



Image and Inverse Image of Neutrosophic Cubic Sets in UP-Algebras under UP-Homomorphisms

¹Metawee Songsaeng, ²Aiyared Iampan

^{1,2}Department of Mathematics, School of Science, University of Phayao, Phayao 56000, Thailand

metawee.faith@gmail.com¹, aiyared.ia@up.ac.th²

Aiyared Iampan is the corresponding author.

Abstract

The concept of a neutrosophic cubic set in a UP-algebra was introduced by Songsaeng and Iampan [Neutrosophic cubic set theory applied to UP-algebras, 2019]. In this paper, we define the image and inverse image of a neutrosophic cubic set in a non-empty set under any function and study the image and inverse image of a neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra (resp., neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter, neutrosophic cubic UP-filter, neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal, neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal) of a UP-algebra under some UP-homomorphisms.

Keywords: UP-algebra, UP-homomorphism, neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra, neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter, neutrosophic cubic UP-filter, neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal, neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal

1 Introduction

The type of the logical algebra, a UP-algebra was introduced by Iampan.⁷ Later Somjanta et al.²⁷ studied a fuzzy UP-subalgebra, a fuzzy UP-ideal and a fuzzy UP-filter of a UP-algebra. Guntasow et al.⁵ studied a fuzzy translation of a fuzzy set in a UP-algebra. Kesorn et al.¹⁷ studied an intuitionistic fuzzy set in a UP-algebra. Kaijjae et al.¹⁶ studied anti-fuzzy UP-ideals and anti-fuzzy UP-subalgebras. Tanamoon et al.³⁶ studied a Q -fuzzy set in a UP-algebra. Sripaeng et al.³⁴ studied an anti Q -fuzzy UP-ideal and an anti Q -fuzzy UP-subalgebra of a UP-algebra. Dokkhamdang et al.⁴ studied a generalized fuzzy set in a UP-algebra. Songsaeng and Iampan^{28,29} studied an \mathcal{N} -fuzzy UP-algebra and a fuzzy proper UP-filter of a UP-algebra. Senapati et al.^{24,25} studies a cubic set and an interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy structure in a UP-algebra.

A fuzzy set f in a non-empty set A is a function from A to the closed interval $[0, 1]$. The concept of a fuzzy set in a non-empty set was first introduced by Zadeh.³⁸ The fuzzy set theory developed by Zadeh and others have found many applications in the domain of mathematics and other domains. Zadeh³⁹ introduced an interval-value fuzzy sets. The concept of a neutrosophic set was introduced by Smarandache²⁶ in 1999. Wang et al.³⁷ introduced the concept of an interval-valued neutrosophic set in 2005. Jun et al.¹³ introduced the concept of an interval-valued neutrosophic set in a BCK/BCI-algebra. The concept of a neutrosophic \mathcal{N} -structure in a semigroup was introduced by Khan et al.¹⁹ in 2017. Jun et al.¹⁴ applied the concept of a neutrosophic \mathcal{N} -structure to a BCK/BCI-algebra in 2017. Songsaeng and Iampan³¹⁻³³ applied the concept of a neutrosophic set to a UP-algebra. Ibrahim et. al.¹⁰ introduced the concept of a neutrosophic subtraction algebra and a neutrosophic subtraction semigroup, and Al-Tahan and Davvaz¹ introduced the concept of a neutrosophic \mathfrak{N} -ideal of a subtraction algebra in 2020.

A neutrosophic cubic set which is the generalized form of fuzzy sets, cubic sets and neutrosophic sets was introduced by Jun et al.¹⁵ in 2017. Iqbal et al.¹¹ introduced the concept of a neutrosophic cubic subalgebra and a neutrosophic cubic closed ideal of a B-algebra in 2016. Songsaeng and Iampan³⁰ introduced the concept of a neutrosophic cubic set in a UP-algebra in 2020. Khalid et. al.¹⁸ applied the concept of a multiplicative interpretation of a neutrosophic cubic set to a B-algebra in 2020.

From literature review, we will study the image and inverse image of neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebras (resp., neutrosophic cubic near UP-filters, neutrosophic cubic UP-filters, neutrosophic cubic UP-ideals, neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideals) under some UP-homomorphisms.

2 Basic concepts and preliminary notes on a UP-algebra

Before the study, we will review the definition of a UP-algebra.

Definition 2.1.⁷ An algebra $X = (X, \circ, 0)$ of type $(2, 0)$ is said to be a *UP-algebra*, where X is a non-empty set, \circ is a binary operation on X , and 0 is a fixed element of X if it holds the followings:

(UP-1) (for all $x, y, z \in X$) $((y \circ z) \circ ((x \circ y) \circ (x \circ z)) = 0)$,

(UP-2) (for all $x \in X$) $(0 \circ x = x)$,

(UP-3) (for all $x \in X$) $(x \circ 0 = 0)$, and

(UP-4) (for all $x, y \in X$) $(x \circ y = 0, y \circ x = 0 \Rightarrow x = y)$.

From,⁷ we already know that the concept of a UP-algebra is a generalization of a KU-algebra (see²¹).

Example 2.2.²³ Let Y be a universal set and let $\Omega \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$, where $\mathcal{P}(Y)$ means the power set of Y . Let $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(Y) = \{A \in \mathcal{P}(Y) \mid \Omega \subseteq A\}$. Define a binary operation \circ on $\mathcal{P}_\Omega(Y)$ by putting $A \circ B = B \cap (A^C \cup \Omega)$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_\Omega(Y)$, where A^C means the complement of a subset A . Then $(\mathcal{P}_\Omega(Y), \circ, \Omega)$ is a UP-algebra. Let $\mathcal{P}^\Omega(Y) = \{A \in \mathcal{P}(Y) \mid A \subseteq \Omega\}$. Define a binary operation \bullet on $\mathcal{P}^\Omega(Y)$ by putting $A \bullet B = B \cup (A^C \cap \Omega)$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{P}^\Omega(Y)$. Then $(\mathcal{P}^\Omega(Y), \bullet, \Omega)$ is a UP-algebra. In particular, $(\mathcal{P}(Y), \circ, \emptyset)$ and $(\mathcal{P}(Y), \bullet, X)$ are UP-algebras.

Example 2.3.⁴ Let \mathbb{N}_0 be the set of all natural numbers with zero. Define two binary operations \cdot and $*$ on \mathbb{N}_0 by

$$(\text{for all } m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0) \left(m \cdot n = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } m < n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \right)$$

and

$$(\text{for all } m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0) \left(m * n = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } m > n \text{ or } m = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \right).$$

Then $(\mathbb{N}_0, \cdot, 0)$ and $(\mathbb{N}_0, *, 0)$ are UP-algebras.

For more examples of a UP-algebra, see.^{2,3,8,22-25}

In a UP-algebra $X = (X, \circ, 0)$, the followings are valid (see^{7,8}).

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)(x \circ x = 0), \tag{2.1}$$

$$(\text{for all } x, y, z \in X)(x \circ y = 0, y \circ z = 0 \Rightarrow x \circ z = 0), \tag{2.2}$$

$$(\text{for all } x, y, z \in X)(x \circ y = 0 \Rightarrow (z \circ x) \circ (z \circ y) = 0), \tag{2.3}$$

$$(\text{for all } x, y, z \in X)(x \circ y = 0 \Rightarrow (y \circ z) \circ (x \circ z) = 0), \tag{2.4}$$

$$(\text{for all } x, y \in X)(x \circ (y \circ x) = 0), \tag{2.5}$$

$$(\text{for all } x, y \in X)((y \circ x) \circ x = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = y \circ x), \tag{2.6}$$

$$(\text{for all } x, y \in X)(x \circ (y \circ y) = 0), \tag{2.7}$$

$$(\text{for all } a, x, y, z \in X)((x \circ (y \circ z)) \circ (x \circ ((a \circ y) \circ (a \circ z)))) = 0), \tag{2.8}$$

$$(\text{for all } a, x, y, z \in X)((((a \circ x) \circ (a \circ y)) \circ z) \circ ((x \circ y) \circ z) = 0), \tag{2.9}$$

$$(\text{for all } x, y, z \in X)((x \circ y) \circ z) \circ (y \circ z) = 0), \tag{2.10}$$

$$(\text{for all } x, y, z \in X)(x \circ y = 0 \Rightarrow x \circ (z \circ y) = 0), \tag{2.11}$$

$$(\text{for all } x, y, z \in X)((x \circ y) \circ z) \circ (x \circ (y \circ z)) = 0), \text{ and} \tag{2.12}$$

$$(\text{for all } a, x, y, z \in X)((x \circ y) \circ z) \circ (y \circ (a \circ z)) = 0). \tag{2.13}$$

From,⁷ the binary relation \leq on a UP-algebra $X = (X, \circ, 0)$ is defined as follows:

$$(\text{for all } x, y \in X)(x \leq y \Leftrightarrow x \circ y = 0).$$

In a UP-algebra, 5 types of special subsets are defined as follows.

Definition 2.4. ^{5-7,27} A non-empty subset A of a UP-algebra $X = (X, \circ, 0)$ is said to be

- (1) a *UP-subalgebra* of X if (for all $x, y \in A$)($x \circ y \in A$).
- (2) a *near UP-filter* of X if
 - (i) the constant 0 of X is in A , and
 - (ii) (for all $x, y \in X$)($y \in A \Rightarrow x \circ y \in A$).
- (3) a *UP-filter* of X if
 - (i) the constant 0 of X is in A , and
 - (ii) (for all $x, y \in X$)($x \circ y \in A, x \in A \Rightarrow y \in A$).
- (4) a *UP-ideal* of X if
 - (i) the constant 0 of X is in A , and
 - (ii) (for all $x, y, z \in X$)($x \circ (y \circ z) \in A, y \in A \Rightarrow x \circ z \in A$).
- (5) a *strong UP-ideal* of X if
 - (i) the constant 0 of X is in A , and
 - (ii) (for all $x, y, z \in X$)(($z \circ y$) \circ ($z \circ x$) $\in A, y \in A \Rightarrow x \in A$).

Guntasow et al.⁵ and Iampan⁶ proved that the concept of a UP-subalgebra is a generalization of a near UP-filter, a near UP-filter is a generalization of a UP-filter, a UP-filter is a generalization of a UP-ideal, and a UP-ideal is a generalization of a strong UP-ideal. Moreover, they proved that the only strong UP-ideal of a UP-algebra X is X .

Definition 2.5. ⁷ Let $(X, \circ, 0_X)$ and $(Y, \bullet, 0_Y)$ be two UP-algebras. A function f from X to Y is said to be a *UP-homomorphism* if

$$\text{(for all } x, y \in X)(f(x \circ y) = f(x) \bullet f(y)).$$

A UP-homomorphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be a *UP-epimorphism* if f is surjective, a *UP-monomorphism* if f is injective, and a *UP-isomorphism* if f is bijective.

