Filomat 32:12 (2018), 4319–4332 https://doi.org/10.2298/FIL1812319M



Published by Faculty of Sciences and Mathematics, University of Niš, Serbia Available at: http://www.pmf.ni.ac.rs/filomat

# **On Pseudo-Valuations on BCK-Algebras**

# S. Mehrshad<sup>a</sup>, N. Kouhestani<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of zabol, Zabol, Iran <sup>b</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of sistan and baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran

**Abstract.** In this paper, we study some properties of pseudo-valuations and their induced quasi metrics. The continuity of operation of a BCK-algebra was studied with topology induced by a pseudo-valuation. Moreover, we show that product of finite number of this pseudo metric spaces is a pseudo metric space. Also, we prove that if a BCK-algebra *X* has a pseudo-valuation, then every quotient space of *X* has a pseudo metric. The completion of this spaces has been investigated in the present study.

## 1. Introduction

A BCK-algebra is one of important of logical algebras introduced by Y. Imai and K. Iseki in 1966 [8]. This notation is originated from two different ways: one of them is based on set theory, the other is from classical and non-classical propositional calculi. The BCK-operator \* is an analogue of the set theoretical difference. As is well known, there is a close relation between the notions of the set difference in set theory and the implication functor in logical systems. Busneag in [2] defined a pesudo-valuation on a Hilbert algebra, and proved that every pseudo-valuation induces a pseudo-metric on a Hilbert algebra. Doh and Kang [3] by using the model of Hilbert algebra introduced the notion of pseudo-valuation on a BCK/BCI-algebra and provided several theorems of pseudo-valuations. In this paper, in section 3, we study some properties of pseudo-valuations on BCK-algebrs and completion ( $\tilde{X}, \tilde{d}_{\varphi}$ ) of pseudo metric space ( $X, d_{\varphi}$ ). In section 4, we introduced some pseudo-valuations on quotient BCK-algebra  $X/I_{\varphi}$  and study the induced pseudo metric by this pseudo-valuations. Moreover, we show that for each pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X there is an ideal J different with  $I_{\varphi}$  such that X/J is pseudo metrizable.

## 2. Preliminaries

# 2.1. BCK-algebras

An algebra (X, \*, 0) of type (2, 0) is called a *BCK-algebra* if it satisfies the following axioms: for any x, y,  $z \in X$ ,

- (1) ((x \* y) \* (x \* z)) \* (z \* y) = 0,
- (2) (x \* (x \* y)) \* y = 0,

<sup>2010</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 06F35; Secondary 03G25 Keywords. BCK-algebra, Pseudo-Valuation, Ideal, Quotient BCK-algebra

Received: 08 December 2017; Accepted: 19 April 2018

Communicated by Dijana Mosić

Email addresses: saeedmehrshad@gmail.com (S. Mehrshad), Kouhestani@math.usb.ac.ir (N. Kouhestani)

- (3) x \* x = 0,
- (4)  $x * y = y * x = 0 \Rightarrow x = y$ ,
- (5) 0 \* x = 0.[See,[4]]

In BCK-algebra X if we define  $\leq$  by  $x \leq y$  if and only if x \* y = 0, then  $\leq$  is a partial order and the following conclusions hold:

- (6)  $(x * y) * (x * z) \le (z * y)$  and  $(y * x) * (z * x) \le (y * z)$ ,
- (7) x \* (x \* (x \* y)) = x \* y,
- (8) (x \* y) \* z = (x \* z) \* y,
- (9) x \* 0 = x,
- (10)  $x * y \le x$ ,
- (11)  $x \leq y$  implies  $x * z \leq y * z$  and  $z * y \leq z * x$ ,
- (12)  $(x * y) * z \le x * z \le x * (z * u)$ .

Let (X, \*, 0) be a BCK-algebra and  $x \land y = y * (y * x)$ . Then X is called *commutative BCK-algebra* if  $x \land y = y \land x$ . If X is commutative BCK-algebra, then  $\inf\{x, y\} = x \land y$ .

If there is an element 1 of a BCK-algebra (X, \*, 0) such that  $x \le 1$  for all  $x \in X$ , then (X, \*, 0) is said to be *bounded* BCK-algebra. [See, [4]]

**Definition 2.1.** [4] Let X be a BCK-algebra. An ideal is a nonempty set  $I \subseteq X$  such that

- (a)  $0 \in I$ ,
- (b)  $x * y \in I, y \in I \Rightarrow x \in I$ .

**Proposition 2.2.** [4] Let I be an ideal in a BCK-algebra (X, \*, 0). Then:

- (*i*) If  $x \leq y$  and  $y \in I$ , then  $x \in I$ .
- (ii) the relation

$$x \equiv^{l} y \Leftrightarrow x * y, \ y * x \in I$$

is a congruence relation on X, i.e. it is an equivalence relation on X such that for each  $a, b, c, d \in X$ , if  $a \equiv^{I} b$  and  $c \equiv^{I} d$ , then  $a * c \equiv^{I} b * d$ ,

(iii) if  $\frac{x}{T} = \{y \in X : x \equiv^{I} y\}$  and  $\frac{X}{T} = \{\frac{x}{T} : x \in X\}$ , then  $\frac{X}{T}$  is a BCK-algebra under the binary operation

$$\frac{x}{I} * \frac{y}{I} = \frac{x * y}{I}.$$

In this case  $\frac{X}{T}$  is said to be a quotient BCK-algebra,

(iv) the mapping  $\pi_I : X \hookrightarrow \frac{X}{I}$  by  $\pi_I(x) = x/I$  is an epimorphism and for each  $S \subseteq X$ ,

$$(\pi_I^{-1} \circ \pi_I)(S) = \bigcup_{x \in S} \frac{x}{I}$$

 $\pi_I$  *is also called a* canonical epimorphism.

#### 2.2. Pseudo-valuations

**Definition 2.3.** [3] A real-valued function  $\varphi$  on a BCK-algebra X is called a weak pseudo-valuation on X if for all  $x, y \in X$ ,

$$\varphi(x * y) \le \varphi(x) + \varphi(y). \quad (15)$$

**Definition 2.4.** [3] A real-valued function  $\varphi$  on a BCK-algebra X is called a pseudo-valuation on X if

- (*i*)  $\varphi(0) = 0$ ,
- (*ii*)  $\varphi(x) \varphi(y) \le \varphi(x * y)$ , for all  $x, y \in X$ .

A pseudo-valuation  $\varphi$  on a BCK-algebra *X* is said to be *valuation* if

$$\varphi(x) = 0 \Longrightarrow x = 0$$

Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. Then for all  $x, y, z \in X$ ,

(16)  $\varphi(x) \ge 0$ ,

(17) 
$$x \le y \Rightarrow \varphi(x) \le \varphi(y)$$
,

(18)  $\varphi(x * z) \leq \varphi(x * y) + \varphi(y * z).$ 

In a BCK-algebra, every pseudo-valuation is a weak pseudo-valuation.[See, [3]]

**Proposition 2.5.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on X. Then  $I_{\varphi} = \{x \in X : \varphi(x) = 0\}$  is an ideal of X.

**Theorem 2.6.** [3] Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. Define  $d_{\varphi} : X \times X \to X$  by

$$d_{\varphi}(x, y) = \varphi(x * y) + \varphi(y * x)$$

for all  $(x, y) \in X \times X$ . Then  $d_{\varphi}$  is a pseudo-metric, i.e. for every  $x, y, z \in X$  we have:

- (*i*)  $d_{\varphi}(x, x) = 0$ ,
- (ii)  $d_{\varphi}(x, y) = d_{\varphi}(y, x)$ ,
- (iii)  $d_{\varphi}(x, y) \leq d_{\varphi}(x, z) + d_{\varphi}(z, y).$

If (X, d) is a pseudo-metric space, then:

(*i*) for each  $x \in X$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the set  $B_{\varepsilon}(x) = \{y \in X : d(y, x) < \varepsilon\}$  is called a *ball of radius*  $\varepsilon$  *with center at* x, (*ii*) the set  $U \subseteq X$  is open in (*X*, *d*) if for each  $x \in U$ , there is an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B_{\varepsilon}(x) \subseteq U$ , (*iii*) the topology  $\tau_d$  induced by *d* is the collection of all open sets in (*X*, *d*).

