



## Homomorphism of complex neutrosophic set extended to cubic $Q$ neutrosophic set concept via subbisemiring of bisemirings

Aiyared Iampan<sup>1,\*</sup>, Murugan Palanikumar<sup>2</sup>

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

<sup>2</sup>Department 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 introduce the concept of complex cubic  $Q$  neutrosophic subbisemiring (CCQNSBS) is a new extension of cubic  $Q$  neutrosophic subbisemiring. We examine the characteristics and homomorphic features of CCQNSBS. We communicate the CCQNSBS level sets for bisemirings. A cubic complex  $Q$  neutrosophic subset  $\Gamma$  of bisemiring  $\mathcal{S}$  if and only if each non-empty level set  $R^{(\ell,b)}$ , where  $R = (\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}} \cdot e^{i\tau\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}, \overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}} \cdot e^{i\tau\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}, \overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}} \cdot e^{i\tau\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}} \cdot e^{i\tau\Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}} \cdot e^{i\tau\Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}} \cdot e^{i\tau\Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}})$  is a CCQNSBS of  $\mathcal{S}$ . We show that the intersection of all CCQNSBSs yields a CCQNSBS of  $\mathcal{S}$ . If  $\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \dots, \Theta_n$  be the finite collection of CCQNSBSs of  $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  respectively. Then  $\Theta_1 \times \Theta_2 \times \dots \times \Theta_n$  is a CCQNSBS of  $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{S}_n$ . If  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_2$  is a homomorphism, then  $\mathcal{F}(\Theta^{(\ell,b)})$  is a subbisemiring of CCQNSBS  $\overline{\Omega}$  of  $\mathcal{S}_2$ . Examples are provided to show how our findings are used.

**Keywords:** CCQNSBS; CCNQNSBS; SBS; Homomorphism

### 1 Introduction

Algebraic structures are used extensively in theoretical physics, computer science, control engineering, information sciences, coding theory, topological spaces, combinatorics, functional analysis, graph theory, Euclidean geometry, probability theory, commutative and non-commutative ring theory, optimization theory, discrete event dynamical systems, automata theory, mathematical modeling of quantum physics, parallel computation systems, and other fields. The complexity of systems grows by the day, making it more difficult for decision-makers to make the proper option. Achieving a single goal is challenging, but it is doable. Many firms struggled to motivate employees, define goals, and form opinions. As a result, whether individual or committee decisions are made, a variety of objectives must be addressed concurrently. Based on this assessment, it appears that the criteria are answered flexibly, making it difficult for each decision maker to find an optimal solution in each of the criterion concerned. To find the optimal choice, decision-makers must establish trustworthy and acceptable techniques. Historically, crisp procedures have been ineffective when dealing with ambiguity and uncertainty in decision making. Zadeh<sup>1</sup> developed fuzzy set (FS) theory, which excels at addressing ambiguity and uncertainty. An element in an FS is considered a member if it includes a single value from the interval. However, because resistance might exist in real-world settings, the degree of non-membership does not always equal one minus the degree of membership. As FS theory improves, an increasing number of hybrid fuzzy models are generated. Uncertainty has led to the development of several theories, such as FS,<sup>1</sup> intuitionistic FS (IFS),<sup>2</sup> Pythagorean FS (PFS),<sup>3</sup> and spherical FS (SFS).<sup>4</sup> Sets with grades ranging from 0 to 1, known as

MG, make up an FS. IFS is classified as MG, notwithstanding Atanassov's<sup>2</sup> statement that non-membership grades (NMG) can only have a value of 1. There is a potential that during the decision-making process, the sum of MGs and NMGs will occasionally exceed 1. Yager<sup>3</sup> used PFS logic to create the generalized MG and NMG logic, which is determined by the square of the MGs and NMGs and has a value of no more than 1. These views fail to describe the neutral condition, which is neither positive nor negative. Cuong<sup>5</sup> shared the image with associates. FS used three grading points: positive, neutral, and negative. These grades combined could not be greater than 1. For some uses, it outperforms PFS and IFS. It is an independent generalization of three models that address the truth, indeterminacy, and falsity of FS and IFS.