Theorem 2.6. ⁹ Let X and Y be two UP-algebras with fixed elements of 0_X and 0_Y , respectively, and let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a UP-homomorphism. Then the followings hold:

- (1) $f(0_X) = 0_Y$, and
- (2) (for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$)($x_1 \leq x_2 \Rightarrow f(x_1) \leq f(x_2)$).

In 1965, the concept of a fuzzy set in a non-empty set was introduced by Zadeh³⁸ with the following definition.

Definition 2.7. A *fuzzy set* (briefly, FS) in a non-empty set X (or a fuzzy subset of X) is defined to be a function $\lambda: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where $[0, 1]$ is the unit segment of the real line. Denote by $[0, 1]^X$ the collection of all FSs in X . Define a binary relation \leq on $[0, 1]^X$ as follows:

$$\text{(for all } \lambda, \mu \in [0, 1]^X)(\lambda \leq \mu \Leftrightarrow \text{(for all } x \in X)(\lambda(x) \leq \mu(x))). \tag{2.14}$$

Definition 2.8. ²⁷ Let λ be a FS in a non-empty set X . The *complement* of λ , denoted by λ^C , is defined by

$$\text{(for all } x \in X)(\lambda^C(x) = 1 - \lambda(x)). \tag{2.15}$$

Definition 2.9. ²⁰ Let $\{\lambda_j \mid j \in J\}$ be a family of FSs in a non-empty set X . We define the *join* and the *meet* of $\{\lambda_j \mid j \in J\}$, denoted by $\bigvee_{j \in J} \lambda_j$ and $\bigwedge_{j \in J} \lambda_j$, respectively, as follows:

$$\text{(for all } x \in X)((\bigvee_{j \in J} \lambda_j)(x) = \sup_{j \in J} \{\lambda_j(x)\}), \tag{2.16}$$

$$\text{(for all } x \in X)((\bigwedge_{j \in J} \lambda_j)(x) = \inf_{j \in J} \{\lambda_j(x)\}). \tag{2.17}$$

In particular, if λ and μ be FSs in X , we have the join and meet of λ and μ as follows:

$$\text{(for all } x \in X)((\lambda \vee \mu)(x) = \max\{\lambda(x), \mu(x)\}), \tag{2.18}$$

$$\text{(for all } x \in X)((\lambda \wedge \mu)(x) = \min\{\lambda(x), \mu(x)\}), \tag{2.19}$$

respectively.

An interval number we mean a close subinterval $\hat{a} = [a^-, a^+]$ of $[0, 1]$, where $0 \leq a^- \leq a^+ \leq 1$. The interval number $\hat{a} = [a^-, a^+]$ with $a^- = a^+$ is denoted by \mathbf{a} . Denote by $\text{int}[0, 1]$ the set of all interval numbers.

Definition 2.10. ¹⁵ Let $\{\hat{a}_j \mid j \in J\}$ be a family of interval numbers. We define the *refined infimum* and the *refined supremum* of $\{\hat{a}_j \mid j \in J\}$, denoted by $\text{rinf}_{j \in J} \hat{a}_j$ and $\text{rsup}_{j \in J} \hat{a}_j$, respectively, as follows:

$$\text{rinf}_{j \in J} \{\hat{a}_j\} = [\inf_{j \in J} \{a_j^-\}, \inf_{j \in J} \{a_j^+\}], \tag{2.20}$$

$$\text{rsup}_{j \in J} \{\hat{a}_j\} = [\sup_{j \in J} \{a_j^-\}, \sup_{j \in J} \{a_j^+\}]. \tag{2.21}$$

In particular, if $\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2 \in \text{int}[0, 1]$, we define the *refined minimum* and the *refined maximum* of \hat{a}_1 and \hat{a}_2 , denoted by $\text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\}$ and $\text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\}$, respectively, as follows:

$$\text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\} = [\min\{a_1^-, a_2^-\}, \min\{a_1^+, a_2^+\}], \tag{2.22}$$

$$\text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\} = [\max\{a_1^-, a_2^-\}, \max\{a_1^+, a_2^+\}]. \tag{2.23}$$

Definition 2.11. ¹⁵ Let $\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2 \in \text{int}[0, 1]$. We define the symbols “ \succeq ”, “ \preceq ”, “ $=$ ” in case of \hat{a}_1 and \hat{a}_2 as follows:

$$\hat{a}_1 \succeq \hat{a}_2 \Leftrightarrow a_1^- \geq a_2^- \text{ and } a_1^+ \geq a_2^+, \tag{2.24}$$

and similarly we may have $\hat{a}_1 \preceq \hat{a}_2$ and $\hat{a}_1 = \hat{a}_2$. To say $\hat{a}_1 \succ \hat{a}_2$ (resp., $\hat{a}_1 \prec \hat{a}_2$) we mean $\hat{a}_1 \succeq \hat{a}_2$ and $\hat{a}_1 \neq \hat{a}_2$ (resp., $\hat{a}_1 \preceq \hat{a}_2$ and $\hat{a}_1 \neq \hat{a}_2$).

Definition 2.12. ³⁹ Let $\hat{a} \in \text{int}[0, 1]$. The *complement* of \hat{a} , denoted by \hat{a}^C , is defined by the interval number

$$\hat{a}^C = [1 - a^+, 1 - a^-]. \tag{2.25}$$

In the $\text{int}[0, 1]$, the followings are valid (see³⁵).

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a} \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a} \succeq \hat{a}), \tag{2.26}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a} \in \text{int}[0, 1]) ((\hat{a}^C)^C = \hat{a}), \tag{2.27}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a} \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\text{rmax}\{\hat{a}, \hat{a}\} = \hat{a} \text{ and } \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}, \hat{a}\} = \hat{a}), \tag{2.28}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\} = \text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_1\} \text{ and } \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\} = \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_1\}), \tag{2.29}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\} \succeq \hat{a}_1 \text{ and } \hat{a}_2 \succeq \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\}), \tag{2.30}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a}_1 \succeq \hat{a}_2 \Leftrightarrow \hat{a}_1^C \preceq \hat{a}_2^C), \tag{2.31}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3, \hat{a}_4 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a}_1 \succeq \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3 \succeq \hat{a}_4 \Rightarrow \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_3\} \succeq \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_4\}), \tag{2.32}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a}_1 \succeq \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3 \succeq \hat{a}_2 \Leftrightarrow \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_3\} \succeq \hat{a}_2), \tag{2.33}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3, \hat{a}_4 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a}_1 \succeq \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3 \succeq \hat{a}_4 \Rightarrow \text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_3\} \succeq \text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_4\}), \tag{2.34}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a}_2 \succeq \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2 \succeq \hat{a}_3 \Leftrightarrow \hat{a}_2 \succeq \text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_3\}), \tag{2.35}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a}_1 \succeq \hat{a}_2 \Leftrightarrow \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\} = \hat{a}_2), \tag{2.36}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a}_1 \preceq \hat{a}_2 \Leftrightarrow \text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\} = \hat{a}_1), \tag{2.37}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_1^C, \hat{a}_2^C\} = \text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\}^C), \tag{2.38}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_1^C, \hat{a}_2^C\} = \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2\}^C), \tag{2.39}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a}_1 \preceq \text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3\} \Leftrightarrow \hat{a}_1^C \succeq \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_2^C, \hat{a}_3^C\}), \tag{2.40}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a}_1 \succeq \text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3\} \Leftrightarrow \hat{a}_1^C \preceq \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_2^C, \hat{a}_3^C\}), \tag{2.41}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a}_1 \preceq \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3\} \Leftrightarrow \hat{a}_1^C \succeq \text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_2^C, \hat{a}_3^C\}), \text{ and} \tag{2.42}$$

$$\text{(for all } \hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3 \in \text{int}[0, 1]) (\hat{a}_1 \succeq \text{rmin}\{\hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_3\} \Leftrightarrow \hat{a}_1^C \preceq \text{rmax}\{\hat{a}_2^C, \hat{a}_3^C\}). \tag{2.43}$$

In 1975, the concept of an interval-valued fuzzy set in a non-empty set was first introduced by Zadeh³⁸ with the following definition.

Definition 2.13. An *interval-valued fuzzy set* (briefly, IVFS) in a non-empty set X is an arbitrary function $A : X \rightarrow \text{int}[0, 1]$. Let $IVFS(X)$ stands for the set of all IVFS in X . For every $A \in IVFS(X)$ and $x \in X$, $A(x) = [A^-(x), A^+(x)]$ is said to be the *degree of membership* of an element x to A , where A^-, A^+ are FSs in X which are called a *lower fuzzy set* and an *upper fuzzy set* in X , respectively. For simplicity, we denote $A = [A^-, A^+]$.

Definition 2.14. ¹⁵ Let A and B be IVFSs in a non-empty set X . We define the symbols “ \subseteq ”, “ \supseteq ”, “ $=$ ” in case of A and B as follows:

$$A \subseteq B \Leftrightarrow (\text{for all } x \in X)(A(x) \preceq B(x)), \tag{2.44}$$

and similarly we may have $A \supseteq B$ and $A = B$.

Definition 2.15. ³⁹ Let A be an IVFS in a non-empty set X . The *complement* of A , denoted by A^C , is defined as follows: $A^C(x) = A(x)^C$ for all $x \in X$, that is,

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)(A^C(x) = [1 - A^+(x), 1 - A^-(x)]). \tag{2.45}$$

We note that $A^{C^-}(x) = 1 - A^+(x)$ and $A^{C^+}(x) = 1 - A^-(x)$ for all $x \in X$.

Definition 2.16. ³⁹ Let $\{A_j \mid j \in J\}$ be a family of IVFSs in a non-empty set X . We define the *intersection* and the *union* of $\{A_j \mid j \in J\}$, denoted by $\cap_{j \in J} A_j$ and $\cup_{j \in J} A_j$, respectively, as follows:

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)((\cap_{j \in J} A_j)(x) = \text{rinf}_{j \in J} \{A_j(x)\}), \tag{2.46}$$

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)((\cup_{j \in J} A_j)(x) = \text{rsup}_{j \in J} \{A_j(x)\}). \tag{2.47}$$

We note that

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)((\cap_{j \in J} A_j)^-(x) = (\wedge_{j \in J} A_j^-(x)) = \inf_{j \in J} \{A_j^-(x)\})$$

and

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)((\cap_{j \in J} A_j)^+(x) = (\wedge_{j \in J} A_j^+(x)) = \inf_{j \in J} \{A_j^+(x)\}).$$

Similarly,

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)((\cup_{j \in J} A_j)^-(x) = (\vee_{j \in J} A_j^-(x)) = \sup_{j \in J} \{A_j^-(x)\})$$

and

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)((\cup_{j \in J} A_j)^+(x) = (\vee_{j \in J} A_j^+(x)) = \sup_{j \in J} \{A_j^+(x)\}).$$

In particular, if A_1 and A_2 are IVFSs in X , we have the intersection and the union of A_1 and A_2 as follows:

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)((A_1 \cap A_2)(x) = \text{rmin}\{A_1(x), A_2(x)\}), \tag{2.48}$$

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)((A_1 \cup A_2)(x) = \text{rmax}\{A_1(x), A_2(x)\}). \tag{2.49}$$

In 1999, the concept of a neutrosophic set in a non-empty set was introduced by Smarandache²⁶ with the following definition.

