the NeuroClosure of the complement of A .

Proposition 3.13.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS and $A \subset X$, then the NeuroClosure of the complement of A is not equal to the complement of the NeuroInterior of A .

Proposition 3.14.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS and $A \subset X$, then the NeuroClosure of A is equal to the complement of the NeuroInterior of the complement of A .

Definition 3.4.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS and $A \subset X$. A point and $x \in X$ is said to be $T_1T_2 - \text{NeurotroExterior}$ of A if $x \in T_1T_2 - \text{NeuInt}(A^c)$.

Definition 3.5.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS and $A \subset X$. A point and $x \in X$ is said to be a T_1T_2 – *NeuroBoundary* point if it is neither an T_1T_2 – *NeuroInterior* nor T_1T_2 – *NeuroExterior* point of A .

We define T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(A) = T_1T_2 – *NeuCl*(A) \cap T_1T_2 – *NeuCl*(A^c).

Proposition 3.15.

Let \mathfrak{S} be a NBS with $T_1 = T_2$ and $A, B \subset X$. Then the following results are found:

- (i) T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(T_1T_2 – *NeuInt*(A)) \subseteq T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(A)
- (ii) T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(T_1T_2 – *NeuCl*(A)) \subseteq T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(A)
- (iii) T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*($A \cup B$) \subseteq T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(A) \cup T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(B)
- (iv) T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*($A \cap B$) \subseteq T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(A) \cup T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(B).

Remark 3.6.

If $T_1 \neq T_2$, then the **proposition 3.15** is not true that is for $A, B \subset X$, the following results are found:

- (i) T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(T_1T_2 – *NeuInt*(A)) $\not\subseteq$ T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(A)
- (ii) T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(T_1T_2 – *NeuCl*(A)) $\not\subseteq$ T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(A)
- (iii) T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*($A \cup B$) $\not\subseteq$ T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(A) \cup T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(B)
- (iv) T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*($A \cap B$) $\not\subseteq$ T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(A) \cup T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(B)

For this we cite the following examples(i) **Example 3.7.**

Let $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$, $T_1 = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{c\}, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, b, d\}\}$ and $T_2 = \{\emptyset, \{b\}, \{d\}, \{c, d\}, \{a, d\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$

T_1 – *NeuroClosed* sets are: $X, \{b, c, d\}, \{a, b, d\}, \{c, d\}, \{a, d\}, \{c\}$ and

T_2 – *NeuroClosed* sets are: $X, \{a, c, d\}, \{a, b, c\}, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{d\}$

Let $A = \{a, d\}$, $A^c = \{b, c\}$.

Now T_1T_2 – *NeuInt*(A) = $\{a\} = B$ (say).

Now T_1T_2 – *NeuCl*(B) = $\{a, d\}$ and T_1T_2 – *NeuCl*(B^c) = X . Therefore, T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(B) = $\{a, d\}$.

Again T_1T_2 – *NeuCl*(A) = X and T_1T_2 – *NeuCl*(A^c) = $\{b, c, d\}$, and T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(B) = $\{b, c, d\}$

Hence T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(T_1T_2 – *NeuInt*(A)) $\not\subseteq$ T_1T_2 – *NeuBd*(A).

Similarly, other properties of Remark 3.6 can be shown.

5. Conclusions

In this work, NeuroBitological space is studied. The terms *NeuroInterior*, *NeuroClosure* and *NeuroBoundary* are defined. It is seen that some properties of NBS are not the same as the properties of GBS. For this, we have cited examples. We hope, this work can lead towards the development of many properties of NeuroBitological space.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Smarandache, F. “Neutrosophy / Neutrosophic probability, set, and logic”. American Research Press, 1998.
<http://gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/NeutLog.txt>
- [2] Smarandache, F. “Neutrosophy and neutrosophic logic, first international conference on neutrosophy,
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54216/IJNS.180208>

