Punjab University Journal of Mathematics
(ISSN 1016-2526)
Vol. 52(1)(2020) pp. 33-45

Neutrosophic Quotient Submodules and Homomorphisms

Binu R.
Department of Mathematics,
Rajagiri School of Engineering and Technology
Cochin, Kerala, India.
Email: 1984binur@gmail.com

Paul Isaac
Department of Mathematics
Bharata Mata College, Thrikkakara
Kerala, India.
Email: pibmct@gmail.com

Received: 26 August, 2019 / Accepted: 21 November, 2019 / Published online: 01 January, 2020

Abstract.: In this paper, we define two different kinds of neutrosophic submodules over a classical quotient R-module using single valued neutrosophic set. We also define neutrosophic submodule homomorphism and study the features of neutrosophic set under R-module homomorphism. Finally we conduct an investigation for the image and inverse image of neutrosophic submodule under classical homomorphim of R-module.

Key Words: Module, Neutrosophic set, Neutrosophic submodule, Quotient module, Homomorphism of neutrosophic submodule

1. Introduction

The Oxford English dictionary defines the term fuzzy as not clear or vague. In 1965, Lotfi A. Zadeh defined a fuzzy set which represent vague concepts and contexts expressed in natural language by means of graded membership of elements in $[0, 1]$ [19, 38]. In 1986 Attanassov put forward intuitionistic fuzzy set theory as a stereotype illustration of a set in which each component is concomitant with a membership grades and non membership grades [4]. In 1995, Smarandache outlined neutrosophic set in which each element of a set is represented by three differing types of membership values [34]. Neutrosophic set is a tool or a framework for sorting out vague, obscure and contrary data in the genuine world pragmatic problems([37, 7, 39, 36]). Neutrosophy is another part of theory and rationale that has focused nature's provenance and equability features. [17]. Each element of a neutrosophic set is defined by three contrasting types of registration estimates that talk to condensed, imprecise and absurd information ([13, 30, 29, 1, 17]).

The algebraic structure in pure mathematics cloning with uncertainty has been studied by some authors. In 1971, Azriel Rosenfield bestowed a seminal paper on fuzzy subgroup and W.J. Liu developed the idea of fuzzy normal subgroup and fuzzy subring. Consolidating neutrosophic set hypothesis with algebraic structures is a rising pattern in the region of mathematical research. In 2011, Isaac.P, P.P.John [16] recognized some algebraic nature of intuitionistic fuzzy submodule of a classical module. Neutrosophic algebraical structures and its properties provide us a solid mathematical foundation to clarify connected scientific ideas in designing, information mining and economic science([2],[26],[28]).

2. Preliminaries

Definition 2.1. *(*[3]*) A module M over a ring R, denoted as M_R, is an abelian group with a law of composition written '$+'$ and the map $R \times M \to M$, written $(\varrho, \vartheta) \rightsquigarrow \varrho\vartheta$, that satisfy these axioms*

(1) $1\vartheta = \vartheta$
(2) $(\varrho\tau)\vartheta = \varrho(\tau\vartheta)$
(3) $(\varrho + \tau)\vartheta = \varrho\vartheta + \tau\vartheta$
(4) $\varrho(\vartheta + \vartheta') = \varrho\vartheta + \varrho\vartheta' \ \forall\, \varrho, \tau \in R$ *and* $\vartheta, \vartheta` \in M$.

Definition 2.2. *(*[3]*) A submodule W of M_R is a nonempty subset that is closed under addition and scalar multiplication.*

Definition 2.3. [3] *A homomorphism $\Upsilon : V \to W$ of R-modules copies that of a linear transformation of vector spaces. It is a map compatible with the laws of composition:*

$$\Upsilon(\vartheta + \vartheta') = \Upsilon(\vartheta) + \Upsilon(\vartheta')\ and\ \Upsilon(\varrho\vartheta) = \varrho\Upsilon(\vartheta)$$

denoted as $Hom_R(M, N)$, $\forall\, \vartheta, \vartheta' \in V\ and\ \varrho \in R$. If Υ is bijective, then ϑ is isomorphic to W .

Definition 2.4. [6, 3] *The kernel of a homomorphism $\Upsilon : V \to W$, the collection of elements $\vartheta \in V$ in which $\Upsilon(\vartheta) = 0$, is a submodule of the domain V.*

The image of a homomorphism $\Upsilon : V \to W$, the collection of elements w in W such that $\Upsilon(\vartheta) = w,\ forall\ \vartheta \in\ V$, is a submodule of the range W.

Definition 2.5. [12, 3] *Let $N \subseteq M_R$. Then the quotient module M/N is the group of additive cosets $\eta + N,\ \eta \in M$.*

Remark 2.6. $[\eta]$ *represents the coset* $\eta + N, \forall\, \eta \in M$

Remark 2.7. $\varrho[\eta] = [\varrho\eta]\ \forall\ \varrho \in R$

Definition 2.8. [22, 15, 11, 5] *Let R be an integral domain. Then M_R is said to be divisible if $\forall\eta \in M$ can be divided by $\varrho \in R$, in the sense that,*

$$0 \neq \varrho \in R,\ \eta \in M \Rightarrow \eta = \varrho n\ for\ some\ n \in M$$

.

Definition 2.9. [23, 21, 14] *A submodule N of M_R is said to be a prime submodule of M if $\varrho\eta \in N, \varrho \in R, \eta \in N \Rightarrow either\ \varrho = 0\ or\ \eta \in N$.*

Definition 2.10. [32, 35] *A neutrosophic set P of the universal set X is defined as*

$$P = \{(\eta, t_P(\eta), i_P(\eta), f_P(\eta)) : \eta \in X\}$$

where $t_P, i_P, f_P : X \to (^-0, 1^+)$. *The three components* t_P, i_P *and* f_P *represent membership value (Percentage of truth), indeterminacy (Percentage of indeterminacy) and non membership value (Percentage of falsity) respectively. These components are functions of non standard unit interval* $(^-0, 1^+)$ [25].