**Theorem 2.7.** [3] Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. Then a map  $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$  is a valuation if and only if  $(X, d_{\varphi})$  is a metric space.

**Proposition 2.8.** [3] Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. Then:

(19)  $d_{\varphi}(x, y) \ge d_{\varphi}(z * x, z * y),$ (20)  $d_{\varphi}(x, y) \ge d_{\varphi}(x * z, y * z),$ (21)  $d_{\varphi}(x * y, z * w) \le d_{\varphi}(x * y, z * y) + d_{\varphi}(z * y, z * w),$ 

for all  $x, y, z, w \in X$ .

## 3. Pseudo-valuations on BCK-algebras

**Proposition 3.1.** Let  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  be pseudo-valuations on BCK-algebra X. Then

- (i)  $d_{\varphi}((x \wedge z), (y \wedge z)) \leq d_{\varphi}(x, y),$
- (*ii*)  $|\varphi(x) \varphi(y)| \le d_{\varphi}(x, y)$ ,
- (iii)  $\varphi: X \to \mathbb{R}$  is continuous,
- (iv)  $I_{\varphi}$  is a closed subset of X,
- (v) for each  $x \in X$ ,  $\varphi + \psi : X \to \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $(\varphi + \psi)(x) = \varphi(x) + \psi(x)$  is a pseudo-valuation on X. Moreover,  $(t\varphi)(x) = t(\varphi(x))$  is a pseudo-valuation on X for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $x \in X$ .

*Proof.* (*i*) We have  $d_{\varphi}((x \land z), (y \land z)) = \varphi((x \land z) * (y \land z)) + \varphi((y \land z) * (x \land z))$ . By (6),

$$(x \land z) * (y \land z) = (z * (z * x)) * (z * (z * y)) \le (z * y) * (z * x) \le (x * z)$$

Similarly, we have  $(y \land z) * (x \land z) \le (y * x)$ . By (17),  $\varphi((z * y) * (z * x)) \le \varphi(x * z)$  and  $\varphi((y \land z) * (x \land z)) \le \varphi(y * x)$ . Hence

$$d_{\varphi}((x \wedge z), (y \wedge z)) = \varphi((x \wedge z) * (y \wedge z)) + \varphi((y \wedge z) * (x \wedge z)) \le \varphi(x * y) + \varphi(y * x) = d_{\varphi}(x, y).$$

(*ii*) Let  $x, y \in X$ . Then:

$$\varphi(y) - \varphi(x) \le \varphi(y * x)) \le \varphi(y * x) + \varphi(x * y) = d_{\varphi}(x, y).$$

and

$$\varphi(x) - \varphi(y) \le \varphi(x * y) \le \varphi(x * y) + \varphi(y * x) = d_{\varphi}(x, y).$$

Hence  $-d_{\varphi}(x, y) \leq \varphi(x) - \varphi(y) \leq d_{\varphi}(x, y)$ . Thus  $|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq d_{\varphi}(x, y)$ . (*iii*) Let  $\{x_n\}$  be a sequence in *X* such that  $x_n \longrightarrow x \in X$ . Then  $d_{\varphi}(x_n, x) \longrightarrow 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . The desired result follows by part (*ii*). (*iii*) Constant  $|x_n| = (x \in X, x_n(x), y)| = (x + 1)^{-1} ||y|| = (x + 1)^{-1} ||x|| = (x + 1)^{-1} ||y|| = (x$ 

(*iv*) Since  $I_{\varphi} = \{x \in X : \varphi(x) = 0\} = \varphi^{-1}(\{0\})$ , by part (*iii*) the proof is clear. (*v*) By definition,  $(\varphi + \psi)(0) = \varphi(0) + \psi(0) = 0 + 0 = 0$ . Suppose that  $x, y \in X$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi + \psi)(x * y) &= \varphi(x * y) + \psi(x * y), \\ &\geq (\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) + (\psi(x) - \psi(y)), \\ &= (\varphi(x) + \psi(x)) - (\varphi(y) + \psi(y)), \\ &= (\varphi + \psi)(x) - (\varphi + \psi)(y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\varphi + \psi$  is a pseudo-valuation on X. The proof for other case is similar.  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 3.2.** If  $\tau_{\varphi}$  is a induced topology by  $d_{\varphi}$ , then  $(X, *, \tau_{\varphi})$  is a topological BCK-algebra.

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.6,  $(X, d_{\varphi})$  is a pseudo-metric space. Let  $x * y \in B_{\varepsilon}(x * y)$ . We claim that  $B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(x) * B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(y) \subseteq B_{\varepsilon}(x * y)$ . Let  $z \in B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(x) * B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(y)$ . Then there exist  $p \in B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(x)$  and  $q \in B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(y)$  such that z = p \* q. Hence  $d_{\varphi}(x, p) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  and  $d_{\varphi}(y, q) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ . By (19) and (20) we have  $d_{\varphi}(x * y, p * y) \leq d_{\varphi}(x, p)$  and  $d_{\varphi}(p * y, p * q) \leq d_{\varphi}(y, q)$ . By (21),

$$d_{\varphi}(x * y, p * q) \leq d_{\varphi}(x * y, p * y) + d_{\varphi}(p * y, p * q) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

Thus  $z = p * q \in B_{\varepsilon}(x * y)$ . Therefore  $(X, *, \tau)$  is a topological BCK-algebra.  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 3.3.** A pseudo-valuation  $\varphi$  on the topological BCK-algebra  $(X, \tau)$  is continuous iff, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a neighbourhood U of 0 such that  $\varphi(z) < \varepsilon$ , for each  $z \in U$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $x \in X$  and  $\varepsilon$  is a positive number. Let U be a neighborhood of 0 such that  $\varphi(z) < \varepsilon$ , for each  $z \in U$ . Since x \* x = 0, there are open neighborhoods V and W of x such that  $V * W \subseteq U$ . Put  $P = V \cap W$ . For each  $y \in P$ , x \* y,  $y * x \in P * P \subseteq U$  and so  $\varphi(x * y)$ ,  $\varphi(y * x) < \varepsilon$ . Thus  $\varphi(y) - \varphi(x) < \varepsilon$  and  $\varphi(x) - \varphi(y) < \varepsilon$ . Hence  $|\varphi(y) - \varphi(x)| < \varepsilon$ . Thus  $\varphi$  is continuous. Conversely, If  $\varphi$  is continuous on X, then it is continuous in 0. Let  $\varepsilon$  be a positive number. Since  $\varphi(0) = 0$ ,  $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$  is an open neighborhood of  $\varphi(0)$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . There is an open neighborhood U of 0 in X such that  $\varphi(U) \subseteq (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ . Therefore  $\varphi(z) < \varepsilon$ , for each  $z \in U$ .

A function between two metric spaces will be called isometry if it preserves distances. Let  $\varphi_X$  and  $\varphi_Y$  be pseudo-valuations on BCK-algebras *X* and *Y* respectively. Then  $f : X \to Y$  will be called *pseudo-valuation preserving* if  $\varphi_Y \circ f = \varphi_X$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** Let X and Y be BCK-algebras and  $\varphi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varphi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$  be pseudo-valuations. If  $f : X \to Y$  ia a homomorphism, then the following are equivalent:

- (*i*) *f* is pseudo-valuation preserving,
- (*ii*) f is an isometry.

*Proof.* Assume that *f* is pseudo-valuation preserving. Then for each  $x \in X$ ,  $\varphi_Y(f(x)) = \varphi_X(x)$ . for any  $x, y \in X$  we have,

$$d_{\varphi_{Y}}(f(x), f(y)) = \varphi_{Y}(f(x) * f(y)) + \varphi_{Y}(f(y) * f(x)),$$
  
=  $\varphi_{Y}(f(x * y)) + \varphi_{Y}(f(y * x)),$   
=  $\varphi_{Y} \circ f(x * y) + \varphi_{Y} \circ f(y * x),$   
=  $\varphi_{X}(x * y) + \varphi_{X}(y * x),$   
=  $d_{\varphi_{X}}(x, y).$ 

Hence *f* is isometry. Conversely, if *f* is an isometry, then for any  $x \in X$ ,

$$\varphi_X(x) = d_{\varphi_X}(x,0) = d_{\varphi_Y}(f(x), f(0)) = \varphi_Y(f(x)) + \varphi_Y(f(0)) = \varphi_Y(f(x)).$$

Therefore *f* is pseudo-valuation preserving.  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 3.5.** Let f be an isomorphism from BCK-algebra  $(X, *, 0_X)$  to BCK-algebra  $(Y, \star, 0_Y)$ . If  $\varphi$  is a pseudovaluation on X, then  $\psi : Y \to \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\psi(y) = \varphi \circ f^{-1}(y)$  for any  $y \in Y$  is a pseudo-valuation on Y.

