



New approach for subbisemiring of bisemiring is applied to complex cubic anti neutrosophic set and its extension

Aiyared Iampan^{1,*}, Murugan Palanikumar²

¹Department of Mathematics, School of Science, University of Phayao, 19 Moo 2, Tambon Mae Ka, Amphur Mueang, Phayao 56000, Thailand

²Department of Mathematics, Saveetha School of Engineering, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Chennai-602105, India

E-mails: aiyared.ia@up.ac.th; palanimaths86@gmail.com

Abstract

We construct and analyze the concept of complex cubic anti neutrosophic subbisemiring (ComCANSBS). We analyze the important properties and homomorphic aspects of ComCANSBS. For bisemirings, we propose the ComCANSBS level sets. A complex neutrosophic subset of bisemiring \mathbb{S} is represented by the symbol Γ if and only if each non-empty level set $R^{(\varphi, \kappa)}$, where $R = (\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{\Gamma}^{\top} \cdot e^{i\theta} \widehat{\mathfrak{S}}_{\Gamma}^{\top}, \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{\Gamma}^{\perp} \cdot e^{i\theta} \widehat{\mathfrak{S}}_{\Gamma}^{\perp}, \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{\Gamma}^F \cdot e^{i\theta} \widehat{\mathfrak{S}}_{\Gamma}^F, \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{\Gamma}^{\top} \cdot e^{i\theta} \widehat{\mathfrak{S}}_{\Gamma}^{\top}, \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{\Gamma}^{\perp} \cdot e^{i\theta} \widehat{\mathfrak{S}}_{\Gamma}^{\perp}, \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{\Gamma}^F \cdot e^{i\theta} \widehat{\mathfrak{S}}_{\Gamma}^F)$ is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} . Let Υ be a ComCANSBS of bisemiring \mathbb{S} . If and only if Υ is a ComCANSBS of $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$, then Γ is a ComCANSBS of bisemiring \mathbb{S} . Let Γ be the strongest complex anti neutrosophic relation of bisemiring \mathbb{S} . We show that homomorphic images of all ComCANSBSs are ComCANSBSs, and homomorphic pre-images of all ComCANSBSs are ComCANSBSs. There are examples given to illustrate our results.

Keywords: ComCANSBS; ComCNANSBS; SBS; homomorphism

1 Introduction

Zadeh¹ developed fuzzy set (FS) theory, which works best at handling ambiguity and uncertainty. An element in an FS is considered a member if it contains a single value inside the interval. However, since resistance can exist in real-world situations, the degree of non-membership does not necessarily equal one minus the degree of membership. As FS theory advances quickly, more and more hybrid fuzzy models are being developed. Numerous uncertain theories, including FS,¹ intuitionistic FS (IFS),² Pythagorean FS (PFS),³ and spherical FS (SFS),⁴ have been developed as a result of the uncertainties. Sets with grades ranging from 0 to 1, referred to as MG, comprise an FS. IFS is classified as MG, in spite of Atanassov² stating that non-membership grades (NMG) can only have a value of 1. There is a chance that, in a decision-making process, the sum of MGs and NMGs will sometimes exceed 1. The generalized MG and NMG logic, which has a value not exceeding 1 and is determined by the square of the MGs and NMGs, was constructed by Yager³ using PFS logic. These ideas are unable to explain the neutral state, which is neither positive nor negative. Cuong⁵ discussed the image with associates. Three grading points were utilized by FS: positive, neutral, and negative. These grades added together could not total more than 1. For some purposes, it is also superior to PFS or IFS. It is an independent generalization of three models that deals with the truth, indeterminacy, and falsity of FS and IFS.

The neutrosophic set (NS) was developed by Smarandache⁶ to deal with contradicting and ambiguous data. This reasoning establishes the degree to which a statement is true, ambiguous, or untrue. The notion of the complex fuzzy set (CFS) is presented by Ramot et al.⁷ There is a wide range of possible values for the membership functions of CFSs deals. The unit circle of the complex plane is extended to $[0, 1]$, but the unit circle of a fuzzy membership function is fixed. The CFS X is characterized by a membership function $\mu_X(x)$ that extends to the unit circle in the complex plane instead of only $[0, 1]$. Thus, $\mu_X(x)$ is a complex-valued function that assigns a grade of membership of the form $\eta_X(x) \cdot e^{i\tau_X(x)}$, where $i = \sqrt{-1}$, to any element x in the discourse universe. The value of $\mu_X(x)$ is defined by the two real-valued variables, $\eta_X(x)$ and $\tau_X(x)$, where $\eta_X(x) \in [0, 1]$. Semiring logic and its uses were introduced by Golan.⁸ Hussian and associates⁹ discussed the idea and application of bisemirings. The topic of bipolar-valued FSs and related procedures is covered by Lee.¹⁰ Ahsan et al. investigated fuzzy semirings.¹¹ The notion of bisemirings was first presented by Sen et al.¹² An intuitionistic fuzzy normal subbisemiring of bisemiring was recently presented by Palanikumar et al.¹³ The notion of bisemiring was established by Palanikumar et al.¹⁴ utilizing bipolar-valued neutrosophic normal sets. Recently, many authors discussed the new concepts such as neutrosophic set, fuzzy extension set and spirical fuzzy set¹⁵⁻²⁶. The following contributions are made to this study:

1. The intersection of a every ComCANSBSs is again a ComCANSBS of bisemiring \mathbb{S} .
2. Let Γ be a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} and Υ be a strongest complex cubic anti neutrosophic relation of \mathbb{S} . Then Γ is a ComCANSBS of bisemiring \mathbb{S} if and only if Υ is a ComCANSBS of $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$.
3. $R = (\mathfrak{R}_\Gamma^\top \cdot e^{i\theta} \mathfrak{S}_\Gamma^\top, \mathfrak{R}_\Gamma^\perp \cdot e^{i\theta} \mathfrak{S}_\Gamma^\perp, \mathfrak{R}_\Gamma^F \cdot e^{i\theta} \mathfrak{S}_\Gamma^F, \mathfrak{R}_\Gamma^\top \cdot e^{i\theta} \mathfrak{S}_\Gamma^\top, \mathfrak{R}_\Gamma^\perp \cdot e^{i\theta} \mathfrak{S}_\Gamma^\perp, \mathfrak{R}_\Gamma^F \cdot e^{i\theta} \mathfrak{S}_\Gamma^F)$ is a subbisemiring of \mathbb{S} for all $\varphi, \varkappa \in \mathbb{D}[0, 1]$.
4. The homomorphic image of every ComCANSBS is a ComCANSBS and homomorphic preimage of every ComCANSBS is a ComCANSBS.

We will look at certain aspects of the SBS and ComCANSBS concepts and make some conclusions. The article is divided into the following five sections. In Section 1, semirings and SBS are introduced. Section 2 contains information on semiring and SBS preparation. Listing of ComCANSBS properties is done in Section 3. Utilizing numerical examples are recommended for ComCANSBS evaluation. Section 4 indicates the outcome and future direction.

2 Preliminaries

Definition 2.1.¹² An algebraic structure $(\mathbb{S}, \uplus, \ominus, \odot)$ is a bisemiring, if $(\mathbb{S}, \uplus, \ominus)$ and $(\mathbb{S}, \ominus, \odot)$ are semirings, i.e., $(S, \uplus), (S, \ominus)$ and (\mathbb{S}, \odot) are semigroups and

1. $z_v \ominus (z_\zeta \uplus z_\eta) = (z_v \ominus z_\zeta) \uplus (z_v \ominus z_\eta),$
2. $(z_\zeta \uplus z_\eta) \ominus z_v = (z_\zeta \ominus z_v) \uplus (z_\eta \ominus z_v),$
3. $z_v \odot (z_\zeta \ominus z_\eta) = (z_v \odot z_\zeta) \ominus (z_v \odot z_\eta),$
4. $(z_\zeta \ominus z_\eta) \odot z_v = (z_\zeta \odot z_v) \ominus (z_\eta \odot z_v), \forall z_v, z_\zeta, z_\eta \in \mathbb{S}.$

Definition 2.2.⁶ A NS v in the universe \mathcal{U} is $v = \{x, u_v^\top(x), u_v^\perp(x), u_v^F(x) | x \in \mathcal{U}\}$, where $u_v^\top(x), u_v^\perp(x), u_v^F(x)$ represents the TD, ID and FD of v respectively. Consider the mapping $u_v^\top : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [0, 1], u_v^\perp : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [0, 1], u_v^F : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $0 \leq u_v^\top(x) + u_v^\perp(x) + u_v^F(x) \leq 3.$