Definition 2.17. A *neutrosophic set* (briefly, NS) in a non-empty set X is a structure of the form:

$$\Lambda = \{(x, \lambda_T(x), \lambda_I(x), \lambda_F(x)) \mid x \in X\}, \tag{2.50}$$

where $\lambda_T : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a *truth membership function*, $\lambda_I : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is an *indeterminate membership function*, and $\lambda_F : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a *false membership function*. For our convenience, we will denote a NS as $\Lambda = (X, \lambda_T, \lambda_I, \lambda_F) = (X, \lambda_{T,I,F}) = \{(x, \lambda_T(x), \lambda_I(x), \lambda_F(x)) \mid x \in X\}$.

Definition 2.18. ²⁶ Let Λ be a NS in a non-empty set X . The NS $\Lambda^C = (X, \lambda_T^C, \lambda_I^C, \lambda_F^C)$ in X is said to be the *complement* of Λ in X .

In 2005, the concept of an interval neutrosophic set in a non-empty set was introduced by Wang et al.³⁷ with the following definition.

Definition 2.19. An *interval-valued neutrosophic set* (briefly, IVNS) in a non-empty set X is a structure of the form:

$$\mathbf{A} := \{(x, A_T(x), A_I(x), A_F(x)) \mid x \in X\}, \tag{2.51}$$

where A_T, A_I and A_F are IVFSs in X , which are called an *interval truth membership function*, an *interval indeterminacy membership function* and an *interval falsity membership function*, respectively. For our convenience, we will denote a IVNS as $\mathbf{A} = (X, A_T, A_I, A_F) = (X, A_{T,I,F}) = \{(x, A_T(x), A_I(x), A_F(x)) \mid x \in X\}$.

Definition 2.20. ³⁷ Let $\mathbf{A} = (X, A_T, A_I, A_F)$ be an IVNS in a non-empty set X . The IVNS $\mathbf{A}^C = (X, A_T^C, A_I^C, A_F^C)$ in X is said to be the *complement* of \mathbf{A} in X .

In 2012, the concept of a cubic set in a non-empty set was introduced by Jun et al.¹² with the following definition.

Definition 2.21. A *cubic set* (briefly, CS) in a non-empty set X is a structure of the form:

$$C = \{(x, A(x), \lambda(x)) \mid x \in X\}, \tag{2.52}$$

where A is an IVFS in X and λ is a FS in X . For our convenience, we will denote a CS as $C = (X, A, \lambda) = \{(x, A(x), \lambda(x)) \mid x \in X\}$.

In 2017, Jun et al.¹⁵ introduced the concept of a neutrosophic cubic set with the following definition.

Definition 2.22. A neutrosophic cubic set (briefly, NCS) in a non-empty set X is a pair $\mathcal{A} = (\mathbf{A}, \Lambda)$, where $\mathbf{A} = (X, A_T, A_I, A_F)$ is an IVNS in X and $\Lambda = (X, \lambda_T, \lambda_I, \lambda_F)$ is a neutrosophic set in X . For simplicity, we denote $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$. A NCS $\mathcal{A} = (\mathbf{A}, \Lambda)$ in a non-empty set X is said to be *constant* if $A_T, A_I, A_F, \lambda_T, \lambda_I,$ and λ_F are constant functions. The complement of a NCS $\mathcal{A} = (\mathbf{A}, \Lambda)$ is defined to be the NCS $\mathcal{A}^C = (\mathbf{A}^C, \Lambda^C)$.

In 2020, the concepts of a neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra, a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter, a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter, a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal, and a neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal of a UP-algebra were introduced by Songsaeng and Iampan³⁰ with the following definition.

Definition 2.23. A NCS $\mathcal{A} = (\mathbf{A}, \Lambda)$ in a UP-algebra $X = (X, \circ, 0)$ is said to be

(1) a *neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra* of X if

$$\text{(for all } x, y \in X) \begin{pmatrix} A_T(x \circ y) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T(x), A_T(y)\} \\ A_I(x \circ y) \preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I(x), A_I(y)\} \\ A_F(x \circ y) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F(x), A_F(y)\} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.53}$$

$$\text{(for all } x, y \in X) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_T(x \circ y) \leq \max\{\lambda_T(x), \lambda_T(y)\} \\ \lambda_I(x \circ y) \geq \min\{\lambda_I(x), \lambda_I(y)\} \\ \lambda_F(x \circ y) \leq \max\{\lambda_F(x), \lambda_F(y)\} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.54}$$

(2) a *neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter* of X if

$$\text{(for all } x \in X) \begin{pmatrix} A_T(0) \succeq A_T(x) \\ A_I(0) \preceq A_I(x) \\ A_F(0) \succeq A_F(x) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.55}$$

$$\text{(for all } x \in X) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_T(0) \leq \lambda_T(x) \\ \lambda_I(0) \geq \lambda_I(x) \\ \lambda_F(0) \leq \lambda_F(x) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.56}$$

$$\text{(for all } x, y \in X) \begin{pmatrix} A_T(x \circ y) \succeq A_T(y) \\ A_I(x \circ y) \preceq A_I(y) \\ A_F(x \circ y) \succeq A_F(y) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.57}$$

$$\text{(for all } x, y \in X) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_T(x \circ y) \leq \lambda_T(y) \\ \lambda_I(x \circ y) \geq \lambda_I(y) \\ \lambda_F(x \circ y) \leq \lambda_F(y) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.58}$$

(3) a *neutrosophic cubic UP-filter* of X if it holds the followings: (2.55), (2.56), and

$$\text{(for all } x, y \in X) \begin{pmatrix} A_T(y) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T(x \circ y), A_T(x)\} \\ A_I(y) \preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I(x \circ y), A_I(x)\} \\ A_F(y) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F(x \circ y), A_F(x)\} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.59}$$

$$\text{(for all } x, y \in X) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_T(y) \leq \max\{\lambda_T(x \circ y), \lambda_T(x)\} \\ \lambda_I(y) \geq \min\{\lambda_I(x \circ y), \lambda_I(x)\} \\ \lambda_F(y) \leq \max\{\lambda_F(x \circ y), \lambda_F(x)\} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.60}$$

(4) a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal of X if it holds the followings: (2.55), (2.56), and

$$(\text{for all } x, y, z \in X) \begin{pmatrix} A_T(x \circ z) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T(x \circ (y \circ z)), A_T(y)\} \\ A_I(x \circ z) \preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I(x \circ (y \circ z)), A_I(y)\} \\ A_F(x \circ z) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F(x \circ (y \circ z)), A_F(y)\} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.61}$$

$$(\text{for all } x, y, z \in X) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_T(x \circ z) \leq \max\{\lambda_T(x \circ (y \circ z)), \lambda_T(y)\} \\ \lambda_I(x \circ z) \geq \min\{\lambda_I(x \circ (y \circ z)), \lambda_I(y)\} \\ \lambda_F(x \circ z) \leq \max\{\lambda_F(x \circ (y \circ z)), \lambda_F(y)\} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.62}$$

(5) a neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal of X if it holds the followings: (2.55), (2.56), and

$$(\text{for all } x, y, z \in X) \begin{pmatrix} A_T(x) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), A_T(y)\} \\ A_I(x) \preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), A_I(y)\} \\ A_F(x) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), A_F(y)\} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.63}$$

$$(\text{for all } x, y, z \in X) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_T(x) \leq \max\{\lambda_T((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), \lambda_T(y)\} \\ \lambda_I(x) \geq \min\{\lambda_I((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), \lambda_I(y)\} \\ \lambda_F(x) \leq \max\{\lambda_F((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), \lambda_F(y)\} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.64}$$

Songsang and Iampan³⁰ proved that the concept of a neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra is a generalization of a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter, a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter is a generalization of a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter, a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter is a generalization of a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal, and a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal is a generalization of a neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal. Moreover, they proved that a neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal and a constant NCS coincide.

3 Homomorphic properties of a NCSs in a UP-algebra

In this section, the image and inverse image of a NCS are defined and some results are studied.

Definition 3.1. Let f be a function from a non-empty set X into a non-empty set Y and $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ be a NCS in X . Then the image of \mathcal{A} under f is defined as a NCS $f(\mathcal{A}) = (f(A)_{T,I,F}, f(\lambda)_{T,I,F})$ in Y , where

$$f(A)_T(y) = \begin{cases} \text{rsup}_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \{A_T(x)\} & \text{if } f^{-1}(y) \text{ is non-empty,} \\ [0, 0] & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$f(A)_I(y) = \begin{cases} \text{rinf}_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \{A_I(x)\} & \text{if } f^{-1}(y) \text{ is non-empty,} \\ [1, 1] & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$f(A)_F(y) = \begin{cases} \text{rsup}_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \{A_F(x)\} & \text{if } f^{-1}(y) \text{ is non-empty,} \\ [0, 0] & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$f(\lambda)_T(y) = \begin{cases} \text{inf}_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \{\lambda_T(x)\} & \text{if } f^{-1}(y) \text{ is non-empty,} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$f(\lambda)_I(y) = \begin{cases} \text{sup}_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \{\lambda_I(x)\} & \text{if } f^{-1}(y) \text{ is non-empty,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$f(\lambda)_F(y) = \begin{cases} \text{inf}_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \{\lambda_F(x)\} & \text{if } f^{-1}(y) \text{ is non-empty,} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Example 3.2. Let $X = \{0_X, 1_X, 2_X\}$ be a UP-algebra with a fixed element 0_X and a binary operation \circ defined by the following Cayley table:

\circ	0_X	1_X	2_X
0_X	0_X	1_X	2_X
1_X	0_X	0_X	1_X
2_X	0_X	0_X	0_X

and let $Y = \{0_Y, 1_Y, 2_Y\}$ be a UP-algebra with a fixed element 0_Y and a binary operation \bullet defined by the following Cayley table:

\bullet	0_Y	1_Y	2_Y
0_Y	0_Y	1_Y	2_Y
1_Y	0_Y	0_Y	2_Y
2_Y	0_Y	0_Y	0_Y

We define a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ as follows:

$$f(0_X) = 0_Y, f(1_X) = 1_Y, \text{ and } f(2_X) = 1_Y.$$

We define a NCS $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ in X with the tabular representation as follows:

X	$\mathbf{A}(x)$	$\Lambda(x)$
0_X	$([0.4, 0.7], [0.5, 0.7], [0.2, 0.4])$	$(0.1, 0.3, 0.4)$
1_X	$([0.1, 0.2], [0.1, 0.5], [0.4, 0.5])$	$(0.3, 0.8, 0.4)$
2_X	$([0.8, 0.9], [0.7, 0.8], [0.1, 0.6])$	$(0.1, 0.5, 0.7)$

Then $f(\mathcal{A}) = (f(A)_{T,I,F}, f(\lambda)_{T,I,F})$ in Y with the tabular representation as follows:

Y	$\mathbf{A}(x)$	$\Lambda(x)$
0_Y	$([0.4, 0.7], [0.5, 0.7], [0.2, 0.4])$	$(0.1, 0.3, 0.4)$
1_Y	$([0.8, 0.9], [0.1, 0.5], [0.4, 0.6])$	$(0.1, 0.8, 0.4)$
2_Y	$([0, 0], [1, 1], [0, 0])$	$(1, 0, 1)$

Hence, $f(\mathcal{A}) = (f(A)_{T,I,F}, f(\lambda)_{T,I,F})$ is a NCS in Y .

Definition 3.3. Let f be a function from a non-empty set X into a non-empty set Y and $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ be a NCS in Y . Then the inverse image of \mathcal{A} is defined as a NCS $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) = (f^{-1}(A)_{T,I,F}, f^{-1}(\lambda)_{T,I,F})$ in X , where

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)(f^{-1}(A)_{T,I,F}(x) = A_{T,I,F}(f(x))), \tag{3.1}$$

$$(\text{for all } x \in X)(f^{-1}(\lambda)_{T,I,F}(x) = \lambda_{T,I,F}(f(x))). \tag{3.2}$$

Example 3.4. In Example 3.2, we have $(X, \circ, 0_X)$ and $(Y, \bullet, 0_Y)$ are two UP-algebras. We define a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ as follows:

$$f(0_X) = 0_Y, f(1_X) = 1_Y, \text{ and } f(2_X) = 1_Y.$$

We define a NCS $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ in Y with the tabular representation as follows:

Y	$\mathbf{A}(x)$	$\Lambda(x)$
0_Y	$([0.3, 0.7], [0.3, 0.5], [0.1, 0.4])$	$(0.5, 0.4, 0.7)$
1_Y	$([0.6, 0.7], [0.1, 0.3], [0.4, 0.5])$	$(0.2, 0.7, 0.8)$
2_Y	$([0.5, 0.9], [0.3, 0.5], [0.5, 0.8])$	$(0.3, 0.5, 0.4)$

Then $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) = (f^{-1}(A)_{T,I,F}, f^{-1}(\lambda)_{T,I,F})$ in X with the tabular representation as follows:

X	$\mathbf{A}(x)$	$\Lambda(x)$
0_X	$([0.3, 0.7], [0.3, 0.5], [0.1, 0.4])$	$(0.5, 0.4, 0.7)$
1_X	$([0.6, 0.7], [0.1, 0.3], [0.4, 0.5])$	$(0.2, 0.7, 0.8)$
2_X	$([0.6, 0.7], [0.1, 0.3], [0.4, 0.5])$	$(0.2, 0.7, 0.8)$

Hence, $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) = (f^{-1}(A)_{T,I,F}, f^{-1}(\lambda)_{T,I,F})$ is a NCS in X .

Definition 3.5. A NCS

$\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ in X is said to be *order preserving* if

$$(\text{for all } x, y \in X) \left(x \leq y \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A_T(x) \preceq A_T(y), A_I(x) \succeq A_I(y), A_F(x) \preceq A_F(y), \\ \lambda_T(x) \geq \lambda_T(y), \lambda_I(x) \leq \lambda_I(y), \lambda_F(x) \geq \lambda_F(y) \end{array} \right. \right). \tag{3.3}$$

Lemma 3.6. Every neutrosophic cubic UP-filter (resp., neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal, neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal) of X is order preserving.

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ is a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter of X . Let $x, y \in X$ be such that $x \leq y$ in X . Then $x \circ y = 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} A_T(y) &\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T(x \circ y), A_T(x)\} = \text{rmin}\{A_T(0), A_T(x)\} = A_T(x), && ((2.59),(2.55),(2.36)) \\ A_I(y) &\preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I(x \circ y), A_I(x)\} = \text{rmin}\{A_I(0), A_I(x)\} = A_I(x), && ((2.59),(2.55),(2.37)) \\ A_F(y) &\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F(x \circ y), A_F(x)\} = \text{rmin}\{A_F(0), A_F(x)\} = A_F(x), && ((2.59),(2.55),(2.36)) \\ \lambda_T(y) &\leq \max\{\lambda_T(x \circ y), \lambda_T(x)\} = \max\{\lambda_T(0), \lambda_T(x)\} = \lambda_T(x), && ((2.60),(2.56)) \\ \lambda_I(y) &\geq \min\{\lambda_I(x \circ y), \lambda_I(x)\} = \min\{\lambda_I(0), \lambda_I(x)\} = \lambda_I(x), && ((2.60),(2.56)) \\ \lambda_F(y) &\leq \max\{\lambda_F(x \circ y), \lambda_F(x)\} = \max\{\lambda_F(0), \lambda_F(x)\} = \lambda_F(x). && ((2.60),(2.56)) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, \mathcal{A} is order preserving. □

Theorem 3.7. Let $(X, \circ, 0_X)$ and $(Y, \bullet, 0_Y)$ be two UP-algebras, $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a UP-homomorphism, and $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ be a NCS in Y . Then the followings hold:

- (1) If \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra of Y , then the inverse image $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} under f is a neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra of X .
- (2) If \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter of Y which is order preserving, then the inverse image $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} under f is a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter of X .
- (3) If \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter of Y , then the inverse image $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} under f is a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter of X .
- (4) If \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal of Y , then the inverse image $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} under f is a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal of X .
- (5) If \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal of Y , then the inverse image $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} under f is a neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal of X .

Proof. (1) Assume that \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra of Y . Then for all $x, y \in X$,

$$f^{-1}(A)_T(x \circ y) = A_T(f(x \circ y)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= A_T(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \\ &\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T(f(x)), A_T(f(y))\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{f^{-1}(A)_T(x), f^{-1}(A)_T(y)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_I(x \circ y) = A_I(f(x \circ y)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= A_I(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \\ &\preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I(f(x)), A_I(f(y))\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

$$= \text{rmax}\{f^{-1}(A)_I(x), f^{-1}(A)_I(y)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_F(x \circ y) = A_F(f(x \circ y)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= A_F(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \\ &\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F(f(x)), A_F(f(y))\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{f^{-1}(A)_F(x), f^{-1}(A)_F(y)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(x \circ y) = \lambda_T(f(x \circ y)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \lambda_T(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \\ &\leq \max\{\lambda_T(f(x)), \lambda_T(f(y))\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.54}$$

$$= \max\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(x), f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(y)\}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(x \circ y) = \lambda_I(f(x \circ y)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \lambda_I(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \\ &\geq \min\{\lambda_I(f(x)), \lambda_I(f(y))\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.54}$$

$$= \min\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(x), f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(y)\}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(x \circ y) = \lambda_F(f(x \circ y)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$= \lambda_F(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \tag{2.54}$$

$$\leq \max\{\lambda_F(f(x)), \lambda_F(f(y))\}$$

$$= \max\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(x), f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(y)\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Hence, $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ is a neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra of X .

(2) Assume that \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter of Y which is order preserving. By Theorem 2.6 (2) and (UP-3), we have for all $x \in X$,

$$f^{-1}(A)_T(0_X) = A_T(f(0_X)) \succeq A_T(f(x)) = f^{-1}(A)_T(x),$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_I(0_X) = A_I(f(0_X)) \preceq A_I(f(x)) = f^{-1}(A)_I(x),$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_F(0_X) = A_F(f(0_X)) \succeq A_F(f(x)) = f^{-1}(A)_F(x),$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(0_X) = \lambda_T(f(0_X)) \leq \lambda_T(f(x)) = f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(x),$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(0_X) = \lambda_I(f(0_X)) \geq \lambda_I(f(x)) = f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(x),$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(0_X) = \lambda_F(f(0_X)) \leq \lambda_F(f(x)) = f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(x).$$

Let $x, y \in X$. Then

$$f^{-1}(A)_T(x \circ y) = A_T(f(x \circ y)) = A_T(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \succeq A_T(f(y)) = f^{-1}(A)_T(y), \tag{2.57},(3.1)$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_I(x \circ y) = A_I(f(x \circ y)) = A_I(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \preceq A_I(f(y)) = f^{-1}(A)_I(y), \tag{2.57},(3.1)$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_F(x \circ y) = A_F(f(x \circ y)) = A_F(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \succeq A_F(f(y)) = f^{-1}(A)_F(y), \tag{2.57},(3.1)$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(x \circ y) = \lambda_T(f(x \circ y)) = \lambda_T(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \leq \lambda_T(f(y)) = f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(y), \tag{2.58},(3.2)$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(x \circ y) = \lambda_I(f(x \circ y)) = \lambda_I(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \geq \lambda_I(f(y)) = f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(y), \tag{2.58},(3.2)$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(x \circ y) = \lambda_F(f(x \circ y)) = \lambda_F(f(x) \bullet f(y)) \leq \lambda_F(f(y)) = f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(y). \tag{2.58},(3.2)$$

Hence, $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ is a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter of X .