*Proof.* Since  $f(0_X) = 0_Y$ ,  $\psi(0_Y) = \varphi \circ f^{-1}(0_Y) = \varphi(0_X) = 0$ . Let  $y, y' \in Y$ . Since f is bijection, there are  $x, x' \in X$  such that f(x) = y and f(x') = y'. Hence

$$\begin{split} \psi(y \star y') &= \varphi(f^{-1}(y \star y')), \\ &= \varphi(f^{-1}(y) \star f^{-1}(y')), \\ &= \varphi(x \star x'), \\ &\geq \varphi(x) - \varphi(x'), \\ &= \varphi(f^{-1}(y)) - \varphi(f^{-1}(y')), \\ &= \psi(y) - \psi(y'). \end{split}$$

Therefore  $\psi$  is a pseudo-valuation on *Y*.

**Proposition 3.6.** Let f be an isomorphism from BCK-algebra  $(X, *, 0_X)$  to BCK-algebra  $(Y, \star, 0_Y)$ . If  $\psi$  is a pseudovaluation on Y, then  $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\varphi(x) = \psi \circ f(x)$  for any  $x \in X$  is a pseudo-valuation on X.

*Proof.* Since  $f(0_X) = 0_Y$ ,  $\varphi(0_X) = \psi \circ f(0_X) = \psi(0_Y) = 0$ . For any  $x, y \in X$  we have

$$\varphi(x * y) = \psi(f(x * y)) = \psi(f(x) \star f(y)) \ge \psi(f(x)) - \psi(f(y)) = \varphi(x) - \varphi(y)$$

Thus  $\varphi$  is a pseudo-valuation on *X*.  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 3.7.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on X and  $A \subseteq X$ . Let  $x \in X$ . If there is a  $y \in A$  such that  $x \equiv^{I_{\varphi}} y$ , then  $x \in \overline{A}$ . The converse is also true, when  $I_{\varphi}$  is a neighborhood of 0.

*Proof.* Let there is a  $y \in A$  such that  $x \equiv^{I_{\varphi}} y$ . Then  $\varphi(x * y) = \varphi(y * x) = 0$ . Thus  $\varphi(x * y) + \varphi(y * x) < \varepsilon$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Hence for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $B_{\varepsilon}(x) \cap A \neq \emptyset$  and so  $x \in \overline{A}$ . Conversely, let  $I_{\varphi}$  be a neighborhood of 0 and  $x \in \overline{A}$ . There is a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in A such that  $x_n \to x$ . Since \* is continuous,  $x * x_n \to 0$  and  $x_n * x \to 0$ . Hence there is a positive integer  $n_0$  such that  $x_{n_0} * x \in I_{\varphi}$  and  $x * x_{n_0} \in I_{\varphi}$ . Thus  $x_{n_0} \equiv^{I_{\varphi}} x$ .  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 3.8.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. If  $m_{\varphi}(x) = \lim_{r \to 0^+} \inf\{\varphi(z) : z \in B_r(x)\}$  and  $M_{\varphi}(x) = \lim_{r \to 0^+} \sup\{\varphi(z) : z \in B_r(x)\}$ , then:

- (*i*) for each  $x \in X$ ,  $m_{\varphi}(x)$  and  $M_{\varphi}(x)$  are pseudo-valuations on X,
- (*ii*)  $m_{\varphi}(x) \leq M_{\varphi}(x)$  for any  $x \in X$ ,
- (iii)  $M_{\varphi}(x) m_{\varphi}(x) \le M_{\varphi}(0)$  for any  $x \in X$ ,
- (iv) if  $M_{\varphi}(0) < \infty$ , then for all  $x \in X$ ,  $M_{\varphi}(x)$ ,  $m_{\varphi}(x) < \infty$ .

*Proof.* (*i*) Let *r* be a positive number and  $z \in B_r(0)$ . Then  $d_{\varphi}(z, 0) < r$  and so  $\varphi(0) = 0 \le \varphi(z) < r$ . Thus  $m_{\varphi}(0) = 0$ . Let  $x, y \in X$  and *r* be a positive number. We show that  $m_{\varphi}(x) \le m_{\varphi}(x * y) + m_{\varphi}(y)$ . If  $u \in B_r(x)$ , then

$$\inf\{\varphi(z): z \in B_r(x)\} \le \varphi(u) \le \varphi(u * v) + \varphi(v)$$

for any  $v \in B_r(y)$ . Hence

$$\inf\{\varphi(z): z \in B_r(x)\} \le \inf\{\varphi(u * v) + \varphi(v): v \in B_r(y)\}.$$

Since for each  $x \in X$ ,  $\varphi(x) \ge 0$ , we get

$$inf\{\varphi(u * v) + \varphi(v) : v \in B_r(y)\} = inf\{\varphi(w) : w \in u * B_r(y)\} + inf\{\varphi(v) : v \in B_r(y)\}$$

From  $u * v \in u * B_r(y) \subseteq B_r(x) * B_r(y) \subseteq B_{2r}(x * y)$ , we conclude that

$$\inf\{\varphi(z) : z \in B_r(x)\} \le \inf\{\varphi(w) : w \in B_{2r}(x * y)\} + \inf\{\varphi(v) : v \in B_r(y)\}.$$

Now, the result follows on taking limits as  $r \to 0^+$ . For other case, since  $\{\varphi(z) : z \in B_r(0)\} = \{\varphi(z) : 0 \le \varphi(z) < r\}$ , we get  $0 \le \sup\{\varphi(z) : 0 \le \varphi(z) < r\} \le r$ . Taking limits as  $r \to 0^+$ , we have  $M_{\varphi}(0) = 0$ . Now by similar argument the desired result will obtain.

(*ii*) The proof is clear.

(*iii*) For  $m_{\varphi}(x) < a$  and  $b < M_{\varphi}(x)$  there exist  $u, v \in B_r(x)$  with  $m_{\varphi}(x) \le \varphi(u) < a$  and  $b < \varphi(v) \le M_{\varphi}(x)$ . Hence

$$b - a < \varphi(v) - \varphi(u) \le \varphi(v * u) = d_{\varphi}(u * v, 0) < 2u$$

beacuse  $v * u \in B_r(x) * B_r(x) \subseteq B_{2r}(x * x) = B_{2r}(0)$ . Thus  $\varphi(v * u) \leq sup\{\varphi(z) : z \in B_{2r}(0)\}$ . Hence, with r fixed, taking *a*, *b* to respective limits,

$$M_{\varphi}(x) - m_{\varphi}(x) \leq \sup\{\varphi(z) : z \in B_{2r}(0)\}.$$

Taking limits as  $r \to 0^+$ , we obtain the inequality.

(*iv*) Clearly,  $0 \le M_{\varphi}(x) - m_{\varphi}(x) \le M_{\varphi}(0)$ , hence both  $M_{\varphi}(x)$  and  $m_{\varphi}(x)$  are finite for every x.

Let *X* be a BCK-algebra. Then *X* is called positive implicative BCK-algebra if (x \* y) \* z = (x \* z) \* (y \* z). The sets of the form

$$[0, c] = \{x \in X : 0 \le x \le c\} = \{x \in X : x \le c\}$$

is called initial segment.

**Proposition 3.9.** If  $\varphi$  is a pseudo-valuation on positive implicative BCK-algebra X and  $a \in X$ , then  $\varphi_a(x) = \varphi(x * a)$  is a pseudo-valuation on X, for any  $x \in X$ . Moreover, if  $\varphi$  is a valuation, then  $\varphi_a$  is a valuation if and only if  $I_{\varphi_a}$  is an initial segment.