Definition 2.3.⁶ Let $\psi_1 = \langle u_{\psi_1}^\top, u_{\psi_1}^\perp, u_{\psi_1}^F \rangle, \psi_2 = \langle u_{\psi_2}^\top, u_{\psi_2}^\perp, u_{\psi_2}^F \rangle$ and $\psi_3 = \langle u_{\psi_3}^\top, u_{\psi_3}^\perp, u_{\psi_3}^F \rangle$ be the three neutrosophic numbers over \mathcal{U} . Then

$$1. \psi_2 \ominus \psi_3 = \left\langle \max(\chi_{\psi_2}^\top, u_{\psi_3}^\top), \min(\chi_{\psi_2}^\perp, u_{\psi_3}^\perp), \min(\chi_{\psi_2}^F, u_{\psi_3}^F) \right\rangle,$$

2. $\psi_2 \otimes \psi_3 = \left\langle \min(\chi_{\psi_2}^\top, u_{\psi_3}^\top), \max(\chi_{\psi_2}^\downarrow, u_{\psi_3}^\downarrow), \max(\chi_{\psi_2}^F, u_{\psi_3}^F) \right\rangle$,
3. $\psi_2 \geq \psi_3$ iff $u_{\psi_2}^\top \geq u_{\psi_3}^\top$ and $u_{\psi_2}^\downarrow \leq u_{\psi_3}^\downarrow$ and $u_{\psi_2}^F \leq u_{\psi_3}^F$,
4. $\psi_2 = \psi_3$ iff $u_{\psi_2}^\top = u_{\psi_3}^\top$ and $u_{\psi_2}^\downarrow = u_{\psi_3}^\downarrow$ and $u_{\psi_2}^F = u_{\psi_3}^F$.

Definition 2.4. ⁶ For any NS $\psi = \{x, \chi_v^\top(x), \chi_v^\downarrow(x), \chi_v^F(x)\}$ of \mathcal{U} . Then (ζ, τ) -cut is defined as $\{x \in U | \chi_v^\top(x) \geq \zeta, \chi_v^\downarrow(x) \geq \zeta, \chi_v^F(x) \leq \tau\}$.

Definition 2.5. ⁶ Let V and Y be two NSs of S . Then Cartesian product of V and Y is defined as $V \times Y = \{\chi_{V \times Y}^\top(\chi, \psi), \chi_{V \times Y}^\downarrow(\chi, \psi), \chi_{V \times Y}^F(\chi, \psi) | \text{for all } \chi, \psi \in S\}$, where

$$\chi_{V \times Y}^\top(\chi, \psi) = \min\{\chi_V^\top(x), \chi_Y^\top(\psi)\}, \chi_{V \times Y}^\downarrow(\chi, \psi) = \frac{\chi_V^\downarrow(x) + \chi_Y^\downarrow(\psi)}{2}, \chi_{V \times Y}^F(\chi, \psi) = \max\{\chi_V^F(x), \chi_Y^F(\psi)\}.$$

Definition 2.6. A fuzzy subset v of a bisemiring $(\mathbb{S}, \circ_1, \circ_2, \circ_3)$ is represents a fuzzy subbisemiring of \mathbb{S} if $\chi_v(\chi \circ_1 \varepsilon) \geq \min\{\chi_v(x), \chi_v(\varepsilon)\}, \chi_v(\chi \circ_2 \varepsilon) \geq \min\{\chi_v(x), \chi_v(\varepsilon)\}, \chi_v(\chi \circ_3 \varepsilon) \geq \min\{\chi_v(x), \chi_v(\varepsilon)\}$, for all $\chi, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{S}$.

3 Complex cubic anti neutrosophic subbisemiring

Here \mathbb{S} denotes bisemiring unless other stated, Ψ stands for real part and Ξ stands for imaginary part and $\mathbb{k} = 2\pi$.

Definition 3.1. The complex cubic anti neutrosophic set(ComCANS) \aleph in universal set \mathcal{U} ,

$$\aleph = \{\zeta, \overbrace{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}} : \zeta \in \mathcal{U}\},$$

where $\overbrace{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}} = [\Psi_N^{\top L}, \Psi_N^{\top U}]$, $\overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} = [\Psi_N^{\downarrow L}, \Psi_N^{\downarrow U}]$, $\overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} = [\Psi_N^{F L}, \Psi_N^{F U}]$ and $\overbrace{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow D[0, 1]$ and $\overbrace{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ represents the truth degree, indeterminacy degree and false degree respectively.

For simplicity the symbol $\overbrace{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}$ is ComCANS $\aleph = \{\zeta, \overbrace{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}} : \zeta \in \mathcal{U}\}$.

Definition 3.2. Let $\aleph = \left\{ \zeta, \overbrace{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}$ and

$$\Sigma = \left\{ \zeta, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \Psi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}$$
 be two ComCANSs of \mathcal{U} .

Then we define the intersection and union operation is defined as

- (i) $\aleph \cap \Sigma = \left\{ \left(\zeta, \max\left\{ \overbrace{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}, \max\left\{ \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}, \max\left\{ \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}, \max\left\{ \Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \Psi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}, \max\left\{ \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}, \min\left\{ \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\} \right\} | \zeta \in \mathcal{U}$.
- (ii) $\aleph \cup \Sigma = \left\{ \left(\zeta, \min\left\{ \overbrace{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}, \min\left\{ \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}, \max\left\{ \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}, \min\left\{ \Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \Psi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\top(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\top(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}, \min\left\{ \overbrace{\Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{\downarrow(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\}, \max\left\{ \overbrace{\Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_N^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_N^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}}, \overbrace{\Psi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Psi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}} \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k}\overbrace{\Xi_\Sigma^F(\zeta, \partial)}^{\Xi_\Sigma^{F(\zeta, \partial)}}} \right\} \right\} | \zeta \in \mathcal{U}$.

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \vartheta)} &\leq \max\{\Psi_N^{\top}(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\top}(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_N^{\top}(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\top}(\rho, \vartheta)}\} \\ \Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta)} &\leq \max\{\Psi_N^{\top}(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\top}(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_N^{\top}(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\top}(\rho, \vartheta)}\} \\ \Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta)} &\leq \max\{\Psi_N^{\top}(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\top}(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_N^{\top}(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\top}(\rho, \vartheta)}\} \end{aligned} \right\}$$

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \Psi_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \vartheta)} &\leq \frac{\Psi_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \vartheta)} + \Psi_N^{\downarrow}(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\rho, \vartheta)}}{2} \\ \text{OR} \\ \Psi_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta)} &\leq \frac{\Psi_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \vartheta)} + \Psi_N^{\downarrow}(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\rho, \vartheta)}}{2} \\ \text{OR} \\ \Psi_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta)} &\leq \frac{\Psi_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \vartheta)} + \Psi_N^{\downarrow}(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\rho, \vartheta)}}{2} \end{aligned} \right\}$$

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \Psi_N^f((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^f((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \vartheta)} &\geq \min\{\Psi_N^f(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^f(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_N^f(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^f(\rho, \vartheta)}\} \\ \Psi_N^f((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^f((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta)} &\geq \min\{\Psi_N^f(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^f(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_N^f(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^f(\rho, \vartheta)}\} \\ \Psi_N^f((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^f((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta)} &\geq \min\{\Psi_N^f(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^f(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_N^f(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^f(\rho, \vartheta)}\} \end{aligned} \right\}$$

for all $\zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}$.

Example 3.6. Consider the bisemiring $\mathbb{S} = \{\varsigma_1, \varsigma_2, \varsigma_3, \varsigma_4\}$ with the Cayley table:

\ddagger_1	ς_1	ς_2	ς_3	ς_4	\ddagger_2	ς_1	ς_2	ς_3	ς_4	\ddagger_3	ς_1	ς_2	ς_3	ς_4
ς_1	ς_1	ς_1	ς_1	ς_1	ς_1	ς_1	ς_2	ς_3	ς_4	ς_1	ς_1	ς_1	ς_1	ς_1
ς_2	ς_1	ς_2	ς_1	ς_2	ς_2	ς_2	ς_2	ς_4	ς_4	ς_2	ς_1	ς_2	ς_3	ς_4
ς_3	ς_1	ς_1	ς_3	ς_3	ς_3	ς_3	ς_4	ς_3	ς_4	ς_3	ς_4	ς_4	ς_4	ς_4
ς_4	ς_1	ς_2	ς_3	ς_4	ς_4	ς_4	ς_4	ς_4	ς_4	ς_4	ς_4	ς_4	ς_4	ς_4

	$(\xi) = \varsigma_1$	$(\xi) = \varsigma_2$
$(\Psi_N^{\top}, \Xi_N^{\top})(\xi)$	$[0.75e^{i2\pi(0.65)}, 0.8e^{i2\pi(0.7)}]$	$[0.8e^{i2\pi(0.75)}, 0.85e^{i2\pi(0.8)}]$
$(\Psi_N^{\downarrow}, \Xi_N^{\downarrow})(\xi)$	$[0.65e^{i2\pi(0.75)}, 0.7e^{i2\pi(0.8)}]$	$[0.7e^{i2\pi(0.8)}, 0.75e^{i2\pi(0.85)}]$
$(\Psi_N^f, \Xi_N^f)(\xi)$	$[0.75e^{i2\pi(0.6)}, 0.8e^{i2\pi(0.65)}]$	$[0.65e^{i2\pi(0.7)}, 0.7e^{i2\pi(0.75)}]$