Remark 2.11. [32, 13]

(1) *If* $t_P, i_P, f_P : X \to [0, 1]$, *then P is known as single valued neutrosophic set(SVNS).*
(2) *In this paper, we discuss about the algebraic structure* R*-module with underlying set as SVNS. For simplicity SVNS will be called neutrosophic set.*
(3) U^X *denotes the set of all neutrosophic subset of* X *or neutrosophic power set of* X.

Definition 2.12. [32, 24, 33] *Let* $P, Q \in U^X$. *Then P is contained in Q, denoted as* $P \subseteq Q$ *if and only if* $P(\eta) \leqslant Q(\eta)\ \forall \eta \in X$, *this means that*

$$t_P(\eta) \le t_Q(\eta), i_P(\eta) \le i_Q(\eta), f_P(\eta) \ge f_Q(\eta),\ \forall\ \eta \in X$$

Definition 2.13. [32, 27, 18] *The complement of* $P = \{(\eta, t_P(\eta), i_P(\eta), f_P(\eta)\}$ *is denoted by* P^C *and defined as* $P^C = \{\eta, f_P(\eta), 1 - i_P(\eta), t_P(\eta)\}$ *and* $(P^C)^C = P$

Definition 2.14. [9, 32, 18] *Let* $P, Q \in U^X$.

(1) *The union* $C = \{\eta, t_C(\eta), i_C(\eta), f_C(\eta) : \eta \in X\}$ *of P and Q* [24] *is denoted by* $C = P \cup Q$ *where*

$$t_C(\eta) = t_P(\eta) \vee t_Q(\eta)$$
$$i_C(\eta) = i_P(\eta) \vee i_Q(\eta)$$
$$f_C(\eta) = f_P(\eta) \wedge f_Q(\eta)$$

(2) *The intersection* $C = \{\eta, t_C(\eta), i_C(\eta), f_C(\eta) : \eta \in \eta\}$ *of P and Q* [24] *is denoted by* $C = P \cap Q$ *where*

$$t_C(\eta) = t_P(\eta) \wedge t_Q(\eta)$$
$$i_C(\eta) = i_P(\eta) \wedge i_Q(\eta)$$
$$f_C(\eta) = f_P(\eta) \vee f_Q(\eta)$$

Definition 2.15. [31] *The sum* $P + Q = \{\eta, t_{P+Q}(\eta), t_{P+Q}(\eta), t_{P+Q}(\eta) : \eta \in M_R\}$ *of two neutrosophic sets* P *and* Q *is a neutrosophic set of* M_R, *defined as follows*

$$t_{P+Q}(\eta) = \vee\{t_P(\theta) \wedge t_Q(\vartheta) | \eta = \theta + \vartheta, \theta, \vartheta \in M_R\}$$
$$i_{P+Q}(\eta) = \vee\{i_P(\theta) \wedge i_Q(\vartheta) | \eta = \theta + \vartheta, \theta, \vartheta \in M_R\}$$
$$f_{P+Q}(\eta) = \wedge\ f_P(\theta) \vee f_B(\vartheta) | \eta = \theta + \vartheta, \theta, \vartheta \in M_R\}$$

Definition 2.16. [33, 24]*For any neutrosophic subset* $P = \{(\eta, t_P(\eta), i_P(\eta), f_P(\eta)) : \eta \in X\}$, *the support* P^* *of the neutrosophic set P can be defined as*

$$P^* = \{\eta \in X, t_P(\eta) > 0, i_P(\eta) > 0, f_P(\eta) < 1\}$$

.

Definition 2.17. [8, 20, 35, 18] *The image of P, where $P \in U^X$, under the map $g : X \to Y$ is denoted by $g(P)$ and is defined as $g(P) = \{\theta, t_{g(P)}(\theta), i_{g(P)}(\theta), f_{g(P)}(\theta) : \theta \in Y\}$ where*

$$t_{g(P)}(\theta) = \begin{cases} \vee t_P(\eta) : \eta \in g^{-1}(\theta)) & g^{-1}(\theta) \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & \textit{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$i_{g(P)}(\theta) = \begin{cases} \vee i_P(\eta) : \eta \in g^{-1}(\theta)) & g^{-1}(\theta) \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}$$

$$f_{g(P)}(\theta) = \begin{cases} \wedge f_P(\eta) : \eta \in g^{-1}(\theta)) & g^{-1}(\theta) \neq \emptyset \\ 1 & otherwise \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, the inverse of g , denoted by $g^{-1} : Y \to X$ is defined by

$$g^{-1}(Q) = \{\eta, t_{g^{-1}(Q)}(\eta), i_{g^{-1}(Q)}(\eta), f_{g^{-1}(Q)}(\eta) : g(\eta) \in Q\}$$

where

$$t_{g^{-1}(Q)}(\eta) = t_Q(g(\eta)),\ i_{g^{-1}(Q)}(\eta) = i_Q(g(\eta)),\ f_{g^{-1}(Q)}(\eta) = f_Q(g(\eta))\ \forall\ \eta \in X$$

Definition 2.18. [9, 10] *Let $P \in U^M$ where $M \in M_R$. Then the neutrosophic subset P of M is called a neutrosophic submodule of M if*