*Proof.* It is easy to prove that  $\varphi_a(0) = 0$ . Let  $x, y, a \in X$ . Then

$$\varphi_a(x) - \varphi_a(y) = \varphi(x * a) - \varphi(y * a) \le \varphi((x * a) * (y * a)) = \varphi((x * y) * a) = \varphi_a(x * y).$$

Hence  $\varphi_a$  is a pseudo-valuation on *X*. Now, we have

$$\varphi_a(x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \varphi(x * a) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x * a = 0 \Leftrightarrow x \le a \Leftrightarrow x \in [0, a].$$

**Proposition 3.10.** Let X and Y be two BCK-algebras and  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on X. If  $f : X \to Y$  is a surjective homomorphism, then  $\varphi(y) = \inf{\{\varphi(x) : f(x) = y\}}$  is a pseudo-valuation on Y.

*Proof.* It is easy to prove that  $\phi(0) = 0$ . Let  $x, y \in Y$ . Then there are  $a, b \in X$  such that f(a) = x and f(b) = y. Since f is a homomorphism, f(a \* b) = x \* y. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x * y) + \phi(y) &= \inf\{\varphi(a * b) : f(a * b) = x * y\} + \inf\{\varphi(b) : f(b) = y\}, \\ &\geq \inf\{\varphi(a * b) + \varphi(b) : f(a * b) = x * y, f(b) = y\}, \\ &\geq \inf\{\varphi(a) : f(a) = x\} = \phi(x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\phi$  is a pseudo-valuation on *Y*.

Let  $(X_1, *_1, 0_1)$  and  $(X_2, *_2, 0_2)$  be two BCK-algebras and  $X = X_1 \times X_2$ . Let  $\pi_i : X \to X_i$  (i = 1, 2) be a projection from X to  $X_i$ . Then for any  $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2) \in X$  we have

$$\pi_i(x * y) = \pi_i(x_1 *_1 y_1, x_2 *_2 y_2) = x_i *_i y_i = \pi_i(x) *_i \pi_i(y).$$

**Proposition 3.11.** Let  $(X_1, *_1, 0_1)$  and  $(X_2, *_2, 0_2)$  be two BCK-algebras and  $X = X_1 \times X_2$ . Then X has a pseudo-valuation  $\varphi$  if and only if  $X_i$  have a pseudo-valuation for each i = 1, 2. Moreover,  $\varphi$  is continuous.

*Proof.* Let *X* has a pseudo-valuation. Since  $\pi_i : X \to X_i$  is an epimorphism,  $X_i$  has a pseudo-valuation for i = 1, 2 by Proposition 3.10. Conversely, let  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  be pseudo-valuations on  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , respectively. Let  $x = (x_1, x_2)$  define  $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$  by  $\varphi(x) = \varphi_1(x_1) + \varphi_2(x_2)$ , then  $\varphi(0) = \varphi((0_1, 0_2)) = \varphi_1(0_1) + \varphi_2(0_2) = 0$ . Let  $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2) \in X$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x * y) &= \varphi(x_1 *_1 y_1, x_2 *_2 y_2), \\ &= \varphi_1(x_1 *_1 y_1) + \varphi_2(x_2 *_2 y_2), \\ \geq \varphi_1(x_1) - \varphi_1(y_1) + \varphi_2(x_2) - \varphi_2(y_2), \\ &= \varphi_1(x_1) + \varphi_1(x_2) - (\varphi_2(y_1) + \varphi_2(y_2)) \\ &= \varphi(x) - \varphi(y). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\varphi$  is a pseudo-valuation on *X*. Now, let  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  be converges sequences to *x* and *y* in *X*<sub>1</sub> and *X*<sub>2</sub>, respectively. Since  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  and \* are continuous,  $\varphi_1(x_n *_1 x) \rightarrow 0$  and  $\varphi_2(y_n *_2 y) \rightarrow 0$ . Hence

$$\varphi((x_n, y_n) * (x, y)) = \varphi(x_n *_1 x, y_n *_2 y) = \varphi_1(x_n *_1 x) + \varphi_2(y_n *_2 y) \to 0.$$

Thus  $\varphi$  is continuous.  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 3.12.** Let  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  be two pseudo-valuations on BCK-algebras  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , respectively. For each  $(x, y), (a, b) \in X_1 \times X_2$  define

$$d((x, y), (a, b)) = d_{\varphi_1}(x, a) + d_{\varphi_2}(y, b).$$

*Then d is a pseudo metric on*  $X_1 \times X_2$ *.* 

*Proof.* For any (x, y),  $(a, b) \in X_1 \times X_2$ , we have

$$d((x, y), (x, y)) = d_{\varphi_1}(x, x) + d_{\varphi_2}(y, y) = 0 + 0 = 0.$$

and

$$d((x, y), (a, b)) = d_{\varphi_1}(x, a) + d_{\varphi_2}(y, b) = d_{\varphi_1}(a, x) + d_{\varphi_2}(b, y) = d((a, b), (x, y)).$$

Let  $(x, y), (a, b), (u, v) \in X_1 * X_2$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} d((x, y), (u, v)) &= d_{\varphi_1}(x, u) + d_{\varphi_2}(y, v), \\ &\leq [d_{\varphi_1}(x, a) + d_{\varphi_1}(a, u)] + [d_{\varphi_2}(y, b) + d_{\varphi_2}(b, v)], \\ &= [d_{\varphi_1}(x, a) + d_{\varphi_2}(y, b)] + [d_{\varphi_1}(a, u) + d_{\varphi_2}(b, v)], \\ &= d((x, y), (a, b)) + d((a, b), (u, v)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $(X_1 \times X_2, d)$  is a pseudo metric space.  $\Box$ 

**Corollary 3.13.** If  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  are two valuations on BCK-algebras  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , respectively, then  $(X_1 \times X_2, d)$  is a metric space.

**Proposition 3.14.** Let  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  be two pseudo-valuations on BCK-algebras  $(X_1, *_1, 0_1)$  and  $(X_2, *_2, 0_2)$  respectively. If  $X = X_1 \times X_2$ , then  $* : X \times X \to X$  is continuous.

*Proof.* Let  $(x, y), (a, b) \in X$ . We show that

$$B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}((a,b)) * B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}((x,y)) \subseteq B_{\varepsilon}((a,b) * (x,y)) = B_{\varepsilon}((a*_1x,b*_2y)).$$

Let  $(s,t) \in B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}((a,b)) * B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}((x,y))$ . Then  $(s,t) = (\alpha *_1 \gamma, \beta *_2 \lambda) = (\alpha, \beta) * (\gamma, \lambda)$  such that  $(\alpha, \beta) \in B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}((a,b))$  and  $(\gamma, \lambda) \in B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}((x,y))$ . Hence  $d((\alpha, \beta), (a, b)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  and  $d((\gamma, \lambda), (x, y)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ . By (19) and (20) we have,

$$d((s,t), (a,b) * (x,y)) = d((\alpha,\beta) * (\gamma,\lambda), (a,b) * (x,y)),$$

$$= d((\alpha *_1 \gamma, \beta *_2 \lambda), (a *_1 x, b *_2 y)),$$

$$= d_{\varphi_1}((\alpha *_1 \gamma), (a *_1 x)) + d_{\varphi_2}((\beta *_2 \lambda), (b *_2 y)),$$

$$\leq [d_{\varphi_1}(\alpha *_1 \gamma, a *_1 \gamma) + d_{\varphi_1}(a *_1 \gamma, a *_1 x)]$$

$$+ [d_{\varphi_2}(\beta *_2 \lambda, \beta *_2 y) + d_{\varphi_2}(\beta *_2 y, b *_2 y)],$$

$$\leq [d_{\varphi_1}(\alpha, a) + d_{\varphi_1}(\gamma, x)] + [d_{\varphi_2}(\lambda, y) + d_{\varphi_2}(\beta, b)],$$

$$= [d_{\varphi_1}(\alpha, a) + d_{\varphi_2}(\beta, b)] + [d_{\varphi_1}(\gamma, x) + d_{\varphi_2}(\lambda, y)],$$

$$= d((\alpha, \beta), (a, b)) + d((\gamma, \lambda), (x, y))$$

$$< \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

Thus \* is continuous.  $\square$ 

A sequence  $\{x_n\} \subseteq X$  is a  $d_{\varphi}$ -cauchy if it is a cauchy sequence of the pseudo-metric  $(X, d_{\varphi})$ . The space  $(X, d_{\varphi})$  is  $d_{\varphi}$ -complete if any  $d_{\varphi}$ -cauchy converges to an element of X. Let  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  be  $d_{\varphi}$ -cauchy sequences. Then the sequence  $\{d_{\varphi}(x_n, y_n)\}$  is convergent, because it is a cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

**Proposition 3.15.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. Define the relation ~ by:

$$\{x_n\} \sim \{y_n\} \Leftrightarrow d_{\varphi}(x_n, y_n) \longrightarrow 0$$

for all  $d_{\varphi}$ -cauchy sequences  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  in X. Then  $\sim$  is a congruence relation on the set of all  $d_{\varphi}$ -cauchy sequences in X.

