

# AN ALGEBRAIC APPROACH TO THE SET OF INTERVALS.

NICOLAS GOZE, ELISABETH REMM

ABSTRACT. In this paper we present the set of intervals as a normed vector space. We define also a four-dimensional associative algebra whose product gives the product of intervals in any cases. This approach allows to give a notion of divisibility and in some cases an euclidian division.

## 1. INTERVALS AND GENERALIZED INTERVALS

An interval is a connected closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . The classical arithmetic operations on intervals are defined such that the result of the corresponding operation on elements belonging to operand intervals belongs to the resulting interval. That is, if  $\diamond$  denotes one of the classical operation  $+$ ,  $-$ ,  $*$ , we have

$$(1) \quad [x^-, x^+] \diamond [y^-, y^+] = \{x \diamond y / x \in [x^-, x^+], y \in [y^-, y^+]\} \quad .$$

In particular we have

$$\begin{cases} [x^-, x^+] + [y^-, y^+] = [x^- + y^-, x^+ + y^+], \\ [x^-, x^+] - [y^-, y^+] = [x^- - y^+, x^+ - y^-] \end{cases}$$

and

$$[x^-, x^+] - [x^-, x^+] = [x^- - x^+, x^+ - x^-] \neq 0.$$

Let  $\mathbb{IR}$  be the set of intervals. It is in one to one correspondence with the half plane of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ :

$$\mathcal{P}_1 = \{(a, b), a \leq b\}.$$

This set is closed for the addition and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is endowed with a regular semigroup structure. Let  $\mathcal{P}_2$  be the half plane symmetric to  $\mathcal{P}_1$  with respect to the first bisector  $\Delta$  of equation  $y - x = 0$ . The substraction on  $\mathbb{IR}$ , which is not the symmetric operation of  $+$ , corresponds to the following operation on  $\mathcal{P}_1$ :

$$(a, b) - (c, d) = (a, b) + s_\Delta \circ s_0(c, d),$$

where  $s_0$  is the symmetry with respect to 0, and  $s_\Delta$  with respect to  $\Delta$ . The multiplication  $*$  is not globally defined. Consider the following subset of  $\mathcal{P}_1$ :

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_{1,1} = \{(a, b) \in \mathcal{P}_1, a \geq 0, b \geq 0\}, \\ \mathcal{P}_{1,2} = \{(a, b) \in \mathcal{P}_1, a \leq 0, b \geq 0\}, \\ \mathcal{P}_{1,3} = \{(a, b) \in \mathcal{P}_1, a \leq 0, b \leq 0\}. \end{cases}$$

We have the following cases:

1) If  $(a, b), (c, d) \in \mathcal{P}_{1,1}$  the product is written  $(a, b) * (c, d) = (ac, bd)$ .

Then if  $e_1 = (1, 1)$  and  $e_2 = (0, 1)$ , these "vectors" generate  $\mathcal{P}_{1,1}$  :

$$\forall (x, y) \in \mathcal{P}_{1,1} \text{ then } (x, y) = xe_1 + (y - x)e_2, \quad x > 0, \quad y - x > 0.$$

The multiplication corresponds in this case to the following associative commutative algebra:

$$\begin{cases} e_1e_1 = e_1, \\ e_1e_2 = e_2e_1 = e_2e_2 = e_2. \end{cases}$$

2) Assume that  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{P}_{1,1}$  and  $(c, d) \in \mathcal{P}_{1,2}$  so  $c \leq 0$  and  $d \geq 0$ . Thus we obtain  $(a, b) * (c, d) = (bc, bd)$  and this product does not depend of  $a$ . Then we obtain the same result for any  $a < b$ . Let  $e_1 = (0, 1)$  and  $e_2 = (-1, 0)$ . Any interval of  $\mathcal{P}_{1,1}$  is written  $ae_1 + be_2$  with  $b < 0$  and any interval of  $\mathcal{P}_{1,2}$ ,  $ce_1 + de_2$  with  $c, d > 0$ . We have no associative multiplication between  $(e_1, e_2)$  which describes the product. We have to add a formal dimension to obtain a 3-dimensional associative algebra and the product appears as the projection in the plane  $(e_1, e_2)$  of this associative algebra. Here if we consider the following associative commutative algebra

$$\begin{cases} e_1e_1 = e_1, e_1e_2 = e_2, e_1e_3 = -e_2, \\ e_2e_3 = -e_1, e_2e_2 = e_1, \\ e_3e_3 = e_3. \end{cases}$$

then  $(\alpha e_1 + \beta e_2 + \gamma e_3)(\delta e_1 + \epsilon e_2) = \alpha\delta e_1 + \beta\epsilon e_2$ . As  $(a, b) = be_1 - ae_2$  and  $(c, d) = de_1 - ce_2$ , we obtain the expected product.