(1) $t_P(0) = 1, i_P(0) = 1, f_P(0) = 0$
(2) $t_P(\eta + \theta) \geq t_P(\eta) \wedge t_P(\theta)$
$i_P(\eta + \theta) \geq i_P(\eta) \wedge i_P(\theta)$
$f_P(\eta + \theta) \leq f_P(\eta) \vee f_P(\theta),\ for\ all\ \eta, \theta\ in\ M$
(3) $t_P(\gamma\eta) \geq t_P(\eta)$
$i_P(\gamma\eta) \geq i_P(\eta)$
$f_P(\gamma\eta) \leq f_P(\eta), for\ all\ \eta\ in\ M_R,\ for\ all\ \gamma\ in\ R$

Remark 2.19. *We denote neutrosophic submodules over a classical R-module using single valued neutrosophic set by $U(M)$.*

Remark 2.20. *If $P \in U(M)$, then the neutrosophic components of P can be denoted as $(t_P(\eta), i_P(\eta), f_P(\eta))$.*

Definition 2.21. [9] *Define the neutrosophic set $\gamma P = \{\eta, t_{\gamma P}(\eta), i_{\gamma P}(\eta), f_{\gamma P}(\eta) : \eta \in M, \gamma \in R\}$ of M_R where $P \in U^M$ as follows*

$$t_{\gamma P}(\eta) = \vee\{t_P(\theta) : \theta \in M_R, \eta = \gamma\theta\}$$

$$i_{\gamma P}(\eta) = \vee\{i_P(\theta) : \theta \in M_R, \eta = \gamma\theta\}$$

$$f_{\gamma P}(\eta) = \wedge\{f_P(\theta) : \theta \in M_R, \eta = \gamma\theta\}$$

3. Construction of Neutrosophic Quotient Submodules

In this precinct, we elucidate two different aspects or methods within the formation of neutrosophic quotient submodule of the classical $(M/N)_R$ where $N \subseteq M$.

Method 1:

Theorem 3.1. *If $P = \{\eta, t_P(\eta), i_P(\eta), f_P(\eta) : \eta \in M\} \in U(M)$ and $N \subseteq M$, then define ω, a neutrosophic set in M/N as follows.*

$$\omega = \{[\eta], t_\omega([\eta]), i_\omega([\eta]), f_\omega([\eta]) : \eta \in M\}$$

where

$$t_\omega([\eta]) = \vee\{t_P(u) : u \in [\eta]\}$$
$$i_\omega([\eta]) = \vee\{i_P(u) : u \in [\eta]\}$$
$$f_\omega([\eta]) = \wedge\{f_P(u) : u \in [\eta]\}$$

Then $\omega \in U(M/N)$

Proof. We have $t_\omega([0]) = \vee\{t_P(u) : u \in [0]\} = t_P(0) = 1$, similarly $i_\omega([0]) = 1$ and $f_\omega([0]) = 0$
Now for $\eta, \theta \in M$

$$\begin{aligned} t_\omega([\eta] + [\theta]) &= \vee\{t_P(u) : u \in [\eta] + [\theta]\} \\ &= \vee\{t_P(\zeta + \xi) : \zeta + \xi \in [\eta] + [\theta]\} \\ &\geq \vee\{t_P(\zeta + \xi) : \zeta \in [\eta], \xi \in [\theta]\} \\ &\geq \vee\{t_P(\zeta) \wedge t_P(\xi) : \zeta \in [\eta], \xi \in [\theta]\} \\ &= (\vee\{t_P(\zeta) : \zeta \in [\eta]\}) \wedge (\vee\{t_P(\xi) : \xi \in [\theta]\}) \\ &= t_\omega([\eta]) + t_\omega([\theta]) \end{aligned}$$

then correspondingly

$$i_\omega([\eta] + [\theta]) \geq i_\omega([\eta]) \wedge i_\omega([\theta])$$

and

$$f_Q([\eta] + [\theta]) \leq f_\omega([\eta]) \vee f_\omega([\theta])$$

Now for all $\varrho \; in \; R, \eta \; in \; M$,

$$\begin{aligned} t_\omega(\varrho[\eta]) &= t_\omega([\varrho\eta]) \\ &\geq \vee\{t_P(\varrho u) : \varrho u \in [\varrho\eta]\} \\ &\geq \vee\{t_P(u) : u \in [\eta]\} \\ &= t_\omega([\eta]) \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we can conclude

$$i_\omega(\varrho[\eta]) \geq i_\omega([\eta]) \; and \; f_\omega(\varrho[\eta]) \leq f_\omega([\eta])$$

Thus $\omega \in U(M/N)$. □

Method 2:

Theorem 3.2. *Let R be an integral domain and M be a divisible module over R. Consider a prime submodule N of M. If $P \in U(M)$, define a neutrosophic set ω in quotient module M/N defined as, for $\eta \in M$*

$$t_\omega([\eta]) = \begin{cases} 1 & [\eta] = N \\ \wedge\{t_P(u) : u \in [\eta]\} & otherwise \end{cases}, \; i_\omega(\eta) = \begin{cases} 1 & [\eta] = N \\ \wedge\{i_P(u) : u \in [\eta]\} & otherwise \end{cases}$$

and

$$f_\omega([\eta]) = \begin{cases} 0 & [\eta] = N \\ \vee\{f_P(u) : u \in [\eta]\} & otherwise \end{cases}$$

Then $\omega \in U(M/N)$.