*Proof.* It is easy to prove that ~ is an equivalence relation on *X*. Let  $\{x_n\} ~ \{y_n\}$  and  $\{a_n\} ~ \{b_n\}$ . Then  $d_{\varphi}(x_n, y_n) \longrightarrow 0$  and  $d_{\varphi}(a_n, b_n) \longrightarrow 0$ . By (19) and (20) we have  $d_{\varphi}(x_n * a_n, y_n * a_n) \longrightarrow 0$  and  $d_{\varphi}(y_n * a_n, y_n * b_n) \longrightarrow 0$ . By (21) we have  $d_{\varphi}(x_n * y_n, a_n * b_n) \longrightarrow 0$  and so  $\{x_n\} * \{y_n\} ~ \{a_n\} * \{b_n\}$ . Therefore ~ is a congruence relation on *X*.  $\Box$ 

**Definition 3.16.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. The set of all equivalence classes  $\{x_n\} = \{\{y_n\} : \{y_n\} \sim \{x_n\}\}$  is denoted by  $\widetilde{X}$ . On this set, we define  $\{\widetilde{x_n}\} * \{\widetilde{y_n}\} = \{\widetilde{x_n} * \widetilde{y_n}\}$ .

**Proposition 3.17.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. Then  $(\widetilde{X}, *, \widetilde{\{0\}})$  is a BCK-algebra and the pseudo-metric  $d_{\varphi}$  induces a metric  $\widetilde{d_{\varphi}}$  on  $\widetilde{X}$  as follows:

$$\widetilde{d_{\varphi}}(\widetilde{\{x_n\}}, \widetilde{\{y_n\}}) = lim_n d_{\varphi}(x_n, y_n)$$

for all  $\widetilde{\{x_n\}}, \widetilde{\{y_n\}} \in \widetilde{X}$ .

*Proof.* It is easy to prove that  $(\widetilde{X}, *, \widetilde{\{0\}})$  is a BCK-algebra and  $\widetilde{d_{\varphi}}$  is a pseudo-metric on  $\widetilde{X}$ . Let  $\{\widetilde{x_n}\}, \{\widetilde{y_n}\} \in \widetilde{X}$  and  $\widetilde{d_{\varphi}}(\{\widetilde{x_n}\}, \{\widetilde{y_n}\}) = 0$ . Then  $d_{\varphi}(x_n, y_n) \longrightarrow 0$  and so  $\{x_n\} \sim \{y_n\}$ . Hence  $\{\widetilde{x_n}\} = \{\widetilde{y_n}\}$ . Therefore  $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{d_{\varphi}})$  is a metric space.  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 3.18.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. Then

- (*i*) If  $\{x_n\}$  is a  $d_{\varphi}$ -cauchy sequence in X, then  $\{\varphi(x_n)\}$  is a cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ .
- (*ii*) the mapping  $\pi_{\varphi} : X \to \widetilde{X}$  by  $\pi_{\varphi}(x) = \{\widetilde{x}\}$  where  $\{\widetilde{x}\}$  is the equivalence class of the constant sequence with any element equal to *x*, is an homomorphism.

*Proof.* (*i*) By Proposition 3.1 (*ii*), the proof is clear. (*ii*) The proof is clear.  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 3.19.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. Then the mapping  $\widetilde{\varphi} : \widetilde{X} \to \mathbb{R}$  by  $\widetilde{\varphi}(\{x_n\}) = \lim_n \varphi(x_n)$  for each  $d_{\varphi}$ -cauchy sequence in X, is a pseudo-valuation on  $\widetilde{X}$ .

*Proof.* It is easy to prove that  $\widetilde{\varphi}(\{0\}) = 0$ . Let  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  be  $d_{\varphi}$ -cauchy sequences in X. Then

$$\widetilde{\varphi}(\widetilde{\{x_n\}}) = Lim_n\varphi(x_n) \le lim_n\varphi(x_n * y_n) + lim_n\varphi(y_n) = \widetilde{\varphi}(\widetilde{\{x_n\}} * \widetilde{\{y_n\}}) + \widetilde{\varphi}(\widetilde{\{y_n\}})$$

Hence  $\widetilde{\varphi}$  is a pseudo-valuation on  $\widetilde{X}$ .

**Corollary 3.20.** The metric space  $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{d_{\varphi}})$  is  $\widetilde{d_{\varphi}}$ -complete.

**Proposition 3.21.** If  $\widetilde{X}$ ,  $\widetilde{\varphi}$ ,  $\pi_{\varphi}$  and  $\widetilde{d}$  are defined as above, then following properties hold:

- (*i*)  $\tilde{\varphi} \circ \pi_{\varphi} = \varphi$  and hence  $\pi_{\varphi}$  is pseudo-valuation preserving.
- (*ii*)  $\varphi$  is a valuation iff,  $\pi_{\varphi}(x) = \widetilde{\{0\}}$  implies that x = 0.

(iii) 
$$d_{\varphi} = d_{\widetilde{\varphi}}$$
.

(iv)  $\pi_{\varphi}$  is continuous.

*Proof.* (*i*) For any  $x \in X$ ,  $\tilde{\varphi} \circ \pi_{\varphi}(x) = \tilde{\varphi}(\pi_{\varphi}(x)) = \lim_{n} \varphi(x) = \varphi(x)$ . (*ii*) Let  $\varphi$  be a valuation and  $\pi_{\varphi}(x) = \{0\}$ . Then  $\{x\} = \{0\}$  and so  $\{x\} \sim \{0\}$ . Hence  $\varphi(x) = d_{\varphi}(x, 0) = 0$ . Since  $\varphi$  is a valuation, x = 0. Conversely, if  $\varphi(x) = 0$  for any  $x \in X$ , then  $d_{\varphi}(x, 0) = \varphi(x) = 0$  and so  $\pi_{\varphi}(x) = \{x\} = \{0\}$ . Hence x = 0. Thus  $\varphi$  is a valuation.

(*iii*) For any  $\widetilde{\{x_n\}}, \widetilde{\{y_n\}} \in \widetilde{X}$  we have

$$d_{\widetilde{\varphi}}(\{\overline{x_n}\}, \{\overline{y_n}\}) = \widetilde{\varphi}(\{\overline{x_n * y_n}\}) + \widetilde{\varphi}(\{\overline{y_n * x_n}\}),$$
  
$$= \lim_n \varphi(x_n * y_n) + \lim_n \varphi(y_n * x_n),$$
  
$$= \lim_n d_{\varphi}(x_n, y_n)$$
  
$$= d_{\widetilde{\varphi}}(\{\overline{x_n}\}, \{\overline{y_n}\}).$$

(*iv*) If  $x_n \longrightarrow x$  in  $(X, d_{\varphi})$ , then  $lim_n d_{\varphi}(x_n, x) = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Since

$$d_{\widetilde{\varphi}}(\pi_{\varphi}(x_n), \pi_{\varphi}(x)) = \widetilde{\varphi}(\pi_{\varphi}(x_n * x)) + \widetilde{\varphi}(\pi_{\varphi}(x * x_n)),$$
  