(3) Assume that \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter of Y . Then \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter of Y . By Lemma 3.6 and the proof of (2), we have $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies the assertions (2.55) and (2.56). Let $x, y \in X$. Then

$$f^{-1}(A)_T(y) = A_T(f(y)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T(f(x) \bullet f(y)), A_T(f(x))\} \tag{2.59}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{A_T(f(x \circ y)), A_T(f(x))\}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{f^{-1}(A)_T(x \circ y), f^{-1}(A)_T(x)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_I(y) = A_I(f(y)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$\preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I(f(x) \bullet f(y)), A_I(f(x))\} \tag{2.59}$$

$$= \text{rmax}\{A_I(f(x \circ y)), A_I(f(x))\}$$

$$= \text{rmax}\{f^{-1}(A)_I(x \circ y), f^{-1}(A)_I(x)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_F(y) = A_F(f(y)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F(f(x) \bullet f(y)), A_F(f(x))\} \tag{2.59}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{A_F(f(x \circ y)), A_F(f(x))\}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{f^{-1}(A)_F(x \circ y), f^{-1}(A)_F(x)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(y) = \lambda_T(f(y)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$\leq \max\{\lambda_T(f(x) \bullet f(y)), \lambda_T(f(x))\} \tag{2.60}$$

$$= \max\{\lambda_T(f(x \circ y)), \lambda_T(f(x))\}$$

$$= \max\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(x \circ y), f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(x)\}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(y) = \lambda_I(f(y)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$\geq \min\{\lambda_I(f(x) \bullet f(y)), \lambda_I(f(x))\} \tag{2.60}$$

$$= \min\{\lambda_I(f(x \circ y)), \lambda_I(f(x))\}$$

$$= \min\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(x \circ y), f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(x)\}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(y) = \lambda_F(f(y)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$\leq \max\{\lambda_F(f(x) \bullet f(y)), \lambda_F(f(x))\} \tag{2.60}$$

$$= \max\{\lambda_F(f(x \circ y)), \lambda_F(f(x))\}$$

$$= \max\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(x \circ y), f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(x)\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Hence, $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ is a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter of X .

(4) Assume that \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal of Y . Then \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter of Y . By the proof of (3), we have $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies the assertions (2.55) and (2.56). Let $x, y, z \in X$. Then

$$f^{-1}(A)_T(x \circ z) = A_T(f(x \circ z)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$= A_T(f(x) \bullet f(z))$$

$$\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T(f(x) \bullet (f(y) \bullet f(z))), A_T(f(y))\} \tag{2.61}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{A_T(f(x) \bullet (f(y \circ z))), A_T(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{A_T(f(x \circ (y \circ z))), A_T(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{f^{-1}(A)_T(x \circ (y \circ z)), f^{-1}(A)_T(y)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_I(x \circ z) = A_I(f(x \circ z)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$= A_I(f(x) \bullet f(z))$$

$$\preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I(f(x) \bullet (f(y) \bullet f(z))), A_I(f(y))\} \tag{2.61}$$

$$= \text{rmax}\{A_I(f(x) \bullet (f(y \circ z))), A_I(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmax}\{A_I(f(x \circ (y \circ z))), A_I(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmax}\{f^{-1}(A)_I(x \circ (y \circ z)), f^{-1}(A)_I(y)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_F(x \circ z) = A_F(f(x \circ z)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$= A_F(f(x) \bullet f(z))$$

$$\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F(f(x) \bullet (f(y) \bullet f(z))), A_F(f(y))\} \tag{2.61}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{A_F(f(x) \bullet (f(y \circ z))), A_F(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{A_F(f(x \circ (y \circ z))), A_F(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{f^{-1}(A)_F(x \circ (y \circ z)), f^{-1}(A)_F(y)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(x \circ z) = \lambda_T(f(x \circ z)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$= \lambda_T(f(x) \bullet f(z))$$

$$\leq \max\{\lambda_T(f(x) \bullet (f(y) \bullet f(z))), \lambda_T(f(y))\} \tag{2.62}$$

$$= \max\{\lambda_T(f(x) \bullet (f(y \circ z))), \lambda_T(f(y))\}$$

$$= \max\{\lambda_T(f(x \circ (y \circ z))), \lambda_T(f(y))\}$$

$$= \max\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(x \circ (y \circ z)), f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(y)\}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(x \circ z) = \lambda_I(f(x \circ z)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$= \lambda_I(f(x) \bullet f(z))$$

$$\geq \min\{\lambda_I(f(x) \bullet (f(y) \bullet f(z))), \lambda_I(f(y))\} \tag{2.62}$$

$$= \min\{\lambda_I(f(x) \bullet (f(y \circ z))), \lambda_I(f(y))\}$$

$$= \min\{\lambda_I(f(x \circ (y \circ z))), \lambda_I(f(y))\}$$

$$= \min\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(x \circ (y \circ z)), f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(y)\}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(x \circ z) = \lambda_F(f(x \circ z)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$= \lambda_F(f(x) \bullet f(z))$$

$$\leq \max\{\lambda_F(f(x) \bullet (f(y) \bullet f(z))), \lambda_F(f(y))\} \tag{2.62}$$

$$= \max\{\lambda_F(f(x) \bullet (f(y \circ z))), \lambda_F(f(y))\}$$

$$= \max\{\lambda_F(f(x \circ (y \circ z))), \lambda_F(f(y))\}$$

$$= \max\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(x \circ (y \circ z)), f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(y)\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Hence, $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ is a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal of X .

(5) Assume that \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal of Y . Then \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal of Y . By the proof of (4), we have $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies the assertions (2.55) and (2.56). Let $x, y, z \in X$. Then

$$f^{-1}(A)_T(x) = A_T(f(x)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T((f(z) \bullet f(y)) \bullet (f(z) \bullet f(x))), A_T(f(y))\} \tag{2.63}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{A_T(f(z \circ y) \bullet f(z \circ x)), A_T(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{A_T(f((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x))), A_T(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{f^{-1}(A)_T((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), f^{-1}(A)_T(y)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_I(x) = A_I(f(x)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$\preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I((f(z) \bullet f(y)) \bullet (f(z) \bullet f(x))), A_I(f(y))\} \tag{2.63}$$

$$= \text{rmax}\{A_I(f(z \circ y) \bullet f(z \circ x)), A_I(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmax}\{A_I(f((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x))), A_I(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmax}\{f^{-1}(A)_I((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), f^{-1}(A)_I(y)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(A)_F(x) = A_F(f(x)) \tag{3.1}$$

$$\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F((f(z) \bullet f(y)) \bullet (f(z) \bullet f(x))), A_F(f(y))\} \tag{2.63}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{A_F(f(z \circ y) \bullet f(z \circ x)), A_F(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{A_F(f((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x))), A_F(f(y))\}$$

$$= \text{rmin}\{f^{-1}(A)_F((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), f^{-1}(A)_F(y)\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(x) = \lambda_T(f(x)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$\leq \max\{\lambda_T((f(z) \bullet f(y)) \bullet (f(z) \bullet f(x))), \lambda_T(f(y))\} \tag{2.64}$$

$$= \max\{\lambda_T(f(z \circ y) \bullet f(z \circ x)), \lambda_T(f(y))\}$$

$$= \max\{\lambda_T(f((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x))), \lambda_T(f(y))\}$$

$$= \max\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_T((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), f^{-1}(\lambda)_T(y)\}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(x) = \lambda_I(f(x)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$\geq \min\{\lambda_I((f(z) \bullet f(y)) \bullet (f(z) \bullet f(x))), \lambda_I(f(y))\} \tag{2.64}$$

$$= \min\{\lambda_I(f(z \circ y) \bullet f(z \circ x)), \lambda_I(f(y))\}$$

$$= \min\{\lambda_I(f((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x))), \lambda_I(f(y))\}$$

$$= \min\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_I((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), f^{-1}(\lambda)_I(y)\}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(x) = \lambda_F(f(x)) \tag{3.2}$$

$$\leq \max\{\lambda_F((f(z) \bullet f(y)) \bullet (f(z) \bullet f(x))), \lambda_F(f(y))\} \tag{2.64}$$

$$= \max\{\lambda_F(f(z \circ y) \bullet f(z \circ x)), \lambda_F(f(y))\}$$

$$= \max\{\lambda_F(f((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x))), \lambda_F(f(y))\}$$

$$= \max\{f^{-1}(\lambda)_F((z \circ y) \circ (z \circ x)), f^{-1}(\lambda)_F(y)\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Hence, $f^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ is a neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal of X . □

Definition 3.8. A NCS $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ in X has *NCS-property* if for any non-empty subset A of X , there exist elements $\alpha_T, \alpha_I, \alpha_F, \beta_T, \beta_I, \beta_F \in A$ (instead of $\alpha_T, \alpha_I, \alpha_F, \beta_T, \beta_I, \beta_F \in A$) such that

$$A_T(\alpha_T) = \text{rsup}_{s \in A}\{A_T(s)\}, A_I(\alpha_I) = \text{rinf}_{s \in A}\{A_I(s)\}, A_F(\alpha_F) = \text{rsup}_{s \in A}\{A_F(s)\},$$

$$\lambda_T(\beta_T) = \text{inf}_{s \in A}\{\lambda_T(s)\}, \lambda_I(\beta_I) = \text{sup}_{s \in A}\{\lambda_I(s)\}, \lambda_F(\beta_F) = \text{inf}_{s \in A}\{\lambda_F(s)\}.$$

Definition 3.9. Let X and Y be any two non-empty sets and let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be any function. A NCS $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ in X is said to be *f-invariant* if

$$(\text{for all } x, y \in X)(f(x) = f(y) \Rightarrow A_{T,I,F}(x) = A_{T,I,F}(y), \lambda_{T,I,F}(x) = \lambda_{T,I,F}(y)). \tag{3.4}$$