Smarandache<sup>6</sup> invented the neutrosophic set (NS) to handle ambiguous and contradictory data. This reasoning determines the degree to which a statement is true, ambiguous, or false. Ramot et al.<sup>7</sup> introduce the concept of a complex fuzzy set (CFS). The membership functions of CFSs transactions can take many different values. The unit circle of the complex plane is extended to  $[0, 1]$ , whereas the unit circle of a fuzzy membership function remains fixed. The CFS  $X$  is distinguished by a membership function  $\mu_X(x)$  that extends to the unit circle in the complex plane rather than only  $[0, 1]$ .  $\mu_X(x)$  is a complex-valued function that awards a grade of membership of the type  $\eta_X(x) \cdot e^{i\tau_X(x)}$ , where  $i = \sqrt{-1}$ , to any element  $x$  of the discourse universe. The value of  $\mu_X(x)$  is determined by two real-valued variables,  $\eta_X(x)$  and  $\tau_X(x)$ , where  $\eta_X(x), \tau_X(x) \in [0, 1]$ . Golan<sup>8</sup> pioneered the use of semiring logic. Hussian and colleagues<sup>9</sup> explored the concept and applications of bisemirings. Lee<sup>10</sup> discusses bipolar-valued FSs and their related techniques. Ahsan et al. studied fuzzy semirings in.<sup>11</sup> Sen et al.<sup>12</sup> introduced bisemirings. Palanikumar et al.<sup>13</sup> proposed an intuitionistic fuzzy normal subbisemiring for bisemiring. Palanikumar et al.<sup>14</sup> proposed bisemiring using bipolar-valued neutrosophic normal sets. Several authors have lately published on innovative ideas such as the fuzzy extension set, neutrosophic set, and specific fuzzy set<sup>15-26</sup>. He studied their properties on the parallel lines to set theory. In 1971, Rosenfeld<sup>27</sup> defined fuzzy subgroups and gave some of its properties. Kuroki<sup>28</sup> introduced fuzzy semigroups as a generalized of classical semigroups. Mordeson<sup>29</sup> obtained some characterization of fuzzy semigroups. We will study several aspects of the concepts of SBS and CCQNSBS and draw some conclusions. The following five sections comprise the article. Section 1 describes semirings and SBS. Section 2 discusses semiring and SBS preparation. The characteristics of CCQNSBS are listed in Section 3. Section 4 describes the homomorphism of a complex cubic  $Q$  neutrosophic subbisemiring. It is recommended to evaluate CCQNSBS with numerical examples.

## 2 Preliminaries

**Definition 2.1.**<sup>12</sup> An algebraic structure  $(\mathcal{S}, \uplus, \ominus, \odot)$  is a bisemiring, if  $(\mathcal{S}, \uplus, \ominus)$  and  $(\mathcal{S}, \ominus, \odot)$  are semirings, i.e.,  $(\mathcal{S}, \uplus)$ ,  $(\mathcal{S}, \ominus)$  and  $(\mathcal{S}, \odot)$  are semigroups and

1.  $\wp_v \ominus (\wp_\zeta \uplus \wp_\eta) = (\wp_v \ominus \wp_\zeta) \uplus (\wp_v \ominus \wp_\eta)$ ,
2.  $(\wp_\zeta \uplus \wp_\eta) \ominus \wp_v = (\wp_\zeta \ominus \wp_v) \uplus (\wp_\eta \ominus \wp_v)$ ,
3.  $\wp_v \odot (\wp_\zeta \ominus \wp_\eta) = (\wp_v \odot \wp_\zeta) \ominus (\wp_v \odot \wp_\eta)$ ,
4.  $(\wp_\zeta \ominus \wp_\eta) \odot \wp_v = (\wp_\zeta \odot \wp_v) \ominus (\wp_\eta \odot \wp_v)$ ,  $\forall \wp_v, \wp_\zeta, \wp_\eta \in \mathcal{S}$ .

**Definition 2.2.**<sup>6</sup> A NS  $v$  in the universe  $U$  is  $v = \{x, u_v^{\mathcal{F}}(x), u_v^{\mathcal{I}}(x), u_v^{\mathcal{F}}(x) | x \in U\}$ , where  $u_v^{\mathcal{F}}(x), u_v^{\mathcal{I}}(x), u_v^{\mathcal{F}}(x)$  represents the TD, ID and FD of  $v$  respectively. Consider the mapping  $u_v^{\mathcal{F}} : U \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $u_v^{\mathcal{I}} : U \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $u_v^{\mathcal{F}} : U \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and  $0 \leq u_v^{\mathcal{F}}(x) + u_v^{\mathcal{I}}(x) + u_v^{\mathcal{F}}(x) \leq 3$ .

**Definition 2.3.**<sup>6</sup> Let  $\psi_1 = \langle u_{\psi_1}^{\mathcal{F}}, u_{\psi_1}^{\mathcal{I}}, u_{\psi_1}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle$ ,  $\psi_2 = \langle u_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{F}}, u_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{I}}, u_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle$  and  $\psi_3 = \langle u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{F}}, u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{I}}, u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle$  be the three neutrosophic numbers over  $U$ . Then

1.  $\psi_2 \uplus \psi_3 = \langle \max(\chi_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{F}}, u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{F}}), \min(\chi_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{I}}, u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{I}}), \min(\chi_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{F}}, u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{F}}) \rangle$ ,
2.  $\psi_2 \uplus \psi_3 = \langle \min(\chi_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{F}}, u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{F}}), \max(\chi_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{I}}, u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{I}}), \max(\chi_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{F}}, u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{F}}) \rangle$ ,
3.  $\psi_2 \geq \psi_3$  iff  $u_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{F}} \geq u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $u_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{I}} \leq u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $u_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{F}} \leq u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{F}}$ ,
4.  $\psi_2 = \psi_3$  iff  $u_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{F}} = u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $u_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{I}} = u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $u_{\psi_2}^{\mathcal{F}} = u_{\psi_3}^{\mathcal{F}}$ .