Proof. Since $N \subseteq M$, the neutrosophic components of $[0] = (1, 1, 0)$
Now for $\eta, \theta \; in \; M$, consider

$$t_\omega([\eta] + [\theta]) = \begin{cases} 1 & [\eta] + [\theta] = N \\ \wedge\{t_P(u) : u \in [\eta] + [\theta]\} & otherwise \end{cases}$$

Case 1: If $[\eta] + [\theta] = N$, then clearly $t_\omega([\eta] + [\theta]) \geq t_\omega([\eta]) \wedge t_\omega([\theta])$, $i_\omega([\eta] + [\theta]) \geq i_\omega([\eta]) \wedge i_\omega([\theta])$ and $f_\omega([\eta] + [\theta]) \leq f_\omega([\eta]) \vee f_\omega([\theta])$

Case 2: If $[m] + [n] \neq N$, then

$$\begin{aligned} t_\omega([\eta] + [\theta]) &= \wedge\{t_P(u) : u \in [\eta] + [\theta]\} \\ &= \wedge\{t_P((\eta + \zeta) + (\theta + \xi) : \zeta, \xi \in N\} \\ &\geq \wedge\{t_P(\eta + \zeta) \wedge t_P(\theta + \xi) : \zeta, \xi \in N\} \\ &\geq (\wedge\{t_P(\eta + \zeta) : \zeta \in N\}) \wedge (\wedge\{t_P(\theta + \xi) : \xi \in N\}) \\ &= (\wedge\{t_P(v_1) : v_1 \in [\eta]\}) \wedge (\wedge\{t_P(v_2) : v_2 \in [\theta]\}) \\ &= t_\omega([\eta]) \wedge t_\omega([\theta]) \end{aligned}$$

In the same manner,

$$i_\omega([\eta] + [\theta]) \geq i_\omega([\eta]) \wedge i_\omega([\theta])$$

and

$$f_\omega([\eta] + [\theta]) \leq f_\omega([\eta]) \vee f_\omega([\theta]).$$

For $\varrho \; in \; R, \eta \; in \; M$, consider

$$t_\omega(\varrho[\eta]) = \begin{cases} 1 & \varrho[\eta] = N \\ \wedge\{t_A(u) : u \in \varrho[\eta]\} & otherwise \end{cases}$$

Case 3: If $\varrho[\eta] = N$, $t_\omega(\varrho[\eta]) = 1 \geq t_\omega([\eta])$, similarly $i_\omega(\varrho[\eta]) \geq i_\omega([\eta]) \; and$ $f_\omega(\varrho[\eta]) \leq f_\omega([\eta])$

Case 4: If $\varrho[\eta] \neq N \Rightarrow \varrho\eta \notin N \Rightarrow \varrho \neq 0, \eta \notin N$ and

$$\begin{aligned} t_\omega(\varrho[\eta]) &= t_\omega([\varrho\eta]) \\ &= \wedge\{t_P(u) : u \in [\varrho\eta]\} \\ &= \wedge\{t_P(\varrho\eta + v) : v \in N\} \\ &= \wedge\{t_P(\varrho\eta + \varrho\theta) : \theta \in N\} \\ &= \wedge\{t_P(\varrho(\eta + \theta)) : \theta \in N\} \\ &= \wedge\{t_P(\eta + \theta) : \theta \in N\} \\ &= \wedge\{t_P(w) : w \in [\eta]\} \\ &= t_\omega([\eta]) \end{aligned}$$

Correspondingly $i_\omega(\varrho[\eta]) \geq i_\omega([\eta])$ *and* $f_\omega(\varrho[\eta]) \leq f_\omega([\eta])$
Hence $\omega \in U(M/N)$

□

Corollary 3.3. *If N is contained in M where $M \in M_R$ and R is a field and $P \in U(M)$. Then by the theorem 3.2, $\omega \in U(M/N)$.*

Definition 3.4. *If $P \in U(M)$ and $N \subseteq M$, then the restriction of a neutrosophic submodule P to N is represented by $P|_N$ and it is a neutrosophic set of N defined as $P|_N = \{\theta, t_{P|_N}(\theta), i_{P|_N}(\theta), f_{P|_N}(\theta)\}$ where $\forall\, \theta \in N$ and*

$$t_{P|_N}(\theta) = t_P(\theta)$$

$$i_{P|_N}(\theta) = i_P(\theta)$$

$$f_{P|_N}(\theta) = f_P(\theta)$$

Proposition 3.5. *If $P \in U(M)$ and $N \subseteq M$, then $P|_N \in U(N)$.*

Proof. If $P = \{\eta, t_P(\eta), i_P(\eta), f_P(\eta) : \eta \in M\} \in U(M)$ and $N \subseteq M$ then the

$$t_{P|_N}(0) = t_P(0) = 1,\ i_{P|_N}(0) = i_P(0) = 1 \text{ and } f_{P|_N}(0) = f_P(0) = 0.$$

Now ϱ *in* R, η *in* M

$$\begin{aligned} t_{P|_N}(\varrho\eta) &= t_P(\varrho\eta) \\ &\geq t_P(\eta) \\ &= t_{P|_N}(\eta) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly $i_{P|_N}(\varrho\eta) \geq i_{P|_N}(\eta)$ *and* $f_{P|_N}(\varrho\eta) \leq f_{P|_N}(\eta)$
Now $\theta, \vartheta \in N$

$$\begin{aligned} t_{P|_N}(\theta + \vartheta) &= t_P(\theta + \vartheta) \\ &\geq t_P(\theta) \wedge t_P(\vartheta) \\ &= t_{P|_N}(\theta) \wedge t_{P|_N}(\vartheta) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly $i_{P|_N}(\theta + \vartheta) \geq i_{P|_N}(\theta) \wedge i_{P|_N}(\vartheta),\ f_{P|_N}(\theta + \vartheta) \leq f_{P|_N}(\theta) \vee f_{P|_N}(\vartheta)$
Thus $P|_N \in U(N)$ □

Remark 3.6. *Let $P, Q \in U(M)$ and $P \subseteq Q$. Then $P^* \subseteq Q^*$ and $Q|_{Q^*} \in U(Q^*)$. Now define Q, a neutrosophic set of Q^*/P^* where for $\eta \in Q^*$*

$$t_\omega([\eta]) = \vee\{t_P(\zeta) : \zeta \in [\eta]\}$$

$$i_\omega([\eta]) = \vee\{i_P(\zeta) : \zeta \in [\eta]\}$$

$$f_\omega([\eta]) = \wedge\{f_P(\zeta) : u \in [\eta]\}$$

Then by the theorem 3.2, $\omega \in U(Q^*/P^*)$ and it is denoted as Q/P.