	$(\xi) = \varsigma_3$	$(\xi) = \varsigma_4$
$(\Psi_N^{\top}, \Xi_N^{\top})(\xi)$	$[0.9e^{i2\pi(0.85)}, 0.95e^{i2\pi(0.9)}]$	$[0.85e^{i2\pi(0.8)}, 0.9e^{i2\pi(0.85)}]$
$(\Psi_N^{\downarrow}, \Xi_N^{\downarrow})(\xi)$	$[0.85e^{i2\pi(0.95)}, 0.9e^{i2\pi(1)}]$	$[0.75e^{i2\pi(0.85)}, 0.8e^{i2\pi(0.9)}]$
$(\Psi_N^f, \Xi_N^f)(\xi)$	$[0.45e^{i2\pi(0.9)}, 0.55e^{i2\pi(0.95)}]$	$[0.55e^{i2\pi(0.8)}, 0.6e^{i2\pi(0.85)}]$

	$(\xi) = \varsigma_1$	$(\xi) = \varsigma_2$
$(\Psi_N^{\top}, \Xi_N^{\top})(\xi)$	$0.7e^{i2\pi(0.85)}$	$0.75e^{i2\pi(0.9)}$
$(\Psi_N^{\downarrow}, \Xi_N^{\downarrow})(\xi)$	$0.55e^{i2\pi(0.8)}$	$0.65e^{i2\pi(0.85)}$
$(\Psi_N^f, \Xi_N^f)(\xi)$	$0.9e^{i2\pi(0.75)}$	$0.8e^{i2\pi(0.65)}$

	$(\xi) = \varsigma_3$	$(\xi) = \varsigma_4$
$(\Psi_N^{\top}, \Xi_N^{\top})(\xi)$	$0.85e^{i2\pi(1)}$	$0.8e^{i2\pi(0.95)}$
$(\Psi_N^{\downarrow}, \Xi_N^{\downarrow})(\xi)$	$0.75e^{i2\pi(0.95)}$	$0.7e^{i2\pi(0.9)}$
$(\Psi_N^f, \Xi_N^f)(\xi)$	$0.6e^{i2\pi(0.45)}$	$0.7e^{i2\pi(0.55)}$

Hence, \aleph is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} .

Theorem 3.7. *The intersection of a every ComCANSBSs is again a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} .*

Proof. Let $\{\widehat{h}_i : i \in I\}$ be the family of ComCANSBSs of \mathbb{S} and $\aleph = \bigcap_{i \in I} \widehat{h}_i$. Let $\zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}$.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} &= \sup_{i \in I} \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in I} \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\} \\ &= \max\left\{\sup_{i \in I} \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \sup_{i \in I} \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\right\} \\ &= \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial)} &\leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\}, \\ \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial)} &\leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} &= \sup_{i \in I} \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in I} \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial)} + \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial)}}{2} \\ &= \frac{\sup_{i \in I} \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial)} + \sup_{i \in I} \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial)}}{2} \\ &= \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial)} + \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial)}}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial)} &\leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial)} + \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial)}}{2} \text{ and} \\ \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial)} &\leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial)} + \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial)}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^f((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^f((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} &= \inf_{i \in I} \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^f((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^f((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} \\ &\geq \inf_{i \in I} \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^f(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^f(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^f(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^f(\rho, \partial)}\} \\ &= \min\left\{\inf_{i \in I} \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^f(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^f(\zeta, \partial)}, \inf_{i \in I} \widehat{\Psi}_{h_i}^f(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{h_i}^f(\rho, \partial)}\right\} \\ &= \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^f(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^f(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^f(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^f(\rho, \partial)}\} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^f((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^f((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial)} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^f(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^f(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^f(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{i\mathbb{k} \widehat{\Xi}_{\aleph}^f(\rho, \partial)}\} \text{ and}$$

$\widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^F((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial)} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial)}\}$.
 Let $\{\tilde{h}_i : i \in I\}$ be the family of ComCANSBSs of \mathbb{S} and $\aleph = \bigcap_{i \in I} \tilde{h}_i$. Let $\zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}$.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} &= \sup_{i \in I} \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in I} \max\{\Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\} \\ &= \max\left\{\sup_{i \in I} \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \sup_{i \in I} \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\right\} \\ &= \max\{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial)} &\leq \max\{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\}, \\ \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial)} &\leq \max\{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} &= \sup_{i \in I} \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in I} \frac{\Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial)} + \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial)}}{2} \\ &= \frac{\sup_{i \in I} \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial)} + \sup_{i \in I} \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial)}}{2} \\ &= \frac{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial)} + \Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial)}}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial)} &\leq \frac{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial)} + \Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial)}}{2} \text{ and} \\ \Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial)} &\leq \frac{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial)} + \Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\rho, \partial)}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\aleph}^F((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} &= \inf_{i \in I} \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^F((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} \\ &\geq \inf_{i \in I} \min\{\Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^F(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^F(\rho, \partial)}\} \\ &= \min\left\{\inf_{i \in I} \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^F(\zeta, \partial)}, \inf_{i \in I} \Psi_{\tilde{h}_i}^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\tilde{h}_i}^F(\rho, \partial)}\right\} \\ &= \min\{\Psi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial)}\} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\aleph}^F((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \partial)} &\geq \min\{\Psi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial)}\} \text{ and} \\ \Psi_{\aleph}^F((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \partial)} &\geq \min\{\Psi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, \aleph is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} .

Theorem 3.8. If \aleph and Σ be the ComCANSBSs of \mathbb{S}_1 and \mathbb{S}_2 respectively, then $\widehat{\aleph \times \Sigma}$ is a ComCANSBS of $\mathbb{S}_1 \times \mathbb{S}_2$.

Proof. Let $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{S}_1$ and $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathbb{S}_2$. Then (ζ_1, ρ_1) and (ζ_2, ρ_2) are in $\mathbb{S}_1 \times \mathbb{S}_2$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)] \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)]} \\ &= \widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)} \\ &= \max\{\widehat{\Psi_N^T} ((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_N^T} ((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)}, \widehat{\Psi_\Sigma^T} ((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_\Sigma^T} ((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)}\} \\ &\leq \max\{\max\{\widehat{\Psi_N^T} (\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_N^T} (\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi_N^T} (\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_N^T} (\zeta_2)}\}, \\ &\quad \max\{\widehat{\Psi_\Sigma^T} (\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_\Sigma^T} (\rho_1)}, \widehat{\Psi_\Sigma^T} (\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_\Sigma^T} (\rho_2)}\}\} \\ &= \max\{\max\{\widehat{\Psi_N^T} (\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_N^T} (\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi_\Sigma^T} (\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_\Sigma^T} (\rho_1)}\}, \\ &\quad \max\{\widehat{\Psi_N^T} (\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_N^T} (\zeta_2)}, \widehat{\Psi_\Sigma^T} (\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_\Sigma^T} (\rho_2)}\}\} \\ &= \max\{\widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)}, \widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)}\} \end{aligned}$$

Also $\widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)] \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)]}$
 $\leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)}, \widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)}\}$

and $\widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)] \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)]}$
 $\leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)}, \widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^T} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)}\}.$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)] \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)]} \\ &= \widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)} \\ &= \frac{\widehat{\Psi_N^J} ((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} + \widehat{\Psi_\Sigma^J} ((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)}}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\widehat{\Psi_N^J} (\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_N^J} (\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi_N^J} (\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_N^J} (\zeta_2)}}{2} + \frac{\widehat{\Psi_\Sigma^J} (\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_\Sigma^J} (\rho_1)} + \widehat{\Psi_\Sigma^J} (\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_\Sigma^J} (\rho_2)}}{2} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\widehat{\Psi_N^J} (\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_N^J} (\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi_\Sigma^J} (\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_\Sigma^J} (\rho_1)}}{2} + \frac{\widehat{\Psi_N^J} (\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_N^J} (\zeta_2)} + \widehat{\Psi_\Sigma^J} (\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_\Sigma^J} (\rho_2)}}{2} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)} + \widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)] \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)]} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)} + \widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)} \right]$$

and

$$\widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)] \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} [((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)]} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)} + \widehat{\Psi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi_{N \times \Sigma}^J} ((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)} \right]$$