Lemma 3.10. Let $(X, \circ, 0_X)$ and $(Y, \bullet, 0_Y)$ be two UP-algebras and let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a UP-epimorphism. Let $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ be an *f-invariant* NCS in X with *NCS-property*. For any $x, y \in Y$, there exist

elements $\alpha_{T,I,F}, \gamma_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(x)$ and $\beta_{T,I,F}, \phi_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(y)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(x) &= A_T(\alpha_T), f(A)_I(x) = A_I(\alpha_I), f(A)_F(x) = A_F(\alpha_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T), f(\lambda)_I(x) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I), f(\lambda)_F(x) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F), \\ f(A)_T(y) &= A_T(\beta_T), f(A)_I(y) = A_I(\beta_I), f(A)_F(y) = A_F(\beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(y) &= \lambda_T(\phi_T), f(\lambda)_I(y) = \lambda_I(\phi_I), f(\lambda)_F(y) = \lambda_F(\phi_F), \\ f(A)_T(x \bullet y) &= A_T(\alpha_T \circ \beta_T), f(A)_I(x \bullet y) = A_I(\alpha_I \circ \beta_I), f(A)_F(x \bullet y) = A_F(\alpha_F \circ \beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet y) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ \phi_T), f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet y) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ \phi_I), f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet y) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ \phi_F). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $x, y \in Y$. Since f is surjective, we have $f^{-1}(x), f^{-1}(y)$, and $f^{-1}(x \circ y)$ are non-empty subsets of X . Since \mathcal{A} has NCS-property, there exist elements $\alpha_{T,I,F}, \gamma_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(x), \beta_{T,I,F}, \phi_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(y)$, and $a_{T,I,F}, b_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(x \bullet y)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(x) &= \text{rsup}_{s \in f^{-1}(x)} \{A_T(s)\} = A_T(\alpha_T), \\ f(A)_I(x) &= \text{rinf}_{s \in f^{-1}(x)} \{A_I(s)\} = A_I(\alpha_I), \\ f(A)_F(x) &= \text{rsup}_{s \in f^{-1}(x)} \{A_F(s)\} = A_F(\alpha_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x) &= \text{inf}_{s \in f^{-1}(x)} \{\lambda_T(s)\} = \lambda_T(\gamma_T), \\ f(\lambda)_I(x) &= \text{sup}_{s \in f^{-1}(x)} \{\lambda_I(s)\} = \lambda_I(\gamma_I), \\ f(\lambda)_F(x) &= \text{inf}_{s \in f^{-1}(x)} \{\lambda_F(s)\} = \lambda_F(\gamma_F), \\ f(A)_T(y) &= \text{rsup}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{A_T(s)\} = A_T(\beta_T), \\ f(A)_I(y) &= \text{rinf}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{A_I(s)\} = A_I(\beta_I), \\ f(A)_F(y) &= \text{rsup}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{A_F(s)\} = A_F(\beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(y) &= \text{inf}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{\lambda_T(s)\} = \lambda_T(\phi_T), \\ f(\lambda)_I(y) &= \text{sup}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{\lambda_I(s)\} = \lambda_I(\phi_I), \\ f(\lambda)_F(y) &= \text{inf}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{\lambda_F(s)\} = \lambda_F(\phi_F), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(x \bullet y) &= \text{rsup}_{s \in f^{-1}(x \bullet y)} \{A_T(s)\} = A_T(a_T), \\ f(A)_I(x \bullet y) &= \text{rinf}_{s \in f^{-1}(x \bullet y)} \{A_I(s)\} = A_I(a_I), \\ f(A)_F(x \bullet y) &= \text{rsup}_{s \in f^{-1}(x \bullet y)} \{A_F(s)\} = A_F(a_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet y) &= \text{inf}_{s \in f^{-1}(x \bullet y)} \{\lambda_T(s)\} = \lambda_T(b_T), \\ f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet y) &= \text{sup}_{s \in f^{-1}(x \bullet y)} \{\lambda_I(s)\} = \lambda_I(b_I), \\ f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet y) &= \text{inf}_{s \in f^{-1}(x \bullet y)} \{\lambda_F(s)\} = \lambda_F(b_F). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} f(a_T) &= x \bullet y = f(\alpha_T) \bullet f(\beta_T) = f(\alpha_T \circ \beta_T), \\ f(a_I) &= x \bullet y = f(\alpha_I) \bullet f(\beta_I) = f(\alpha_I \circ \beta_I), \\ f(a_F) &= x \bullet y = f(\alpha_F) \bullet f(\beta_F) = f(\alpha_F \circ \beta_F), \\ f(b_T) &= x \bullet y = f(\gamma_T) \bullet f(\phi_T) = f(\gamma_T \circ \phi_T), \\ f(b_I) &= x \bullet y = f(\gamma_I) \bullet f(\phi_I) = f(\gamma_I \circ \phi_I), \\ f(b_F) &= x \bullet y = f(\gamma_F) \bullet f(\phi_F) = f(\gamma_F \circ \phi_F), \end{aligned}$$

and \mathcal{A} is f -invariant, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(x \bullet y) &= A_T(a_T) = A_T(\alpha_T \circ \beta_T), \\ f(A)_I(x \bullet y) &= A_I(a_I) = A_I(\alpha_I \circ \beta_I), \\ f(A)_F(x \bullet y) &= A_F(a_F) = A_F(\alpha_F \circ \beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet y) &= \lambda_T(b_T) = \lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ \phi_T), \\ f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet y) &= \lambda_I(b_I) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ \phi_I), \\ f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet y) &= \lambda_F(b_{TF}) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ \phi_F). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. □

Theorem 3.11. Let $(X, \circ, 0_X)$ and $(Y, \bullet, 0_Y)$ be two UP-algebras, $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a UP-epimorphism, and $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ be a NCS in X . Then the followings hold:

- (1) If \mathcal{A} is an f -invariant neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra of X with NCS-property, then the image $f(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} under f is a neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra of Y .
- (2) If \mathcal{A} is an f -invariant neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter of X with NCS-property, then the image $f(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} under f is a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter of Y .
- (3) If \mathcal{A} is an f -invariant neutrosophic cubic UP-filter of X with NCS-property, then the image $f(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} under f is a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter of Y .
- (4) If \mathcal{A} is an f -invariant neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal of X with NCS-property, then the image $f(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} under f is a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal of Y .
- (5) If \mathcal{A} is an f -invariant neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal of X with NCS-property, then the image $f(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} under f is a neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal of Y .

Proof. (1) Assume that $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ is an f -invariant neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra of X with NCS-property. Let $x, y \in Y$. Since f is surjective, we have $f^{-1}(x), f^{-1}(y)$, and $f^{-1}(x \bullet y)$ are non-empty. By Lemma 3.10, there exist elements $\alpha_{T,I,F}, \gamma_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(x)$ and $\beta_{T,I,F}, \phi_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(y)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(x) &= A_T(\alpha_T), f(A)_I(x) = A_I(\alpha_I), f(A)_F(x) = A_F(\alpha_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T), f(\lambda)_I(x) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I), f(\lambda)_F(x) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F), \\ f(A)_T(y) &= A_T(\beta_T), f(A)_I(y) = A_I(\beta_I), f(A)_F(y) = A_F(\beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(y) &= \lambda_T(\phi_T), f(\lambda)_I(y) = \lambda_I(\phi_I), f(\lambda)_F(y) = \lambda_F(\phi_F), \\ f(A)_T(x \bullet y) &= A_T(\alpha_T \circ \beta_T), f(A)_I(x \bullet y) = A_I(\alpha_I \circ \beta_I), f(A)_F(x \bullet y) = A_F(\alpha_F \circ \beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet y) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ \phi_T), f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet y) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ \phi_I), f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet y) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ \phi_F). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$f(A)_T(x \bullet y) = A_T(\alpha_T \circ \beta_T) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T(\alpha_T), A_T(\beta_T)\} = \text{rmin}\{f(A)_T(x), f(A)_T(y)\}, \quad (2.53)$$

$$f(A)_I(x \bullet y) = A_I(\alpha_I \circ \beta_I) \preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I(\alpha_I), A_I(\beta_I)\} = \text{rmax}\{f(A)_I(x), f(A)_I(y)\}, \quad (2.53)$$

$$f(A)_F(x \bullet y) = A_F(\alpha_F \circ \beta_F) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F(\alpha_F), A_F(\beta_F)\} = \text{rmin}\{f(A)_F(x), f(A)_F(y)\}, \quad (2.53)$$

$$f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet y) = \lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ \phi_T) \leq \max\{\lambda_T(\gamma_T), \lambda_T(\phi_T)\} = \max\{f(\lambda)_T(x), f(\lambda)_T(y)\}, \quad (2.54)$$

$$f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet y) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ \phi_I) \geq \min\{\lambda_I(\gamma_I), \lambda_I(\phi_I)\} = \min\{f(\lambda)_I(x), f(\lambda)_I(y)\}, \quad (2.54)$$

$$f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet y) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ \phi_F) \leq \max\{\lambda_F(\gamma_F), \lambda_F(\phi_F)\} = \max\{f(\lambda)_F(x), f(\lambda)_F(y)\}. \quad (2.54)$$

Hence, $f(\mathcal{A})$ is a neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra of Y .

(2) Assume that $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ is an f -invariant neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter of X with NCS-property. By Theorem 2.6 (1), we have $0_X \in f^{-1}(0_Y)$ and so $f^{-1}(0_Y)$ is non-empty. Thus

$$\left(\begin{array}{l} f(A)_T(0_Y) = \text{rsup}_{s \in f^{-1}(0_Y)} \{A_T(s)\} \succeq A_T(0_X) \\ f(A)_I(0_Y) = \text{rinf}_{s \in f^{-1}(0_Y)} \{A_I(s)\} \preceq A_I(0_X) \\ f(A)_F(0_Y) = \text{rsup}_{s \in f^{-1}(0_Y)} \{A_F(s)\} \succeq A_F(0_X) \\ f(\lambda)_T(0_Y) = \text{inf}_{s \in f^{-1}(0_Y)} \{\lambda_T(s)\} \leq \lambda_T(0_X) \\ f(\lambda)_I(0_Y) = \text{sup}_{s \in f^{-1}(0_Y)} \{\lambda_I(s)\} \geq \lambda_I(0_X) \\ f(\lambda)_F(0_Y) = \text{inf}_{s \in f^{-1}(0_Y)} \{\lambda_F(s)\} \leq \lambda_F(0_X) \end{array} \right). \quad (3.5)$$

Let $y \in Y$. Since f is surjective, we have $f^{-1}(y)$ is non-empty. By (2.55) and (2.56), we have $A_T(0_X) \succeq A_T(s), A_I(0_X) \preceq A_I(s), A_F(0_X) \succeq A_F(s), \lambda_T(0_X) \leq \lambda_T(s), \lambda_I(0_X) \geq \lambda_I(s), \lambda_F(0_X) \leq \lambda_F(s)$ for all $s \in f^{-1}(y)$. Then $A_T(0_X)$ is an upper bound of $\{A_T(s)\}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)}$, $A_I(0_X)$ is a lower bound of $\{A_I(s)\}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)}$, $A_F(0_X)$ is an upper bound of $\{A_F(s)\}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)}$, $\lambda_T(0_X)$ is a lower bound of $\{\lambda_T(s)\}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)}$, $\lambda_I(0_X)$ is an

upper bound of $\{\lambda_I(s)\}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)}$, and $\lambda_F(0_X)$ is a lower bound of $\{\lambda_F(s)\}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)}$. By (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(0_Y) &\succeq A_T(0_X) \succeq \text{rsup}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{A_T(s)\} = f(A)_T(y), \\ f(A)_I(0_Y) &\preceq A_I(0_X) \preceq \text{rinf}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{A_I(s)\} = f(A)_I(y), \\ f(A)_F(0_Y) &\succeq A_F(0_X) \succeq \text{rsup}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{A_F(s)\} = f(A)_F(y), \\ f(\lambda)_T(0_Y) &\leq \lambda_T(0_X) \leq \text{inf}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{\lambda_T(s)\} = f(\lambda)_T(y), \\ f(\lambda)_I(0_Y) &\geq \lambda_I(0_X) \geq \text{sup}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{\lambda_I(s)\} = f(\lambda)_I(y), \\ f(\lambda)_F(0_Y) &\leq \lambda_F(0_X) \leq \text{inf}_{s \in f^{-1}(y)} \{\lambda_F(s)\} = f(\lambda)_F(y). \end{aligned}$$