Remark 3.7. *We write P_N for the neutrosophic quotient submodule ω of M/N, i.e. $P_N \in U(M/N)$*

4. Homomorphisms of Neutrosophic Submodules

In this section we study about the inherent attributes of the image and inverse image of a neutrosophic set and a neutrosophic submodule under classical module homomorphism and the homomorphism properties of neutrosophic submodules.

Let M and N be the R modules and $\Upsilon \in Hom_R(M, N)$. Also $P \in U(M)$ and $Q \in U(N)$

Definition 4.1. *$\Upsilon \in Hom_R(M, N)$ is called a weak neutrosophic homomorphism of P onto Q if $\Upsilon(P) \subseteq Q$ and we denote it as $P \sim Q$.*

*$\Upsilon \in Hom_R(M, N)$ is called a **neutrosophic homomorphism** of P onto Q if $\Upsilon(P) = Q$ and we represent it as $P \approx Q$.*

Theorem 4.2. *Let $P,\ Q \in U^M$ and $\Upsilon \in Hom_R(M, N)$. Then*

(1) $\Upsilon(P + Q) = \Upsilon(P) + \Upsilon(Q)$
(2) $\Upsilon(rP) = r\Upsilon(P)\ \forall\ r \in R$
(3) $\Upsilon(r_1P + r_2Q) = r_1\Upsilon(P) + r_2\Upsilon(Q)\ \forall\ r_1, r_2 \in R$

Proof. **(1):** We have

$$\Upsilon(P + Q)(\theta) = \{\theta, t_{\Upsilon(P+Q)}(\theta), i_{\Upsilon(P+Q)}(\theta), f_{\Upsilon(P+Q)}(\theta) : \theta \in N\}$$

and

$$(\Upsilon(P) + \Upsilon(Q))(\theta) = \{\theta, t_{\Upsilon(P)+\Upsilon(Q)}(\theta), i_{\Upsilon(P)+\Upsilon(Q)}(\theta), f_{\Upsilon(P)+\Upsilon(Q)}(\theta) : \theta \in N\}$$

If $\Upsilon^{-1}(\theta) = \phi$, then $t_{\Upsilon(P+Q)}(\theta) = 0,\ i_{\Upsilon(P+Q)}(\theta) = 0$ and $f_{\Upsilon(P+Q)}(\theta) = 1$ also,

$$t_{\Upsilon(P)+\Upsilon(Q)}(\theta) = \vee\{t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\kappa) \wedge t_{\Upsilon(Q)}(\nu); y = \kappa + \nu, \kappa, \nu \in N\} = 0$$

since $\Upsilon^{-1}(\kappa) = \phi$ or $\Upsilon^{-1}(\nu) = \phi$ as $\Upsilon^{-1}(\theta) = \phi$
Thus $t_{\Upsilon(P+Q)}(\theta) = t_{\Upsilon(P)+\Upsilon(Q)}(\theta)$

If $\Upsilon^{-1}(\theta) \neq \phi$, then

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\Upsilon(P+Q)}(\theta) &= \vee\{t_{P+Q}(\eta) : \eta \in M, \theta = g(\eta)\} \\ &= \vee\{\vee\{t_P(\rho) \wedge t_Q(\varsigma) : \rho, \varsigma \in M, \eta = \rho + \varsigma\}; \theta = \Upsilon(\eta)\} \\ &= \vee\{\vee\{t_P(\rho) \wedge t_Q(\varsigma) : \rho, \varsigma \in M\} : \theta = \Upsilon(\rho) + \Upsilon(\varsigma)\} \\ &= \vee(\{\vee\{t_P(\rho) : \kappa = \Upsilon(\rho)\}\} \wedge \{\vee\{t_Q(\varsigma) : \nu = \Upsilon(\varsigma)\}\} : \theta = \kappa + \nu\}) \\ &= \vee\{t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\rho) \wedge t_{\Upsilon(Q)}(\varsigma) : \theta = \kappa + \nu\} \\ &= t_{\Upsilon(P) + t_{\Upsilon}(Q)}(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

Thus in both cases $t_{\Upsilon(P+Q)}(\theta) = t_{\Upsilon(P)+\Upsilon(Q)}(\theta)$. In the same way, we can prove that

$i_{\Upsilon(P+Q)}(\theta) = i_{\Upsilon(P)+\Upsilon(Q)}(\theta)$ and $f_{\Upsilon(P+Q)}(\theta) = f_{\Upsilon(P)+\Upsilon(Q)}(\theta)$

(2) We have

$$\Upsilon(rP) = \{\theta, t_{\Upsilon(rP)}(\theta), i_{\Upsilon(rP)}(\theta), f_{\Upsilon(rP)}(\theta) : \theta \in N\}$$

and

$$r\Upsilon(P) = \{\theta, t_{r\Upsilon(P)}(\theta), i_{r\Upsilon(P)}(\theta), f_{r\Upsilon(P)}(\theta) : \theta \in N\}$$

If $\Upsilon^{-1}(\theta) = \phi,\ then\ t_{\Upsilon(rP)}(\theta) = 0$. Also

$$t_{r\Upsilon(P)}(\theta) = \vee\{t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\vartheta) : \vartheta \in N, \theta = r\vartheta\} = 0$$