$$\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)}}}.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))}} \\ = & \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)}} \\ = & \min\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N}}^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\Sigma}^F((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)}}\} \\ \geq & \min\{\min\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N}}^F(\zeta_1)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N}}^F(\zeta_1)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N}}^F(\zeta_2)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N}}^F(\zeta_2)}}\}, \\ & \min\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_1)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_1)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_2)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_2)}}\}\} \\ = & \min\{\min\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N}}^F(\zeta_1)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N}}^F(\zeta_1)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_1)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_1)}}\}, \\ & \min\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N}}^F(\zeta_2)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N}}^F(\zeta_2)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_2)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_2)}}\}\} \\ = & \min\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)}}\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Also } & \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))}} \\ \geq & \min\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)}}\}, \\ & \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))}} \\ \geq & \min\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{S}_1$ and $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathbb{S}_2$. Then (ζ_1, ρ_1) and (ζ_2, ρ_2) are in $\mathbb{S}_1 \times \mathbb{S}_2$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} & \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))}} \\ = & \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)}} \\ = & \max\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N}}^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N}}^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\Sigma}^T((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\Sigma}^T((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)}}\} \\ \leq & \max\{\max\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N}}^T(\zeta_1)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N}}^T(\zeta_1)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N}}^T(\zeta_2)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N}}^T(\zeta_2)}}\}, \max\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\Sigma}^T(\rho_1)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\Sigma}^T(\rho_1)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\Sigma}^T(\rho_2)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\Sigma}^T(\rho_2)}}\}\} \\ = & \max\{\max\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N}}^T(\zeta_1)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N}}^T(\zeta_1)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\Sigma}^T(\rho_1)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\Sigma}^T(\rho_1)}}\}, \max\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N}}^T(\zeta_2)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N}}^T(\zeta_2)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\Sigma}^T(\rho_2)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\Sigma}^T(\rho_2)}}\}\} \\ = & \max\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)}}\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Also } & \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))}} \\ \leq & \max\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)}}\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{and } & \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta))}} \\ \leq & \max\{\overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \vartheta)}}, \overbrace{\Psi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)} \cdot e^{ik \overbrace{\Xi_{\mathbb{N} \times \Sigma}^T((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \vartheta)}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial))} \\
 = & \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)} \\
 = & \frac{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \partial)} + \Psi_{\Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}}{2} \\
 \leq & \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1)} + \Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta_2)}}{2} + \frac{\Psi_{\Sigma}^{\downarrow}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\Sigma}^{\downarrow}(\rho_1)} + \Psi_{\Sigma}^{\downarrow}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\Sigma}^{\downarrow}(\rho_2)}}{2} \right] \\
 = & \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1)} + \Psi_{\Sigma}^{\downarrow}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\Sigma}^{\downarrow}(\rho_1)}}{2} + \frac{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}(\zeta_2)} + \Psi_{\Sigma}^{\downarrow}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\Sigma}^{\downarrow}(\rho_2)}}{2} \right] \\
 = & \frac{1}{2} \left[\Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial)} + \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)} \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial))} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial)} + \right. \\
 & \left. \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)} \right] \\
 \text{and} \\
 & \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial))} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial)} + \right. \\
 & \left. \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^{\downarrow}((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)} \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_1 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial))} \\
 = & \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2, \rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)} \\
 = & \min\{\Psi_{\aleph}^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \partial)}, \Psi_{\Sigma}^F((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\Sigma}^F((\rho_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}\} \\
 \geq & \min\{\min\{\Psi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta_2)}\}, \min\{\Psi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_1)}, \Psi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_2)}\}\} \\
 = & \min\{\min\{\Psi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_1)}\}, \min\{\Psi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta_2)}, \Psi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\Sigma}^F(\rho_2)}\}\} \\
 = & \min\{\Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial)}, \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)}\}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Also } & \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_2 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial))} \\
 \geq & \min\{\Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial)}, \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)}\}, \\
 & \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F(((\zeta_1, \rho_1) \ddagger_3 (\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial))} \\
 \geq & \min\{\Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_1, \rho_1), \partial)}, \Psi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_{\aleph \times \Sigma}^F((\zeta_2, \rho_2), \partial)}\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\widehat{\aleph \times \Sigma}$ is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} .

Corollary 3.9. If $\aleph_1, \aleph_2, \dots, \aleph_n$ be the finite collection of ComCANSBSs of $\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{S}_2, \dots, \mathbb{S}_n$ respectively. Then $\aleph_1 \times \aleph_2 \times \dots \times \aleph_n$ is a ComCANSBS of $\mathbb{S}_1 \times \mathbb{S}_2 \times \dots \times \mathbb{S}_n$.

Definition 3.10. Let $\aleph \subseteq \mathbb{S}$, the strongest ComCAN relation on \mathbb{S} is

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned}
 & \widehat{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}((\zeta, \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}}((\zeta, \rho), \partial) = \min\{\widehat{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}}(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}}(\rho, \partial)\} \\
 & \widehat{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}((\zeta, \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}}((\zeta, \rho), \partial) = \frac{\widehat{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}}(\zeta, \partial) + \widehat{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi_{\aleph}^{\downarrow}}}(\rho, \partial)}{2} \\
 & \widehat{\Psi_{\aleph}^F}((\zeta, \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi_{\aleph}^F}}((\zeta, \rho), \partial) = \max\{\widehat{\Psi_{\aleph}^F}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi_{\aleph}^F}}(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi_{\aleph}^F}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi_{\aleph}^F}}(\rho, \partial)\}
 \end{aligned} \right.$$

Theorem 3.11. Let \aleph be a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} and $\widehat{\aleph}$ be a strongest complex cubic anti neutrosophic relation of \mathbb{S} . Then \aleph is a ComCANSBS of $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$ if and only if $\widehat{\aleph}$ is a ComCANSBS of $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$.

Proof. Suppose \aleph is a ComCANSBS of $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$ and $\widehat{\aleph}$ be the strongest complex cubic anti neutrosophic relation of \mathbb{S} .

For any $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \rho = (\rho_1, \rho_2) \in S \times \mathbb{S}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}((\zeta \dagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}((\zeta \dagger_1 \rho), \partial) \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}[\overbrace{((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \dagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial))}^{\zeta \dagger_1 (\rho_1, \rho_2)}] \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}[\overbrace{((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \dagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial))}^{\zeta \dagger_1 (\rho_1, \rho_2)}] \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}(\zeta_1 \dagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \dagger_1 \rho_2) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}(\zeta_1 \dagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \dagger_1 \rho_2) \\ &= \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \dagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \dagger_1 \rho_1), \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}((\zeta_2 \dagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}((\zeta_2 \dagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)\} \\ &\leq \max\{\max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\zeta_1), \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\rho_1)\}, \\ &\quad \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\zeta_2), \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\rho_2)\}\} \\ &= \max\{\max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\zeta_1), \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\zeta_2)\}, \\ &\quad \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\rho_1), \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\rho_2)\}\} \\ &= \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial)\} \\ &= \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}(\rho, \partial)\} \end{aligned}$$

Also $\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}((\zeta \dagger_2 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}((\zeta \dagger_2 \rho), \partial) \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}(\rho, \partial)\},$
 $\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}((\zeta \dagger_3 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}((\zeta \dagger_3 \rho), \partial) \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}(\rho, \partial)\}.$

Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}(\zeta \dagger_1 \rho) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}(\zeta \dagger_1 \rho)$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}[\overbrace{((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \dagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial))}^{\zeta \dagger_1 (\rho_1, \rho_2)}] \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}[\overbrace{((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \dagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial))}^{\zeta \dagger_1 (\rho_1, \rho_2)}] \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}(\zeta_1 \dagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \dagger_1 \rho_2) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}(\zeta_1 \dagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \dagger_1 \rho_2) \\ &= \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_1 \dagger_1 \rho_1) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_1 \dagger_1 \rho_1) + \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_2 \dagger_1 \rho_2) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_2 \dagger_1 \rho_2)}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_1) + \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\dagger}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\dagger}(\rho_1)}{2} + \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_2) + \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\dagger}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\dagger}(\rho_2)}{2} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_1) + \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\dagger}(\zeta_2)}{2} + \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\dagger}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\dagger}(\rho_1) + \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\dagger}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\dagger}(\rho_2)}{2} \right] \\ &= \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) + \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial)}{2} \\ &= \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}(\zeta, \partial) + \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}(\rho, \partial)}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Also $\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}((\zeta \dagger_2 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}((\zeta \dagger_2 \rho), \partial) \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}(\zeta, \partial) + \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}(\rho, \partial)}{2}$

and $\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}((\zeta \dagger_3 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}((\zeta \dagger_3 \rho), \partial) \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}(\zeta, \partial) + \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\dagger}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\dagger}(\rho, \partial)}{2}.$

Similarly, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^F((\zeta \dagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^F((\zeta \dagger_1 \rho), \partial) \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^F(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^F(\rho, \partial)\},$