Received: November 10, 2021 Accepted: March 23, 2022

- neutrosophic logic, set, probability, and statistics”. University of New Mexico, Gallup, NM 87301, USA, 2002
- [3] Smarandache, F. “Introduction to NeutroAlgebraic Structures and AntiAlgebraic Structures, in Advances of Standard and Nonstandard NeutrosophicTheories”.*Pons Publishing House Brussels, Belgium*, Ch. 6, 240-265, 2019.
- [4] Smarandache, F. “Introduction to NeutroAlgebraic Structures and AntiAlgebraic Structures (revisited)”.*Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 31, 1-16,2020.
- [5] Sumathi, I. R. &Arockiarani, I. “Topological Group Structure of Neutrosophic set”. *Journal of Advanced Studies in Topology*,7(1), 12-20, 2016.
- [6] Mwchahary, D. D. &Basumatary, B. “A note on Neutrosophic Bitopological Space”.*Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*,33, 134-144, 2020.
- [7] Smarandache, F. “NeutroAlgebra is a Generalization of Partial Algebra”. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS)*, 2, 8-17, 2020.
- [8] Şahin, M., Kargin, A. &Yücel, M. “Neutro-Topological Space and Anti-Topological Space”.*The Educational Publisher Inc.*, 1091 West 1st Ave., Grandview Heights, OH 43212, United States, 2021.
- [9] Smarandache, F. “Introduction to NeutroAlgebraic Structures and AntiAlgebraic Structures (revisited)”. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 31, 1-16, 2020.
- [10] Smarandache, F. “Generalizations and Alternatives of Classical Algebraic Structures to NeutroAlgebraic Structures and AntiAlgebraicStructures”.*Journal of Fuzzy Extension and Applications (JFEA)*, J. Fuzzy. Ext. Appl.,1(2), 85–87, 2020.
- [11] Agboola, A. A. A., Ibrahim, M. A. &Adeleke, E. O. “Elementary Examination of NeutroAlgebras and AntiAlgebrasviz-a-viz the Classical Number Systems”. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS)*, 4, 16-19, 2020.
- [12] Agboola, A. A. A. “Introduction to NeutroGroups”. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS)*, 6, 41-47, .2020.
- [13] Agboola, A. A. A. “Introduction to NeutroRings”. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS)*, 7, 62-73, 2020.
- [14] Rezaei, A. &Smarandache, F. “On Neutro-BE-algebras and Anti-BE-algebras”. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS)*, 4, 8-15, .2020.
- [15] Hamidi, M. &Smarandache, F. “Neutro-BCK-Algebra”. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS)*, 8, 110-117, 2020.
- [16] Smarandache, F., Rezaei, A. & Kim, H. S. “A New Trend to Extensions of CI-algebras”. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS)*, 5(1), 8-15,2020.
- [17] Agboola, A. A. A. “On Finite NeutroGroups of Type-NG”. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science (IJNS)*, 10(2), 84-95, 2020.
- [18] Broumi, S., Deli, I. and Smarandache, F. “Relations on interval valued neutrosophic soft sets”. *J. New Results Sci.*, 3(5), pp.1–20, 2014.
- [19] Broumi, S., Deli, I. and Smarandache, F. “Neutrosophic parametrized soft set theory and its decision making”. *International Frontier Science Letters*, 1(1), pp.1–11, 2014.
- [20] Basumatary, B., Wary, N., Mwchahary, D.D., Brahma, A.K., Moshahary, J., Basumatary, U.R., and Basumatary, J. “A study on some properties of neutrosophic multi topological group”. *Symmetry*, 13(9), pp.1689, 2021.
- [21] Basumatary, B., Khaklary, J. K., Wary, N, and Smarandache, F. “On Some properties of NeutroTopological space, Acceted for publication.
- [22] Basumatary, B. “Towards forming the field of fuzzy closure with reference to fuzzy boundary”. *Journal of* DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54216/IJNS.180208>

Process Management. New Technologies, 4(1), pp.30–40, 2016.