Thus $t_{\Upsilon(rP)}(\theta) = t_{r\Upsilon(P)}(\theta)$

If $\Upsilon^{-1}(\theta) \neq \phi$, then

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\Upsilon(rP)}(\theta) &= \vee\{t_{rP}(\eta) : \eta \in M, \theta = \Upsilon(\eta)\} \\ &= \vee\{\vee\{t_P(u) : u \in M, \eta = ru\}\} \\ &= \vee\{\vee\{t_P(u) : u \in M, \theta = \Upsilon(ru)\}\} \\ &= \vee\{\vee\{t_P(u) : u \in M, \theta = r\Upsilon(u)\}\} \\ &= \vee\{t_{r\Upsilon(P)}(u) : \theta = r\Upsilon(u)\} \\ &= \vee t_{r\Upsilon(P)}(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get $t_{\Upsilon(rP)}(\theta) = t_{r\Upsilon(P)}(\theta)\ \forall \theta \in N$. Similarly we get

$$i_{\Upsilon(rP)}(\theta) = i_{r\Upsilon(P)}(\theta)\ f_{\Upsilon(rP)}(\theta) = f_{r\Upsilon(P)}(\theta)$$

(3) This follows from (1) and (2). □

Theorem 4.3. *If* $P \in U(M)$ and $\Upsilon \in Hom_R(M, N)$*, then* $\Upsilon(P) \in U(N)$.

Proof. We have $\Upsilon(P) = \{(\theta, t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\theta), i_{\Upsilon(P)}(\theta), f_{\Upsilon(P)}(\theta)) : y \in N\}$. Then

$$t_{\Upsilon(P)}(0) = \vee\{t_P(\eta) : \eta \in M,\ \Upsilon(\eta) = 0\} = t_P(0) = 1$$

Similarly $i_{\Upsilon(P)}(0) = 1$ and $f_{\Upsilon(P)}(0) = 0$

Now, let $\kappa, \nu \in N$

If $\Upsilon^{-1}(\kappa) = \phi$ or $\Upsilon^{-1}(\nu) = \phi$**,:** then correspondingly $t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\kappa) = 0$ or $t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\nu) = 0$

$\Rightarrow t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\kappa) \wedge t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\nu) = 0$ and so $t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\kappa + \nu) \geq t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\kappa) \wedge t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\nu)$.

If $\Upsilon^{-1}(\kappa) \neq \phi \neq \Upsilon^{-1}(\nu)$**,:** then

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\kappa+\nu) &= \vee\{t_P(\eta) : \eta \in M, \kappa+\nu = \Upsilon(\eta)\} \\ &= \vee\{t_P(\rho+\varsigma) : \rho,\varsigma \in M, \kappa+\nu = \Upsilon(\rho+\varsigma)\} \\ &\geq \vee\{t_P(\rho+\varsigma) : \rho \in \Upsilon^{-1}(\kappa), \varsigma \in \Upsilon^{-1}(\nu)\} \\ &= \vee\{t_P(\rho+\varsigma) : \rho,\varsigma \in M,\ \Upsilon(\rho) = \kappa, \Upsilon(\varsigma) = \nu\} \\ &\geq \vee\{t_P(\rho) \wedge t_P(\varsigma) : \rho,\varsigma \in M,\ \Upsilon(\rho) = \kappa, \Upsilon(\varsigma) = \nu\} \\ &\geq (\vee\{t_P(\rho), \rho \in M,\ \Upsilon(\rho) = \kappa\}) \wedge (\vee\{t_P(\varsigma) : \varsigma \in M, \Upsilon(\varsigma) = \nu\}) \\ &= t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\kappa) \wedge t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\nu) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can prove that

$$i_{\Upsilon(P)}(\kappa+\nu) \geq i_{\Upsilon(P)}(\kappa) \wedge i_{\Upsilon(P)}(\nu)$$

and

$$f_{\Upsilon(P)}(\kappa+\nu) \leq f_{\Upsilon(P)}(\kappa) \vee f_{\Upsilon(P)}(\nu)$$

If $\Upsilon^{-1}(\theta) = \phi,\ \theta \in N,$**:** then $t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\theta) = 0\ \Rightarrow t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\varrho\theta) \geq t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\theta), \forall \varrho \in R$
If $\Upsilon^{-1}(\theta) \neq \phi,\ \theta \in N,$**:** then

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\Upsilon(P)}(r\theta) &= \vee\{t_P(\eta) : \eta \in M, \varrho\theta = \Upsilon(\eta)\} \\ &\geq \vee\{t_P(\varrho\rho) : \varrho\rho \in M, \varrho\theta = \Upsilon(\varrho\rho)\} \\ &\geq \vee\{t_P(\varrho\rho) : r\rho \in M, \rho \in \Upsilon^{-1}(\theta)\} \\ &= \vee\{t_P(r\rho) : r\rho \in M, \theta = \Upsilon(\rho)\} \\ &\geq \vee\{t_P(\rho) : \rho \in M, \theta = \Upsilon(\rho)\} \\ &= t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can prove that $i_{\Upsilon(P)}(\varrho\theta) \geq i_{\Upsilon(P)}(\theta)\ and\ f_{\Upsilon(P)}(\varrho\theta) \leq f_{\Upsilon(P)}(\theta), \forall \theta \in N$.