Let $x, y \in Y$. By Lemma 3.10, there exist elements $\alpha_{T,I,F}, \gamma_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(x)$ and $\beta_{T,I,F}, \phi_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(y)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(x) &= A_T(\alpha_T), f(A)_I(x) = A_I(\alpha_I), f(A)_F(x) = A_F(\alpha_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T), f(\lambda)_I(x) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I), f(\lambda)_F(x) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F), \\ f(A)_T(y) &= A_T(\beta_T), f(A)_I(y) = A_I(\beta_I), f(A)_F(y) = A_F(\beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(y) &= \lambda_T(\phi_T), f(\lambda)_I(y) = \lambda_I(\phi_I), f(\lambda)_F(y) = \lambda_F(\phi_F), \\ f(A)_T(x \bullet y) &= A_T(\alpha_T \circ \beta_T), f(A)_I(x \bullet y) = A_I(\alpha_I \circ \beta_I), f(A)_F(x \bullet y) = A_F(\alpha_F \circ \beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet y) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ \phi_T), f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet y) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ \phi_I), f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet y) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ \phi_F). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$f(A)_T(x \bullet y) = A_T(\alpha_T \circ \beta_T) \succeq A_T(\beta_T) = f(A)_T(y), \tag{2.57}$$

$$f(A)_I(x \bullet y) = A_I(\alpha_I \circ \beta_I) \preceq A_I(\beta_I) = f(A)_I(y), \tag{2.57}$$

$$f(A)_F(x \bullet y) = A_F(\alpha_F \circ \beta_F) \succeq A_F(\beta_F) = f(A)_F(y), \tag{2.57}$$

$$f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet y) = \lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ \phi_T) \leq \lambda_T(\phi_T) = f(\lambda)_T(y), \tag{2.58}$$

$$f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet y) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ \phi_I) \geq \lambda_I(\phi_I) = f(\lambda)_I(y), \tag{2.58}$$

$$f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet y) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ \phi_F) \leq \lambda_F(\phi_F) = f(\lambda)_F(y). \tag{2.58}$$

Hence, $f(\mathcal{A})$ is a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter of Y .

(3) Assume that $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ is an f -invariant neutrosophic cubic UP-filter of X with NCS-property. Then \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter of X . By the proof of (2), we have $f(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies the assertions (2.55) and (2.56). Let $x, y \in Y$. By Lemma 3.10, there exist elements $\alpha_{T,I,F}, \gamma_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(x)$ and $\beta_{T,I,F}, \phi_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(y)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(x) &= A_T(\alpha_T), f(A)_I(x) = A_I(\alpha_I), f(A)_F(x) = A_F(\alpha_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T), f(\lambda)_I(x) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I), f(\lambda)_F(x) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F), \\ f(A)_T(y) &= A_T(\beta_T), f(A)_I(y) = A_I(\beta_I), f(A)_F(y) = A_F(\beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(y) &= \lambda_T(\phi_T), f(\lambda)_I(y) = \lambda_I(\phi_I), f(\lambda)_F(y) = \lambda_F(\phi_F), \\ f(A)_T(x \bullet y) &= A_T(\alpha_T \circ \beta_T), f(A)_I(x \bullet y) = A_I(\alpha_I \circ \beta_I), f(A)_F(x \bullet y) = A_F(\alpha_F \circ \beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet y) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ \phi_T), f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet y) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ \phi_I), f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet y) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ \phi_F). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$f(A)_T(y) = A_T(\beta_T) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T(\alpha_T \circ \beta_T), A_T(\alpha_T)\} = \text{rmin}\{f(A)_T(x \bullet y), f(A)_T(x)\}, \tag{2.59}$$

$$f(A)_I(y) = A_I(\beta_I) \preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I(\alpha_I \circ \beta_I), A_I(\alpha_I)\} = \text{rmax}\{f(A)_I(x \bullet y), f(A)_I(x)\}, \tag{2.59}$$

$$f(A)_F(y) = A_F(\beta_F) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F(\alpha_F \circ \beta_F), A_F(\alpha_F)\} = \text{rmin}\{f(A)_F(x \bullet y), f(A)_F(x)\}, \tag{2.59}$$

$$f(\lambda)_T(y) = \lambda_T(\phi_T) \leq \text{max}\{\lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ \phi_T), \lambda_T(\gamma_T)\} = \text{max}\{f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet y), f(\lambda)_T(x)\}, \tag{2.60}$$

$$f(\lambda)_I(y) = \lambda_I(\phi_I) \geq \text{min}\{\lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ \phi_I), \lambda_I(\gamma_I)\} = \text{min}\{f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet y), f(\lambda)_I(x)\}, \tag{2.60}$$

$$f(\lambda)_F(y) = \lambda_F(\phi_F) \leq \text{max}\{\lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ \phi_F), \lambda_F(\gamma_F)\} = \text{max}\{f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet y), f(\lambda)_F(x)\}. \tag{2.60}$$

Hence, $f(\mathcal{A})$ is a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter of Y .

(4) Assume that $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ is an f -invariant neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal of X with NCS-property. Then \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic UP-filter of X . By the proof of (3), we have $f(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies the

assertions (2.55) and (2.56). Let $x, y, z \in Y$. By Lemma 3.10, there exist elements $\alpha_{T,I,F}, \gamma_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(x)$, $\beta_{T,I,F}, \phi_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(y)$ and $\psi_{T,I,F}, \omega_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(z)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(y) &= A_T(\beta_T), f(A)_I(y) = A_I(\beta_I), f(A)_F(y) = A_F(\beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(y) &= \lambda_T(\phi_T), f(\lambda)_I(y) = \lambda_I(\phi_I), f(\lambda)_F(y) = \lambda_F(\phi_F), \\ f(A)_T(x \bullet z) &= A_T(\alpha_T \circ \psi_T), f(A)_I(x \bullet z) = A_I(\alpha_I \circ \psi_I), f(A)_F(x \bullet z) = A_F(\alpha_F \circ \psi_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet z) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ \omega_T), f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet z) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ \omega_I), f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet z) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ \omega_F), \\ f(A)_T(x \bullet (y \bullet z)) &= A_T(\alpha_T \circ (\beta_T \circ \psi_T)), \\ f(A)_I(x \bullet (y \bullet z)) &= A_I(\alpha_I \circ (\beta_I \circ \psi_I)), \\ f(A)_F(x \bullet (y \bullet z)) &= A_F(\alpha_F \circ (\beta_F \circ \psi_F)), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet (y \bullet z)) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ (\phi_T \circ \omega_T)), \\ f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet (y \bullet z)) &= \lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ (\phi_I \circ \omega_I)), \\ f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet (y \bullet z)) &= \lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ (\phi_F \circ \omega_F)). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(x \bullet z) &= A_T(\alpha_T \circ \psi_T) \\ &\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T(\alpha_T \circ (\beta_T \circ \psi_T)), A_T(\beta_T)\} \\ &= \text{rmin}\{f(A)_T(x \bullet (y \bullet z)), f(A)_T(y)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.61}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_I(x \bullet z) &= A_I(\alpha_I \circ \psi_I) \\ &\preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I(\alpha_I \circ (\beta_I \circ \psi_I)), A_I(\beta_I)\} \\ &= \text{rmax}\{f(A)_I(x \bullet (y \bullet z)), f(A)_I(y)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.61}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_F(x \bullet z) &= A_F(\alpha_F \circ \psi_F) \\ &\succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F(\alpha_F \circ (\beta_F \circ \psi_F)), A_F(\beta_F)\} \\ &= \text{rmin}\{f(A)_F(x \bullet (y \bullet z)), f(A)_F(y)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.61}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet z) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ \omega_T) \\ &\leq \max\{\lambda_T(\gamma_T \circ (\phi_T \circ \omega_T)), \lambda_T(\phi_T)\} \\ &= \max\{f(\lambda)_T(x \bullet (y \bullet z)), f(\lambda)_T(y)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.62}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet z) &= \lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ \omega_I) \\ &\geq \min\{\lambda_I(\gamma_I \circ (\phi_I \circ \omega_I)), \lambda_I(\phi_I)\} \\ &= \min\{f(\lambda)_I(x \bullet (y \bullet z)), f(\lambda)_I(y)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.62}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet z) &= \lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ \omega_F) \\ &\leq \max\{\lambda_F(\gamma_F \circ (\phi_F \circ \omega_F)), \lambda_F(\phi_F)\} \\ &= \max\{f(\lambda)_F(x \bullet (y \bullet z)), f(\lambda)_F(y)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.62}$$

Hence, $f(\mathcal{A})$ is a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal of Y .