$$= \varphi(x_n * x) + \varphi(x * x_n),$$
  
$$= d_{\varphi}(x_n, x).$$

Hence  $\pi_{\varphi}(x_n) \longrightarrow \pi_{\varphi}(x)$  in  $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{d_{\varphi}})$ .  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 3.22.** Let  $\psi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra Y such that  $(Y, d_{\psi})$  is a  $d_{\psi}$ -complete space. If  $\varphi$  is a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X and  $f : X \to Y$  is a pseudo-valuation preserving homomorphism, then there exists a unique pseudo-valuation preserving homomorphism  $\tilde{f} : \tilde{X} \to Y$  such that  $\tilde{f} \circ \pi_{\varphi} = f$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $f : X \to Y$  is a pseudo-valuation preserving homomorphism. By Proposition 3.4, f is an isometry. If  $\{x_n\}$  is a  $d_{\varphi}$ -cauchy sequence in X, then  $\{f(x_n)\}$  is a  $d_{\psi}$ -cauchy sequence in Y. Since Y is  $d_{\psi}$ -complete,  $f(x_n) \to y$  for some  $y \in Y$ . Define  $\widetilde{f}(\{x_n\}) = y$ . We show that  $\widetilde{f}$  is the unique isometry such that  $\widetilde{f} \circ \pi_{\varphi} = f$ . Let  $\{\overline{x_n}\}, \{\overline{y_n}\} \in \widetilde{X}, f(x_n) \to x$  and  $f(y_n) \to y$ . Then

$$d_{\overline{\varphi}}(\overline{\{x_n\}},\overline{\{y_n\}}) = d_{\varphi}(\overline{\{x_n\}},\overline{\{y_n\}}),$$

$$= \lim_n \varphi(x_n * y_n) + \lim_n \varphi(y_n * x_n),$$

$$= \lim_n \psi \circ f(x_n * y_n) + \lim_n \psi \circ f(y_n * x_n),$$

$$= \lim_n \psi(f(x_n * y_n)) + \lim_n \psi(f(y_n * x_n)),$$

$$= \lim_n \psi(f(x_n) * f(y_n)) + \lim_n \psi(f(y_n) * f(x_n)),$$

$$= \lim_n \psi(x * y) + \lim_n \psi(y * x),$$

$$= \psi(x * y) + \psi(y * x),$$

$$= \psi(\widetilde{f}(\overline{\{x_n\}}) * \widetilde{f}(\overline{\{y_n\}})) + \psi(\widetilde{f}(\overline{\{y_n\}}) * \widetilde{f}(\overline{\{x_n\}})),$$

The uniqueness is obvious. Since the BCK-algebra operation *Y* is continuous respect to  $d_{\psi}$ , we get that  $\tilde{f}$  is a homomorphism. Finally, for each  $x \in X$ ,  $\tilde{f} \circ \pi_{\varphi}(x) = \tilde{f}(\{x\}) = f(x)$ . Thus  $\tilde{f} \circ \pi_{\varphi} = f$ .  $\Box$ 

# 4. Pseudo-valuations on Quotient BCK-algebras

Proposition 4.1. Let I be an ideal in a BCK-algebra X. Then:

(i) If  $\varphi$  is a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X, then  $\overline{\varphi}(x/I) = \inf \{\varphi(z) : z \in x/I\}$  is a pseudo-valuation on X/I.

(ii) If  $\overline{\varphi}$  is a pseudo-valuation on X/I, then  $\varphi(x) = \overline{\varphi}(x/I)$  is a pseudo-valuation on X. Moreover,  $\overline{\varphi}$  is a valuation on X if and only if  $I = I_{\varphi}$ .

*Proof.* (*i*) This is Proposition 3.10 with y = x/I and  $f = \pi_I$ .

(*ii*) Let  $\overline{\varphi}$  be a pseudo-valuation on X/I. It is easy to prove that the mapping  $\overline{\varphi}(x/I) = \varphi(x)$  is a pseudo-valuation on X. Let  $\overline{\varphi}$  be a valuation on X/I. If  $x \in I$ , then x/I = 0/I and so  $\varphi(x) = \overline{\varphi}(x/I) = \overline{\varphi}(0/I) = 0$ . Hence  $I \subseteq I_{\varphi}$ . If  $x \in I_{\varphi}$ , then  $\varphi(x) = 0$  and so  $\overline{\varphi}(x/I) = 0$ . Thus x/I = 0/I and hence  $x \in I$ . Therefore  $I_{\varphi} \subseteq I$ . Conversly, let  $I_{\varphi} = I$  and  $\overline{\varphi}(x/I) = 0$ . Then  $\varphi(x) = 0$  and so  $x \in I$ . Hence x/I = 0/I. Thus  $\overline{\varphi}$  is a valuation on X/I.  $\Box$ 

**Corollary 4.2.** Let  $\varphi$  be a valuation on a BCK-algebra X. If for each  $x \in X$ , the set x/I has a minimum, then  $\overline{\varphi}(x/I) = \inf\{\varphi(z) : z \in x/I\}$  is a valuation on X/I.

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.1 (*i*),  $\overline{\varphi}$  is a pseudo-valuation. Let for some  $x \in X$ ,  $\overline{\varphi}(x/I) = 0$ . By assumption, there is an  $a \in X$  such that a = minx/I. Since for each  $z \in x/I$ ,  $a \le z$ , we get that  $\varphi(a) \le \varphi(z) = \overline{\varphi}(z/I) = \overline{\varphi}(x/I)$  and so  $\varphi(a) = 0$ . Since  $\varphi$  is a valuation, a = 0. Hence x/I = 0/I.  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 4.3.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. Then  $I \subseteq I_{\varphi}$  if and only if there exists a pseudo-valuation  $\phi : X/I \to \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\phi \circ \pi_I = \varphi$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\phi : X/I \to \mathbb{R}$  be a pseudo-valuation on X/I such that  $\phi \circ \pi_I = \varphi$ . If  $x \in I$ , then x/I = 0/I. Hence

$$\varphi(x) = \phi \circ \pi_I(x) = \phi(\pi_I(x)) = \phi(x/I) = \phi(0/I) = \phi \circ \pi_I(0) = \varphi(0) = 0.$$

Thus  $x \in I_{\varphi}$  and hence  $I \subseteq I_{\varphi}$ . Conversely, let  $I = I_{\varphi}$ . Define  $\phi(x) = \varphi(x)$  for any  $x \in X$ . If  $x, y \in X$  and x/I = y/I, then  $x * y, y * x \in I$ . Since  $\phi(x) = \varphi(x), \varphi(x * y) = \varphi(y * x) = 0$ . Therefore  $0 = \varphi(x * y) \ge \varphi(x) - \varphi(y)$  and  $0 = \varphi(y * x) \ge \varphi(y) - \varphi(x)$ . Thus  $\varphi(x) = \varphi(y)$  and hence  $\phi$  is well defined. We have  $\phi(0/I) = \varphi(0) = 0$  and

$$\phi(x/I * y/I) = \phi(x * y/I) = \varphi(x * y) \ge \varphi(x) - \varphi(y) = \phi(x/I) - \phi(y/I).$$

Thus  $\phi$  is a pseudo-valuation on *X*/*I*. It is easy to prove that  $\phi \circ \pi_I = \varphi$ .  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 4.4.** Let  $\varphi$  be pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X and  $I_{\varphi} = \{x \in X : \varphi(x) = 0\}$ . If  $d_{\varphi}$  is the induced pseudo-metric by  $\varphi$ , Then  $D(x/I_{\varphi}, y/I_{\varphi}) = d_{\varphi}(x, y)$  is a metric on  $X/I_{\varphi}$ .