Thus $\Upsilon(P) \in U(N)$ □

Theorem 4.4. *If $Q \in U(N)\ and\ \Upsilon \in Hom_R(M,N)$, then $\Upsilon^{-1}(Q) \in U(M)$.*

Proof. We have $\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)(\eta) = \{\eta, t_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\eta), i_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\eta), f_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\eta) : \eta \in M\}$ where

$$t_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\eta) = t_Q(\Upsilon(\eta)),\ i_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\eta) = i_Q(\Upsilon(\eta))\ and\ f_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(x) = f_Q(\Upsilon(\eta)).$$

Now
$t_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(0) = t_Q(\Upsilon(0)) = t_Q(0) = 1$. Similarly we can write $i_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(0) = 1\ and\ f_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(0) = 0$
Now $\forall\ \eta, \theta \in M$

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\eta+\theta) &= t_Q(\Upsilon(\eta+\theta)) \\ &= t_Q(\Upsilon(\eta)+\Upsilon(\theta)) \\ &\geq t_Q(\Upsilon(\eta)) \wedge t_Q(\Upsilon(\theta)) \\ &= t_{\Upsilon^{-1}Q}(\eta) \wedge t_{\Upsilon^{-1}Q}(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can prove that

$$i_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\eta+\theta) \geq i_{\Upsilon^{-1}Q}(\eta) \wedge i_{\Upsilon^{-1}Q}(\theta)$$

and

$$f_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\eta+\theta) \geq f_{\Upsilon^{-1}Q}(\eta) \wedge f_{\Upsilon^{-1}Q}(\theta)$$

Now $\forall \eta \in M, \varrho \in R$

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\varrho\eta) &= t_Q(\Upsilon(\varrho\eta)) \\ &= t_Q(\varrho\Upsilon(\eta)) \\ &\geq t_Q(\Upsilon(\eta)) \\ &= t_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\eta) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly $i_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\varrho\eta) \geq i_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\eta)$ *and* $f_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\varrho\eta) \leq f_{\Upsilon^{-1}(Q)}(\eta)$.
Thus $\Upsilon^{-1}(Q) \in U(M)$ □

Theorem 4.5. *Let $\Upsilon \in Hom_R(M, M^{\circledast})$ be a neutrosophic module homomorphism of P onto Q, where $P \in U(M)$ and $Q \in U(\Upsilon(M))$. Then the map $\Pi : M/N \to M^{\circledast}$, defined by $\Pi([\eta]) = \Upsilon(\eta),\ \eta \in M$ is a neutrosophic quotient module homomorphism of P_N on to Q, where $P_N \in U(M/N)$ and $N \subseteq M$.*

Proof. Given that $\Upsilon : M \to M^{\circledast}$ be neutrosophic module homomorphism of P onto Q, $\Rightarrow \Upsilon(P) = Q$. Then to prove that $\Pi : M/N \to M^{\circledast}$ *where* $\Pi([\eta]) = \Upsilon(\eta)$ is neutrosophic module homomorphism of P_N onto Q.
First we prove that $\Pi \in Hom_R(M/N, M^{\circledast})$. Let $\varrho_1, \varrho_2 \in R, \rho, \varsigma \in M$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi([\varrho_1[\rho] + \varrho_2[\varsigma]) &= \Pi(\varrho_1(\rho + N) + \varrho_2(\varsigma + N)) \\ &= \Pi(\varrho_1\rho + \varrho_2\varsigma + N) \\ &= \Pi([\varrho_1\rho + \varrho_2\varsigma]) \\ &= \Upsilon(\varrho_1\rho + \varrho_2\varsigma) \\ &= \varrho_1\Upsilon(\rho) + \varrho_2\Upsilon(\varsigma) \\ &= \varrho_1\Pi([\rho]) + \varrho_2\Pi([\varsigma]) \end{aligned}$$

For any $r \in R,\ [\eta] \in M/N$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(r[m]) &= \Pi(r(\eta + N)) \\ &= \Pi(r\eta + N) \\ &= \Pi([r\eta]) \\ &= \Upsilon(r\eta) \\ &= r\Upsilon(\eta) \\ &= r\Pi([\eta]) \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow\ \Pi \in Hom_R(M/N, M^{\circledast})$. Then to prove that $\Pi(P_N) = Q$, Now

$$\Pi(P_N)(\vartheta) = \{\vartheta, t_{\psi_{P_N}}(\vartheta), i_{\psi_{P_N}}(\vartheta), f_{\psi_{P_N}}(\vartheta) : \vartheta \in \Pi(M/N)\}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\Pi(P_N)}(\vartheta) &= \vee\{t_{P_N}([\eta]) : [\eta] \in \Pi^{-1}(\vartheta), \vartheta \in \Pi(M/N)\} \\ &= \vee\{\vee\{t_P(\zeta) : \zeta \in [\eta], \Pi([\eta]) = \vartheta,\ \vartheta \in \Upsilon(M)\} \\ &= \vee\{t_P(\zeta) : \zeta \in [\eta], \Upsilon(\eta) = \vartheta,\ \vartheta \in \Upsilon(M)\} \\ &= t_{\Upsilon(P)}(\vartheta) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $i_{\Pi(P_N)}(\vartheta) = i_{\Upsilon(P)}(\vartheta),\ f_{\Pi(P_N)}(\vartheta) = f_{\Upsilon(P)}(\vartheta)$
$\Rightarrow\ \Pi(P_N) = \Upsilon(P) = Q\ \Rightarrow \Pi$ is a neutrosophic module homomorphism of P_N onto Q. □

5. Conclusion

Neutrosophic submodule is one among the generalizations of classical algebraic structure, module. Neutrosophic algebraic constructions provide additional preciseness and mouldability to the classic algebraic structures as in contrast to the fuzzy or intuitionistic fuzzy algebraic structures. This study has evolved the perception of quotient module in neutrosophic set and defined the development of neutrosophic submodule from a quotient module . The properties of homomorphism of neutrosophic submodules are additionally examined. This work are often extended to the properties of isomorphism of neutrosophic submodules.

References

[1] Aggarwal, S., Biswas, R., and Ansari, A. *Neutrosophic modeling and control*, In emphem 2010 International Conference on Computer and Communication Technology, IEEE, (2010) 718–723.

[2] Ali, M., Smarandache, F., Shabir, M., and Vladareanu, L. *Generalization of Neutrosophic Rings and Neutrosophic Fields,* Infinite Study, 2014.