$\widehat{\Psi}_h^F((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta)} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\rho, \vartheta)}\}$ and
 $\widehat{\Psi}_h^F((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta)} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\rho, \vartheta)}\}$.
 For any $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \rho = (\rho_1, \rho_2) \in \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_h^\top((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \vartheta)} \\ &= \Psi_h^\top[(((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \vartheta) \ddagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \vartheta))] \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top[(((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \vartheta) \ddagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \vartheta))]} \\ &= \Psi_h^\top(\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top(\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2)} \\ &= \max\{\Psi_N^\top((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \vartheta)}, \Psi_N^\top((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)}\} \\ &\leq \max\{\max\{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^\top(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top(\rho_1)}\}, \\ &\quad \max\{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top(\zeta_2)}, \Psi_N^\top(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top(\rho_2)}\}\} \\ &= \max\{\max\{\Psi_N^\top(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^\top(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top(\zeta_2)}\}, \\ &\quad \max\{\Psi_N^\top(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top(\rho_1)}, \Psi_N^\top(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top(\rho_2)}\}\} \\ &= \max\{\Psi_h^\top((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \vartheta)}, \Psi_h^\top((\rho_1, \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top((\rho_1, \rho_2), \vartheta)}\} \\ &= \max\{\Psi_h^\top(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_h^\top(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top(\rho, \vartheta)}\} \end{aligned}$$

Also $\Psi_h^\top((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta)} \leq \max\{\Psi_h^\top(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_h^\top(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top(\rho, \vartheta)}\}$,
 $\Psi_h^\top((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta)} \leq \max\{\Psi_h^\top(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_h^\top(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\top(\rho, \vartheta)}\}$.
 Now, $\Psi_h^\ddagger(\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger(\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho)}$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \Psi_h^\ddagger[(((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \vartheta) \ddagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \vartheta))] \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger[(((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \vartheta) \ddagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \vartheta))]} \\ &= \Psi_h^\ddagger((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)} \\ &= \frac{\Psi_N^\ddagger((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\ddagger((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \vartheta)} + \Psi_N^\ddagger((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\ddagger((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \vartheta)}}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\Psi_N^\ddagger(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\ddagger(\zeta_1)} + \Psi_N^\ddagger(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\ddagger(\rho_1)}}{2} + \frac{\Psi_N^\ddagger(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\ddagger(\zeta_2)} + \Psi_N^\ddagger(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\ddagger(\rho_2)}}{2} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\Psi_N^\ddagger(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\ddagger(\zeta_1)} + \Psi_N^\ddagger(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\ddagger(\zeta_2)}}{2} + \frac{\Psi_N^\ddagger(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\ddagger(\rho_1)} + \Psi_N^\ddagger(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\ddagger(\rho_2)}}{2} \right] \\ &= \frac{\Psi_h^\ddagger((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \vartheta)} + \Psi_h^\ddagger((\rho_1, \rho_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger((\rho_1, \rho_2), \vartheta)}}{2} \\ &= \frac{\Psi_h^\ddagger(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger(\zeta, \vartheta)} + \Psi_h^\ddagger(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger(\rho, \vartheta)}}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Also $\Psi_h^\ddagger((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta)} \leq \frac{\Psi_h^\ddagger(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger(\zeta, \vartheta)} + \Psi_h^\ddagger(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger(\rho, \vartheta)}}{2}$

and $\Psi_h^\ddagger((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta)} \leq \frac{\Psi_h^\ddagger(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger(\zeta, \vartheta)} + \Psi_h^\ddagger(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^\ddagger(\rho, \vartheta)}}{2}$.

Similarly, $\Psi_h^F((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \vartheta)} \geq \min\{\Psi_h^F(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_h^F(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\rho, \vartheta)}\}$,
 $\Psi_h^F((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F((\zeta \ddagger_2 \rho), \vartheta)} \geq \min\{\Psi_h^F(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_h^F(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\rho, \vartheta)}\}$ and
 $\Psi_h^F((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F((\zeta \ddagger_3 \rho), \vartheta)} \geq \min\{\Psi_h^F(\zeta, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\zeta, \vartheta)}, \Psi_h^F(\rho, \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\rho, \vartheta)}\}$.

Therefore, \tilde{h} is a ComCANSBS of $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$.

Conversely, suppose that \tilde{h} is a ComCANSBS of $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$. Let $\zeta = ((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \vartheta), \rho = ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \vartheta) \in \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}\} \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2)} \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_h^T(((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \ddagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_v^T(((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \ddagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial))} \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho)} \\ &\leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\rho, \partial)}\} \\ &= \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^T((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^T((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial)}\} \\ &= \max\{\max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\zeta_2)}\}, \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\rho_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\rho_2)}\}\} \end{aligned}$$

If $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\zeta_1)} \geq \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\zeta_2)}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\rho_1)} \geq \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\rho_2)}$. We get $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\rho_1)}\}$ for all $\zeta_1, \rho_1 \in \mathbb{S}$, and $\max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial)}\} \leq \max\{\max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\zeta_2)}\}, \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\rho_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\rho_2)}\}\}$

If $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\rho_1)}\}$.

$\max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial)}\} \leq \max\{\max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\zeta_2)}\}, \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\rho_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\rho_2)}\}\}$

If $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^T(\rho_1)}\}$.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \left[\widehat{\Psi}_N^J((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^J((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^J((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^J((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)} \right] \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_h^J(\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J(\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2)} \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_h^J(((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \ddagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J(((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \ddagger_1 ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial))} \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_h^J(\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J(\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho, \partial)} \\ &\leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^J(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J(\zeta, \partial)} + \widehat{\Psi}_h^J(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J(\rho, \partial)}}{2} \\ &= \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^J((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial)} + \widehat{\Psi}_h^J((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial)}}{2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^J(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^J(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^J(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^J(\zeta_2)}}{2} + \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^J(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^J(\rho_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^J(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^J(\rho_2)}}{2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

If $\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1)} \geq \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta_2)}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\rho_1)} \geq \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\rho_2)}$.

We get $\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\rho_1)}}{2}$.

Similarly, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\rho_1)}}{2}$

and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\downarrow}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\downarrow}(\rho_1)}}{2}$.

Similarly to prove that

$\min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}\} \geq \min\{\min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}, \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\rho_2)}\}\}$

If $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)} \leq \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\rho_1)} \leq \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\rho_2)}$.

We get $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}\}$.

$\min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial)}\} \geq \min\{\min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}, \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\rho_2)}\}\}$

If $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}\}$.

$\min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial)}\} \geq \min\{\min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}, \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\rho_2)}\}\}$

If $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}\}$.

Let $\zeta = ((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial), \rho = ((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial) \in \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\{\Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)}, \Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}\} \\ &= \Psi_h^{\top}(\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_h^{\top}(\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2)} \\ &= \Psi_h^{\top}([(\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial] \ddagger_1 [(\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial]) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_v^{\top}([(\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial] \ddagger_1 [(\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial])} \\ &= \Psi_h^{\top}(\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_h^{\top}(\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho)} \\ &\leq \max\{\Psi_h^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_h^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_h^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_h^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\} \\ &= \max\{\Psi_h^{\top}((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial)\} \cdot e^{ik \Xi_h^{\top}((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial)}, \Psi_h^{\top}((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_h^{\top}((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial)}\} \\ &= \max\{\max\{\Psi_N^{\top}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^{\top}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\zeta_2)}\}, \max\{\Psi_N^{\top}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\rho_1)}, \Psi_N^{\top}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\rho_2)}\}\} \end{aligned}$$

If $\Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\Psi_N^{\top}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\zeta_1)} \geq \Psi_N^{\top}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\zeta_2)}$ and $\Psi_N^{\top}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\rho_1)} \geq \Psi_N^{\top}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\rho_2)}$. We get $\Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \max\{\Psi_N^{\top}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^{\top}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\rho_1)}\}$ for all $\zeta_1, \rho_1 \in \mathbb{S}$, and

$\max\{\Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)}, \Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial)}\} \leq \max\{\max\{\Psi_N^{\top}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^{\top}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\zeta_2)}\}, \max\{\Psi_N^{\top}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\rho_1)}, \Psi_N^{\top}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\rho_2)}\}\}$

If $\Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\Psi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \min\{\Psi_N^{\top}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^{\top}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_N^{\top}(\rho_1)}\}$.