(5) Assume that $\mathcal{A} = (A_{T,I,F}, \lambda_{T,I,F})$ is an f -invariant neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal of X with NCS-property. Then \mathcal{A} is a neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal of X . By the proof of (4), we have $f(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies the assertions (2.55) and (2.56). Let $x, y, z \in Y$. By Lemma 3.10, there exist elements $\alpha_{T,I,F}, \gamma_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(x)$, $\beta_{T,I,F}, \phi_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(y)$ and $\psi_{T,I,F}, \omega_{T,I,F} \in f^{-1}(z)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(x) &= A_T(\alpha_T), f(A)_I(x) = A_I(\alpha_I), f(A)_F(x) = A_F(\alpha_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(x) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T), f(\lambda)_I(x) = \lambda_I(\gamma_I), f(\lambda)_F(x) = \lambda_F(\gamma_F), \\ f(A)_T(y) &= A_T(\beta_T), f(A)_I(y) = A_I(\beta_I), f(A)_F(y) = A_F(\beta_F), \\ f(\lambda)_T(y) &= \lambda_T(\phi_T), f(\lambda)_I(y) = \lambda_I(\phi_I), f(\lambda)_F(y) = \lambda_F(\phi_F), \\ f(A)_T((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)) &= A_T((\psi_T \circ \beta_T) \circ (\psi_T \circ \alpha_T)), \\ f(A)_I((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)) &= A_I((\psi_I \circ \beta_I) \circ (\psi_I \circ \alpha_I)), \\ f(A)_F((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)) &= A_F((\psi_F \circ \beta_F) \circ (\psi_F \circ \alpha_F)), \\ f(\lambda)_T((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)) &= \lambda_T((\omega_T \circ \phi_T) \circ (\omega_T \circ \gamma_T)), \\ f(\lambda)_I((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)) &= \lambda_I((\omega_I \circ \phi_I) \circ (\omega_I \circ \gamma_I)), \\ f(\lambda)_F((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)) &= \lambda_F((\omega_F \circ \phi_F) \circ (\omega_F \circ \gamma_F)). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_T(x) &= A_T(\alpha_T) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_T((\psi_T \circ \beta_T) \circ (\psi_T \circ \alpha_T)), A_T(\beta_T)\} \\ &= \text{rmin}\{f(A)_T((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)), f(A)_T(y)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.63)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_I(x) &= A_I(\alpha_I) \preceq \text{rmax}\{A_I((\psi_I \circ \beta_I) \circ (\psi_I \circ \alpha_I)), A_I(\beta_I)\} \\ &= \text{rmax}\{f(A)_I((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)), f(A)_I(y)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.63)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(A)_F(x) &= A_F(\alpha_F) \succeq \text{rmin}\{A_F((\psi_F \circ \beta_F) \circ (\psi_F \circ \alpha_F)), A_F(\beta_F)\} \\ &= \text{rmin}\{f(A)_F((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)), f(A)_F(y)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.63)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda)_T(x) &= \lambda_T(\gamma_T) \leq \max\{\lambda_T((\omega_T \circ \phi_T) \circ (\omega_T \circ \gamma_T)), \lambda_T(\phi_T)\} \\ &= \max\{f(\lambda)_T((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)), f(\lambda)_T(y)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.64)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda)_I(x) &= \lambda_I(\gamma_I) \geq \min\{\lambda_I((\omega_I \circ \phi_I) \circ (\omega_I \circ \gamma_I)), \lambda_I(\phi_I)\} \\ &= \min\{f(\lambda)_I((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)), f(\lambda)_I(y)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.64)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda)_F(x) &= \lambda_F(\gamma_F) \leq \max\{\lambda_F((\omega_F \circ \phi_F) \circ (\omega_F \circ \gamma_F)), \lambda_F(\phi_F)\} \\ &= \max\{f(\lambda)_F((z \bullet y) \bullet (z \bullet x)), f(\lambda)_F(y)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.64)$$

Hence, $f(\mathcal{A})$ is a neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal of Y . \square

4 Conclusions and future work

In this paper, we have studied the image and inverse image of a neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebra (resp., neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter, neutrosophic cubic UP-filter, neutrosophic cubic UP-ideal, neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideal) of a UP-algebra under some UP-homomorphisms. The results of the study, in the case of inverse image, we noticed that only a neutrosophic cubic near UP-filter required order preserving condition. In the case of image, we noticed that all concepts of NCSs required f -invariant and NCS-property assertions and UP-epimorphism.

In our future study, we will apply this concept/results to other types of NCSs in a UP-algebra. Also, we will study the P-intersection, P-union, R-intersection, R-union of neutrosophic cubic UP-subalgebras, neutrosophic cubic near UP-filters, neutrosophic cubic UP-filters, neutrosophic cubic UP-ideals, and neutrosophic cubic strong UP-ideals of a UP-algebra.

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by the Unit of Excellence, University of Phayao, Thailand.

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

References

- [1] Al-Tahan, M.; Davvaz, B. Neutrosophic \aleph -ideals (\aleph -subalgebras) of subtraction algebra. *Int. J. Neutrosophic Sci.* 2020, 3(1), 44–53.
- [2] Ansari, M. A.; Haidar, A.; Koam, A. N. A. On a graph associated to UP-algebras. *Math. Comput. Appl.* 2018, 23(4), 61.
- [3] Ansari, M. A.; Koam, A. N. A.; Haider, A. Rough set theory applied to UP-algebras. *Ital. J. Pure Appl. Math.* 2019, 42, 388–402.
- [4] Dokkhamdang, N.; Kesorn, A.; Iampan, A. Generalized fuzzy sets in UP-algebras. *Ann. Fuzzy Math. Inform.* 2018, 16(2), 171–190.
- [5] Guntasow, T.; Sajak, S.; Jomkham, A.; Iampan, A. Fuzzy translations of a fuzzy set in UP-algebras. *J. Indones. Math. Soc.* 2017, 23(2), 1–19.
- [6] Iampan, A. Multipliers and near UP-filters of UP-algebras. *J. Discrete Math. Sci. Cryptography* (in press).
- [7] Iampan, A. A new branch of the logical algebra: UP-algebras. *J. Algebra Relat. Top.* 2017, 5(1), 35–54.
- [8] Iampan, A. Introducing fully UP-semigroups. *Discuss. Math., Gen. Algebra Appl.* 2018, 38(2), 297–306.
- [9] Iampan, A. The UP-isomorphism theorems for UP-algebras. *Discuss. Math., Gen. Algebra Appl.* 2019, 39(1), 113–123.

- [10] Ibrahim, M. A.; Agboola, A. A. A.; Adeleke, E. O.; Akinleye, S. A. Introduction to neutrosophic subtraction algebra and neutrosophic subtraction semigroup. *Int. J. Neutrosophic Sci.* 2020, 2(1), 47–62.
- [11] Iqbal, R.; Zafar, S.; Sardar, M. S. Neutrosophic cubic subalgebras and neutrosophic cubic closed ideals of B-algebras. *Neutrosophic Sets Syst.* 2016, 14, 47–60.
- [12] Jun, Y. B.; Kim, C. S.; Yang, K. O. Cubic sets. *Ann. Fuzzy Math. Inform.* 2012, 4(1), 83–98.
- [13] Jun, Y. B.; Kim, S. J.; Smarandache, F. Interval neutrosophic sets with applications in BCK/BCI-algebra. *Axioms* 2018, 7(2), 23–35.
- [14] Jun, Y. B.; Smarandache, F.; Bordbar, H. Neutrosophic \mathcal{N} -structures applied to BCK/BCI-algebras. *Inform.* 2017, 8(4), 128.
- [15] Jun, Y. B.; Smarandache, F.; Kim, C. S. Neutrosophic cubic sets. *New Math. Nat. Comput.* 2017, 13(1), 41–54.
- [16] Kaijae, W.; Pongsumpao, P.; Arayarangsi, S.; Iampan, A. UP-algebras characterized by their anti-fuzzy UP-ideals and anti-fuzzy UP-subalgebras. *Ital. J. Pure Appl. Math.* 2016, 36, 667–692.
- [17] Kesorn, B.; Maimun, K.; Ratbandan, W.; Iampan, A. Intuitionistic fuzzy sets in UP-algebras. *Ital. J. Pure Appl. Math.* 2015, 34, 339–364.
- [18] Khalid, M.; Khalid, N. A.; Khalid, H.; Broumi, S. Multiplicative interpretation of neutrosophic cubic set on B-algebra. *Int. J. Neutrosophic Sci.* 2020, 1(2), 64–73.
- [19] Khan, M.; Anis, S.; Smarandache, F.; Jun, Y. B. Neutrosophic \mathcal{N} -structures and their applications in semigroups. *Ann. Fuzzy Math. Inform.* 2017, 14(6), 583–598.
- [20] Mordeson, J. N.; Malik, D. S.; Kuroki, N. *Fuzzy Semigroups*, volume 131; Springer, 2012.
- [21] Prabpayak, C.; Leerawat, U. On ideals and congruences in KU-algebras. *Sci. Magna* 2009, 5(1), 54–57.
- [22] Satirad, A.; Mosrijai, P.; Iampan, A. Formulas for finding UP-algebras. *Int. J. Math. Comput. Sci.* 2019, 14(2), 403–409.
- [23] Satirad, A.; Mosrijai, P.; Iampan, A. Generalized power UP-algebras. *Int. J. Math. Comput. Sci.* 2019, 14(1), 17–25.
- [24] Senapati, T.; Jun, Y. B.; Shum, K. P. Cubic set structure applied in UP-algebras. *Discrete Math. Algorithms Appl.* 2018, 10(4), 1850049.
- [25] Senapati, T.; Muhiuddin, G.; Shum, K. P. Representation of UP-algebras in interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy environment. *Ital. J. Pure Appl. Math.* 2017, 38, 497–517.
- [26] Smarandache, F. *A Unifying Field in Logic: Neutrosophic Logic. Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Probability*; American Research Press, Rehoboth, NM, 1999.
- [27] Somjanta, J.; Thuekaew, N.; Kumpeangkeaw, P.; Iampan, A. Fuzzy sets in UP-algebras. *Ann. Fuzzy Math. Inform.* 2016, 12(6), 739–756.
- [28] Songsaeng, M.; Iampan, A. \mathcal{N} -fuzzy UP-algebras and its level subsets. *J. Algebra Relat. Top.* 2018, 6(1), 1–24.
- [29] Songsaeng, M.; Iampan, A. Fuzzy proper UP-filters of UP-algebras. *Honam Math. J.* 2019, 41(3), 515–530.
- [30] Songsaeng, M.; Iampan, A. Neutrosophic cubic set theory applied to UP-algebras. *Thai J. Math.* (accepted).
- [31] Songsaeng, M.; Iampan, A. Neutrosophic set theory applied to UP-algebras. *Eur. J. Pure Appl. Math.* 2019, 12(4), 1382–1409.
- [32] Songsaeng, M.; Iampan, A. Neutrosophic sets in UP-algebras by means of interval-valued fuzzy sets. *J. Int. Math. Virtual Inst.* 2020, 10(1), 93–122.

- [33] Songsaeng, M.; Iampan, A. A novel approach to neutrosophic sets in UP-algebras. *J. Math. Computer Sci.* 2020, 21(1), 78–98.
- [34] Sripaeng, S.; Tanamoon, K.; Iampan, A. On anti Q -fuzzy UP-ideals and anti Q -fuzzy UP-subalgebras of UP-algebras. *J. Inf. Optim. Sci.* 2018, 39(5), 1095–1127.
- [35] Taboon, K.; Butsri, P.; Iampan, A. A cubic set theory approach to UP-algebras. *J. Interdiscip. Math.* (accepted).
- [36] Tanamoon, K.; Sripaeng, S.; Iampan, A. Q -fuzzy sets in UP-algebras. *Songklanakarin J. Sci. Technol.* 2018, 40(1), 9–29.
- [37] Wang, H.; Smarandache, F.; Zhang, Y. Q.; Sunderraman, R. *Interval Neutrosophic Sets and logic: Theory and Applications in Computing*; Hexis, Phoenix, Ariz, USA, 2005.
- [38] Zadeh, L. A. Fuzzy sets. *Inf. Cont.* 1965, 8, 338–353.
- [39] Zadeh, L. A. The concept of a linguistic variable and its application to approximate reasoning-I. *Inf. Sci.* 1975, 8, 199–249.