[3] Artin, M. *Algebra*, Pearson Prentice Hall, 2011.

[4] Atanassov, K. T. *New operations defined over the intuitionistic fuzzy sets*, Fuzzy sets and Systems **61** (2) (1994) 137–142.

[5] Atani, S. E. *On prime modules over pullback rings*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal **54** (3) (2004), 781–789.

[6] Bergstra, J. A., Heering, J., and Klint, P. *Module algebra*,emphem Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery **37**(2) (1990) 335–372.

[7] Broumi, S., Talea, M., Smarandache, F., and Bakali, A. *Decision-making method based on the interval valued neutrosophic graph,* In 2016 Future Technologies Conference (FTC) , IEEE, (2016) 44–50.

[8] Çetkin, V., and Aygün, H. *An approach to neutrosophic subgroup and its fundamental properties,* Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems **29** (5) (2015) 1941–1947.

[9] Cetkin, V., Varol, B. P., and Aygün, H. *On neutrosophic submodules of a module,* Hacettepe Journal of Mathematics and Statistics **46**(5) (2017) 791–799.

[10] Chashkin, A. C*omputation of boolean functions by randomized programs,* Discrete applied mathematics **135**, 1-3 (2004) 65–82.

[11] Colombo, F., Sabadini, I., Sommen, F., and Struppa, D. C. Analysis of Dirac systems and computational algebra, S*pringer Science* & Business Media, **39** (2012).

[12] Futa, Y., Okazaki, H., and Shidama, Y. *Quotient module of z-module*, Formalized Mathematics **20** (3) (2012) 205–214.

[13] Haibin, W., Smarandache, F., Zhang, Y., and Sunderraman, R. Single valued neutrosophic sets. Infinite Study, 2010.

[14] Harehdashti, J. B., and Moghimi, H. F. *Complete homomorphisms between the lattices of radical submodules*, MATHEMATICAL REPORTS **20** (2) (2018) 187–200.

[15] Herzog, I., and Puninskaya, V. *The model theory of divisible modules over a domain,* Fund. Math. Appl. **2** (1996) 563–594.

[16] Isaac, P., and John, P. P. *On intuitionistic fuzzy submodules of a module,* **11** (3) (2011) 1447–1454.

[17] Jaiyeola, T., and Smarandache, F. *Inverse properties in neutrosophic triplet loop and their application to cryptography*, Algorithms **11(** 3) (2018) 32.

[18] Kahraman, C., and Otay, İ. Fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making using neutrosophic sets, Springer, 2019.

[19] Klir, G. J., and Yuan, B. *Fuzzy sets and fuzzy logic: theory and applications*, Prentice Hall PTR New Jersey, **575** 1995.

[20] Lombardi, H., and Quitté, C. *Commutative algebra: constructive methods*, Traduction anglaise, révisée et augmentée, de lédition française (Algebre commutative. Méthodes constructives. Calvage et Mounet, 2011). Springer, Berlin **1**(2) (2015) 3.

[21] Lu, C.-P., et al. *Prime submodules of modules*, Rikkyo Daigaku sugaku zasshi **33** (1) (1984) 61–69.

[22] Matlis, E. *Divisible modules*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, **11** (3) (1960) 385–391.

[23] McCasland, R., and Moore, M. *Prime submodules*, Communications in Algebra, **20** (6) (1992) 1803–1817.

[24] Pramanik, S., Banerjee, D., and Giri, B. Multi–criteria group decision making model in neutrosophic refined set and its application, Infinite Study, 2016.

[25] Robinson, A. *Non-standard analysis*. Princeton University Press, 2016.

[26] Schumann, A., and Smarandache, F. *Neutrality and many-valued logics*, Infinite Study, 2007.

[27] *Set, N., Logic, N., and Probability, N.* Neutrosophic sets and systems.

[28] Smarandache, F. " *neutrosophy:* Neutrosophic probability, set, and logic"-first version.

[29] Smarandache, F. *Definiton of neutrosophic logic-a generalization of the intuitionistic fuzzy logic*, In EUSFLAT Conf. (2003) 141–146.

[30] Smarandache, F. *A unifying field in logics: Neutrosophic logic. neutrosophy, neutrosophic set, neutrosophic probability: Neutrosophic logic: neutrosophy, neutrosophic set, neutrosophic probability*. Infinite Study, 2003.

[31] Smarandache, F. *Neutrosophic set-a generalization of the intuitionistic fuzzy set*, Tech. rep., math/0404520, 2004.

[32] Smarandache, F. *Neutrosophic set-a generalization of the intuitionistic fuzzy set,* International journal of pure and applied mathematics **24** (3) (2005) 287.

[33] Smarandache, F., and Ali, M. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, book series*, Infinite Study, **(9)** 201.5

[34] Smarandache, F., et al. *Neutrosophic set–a generalization of the intuitionistic fuzzy set*, Journal of Defense Resources Management (JoDRM) 1 (1) (2010), 107–116.

[35] Smarandache, F., and Pramanik, S. *New trends in neutrosophic theory and applications*, Infinite Study, **(1)** 2016.

[36] Ye, J., *A multicriteria decision-making method using aggregation operators for simplified neutrosophic sets*, Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems **26** (5) (2014) 2459–2466.

[37] Ye, J., *Vector similarity measures of simplified neutrosophic sets and their application in multicriteria decision making*. Infinite Study, 2014.

[38] Zadeh, L. A. *Fuzzy sets*, Informtaion and control **8** (3) (1965) 338–353.

[39] Zhang, H.-y., Wang, J.-q., and Chen, X.-h. *Interval neutrosophic sets and their application in multicriteria decision making problems*, The Scientific World Journal **2014** (2014).