$e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \max\{\Psi_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^T(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\rho_1)}\}$.
 $\max\{\Psi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)}, \Psi_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial)}\} \leq \max\{\max\{\Psi_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)}\}, \max\{\Psi_N^T(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\rho_1)}, \Psi_N^T(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\rho_2)}\}\}$
 If $\Psi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \Psi_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\Psi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \max\{\Psi_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^T(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\rho_1)}\}$.
 Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2} \left[\Psi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} + \Psi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)} \right] \\
 &= \Psi_h^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1, \zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2)} \\
 &= \Psi_h^{\ddagger}[(\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial] \ddagger_1 [(\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial] \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^{\ddagger}[(\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial] \ddagger_1 [(\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial]} \\
 &= \Psi_h^{\ddagger}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^{\ddagger}((\zeta \ddagger_1 \rho), \partial)} \\
 &\leq \frac{\Psi_h^{\ddagger}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^{\ddagger}(\zeta, \partial)} + \Psi_h^{\ddagger}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^{\ddagger}(\rho, \partial)}}{2} \\
 &= \frac{\Psi_h^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1, \zeta_2), \partial)} + \Psi_h^{\ddagger}((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^{\ddagger}((\rho_1, \rho_2), \partial)}}{2} \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1)} + \Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_2)}}{2} + \frac{\Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_1)} + \Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_2)}}{2} \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

If $\Psi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \Psi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1)} \geq \Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_2)}$ and $\Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_1)} \geq \Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_2)}$.

We get $\Psi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \frac{\Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1)} + \Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_1)}}{2}$.

Similarly, $\Psi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \frac{\Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1)} + \Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_1)}}{2}$

and $\Psi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \frac{\Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\zeta_1)} + \Psi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}(\rho_1)}}{2}$.

Similarly to prove that

$\min\{\Psi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)}, \Psi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}\}$
 $\geq \min\{\min\{\Psi_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}, \min\{\Psi_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}, \Psi_N^F(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\rho_2)}\}\}$

If $\Psi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \Psi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_1 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\Psi_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)} \leq \Psi_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}$ and $\Psi_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\rho_1)} \leq \Psi_N^F(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\rho_2)}$.

We get $\Psi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \min\{\Psi_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}\}$.

$\min\{\Psi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)}, \Psi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial)}\}$
 $\geq \min\{\min\{\Psi_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}, \min\{\Psi_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}, \Psi_N^F(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\rho_2)}\}\}$

If $\Psi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \Psi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_2 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\Psi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \min\{\Psi_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}\}$.

$\min\{\Psi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)}, \Psi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial)}\}$
 $\geq \min\{\min\{\Psi_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}, \min\{\Psi_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}, \Psi_N^F(\rho_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\rho_2)}\}\}$

If $\Psi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)} \leq \Psi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_2 \ddagger_3 \rho_2), \partial)}$, then $\Psi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \rho_1), \partial)} \geq \min\{\Psi_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \Psi_N^F(\rho_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\rho_1)}\}$.

Therefore, \aleph is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} .

Theorem 3.12. Suppose that \aleph is a subset of \mathbb{S} . Then $R = (\widehat{\Psi_N^T} \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T}, \widehat{\Psi_N^{\ddagger}} \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}}, \widehat{\Psi_N^F} \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F}, \Psi_N^T, e^{ik\Xi_N^T}, \Psi_N^{\ddagger} \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}}, \Psi_N^F \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F})$ is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} if and only if $\Psi^{(\beta, \delta)}$ is a SBS of \mathbb{S} for all $\beta, \delta \in D[0, 1]$.

Proof. Assume that $\widehat{\Psi}$ is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} . For each $\beta, \delta \in D[0, 1]$ and $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \Psi^{(\beta, \delta)}$. Now, $\widehat{\Psi_N^T}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T}(\zeta_1) \leq \beta$, $\widehat{\Psi_N^T}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T}(\zeta_2) \leq \beta$ and $\widehat{\Psi_N^{\ddagger}}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}}(\zeta_1) \leq \beta$, $\widehat{\Psi_N^{\ddagger}}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^{\ddagger}}(\zeta_2) \leq \beta$ and $\widehat{\Psi_N^F}(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F}(\zeta_1) \geq \delta$, $\widehat{\Psi_N^F}(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F}(\zeta_2) \geq \delta$. Now, $\widehat{\Psi_N^T}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T}((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \partial) \leq$

$\max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)}\} \leq \beta$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \leq$
 $\frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)}}{2} \leq \frac{\beta + \beta}{2} = \beta$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \geq$
 $\min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\} \geq \delta$. This implies that $\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2 \in \widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$. Similarly, $\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \zeta_2 \in$
 $\widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$ and $\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \zeta_2 \in \widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$. Hence, $\widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$ is a SBS of \mathbb{S} , for all $\beta, \delta \in D[0, 1]$.

For each $\beta, \delta \in [0, 1]$ and $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$. Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)} \leq \beta$, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)} \leq \beta$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)} \geq \delta$, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)} \geq \delta$.
 Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)}\} \leq \beta$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \leq$
 $\frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}}{2} \leq \frac{\beta + \beta}{2} = \beta$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)}\} \geq \delta$. This implies that $\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2 \in \widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$.
 Similarly, $\zeta_1 \ddagger_2 \zeta_2 \in \widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$ and $\zeta_1 \ddagger_3 \zeta_2 \in \widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$. Hence, $\widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$ is a SBS of \mathbb{S} , for all $\beta, \delta \in D[0, 1]$.

Conversely, assume that $\widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$ is a SBS of \mathbb{S} and $\beta, \delta \in D[0, 1]$. Suppose if there exist $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{S}$ such
 that $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} > \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)}\}$, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1$
 $\zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} > \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}}{2}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1$
 $\zeta_2), \vartheta) < \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}$. For $\beta, \delta \in D[0, 1]$ such that $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1$
 $\zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} > \beta \geq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)}\}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1$
 $\zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} > \beta \geq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}}{2}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1$
 $\zeta_2), \vartheta) < \delta \leq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}$. Thus, $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$, but
 $\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2 \notin \widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$. This contradicts, $\widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$ is a SBS of \mathbb{S} . Therefore $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1$
 $\zeta_2), \vartheta) \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)}\}$, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \leq$
 $\frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}}{2}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot$
 $e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}$. Similarly, \ddagger_2 and \ddagger_3 cases.

Hence $\widehat{\Psi} = (\widehat{\Psi}_N^T \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T})$ is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} .

Let us assume that $\widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$ is a SBS of \mathbb{S} and $\beta, \delta \in [0, 1]$. Suppose if there exist $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1$
 $\zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} > \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)}\}$, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1$
 $\zeta_2), \vartheta) > \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}}{2}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} < \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot$
 $e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}$. For $\beta, \delta \in D[0, 1]$ such that $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} >$
 $\beta \geq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)}\}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} > \beta \geq$
 $\frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}}{2}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} < \delta \leq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot$
 $e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}$. Thus, $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$, but $\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2 \notin \widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$. This contradicts, $\widehat{\Psi}^{(\beta, \delta)}$ is a SBS of \mathbb{S} . There-
 fore $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T(\zeta_2)}\}$, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1$
 $\zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)} + \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}}{2}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T((\zeta_1 \ddagger_1 \zeta_2), \vartheta)} \geq$
 $\min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_1) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_1)}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta_2) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F(\zeta_2)}\}$. Similarly, \ddagger_2 and \ddagger_3 cases.

Hence $\Psi = (\Psi_N^T \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T}, \Psi_N^F \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F}, \Psi_N^T \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T})$ is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S} .

Definition 3.13. Let $(\mathbb{S}_1, \ominus_1, \ominus_2, \ominus_3)$ and $(\mathbb{S}_2, \otimes_1, \otimes_2, \otimes_3)$ be any two bisemirings. The mapping $\nabla : \mathbb{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_2$ and \mathfrak{N} be any ComCANSBS in \mathbb{S}_1 , \mathfrak{h} be any ComCANSBS in $\nabla(\mathbb{S}_1) = \mathbb{S}_2$. If $\Psi_N \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N} = [\widehat{\Psi}_N^T \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^F \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F}, \widehat{\Psi}_N^T \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^T}]$, $\Psi_N \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N}$ is a ComCANS in \mathbb{S}_1 , then $\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}$ is a ComCANS in \mathbb{S}_2 , defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Psi}_h^\top(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}(\rho, \partial) &= \begin{cases} \inf \widehat{\Psi}_N^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}(\zeta, \partial) & \text{if } \zeta \in \nabla^{-1}\rho \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \widehat{\Psi}_h^\downarrow(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) &= \begin{cases} \inf \widehat{\Psi}_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) & \text{if } \zeta \in \nabla^{-1}\rho \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^F}(\rho, \partial) &= \begin{cases} \sup \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^F}(\zeta, \partial) & \text{if } \zeta \in \nabla^{-1}\rho \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \Psi_h^\top(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top}(\rho, \partial) &= \begin{cases} \inf \Psi_N^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top}(\zeta, \partial) & \text{if } \zeta \in \nabla^{-1}\rho \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \Psi_h^\downarrow(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\downarrow}(\rho, \partial) &= \begin{cases} \inf \Psi_N^\downarrow(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\downarrow}(\zeta, \partial) & \text{if } \zeta \in \nabla^{-1}\rho \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \Psi_h^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F}(\rho, \partial) &= \begin{cases} \sup \Psi_N^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F}(\zeta, \partial) & \text{if } \zeta \in \nabla^{-1}\rho \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{S}_1$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{S}_2$ is represents the image of R_N under ∇ .