*Proof.* First we show that *D* is well defined. Let *x*, *y*, *a* and *b* be in *X* and  $x/I_{\varphi} = a/I_{\varphi}$  and  $y/I_{\varphi} = b/I_{\varphi}$ . Then  $x * a, a * x, y * b, b * y \in I_{\varphi}$  and so  $\varphi(x * a) = \varphi(a * x) = \varphi(y * b) = \varphi(b * y) = 0$ . By (6),  $(x * y) * (x * a) \leq (a * y)$  and  $(a * y) * (b * y) \leq (a * b)$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x*y) - \varphi(x*a) &\leq \varphi((x*y)*(x*a)) &\leq \varphi(a*y) \\ &= \varphi(a*y) - \varphi(b*y) \\ &\leq \varphi((a*y)*(b*y)) \leq \varphi(a*b). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\varphi(x * y) \leq \varphi(a * b)$ . By similar argument we have  $\varphi(a * b) \leq \varphi(x * y)$  and so  $\varphi(x * y) = \varphi(a * b)$ . In a similar fashion we have  $\varphi(y * x) = \varphi(b * a)$ . Therefore  $D(x/I_{\varphi}, y/I_{\varphi}) = D(a/I_{\varphi}, b/I_{\varphi})$  and so *D* is well defined. It is easy to prove that *D* is a pseudo-metric. To prove that *D* is a metric, let  $D(x/I_{\varphi}, y/I_{\varphi}) = 0$ . Then  $\varphi(x * y) = \varphi(y * x) = 0$  and so  $x * y, y * x \in I_{\varphi}$ . Thus  $x/I_{\varphi} = y/I_{\varphi}$ . Hence *D* is a metric on  $X/I_{\varphi}$ .  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 4.5.** Let  $\varphi$  be pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X and  $I_{\varphi} = \{x \in X : \varphi(x) = 0\}$ . If  $\tau_D$  is the induced topology by D on  $X/I_{\varphi}$  and  $\tau$  is the quotient topology on  $X/I_{\varphi}$ , then:

- (*i*) the epimorphism  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}}$ :  $(X, \tau_{\varphi}) \rightarrow (X/I_{\varphi}, \tau_D)$  is an open map,
- (*ii*)  $\tau_D = \tau$ ,
- (iii) if  $\varphi$  is a valuation, then  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}}$  is a homeomorphism.

*Proof.* (*i*) It is enough to show that  $\pi_{I_{\omega}}(B_{\varepsilon}(x)) \in \tau_D$  for each  $x \in X$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{I_{\varphi}}(B_{\varepsilon}(x)) &= \{\pi_{I_{\varphi}}(y) : y \in B_{\varepsilon}(x)\} = \{y/I_{\varphi} : d_{\varphi}(y,x) < \varepsilon\} \\ &= \{y/I_{\varphi} : D(y/I_{\varphi}, x/I_{\varphi}) < \varepsilon\}, \\ &= B_{\varepsilon}^{D}(x/I_{\varphi}) \in \tau_{D}. \end{aligned}$$

(*ii*) It is clear that the map  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}} : (X, \tau_{\varphi}) \to (X/I_{\varphi}, \tau_D)$  is continuous, becaus  $D(x/I_{\varphi}, y/I_{\varphi}) = d_{\varphi}(x, y)$ . Thus  $\tau_D \subseteq \tau$ . If  $U \in \tau$ , then  $\pi_{\varphi}^{-1}(U) \in \tau_{\varphi}$ . Hence  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}}^{-1}(U) = \bigcup_{x \in \pi_{I_{\varphi}}^{-1}(U)} B_{\varepsilon}(x)$ . Since  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}}$  is an epimorphism,  $U = \pi_{I_{\varphi}}(\pi_{I_{\varphi}}^{-1}(U)) = \pi_{I_{\varphi}}(\bigcup_{x \in \pi_{I_{\varphi}}^{-1}(U)} B_{\varepsilon}(x)) = \bigcup_{x \in \pi_{I_{\varphi}}^{-1}(U)} B_{\varepsilon}^{D}(x/I_{\varphi}) \in \tau_D$ . Thus  $U \in \tau_D$ . Therefore  $\tau_D = \tau$ . (*ii*) It is enough to show that  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}}$  is injective. Let  $x, y \in X$  and  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}}(x) = \pi_{I_{\varphi}}(y)$ . Then  $x/I_{\varphi} = y/I_{\varphi}$  and so

(*iii*) It is enough to show that  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}}$  is injective. Let  $x, y \in X$  and  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}}(x) = \pi_{I_{\varphi}}(y)$ . Then  $x/I_{\varphi} = y/I_{\varphi}$  and so  $x * y, y * x \in I_{\varphi}$ . Thus  $\varphi(x * y) = \varphi(y * x) = 0$ . Since  $\varphi$  is a valuation, x \* y = y \* x = 0. By (4), x = y. Hence  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}}$  is a homeomorphism.  $\Box$ 

**Proposition 4.6.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. If  $x/I_{\varphi} = y/I_{\varphi}$ , then  $\varphi(x) = \varphi(y)$  for any  $x, y \in X$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x/I_{\varphi} = y/I_{\varphi}$ . Then  $x \equiv^{I_{\varphi}} y$  and so  $\varphi(x * y) = \varphi(y * x) = 0$ . By Proposition 3.1, we have

$$|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \le d_{\varphi}(x, y) = \varphi(x * y) + \varphi(y * x) = 0.$$

Thus  $\varphi(x) = \varphi(y)$ .  $\Box$ 

**Theorem 4.7.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X and for each  $x \in X$  the set  $x/I_{\varphi}$  has a minimum. Then there is a pseudo-valuation  $\varphi$  on  $X/I_{\varphi}$  such that  $(X/I_{\varphi}, d_{\varphi})$  is a metric space. Moreover, if  $\tau_{\varphi}$  is the induced topology by  $d_{\varphi}$ , then  $\tau_{\varphi}$  is weaker than the quotient topology on  $X/I_{\varphi}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in X$ . By assumption, there is a  $x_0 \in x/I_{\varphi}$  such that  $x_0 = \min x/I_{\varphi}$ . Define  $\phi(x/I_{\varphi}) = \varphi(x_0)$ . We show that  $\phi$  is a pseudo-valuation on  $X/I_{\varphi}$ . Since  $0 \in I_{\varphi} = 0/I_{\varphi}$ ,  $\phi(0/I_{\varphi}) = \varphi(0) = 0$ . Let  $x, y \in X$ ,  $x_0 = \min x/I_{\varphi}$ ,  $y_0 = \min y/I_{\varphi}$  and  $z_0 = \min (x * y)/I_{\varphi}$ . Since  $x_0 * y_0 \in (x * y)/I_{\varphi}$ ,  $x_0 * y_0 \equiv I_{\varphi} z_0$  and so  $(x_0 * y_0)/I_{\varphi} = z_0/I_{\varphi}$ . By Proposition 4.6,  $\varphi(x_0 * y_0) = \varphi(z_0)$ . Thus

$$\phi(x/I_{\varphi}) = \varphi(x_0) \le \varphi(x_0 * y_0) + \varphi(y_0) = \varphi(z_0) + \varphi(y_0) = \phi((x * y)/I_{\varphi}) + \phi(y/I_{\varphi})$$

Hence  $\phi$  is a pseudo-valuation on  $X/I_{\varphi}$ . By Theorem 2.6,  $d_{\phi} = \phi((x*y)/I_{\varphi}) + \phi((y*x)/I_{\varphi})$  is a pseudo-valuation on  $X/I_{\varphi}$ . Now, we show that  $d_{\phi}$  is a metric. Let  $x \in X$  and  $x_0 = \min x/I_{\varphi}$ . If  $\phi(x/I_{\varphi}) = 0$ , then  $\varphi(x_0) = 0$  and so  $x_0 \in I_{\varphi}$ . Hence  $x/I_{\varphi} = x_0/I_{\varphi} = 0/I_{\varphi}$ . Thus  $d_{\phi}$  is a metric on  $X/I_{\varphi}$ . Finally, we show that  $\tau_{\phi}$  is weaker than the quotient topology on  $X/I_{\varphi}$ . For this, let  $a_0 = \min (x*y)/I_{\varphi}$  and  $b_0 = \min (y*x)/I_{\varphi}$ . Then  $a_0 \le x*y$  and  $b_0 \le y*x$  we have

$$d_{\phi}(x/I_{\varphi}, y/I_{\varphi}) = \phi((x * y)/I_{\varphi}) + \phi((y * x)/I_{\varphi}) = \varphi(a_0) + \varphi(b_0) \le \varphi(x * y) + \varphi(y * x) = d_{\varphi}(x, y).$$

Now it is easy to prove that the mapping  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}} : X \to X/I_{\varphi}$  by  $\pi_{I_{\varphi}}(x) = x/I_{\varphi}$  is continuous. Therefore  $\tau_{\varphi}$  is weaker than the quotient topology on  $X/I_{\varphi}$ .  $\Box$ 

**Theorem 4.8.** Let  $\varphi$  be a valuation on a BCK-algebra X. If  $(X, d_{\varphi})$  is a  $d_{\varphi}$ -complete, then for each closed ideal I, X/I is a metric space.