**Example 3.6.** Consider the bisemiring  $\mathcal{S} = \{\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4\}$  with the Cayley table:

$\odot_1$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_4$	$\odot_2$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_4$	$\odot_3$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_4$
$\mu_1$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_1$
$\mu_2$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_4$
$\mu_3$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$
$\mu_4$	$\mu_1$	$\mu_2$	$\mu_3$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$	$\mu_4$

	$(w) = \mu_1$	$(w) = \mu_2$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$[0.85e^{i2\pi(0.7)}, 0.95e^{i2\pi(0.8)}]$	$[0.75e^{i2\pi(0.6)}, 0.85e^{i2\pi(0.7)}]$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$[0.55e^{i2\pi(0.4)}, 0.65e^{i2\pi(0.5)}]$	$[0.45e^{i2\pi(0.3)}, 0.55e^{i2\pi(0.4)}]$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$[0.65e^{i2\pi(0.5)}, 0.75e^{i2\pi(0.6)}]$	$[0.75e^{i2\pi(0.6)}, 0.85e^{i2\pi(0.65)}]$

	$(w) = \mu_3$	$(w) = \mu_4$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$[0.45e^{i2\pi(0.3)}, 0.55e^{i2\pi(0.4)}]$	$[0.65e^{i2\pi(0.5)}, 0.75e^{i2\pi(0.6)}]$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$[0.25e^{i2\pi(0.2)}, 0.35e^{i2\pi(0.3)}]$	$[0.35e^{i2\pi(0.2)}, 0.45e^{i2\pi(0.3)}]$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$[0.95e^{i2\pi(0.8)}, 0.85e^{i2\pi(0.7)}]$	$[0.9e^{i2\pi(0.75)}, 0.95e^{i2\pi(0.8)}]$

	$(w) = \mu_1$	$(w) = \mu_2$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$0.8e^{i2\pi(0.65)}$	$0.7e^{i2\pi(0.55)}$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$0.5e^{i2\pi(0.35)}$	$0.4e^{i2\pi(0.25)}$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$0.6e^{i2\pi(0.45)}$	$0.7e^{i2\pi(0.55)}$

	$(w) = \mu_3$	$(w) = \mu_4$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$0.4e^{i2\pi(0.25)}$	$0.6e^{i2\pi(0.45)}$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$0.2e^{i2\pi(0.15)}$	$0.3e^{i2\pi(0.15)}$
$(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}})(w)$	$0.9e^{i2\pi(0.75)}$	$0.85e^{i2\pi(0.7)}$

Hence,  $\Theta$  is a CCQNSBS of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Theorem 3.7.** *The intersection of all CCQNSBSs is a CCQNSBS of  $\mathcal{S}$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\{\overline{\Omega}_i : i \in I\}$  be the collection of CCQNSBSs of  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\Theta = \bigcap_{i \in I} \overline{\Omega}_i$ . Let  $\alpha, \varpi \in \mathcal{S}$ .

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}((\alpha \odot_1 \varpi), \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}((\alpha \odot_1 \varpi), \rho) &= \bigwedge_{i \in I} \overline{\Omega}_{i\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}((\alpha \odot_1 \varpi), \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}((\alpha \odot_1 \varpi), \rho) \\ &\succeq \bigwedge_{i \in I} \min\{\overline{\Omega}_{i\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\alpha, \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Omega}_{i\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}(\alpha, \rho), \overline{\Omega}_{i\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\varpi, \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Omega}_{i\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}(\varpi, \rho)\} \\ &= \min\left\{ \bigwedge_{i \in I} \overline{\Omega}_{i\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\alpha, \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Omega}_{i\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}(\alpha, \rho), \bigwedge_{i \in I} \overline{\Omega}_{i\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\varpi, \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Omega}_{i\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}(\varpi, \rho) \right\} \\ &= \min\{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\alpha, \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}(\alpha, \rho), \overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\varpi, \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}(\varpi, \rho)\} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}((\alpha \odot_2 \varpi), \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}((\alpha \odot_2 \varpi), \rho) &\succeq \min\{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\alpha, \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}(\alpha, \rho), \overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\varpi, \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}(\varpi, \rho)\}, \\ \overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}((\alpha \odot_3 \varpi), \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}((\alpha \odot_3 \varpi), \rho) &\succeq \min\{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\alpha, \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}(\alpha, \rho), \overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\varpi, \rho) \cdot M^{\overline{\Theta}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{F}}}(\varpi, \rho)\}. \end{aligned}$$





























**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] Javed Ahsan, John N. Mordeson, and Muhammad Shabir, *Fuzzy Semirings with Applications to Automata Theory*, Springer Heidelberg New York Dordrecht, London, 2012.
- [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," *Journal of 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," *Journal of 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," *Journal of 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.
- [27] Rosenfeld, Fuzzy groups, *J.Math. Anal. Appl.*35, (1971), 512-517.
- [28] N. Kuroki, On fuzzy semigroups, *Inform. Sci.* 53, (1991), 203-236.
- [29] J. N. Mordeson, D. S. Malik, N. Kuroki, *Fuzzy semigroups*, springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg GmbH, 2003.