Similarly, If $\Psi_h \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h} = [\widehat{\Psi}_h^\top \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^\downarrow \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\downarrow}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^F \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^F}]$, $\Psi_h \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h}, \Psi_h^\top \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\top}, \Psi_h^\downarrow \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^\downarrow}, \Psi_h^F \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N^F}$ is a ComCANS in \mathbb{S}_2 , then ComCANS $\Psi_N = \nabla \circ \Psi_h$ in \mathbb{S}_1 ie, the ComCANS defined by $\Psi_N(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_h(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))}, \Psi_N = \nabla \circ \Psi_h$ in \mathbb{S}_1 [ie, the ComCANS defined by $\Psi_N(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N(\zeta, \partial)} = \Psi_h(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_N(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))}$] is represents the preimage of Ψ_h under ∇ .

Theorem 3.14. *The homomorphic image of every ComCANSBS is a ComCANSBS.*

Proof. The mapping $\nabla : \mathbb{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_2$ be any homomorphism. Now, $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$, $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_2 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$ and $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_3 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$ for all $\zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}_1$. Let $\widehat{h} = \nabla(N), N$ is any ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S}_1 . Let $\nabla(\zeta, \partial), \nabla(\rho, \partial) \in \mathbb{S}_2$. Let $\zeta \in u\nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))$ and $\rho \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))$ be

$$\text{such that } \widehat{\Psi}_N^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}(\zeta, \partial) = \inf_{\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}(\zeta, \partial) \text{ and } \widehat{\Psi}_N^\top(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}(\rho, \partial) = \inf_{\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}(\zeta, \partial).$$

$$\text{Now, } \widehat{\Psi}_h^\top((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \inf_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^\top(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}(\zeta') \\ &= \inf_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^\top(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}(\zeta') \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_N^\top((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \\ &\leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^\top(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_N^\top(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_N^\top}(\rho, \partial)\} \\ &= \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^\top(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^\top}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)), \widehat{\Psi}_h^\top(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^\top}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))\}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Thus, } \widehat{\Psi}_h^\top((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^\top(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^\top}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)), \widehat{\Psi}_h^\top(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^\top}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))\}.$$

Similarly, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)\}$ and

$\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)\}$.

Let $\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))$ and $\rho \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))$ be such that $\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) = \inf_{\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}(\rho, \partial) = \inf_{\rho \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}(\rho, \partial)$.

Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \inf_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\zeta') \\ &= \inf_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\zeta') \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \\ &\leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) + \widehat{\Psi}_N^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}{2} \\ &= \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) + \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) + \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}{2}$$

Similarly,

$$\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) + \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}{2}$$

and

$$\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) + \widehat{\Psi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}{2}$$

Let $\nabla(\zeta, \partial), \nabla(\rho, \partial) \in \mathbb{S}_2$. Let $\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))$ and $\rho \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))$ be such that $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^F(\zeta, \partial) = \sup_{\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^F(\zeta, \partial)$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^F(\rho, \partial) = \sup_{\rho \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^F(\rho, \partial)$.

Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sup_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^F(\zeta') \\ &= \sup_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial))} \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^F(\zeta') \\ &= \widehat{\Psi}_N^F((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^F((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \\ &\geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^F(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_N^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^F(\rho, \partial)\} \\ &= \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial)\} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi}_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi}_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi}_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\}$. Similarly,

$\widehat{\Psi}_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi}_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi}_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi}_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\}$ and

$\widehat{\Psi}_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi}_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi}_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \widehat{\Xi}_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\}$.

The mapping $\nabla : \mathbb{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_2$ be any homomorphism. Now, $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$, $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_2 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$ and $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_3 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$ for all $\zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}_1$. Let $\mathfrak{h} = \nabla(\aleph)$, \aleph is any ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S}_1 . Let $\nabla(\zeta, \partial), \nabla(\rho, \partial) \in \mathbb{S}_2$. Let $\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))$ and $\rho \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))$ be such that $\Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)} = \inf_{\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}$ and $\Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)} = \inf_{\rho \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}$. Now, $\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))}$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \inf_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta')} \\ &= \inf_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial))} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta')} \\ &= \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} \\ &\leq \max\{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}\} \\ &= \max\{\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \leq \max\{\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\}$.

Similarly, $\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \leq \max\{\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\}$ and

$\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \leq \max\{\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\}$.

Let $\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))$ and $\rho \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))$ be such that $\Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)} = \inf_{\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)}$ and $\Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)} = \inf_{\rho \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}$.

Now, $\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))}$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \inf_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta')} \\ &= \inf_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial))} \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta')} \\ &= \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} \\ &\leq \frac{\Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\zeta, \partial)} + \Psi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^{\top}(\rho, \partial)}}{2} \\ &= \frac{\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial)} + \Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \leq \frac{\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial)} + \Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}}{2}$. Similarly,

$\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \leq \frac{\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial)} + \Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}}{2}$ and

$\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top}((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \leq \frac{\Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\zeta, \partial)} + \Psi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\top} \nabla(\rho, \partial)}}{2}$.

Let $\nabla(\zeta, \partial), \nabla(\rho, \partial) \in \mathbb{S}_2$. Let $\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))$ and $\rho \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))$ be such that $\Psi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial)} = \sup_{\zeta \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial))} \Psi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^F(\zeta, \partial)}$ and $\Psi_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial)} = \sup_{\rho \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\rho, \partial))} \Psi_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik \Xi_{\aleph}^F(\rho, \partial)}$.

$$e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\zeta, \partial)}$$

Now, $\Psi_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))}$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sup_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))} \Psi_h^F(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\zeta')} \\ &= \sup_{(\zeta') \in \nabla^{-1}(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial))} \Psi_h^F(\zeta') \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\zeta')} \\ &= \Psi_h^F((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} \\ &\geq \min\{\Psi_h^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_h^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F(\rho, \partial)}\} \\ &= \min\{\Psi_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\Psi_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \geq \min\{\Psi_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\}$.

Similarly, $\Psi_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \geq \min\{\Psi_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\}$ and

$\Psi_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \geq \min\{\Psi_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \Psi_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\Xi_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\}$. Thus, \widehat{h} is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S}_2 .

Theorem 3.15. *The homomorphic preimage of every ComCANSBS is a ComCANSBS.*

Proof. The mapping $\nabla : \mathbb{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_2$ be a homomorphism. Now, $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$, $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_2 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$ and $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_3 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$ for all $\zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}_1$. Let $\widehat{h} = \nabla(\mathbb{N})$, \widehat{h}

is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S}_2 . Let $\zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}_1$. Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^T((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} = \widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial))} = \widehat{\Psi}_h^T((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^T \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^T \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\} = \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\rho, \partial)}\}$.

Thus, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^T((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\rho, \partial)}\}$.

Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^J((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} = \widehat{\Psi}_h^J(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial))} = \widehat{\Psi}_h^J((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^J \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J \nabla(\zeta, \partial)} + \widehat{\Psi}_h^J \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J \nabla(\rho, \partial)}}{2} = \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^J(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J(\zeta, \partial)} + \widehat{\Psi}_h^J(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J(\rho, \partial)}}{2}$.

Thus, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^J((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_h^J(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J(\zeta, \partial)} + \widehat{\Psi}_h^J(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J(\rho, \partial)}}{2}$.

Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^F((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^F((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} = \widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^F(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial))} = \widehat{\Psi}_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^F((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^F \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^F \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\} = \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^F(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^F(\rho, \partial)}\}$.

Thus, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^F((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^F((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} \geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^F(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^F(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^F(\rho, \partial)}\}$.

The mapping $\nabla : \mathbb{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_2$ be a homomorphism. Now, $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$, $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_2 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$ and $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_3 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$ for all $\zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}_1$. Let $\widehat{h} = \nabla(\mathbb{N})$, \widehat{h} is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S}_2 . Let $\zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}_1$. Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^T((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} = \widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial))} = \widehat{\Psi}_h^T((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))} \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^T \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T \nabla(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^T \nabla(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T \nabla(\rho, \partial)}\} = \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\rho, \partial)}\}$. Thus, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^T((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\zeta, \partial)}, \widehat{\Psi}_h^T(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^T(\rho, \partial)}\}$.

Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_h^J((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)} = \widehat{\Psi}_h^J(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial)) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J(\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial))} = \widehat{\Psi}_h^J((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik\widehat{\Xi}_h^J((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))}$.

$$e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \leq \beta, \widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) = \widehat{\Psi}_h^j(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \leq \beta.$$

Thus, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) + \widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\rho, \partial)}{2} \leq \beta$. Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) = \widehat{\Psi}_h^j(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \geq \delta$, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) = \widehat{\Psi}_h^j(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \geq \delta$.

$$\widehat{\Psi}_N^j((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) = \widehat{\Psi}_h^j((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)))$$

$$\geq \min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\rho, \partial)\} \geq \delta, \text{ for all } \zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}_1.$$

Similarly other operations, $\widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_{(\beta, \delta)}$ is a SBS of ComCANSBS \mathfrak{N} of \mathbb{S}_1 .

The mapping $\nabla : \mathbb{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_2$ be any homomorphism. We have $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$, $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_2 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_2 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$ and $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_3 \rho), \partial) = \nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_3 \nabla(\rho, \partial)$ for all $\zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}_1$. Let $\widehat{h} = \nabla(\mathfrak{N})$, \widehat{h} is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S}_2 . By Theorem 3.15, \mathfrak{N} is a ComCANSBS of \mathbb{S}_1 . Let $\nabla(\widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_{(\beta, \delta)})$ be a SBS of \widehat{h} . Suppose that $\nabla(\zeta, \partial), \nabla(\rho, \partial) \in \nabla(\widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_{(\beta, \delta)})$. Now, $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial), \nabla((\zeta \ominus_2 \rho), \partial)$ and $\nabla((\zeta \ominus_3 \rho), \partial) \in \nabla(\widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_{(\beta, \delta)})$.

Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) = \widehat{\Psi}_h^j(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \leq \beta$, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) = \widehat{\Psi}_h^j(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \leq \beta$.

Thus, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \leq \max\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\rho, \partial)\} \leq \beta$. Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) = \widehat{\Psi}_h^j(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \leq \beta$, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) = \widehat{\Psi}_h^j(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \leq \beta$.

Thus, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \leq \frac{\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) + \widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\rho, \partial)}{2} \leq \beta$. Now, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) = \widehat{\Psi}_h^j(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j(\nabla(\zeta, \partial)) \geq \delta$, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) = \widehat{\Psi}_h^j(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j(\nabla(\rho, \partial)) \geq \delta$.

Thus, $\widehat{\Psi}_N^j((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j((\zeta \ominus_1 \rho), \partial) = \widehat{\Psi}_h^j((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_h^j((\nabla(\zeta, \partial) \otimes_1 \nabla(\rho, \partial))) \geq$

$$\min\{\widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\zeta, \partial), \widehat{\Psi}_N^j(\rho, \partial) \cdot e^{ik} \widehat{\Xi}_N^j(\rho, \partial)\} \geq \delta, \text{ for all } \zeta, \rho \in \mathbb{S}_1.$$

Similarly other operations, $\widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_{(\beta, \delta)}$ is a SBS of ComCANSBS \mathfrak{N} of \mathbb{S}_1 .

4 Conclusion and future direction

In this work a new type of ComCANSBS is presented. The complex cubic neutrosophic subbisemiring, which expresses three grades in terms of a complex number, takes a fresh approach to the idea of three grades. Since a complex form of three grades reduces three grades to a two-dimensional parameter, it represents a paradigm shift. A complex interval value-containing neutrosophic SBS was defined. ComCANSBS level sets and ComCNANSBS level sets were defined. Our goal is to apply the cubic set to bisemiring. Additionally, a study of the characteristics of different conversions is done. In addition to data analysis, we are trying to handle images and signals, thus it makes sense to use F-transforms to expand the use of new fuzzy structures. Thus, we ought to consider applying soft set ComCANSBS, soft set ComCNANSBS in the future.

Acknowledgment. This research was supported by the University of Phayao and the Thailand Science Research and Innovation Fund (Fundamental Fund 2024).

Conflicts of Interest The author(s) declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- [1] L. A. Zadeh, Fuzzy sets, Information and Control, 8, (1965), 338-353.
- [2] K. Atanassov, Intuitionistic fuzzy sets, Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 20(1), (1986) 87-96.

- [3] R. R. Yager, Pythagorean membership grades in multi criteria decision-making, *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Systems*, 22, (2014), 958-965.
- [4] S. Ashraf, S. Abdullah, T. Mahmood, F. Ghani and T. Mahmood, Spherical fuzzy sets and their applications in multi-attribute decision making problems, *Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems*, 36, (2019), 2829-284.
- [5] B.C. Cuong and V. Kreinovich, Picture fuzzy sets a new concept for computational intelligence problems, in *Proceedings of 2013 Third World Congress on Information and Communication Technologies (WICT 2013)*, IEEE, (2013), 1-6.
- [6] F. Smarandache, *A unifying field in logics Neutrosophy Neutrosophic Probability, Set and Logic*, Rebooth American Research Press (1999).
- [7] Daniel Ramot, Ron Milo, Menahem Friedman, and Abraham Kandel, Complex fuzzy set, *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy System*, 10(2), 2002.
- [8] S.J Golan, *Semirings and their Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, London, 1999.
- [9] Faward Hussian, Raja Muhammad Hashism, Ajab Khan, Muhammad Naeem, Generalization of bisemirings, *International Journal of Computer Science and Information Security*, 14(9), (2016), 275-289.
- [10] K. M. Lee, Bipolar-valued fuzzy sets and their operations, *Proc. Int. Conf. Intelligent Technologies Bangkok, Thailand*, (2000) 307-312.
- [11] J. Ahsan, K. Saifullah, and F. Khan, Fuzzy semirings, *Fuzzy Sets and systems*, 60, (1993), 309-320.
- [12] M.K Sen, S. Ghosh An introduction to bisemirings, *Southeast Asian Bulletin of Mathematics*, 28(3), (2001), 547-559.
- [13] Hasan, Z. "Deep Learning for Super Resolution and Applications," *Galoitica: Journal of Mathematical Structures and Applications*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 34-42, 2023.
- [14] Roopadevi1., P. Karpagadevi, M. Krishnaprakash, S. Broumi, S. Gomathi, S. "Comprehensive Decision-Making with Spherical Fermatean Neutrosophic Sets in Structural Engineering," *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 432-450, 2024.
- [15] SG Quek, H Garg, G Selvachandran, M Palanikumar, K Arulmozhi, VIKOR and TOPSIS framework with a truthful-distance measure for the (t, s)-regulated interval-valued neutrosophic soft set, *Soft Computing*, 1-27, 2023.
- [16] Mahmoud, H. Abdelhafeez, A. "Spherical Fuzzy Multi-Criteria Decision-Making Approach for Risk Assessment of Natech," *Journal of Neutrosophic and Information Fusion*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 59-68, 2023.
- [17] M Palanikumar, K Arulmozhi, MCGDM based on TOPSIS and VIKOR using Pythagorean neutrosophic soft with aggregation operators, *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, (2022), 538-555.
- [18] M Palanikumar, S Broumi, Square root (l_1, l_2) phantine neutrosophic normal interval-valued sets and their aggregated operators in application to multiple attribute decision making, *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science*, 4, (2022).
- [19] Ozcek, M. "A Review on the Structure of Fuzzy Regular Proper Mappings in Fuzzy Topological Spaces and Their Properties," *Journal of Pure Mathematics for Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 60-71, 2023.
- [20] Ali, O. Mashhadani, S. Alhakam, I. M., S. "A New Paradigm for Decision Making under Uncertainty in Signature Forensics Applications based on Neutrosophic Rule Engine," *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 268-282, 2024.
- [21] M Palanikumar, N Kausar, H Garg, A Iampan, S Kadry, M Sharaf, Medical robotic engineering selection based on square root neutrosophic normal interval-valued sets and their aggregated operators, *AIMS Mathematics*, 8(8), (2023), 17402-17432.
- [22] A. Al Quran, A. G. Ahmad, F. Al-Sharqi, A. Lutfi, Q-Complex Neutrosophic Set, *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science*, 20(2), (2023), 08-19.

- [23] F. Al-Sharqi, M. U. Romdhini, A. Al-Quran, Group decision-making based on aggregation operator and score function of Q -neutrosophic soft matrix, *Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems*, 45, (2023), 305–321.
- [24] F. Al-Sharqi, Y. Al-Qudah and N. Alotaibi, Decision-making techniques based on similarity measures of possibility neutrosophic soft expert sets. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 55(1), (2023), 358–382.
- [25] F. Al-Sharqi, A. G. Ahmad, A. Al Quran, Mapping on interval complex neutrosophic soft sets, *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science*, 19(4), (2022), 77–85.
- [26] A. Al-Quran, F. Al-Sharqi, K. Ullah, M. U. Romdhini, M. Balti and M. Alomai, Bipolar fuzzy hypersoft set and its application in decision making, *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science*, 20(4), (2023), 65–77.