*Proof.* Let *I* be a closed ideal in  $(X, d_{\varphi})$ . By Proposition 4.1, the mapping  $\overline{\varphi}(x/I) = inf\{\varphi(z) : z \in x/I\}$  is a pseudo-valuation on X/I. We prove that  $\overline{\varphi}$  is a valuation. For this let  $\overline{\varphi}(x/I) = 0$  for some  $x \in X$ . Since  $\overline{\varphi}(x/I) = inf\{\varphi(z) : z \in x/I\}$ , there is a sequence  $\{z_n\} \subseteq x/I$  such that the sequence  $\{\varphi(z_n)\}$  converges to 0. We show that  $\{z_n\}$  is a  $d_{\varphi}$ -cauchy sequence. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . There is a  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for each  $n \ge n_0$ ,  $\varphi(z_n) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ . Now by (17), for each  $n, m \ge n_0$ , we have

$$d_{\varphi}(z_n, z_m) = \varphi(z_n * z_m) + \varphi(z_m * z_n) \le \varphi(z_n) + \varphi(z_m) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

Hence the sequence  $\{z_n\}$  is  $d_{\varphi}$ -cauchy sequence and so converges to a  $z \in X$ . Since  $\varphi$  is continuous, the sequence  $\{\varphi(z_n)\}$  converges to  $\varphi(z)$ . Hence  $\varphi(z) = 0$  and since  $\varphi$  is a valuation on X, we get z = 0. On oter hand, since the sequence  $\{z_n\}$  is converges to z, then  $z \in \overline{x/I}$ . Since I is closed in  $(X, d_{\varphi})$  and  $(X, *, \tau_{\varphi})$  is a topological BCK-algebra, by [[10], Proposition 3.8] x/I is closed in  $(X, d_{\varphi})$  and so  $0 = z \in x/I$ . Thus  $\overline{\varphi}$  is a valuation on X/I. Now by Proposition 2.7, X/I is a metric space.  $\Box$ 

**Theorem 4.9.** Let  $\varphi$  be a pseudo-valuation on a BCK-algebra X. Then there exists a closed ideal J on X such that the quotient BCK-algebra X/J is pseudo-metrizable.

*Proof.* We define a binary relation ~ for elements  $a, b \in X$  by the rule  $a \sim b$  if  $\varphi((x * a) * y) = \varphi(x * b) * y)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ . It is immediate from definition that this relation is an equivalence relation. Let J be the class containing  $0 \in X$ . Let us show that J is a closed ideal of X and for each  $x \in X, x/J \subseteq x/ \sim$ . Clearly,

$$J = \{a \in X : \varphi((x * a) * y) = \varphi(x * 0) * y\} = \varphi(x * y) \text{ for all } x, y \in X\}$$

For  $x, y \in X$  define a function  $f_{x,y} : X \to \mathbb{R}$  by  $f_{x,y}(z) = \varphi((x * z) * y)$  for each  $z \in X$ . Since the function  $f_{x,y}$  is continuous, the set  $J = \bigcap_{x,y \in X} f_{x,y}^{-1}(f_{x,y}(0))$  is closed in X. To show that J is an ideal of X, let  $a * b, b \in J$ . Then  $\varphi((x * (a * b) * y) = \varphi(x * y))$  and  $\varphi((x * b) * y) = \varphi(x * y)$ . Replacing x by x \* b in the frist equality, by (6) we obtain

$$\varphi((x * b) * y) = \varphi(((x * b) * (a * b)) * y) \le \varphi((x * a) * y).$$

Thus  $\varphi(x * y) \leq \varphi((x * a) * y)$ . On the other hand, (8) and (10) imply  $(x * a) * y = (x * y) * a \leq x * y$ . By (17),  $\varphi((x * a) * y) \leq \varphi(x * y)$ . Therefore  $\varphi((x * a) * y) = \varphi(x * y)$  and so  $a \in J$ . Thus *J* is an ideal of *X*.

Let  $d \in c/J$ . Then c \* d,  $d * c \in J$ . Since  $\varphi((x * (c * d)) * y) = \varphi(x * y)$  and  $\varphi((x * (d * c)) * y) = \varphi(x * y)$ , replacing x by x \* d in frist equality, we obtain

$$\varphi((x*d)*y) = \varphi(((x*d)*(c*d))*y) \le \varphi((x*c)*y).$$

Similarly, replacing *x* by *x* \* *c* in second equality, we obtain  $\varphi((x * c) * y) = \varphi(((x * c) * (d * c)) * y) \le \varphi((x * d) * y)$ . Thus  $\varphi((x * d) * y) = \varphi((x * c) * y)$  which implies that  $c \sim d$ . Hence  $d \in c/\sim$ . Therefore  $c/J \subseteq c/\sim$ . Since for any  $x, y \in X$ , the function  $\varphi((x * a) * y)$  with argument *a* is constant on the set *a*/*J*, so for any *a*, *b*  $\in X$ , we can define

$$\rho(a/J, b/J) = \sup_{x,y \in X} |\varphi((x * a) * y) - \varphi((x * b) * y)|$$

We claim that  $\rho$  is a pseudo-metric on X/J. Clearly,  $\rho(a/J, b/J) \ge 0$  for each  $a, b \in X$ . It is clear that  $\rho(a/J, b/J) = \rho(b/J, a/J)$ . To verify triangle inequality, let  $a, b, c \in X$ . Then

$$\begin{split} \rho(a/J,c/J) &= \sup_{x,y \in X} |\varphi((x*a)*y) - \varphi((x*c)*y)| \\ &\leq \sup_{x,y \in X} (|\varphi((x*a)*y) - \varphi((x*b)*y)| + |\varphi((x*b)*y) - \varphi((x*c)*y)|) \\ &\leq \sup_{x,y \in X} |\varphi((x*a)*y) - \varphi((x*b)*y)| + \sup_{x,y \in X} |\varphi((x*b)*y) - \varphi((x*c)*y)| \\ &= \rho(a/J,b/J) + \rho(b/J,c/J). \end{split}$$

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we studied some properties of pseudo-valuations and their induced metrics on a BCKalgebra and we showed that there are many pseudo-valuations on a BCK-algebra. The set of all pseudovaluations on a BCK-algebra is a BCK-algebra, too. Next the researchers can study properties of this BCKalgebra. Moreover, since the power set of a non-empty set is a BCK-algebra using of pseudo-valuations can be useful in the study of theory of sets.

#### References

- [1] R. A. Borzooei, G. R. Rezaei and N. Kouhestani, Metrizability (semi)topological BL-algebras, Soft Comput, 16(2012), 1681-1690.
- [2] D. Busneag, Hilbert-algebras with valuations, Didcrete Math. 263(2003), 11-14.
- [3] M. I. Doh, M. S. Kang, BCK/BCI-algebras with pseudo-valuations, Honam Mathematical J, 32 (2010), 217-226.
- [4] A. Dvurecenskij, S. Pulmannova, (1rd edition), New trends in quantum structures, Springer- Science+Business Media, Berlin, 2000.
- [5] S. Ghorbani, Quotient BCI-algebras induced by pseudo-valuations, Iranian Journal of Mathematical Sciences and Informatics, 5(2010), 13-24.
- [6] K. Iséki, On BCI-algebras, Math. Seminar Notes, 8(1980), 125-130.
- [7] K. Iséki, Tanaka, An introduction to theory of BCK-algebras, Math. Japonica, 23(1978), 1-26.
- [8] Y. Imai, K. Iséki, On axiom system of propositional calculi XIV, Proc. Japan Academy 42(1966), 19-22.
- [9] N. Kouhestani, S. Mehrshad, (Semi)topological quotient BCK-algebras, Afrika Matematika, 28(2017), 1235-1251.
- [10] S. Mehrshad, N. Kouhestani, A quasi-uniformity on BCC-algebras, Annals of the University of Craiova, 44(2017), 64-77.
- [11] T. Senapati, K. P. Shum, Cubic implicative ideals of BCK-algebras, Missouri Journal of Mathematical Sciences, 29(2017), 125-138.