3) If  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{P}_{1,1}$  and  $(c, d) \in \mathcal{P}_{1,3}$  then  $a \geq 0, b \geq 0$  and  $c \leq 0, d \leq 0$  and we have  $(a, b) * (c, d) = (bd, ac)$ . Let  $e_1 = (1, 1)$ ,  $e_2 = (0, 1)$ . This product corresponds to the following associative algebra:

$$\begin{cases} e_1e_1 = e_1, \\ e_1e_2 = e_1 - e_2, \\ e_2e_2 = e_1 - e_2. \end{cases}$$

We have similar results for the cases  $(\mathcal{P}_{1,2}, \mathcal{P}_{1,2})$ ,  $(\mathcal{P}_{1,2}, \mathcal{P}_{1,3})$  and  $(\mathcal{P}_{1,3}, \mathcal{P}_{1,3})$ .

All this shows that the set  $\mathbb{IR}$  is not algebraically structured. Let us describe a vectorial structure on  $\mathbb{IR}$  using the previous geometrical interpretation of  $\mathbb{IR}$  with  $\mathcal{P}_1$ . First we extend  $\mathcal{P}_1$  to  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and we obtain an extended set  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  which corresponds to the classical interval  $[a, b]$  and "generalized intervals"  $[a, b]$  with  $a > b$ . Of course using the addition of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , we obtain on  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  a structure of abelian group and the symmetric of  $[a, b] \in \mathbb{IR}$  is  $[-a, -b] \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}} \setminus \mathbb{IR}$ . In this context  $[a, b] + [-a, -b] = 0$ . This aspect has been developed in [5].

We have a group homomorphism  $\varphi$  on  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : \overline{\mathbb{IR}} &\longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{IR}} \\ (a, b) &\longrightarrow (b, a). \end{aligned}$$

This map is called dual and we denote by dual  $(a, b)$  the generalized interval  $(b, a)$ . The corresponding arithmetic has been developed by Kaucher [4] and is naturally called the Kaucher arithmetic. In the following we recall how to complete the semigroup  $\mathbb{IR}$  to obtain a natural vectorial structure on  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ .

## 2. THE REAL VECTOR SPACE $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$

**2.1. The semigroup  $(\mathbb{IR}, +)$ .** Consider  $x = [x^-, x^+]$  and  $y = [y^-, y^+]$  two elements of  $\mathbb{IR}$ . From (1) we get the addition

$$x + y = [x^- + y^-, x^+ + y^+].$$

This operation is commutative, associative and has an unit  $[0, 0]$  simply denoted by 0.

**Theorem 1.** *The semigroup  $(\mathbb{IR}, +)$  is commutative and regular.*

*Proof.* We recall that a semigroup is a nonempty set with an associative unitary operation  $+$ . It is regular if it satisfies

$$x + z = x + y \implies z = y,$$

for all  $x, y, z$ . The semigroup  $(\mathbb{IR}, +)$  is regular. In fact

$$x + z = x + y \implies [x^- + z^-, x^+ + z^+] = [x^- + y^-, x^+ + y^+]$$

which gives  $z^- = y^-$  and  $z^+ = y^+$ , that is  $z = y$ .

**2.2. The group  $(\overline{\mathbb{IR}}, +)$ .** The goal is to define a subtraction corresponding to an inverse of the addition. For that we build the symmetrized of the semigroup  $(\mathbb{IR}, +)$ . We consider on the set  $\mathbb{IR} \times \mathbb{IR}$  the equivalence relation:

$$(x, y) \sim (z, t) \iff x + t = y + z,$$

for all  $x, y, z, t \in \mathbb{IR}$ . The quotient set is denoted by  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ . The addition of intervals is compatible with this equivalence relation:

$$\overline{(x, y)} + \overline{(z, t)} = \overline{(x + z, y + t)}$$

where  $\overline{(x, y)}$  is the equivalence class of  $(x, y)$ . The unit is  $\bar{0} = \{(x, x), x \in \mathbb{IR}\}$  and each element  $\overline{(x, y)}$  has an inverse

$$\sphericalangle \overline{(x, y)} = \overline{(y, x)}.$$

Then  $(\overline{\mathbb{IR}}, +)$  is a commutative group.

For all  $x = [x^-, x^+] \in \mathbb{IR}$ , we denote by  $l(x)$  his length, so  $l(x) = x^+ - x^-$ , and by  $c(x)$  his center, so  $c(x) = \frac{x^+ + x^-}{2}$ .

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(x, y)}$  be in  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ . Thus*

- *if  $l(y) < l(x)$ , there is an unique  $A \in \mathbb{IR} \setminus \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(A, 0)}$ ,*
- *if  $l(y) > l(x)$ , there is an unique  $A \in \mathbb{IR} \setminus \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(0, A)} = \sphericalangle \overline{(A, 0)}$ ,*
- *if  $l(y) = l(x)$ , there is an unique  $A = \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(\alpha, 0)} = \overline{(0, -\alpha)}$ .*

*Proof.* It is based on the following lemmas:

**Lemma 3.** *Consider  $\overline{(x, y)} \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  with  $l(x) < l(y)$ . Then*

$$(x, y) \sim (0, [y^- - x^-, y^+ - x^+]).$$

*Proof.* For all  $x, y, z, t \in \mathbb{IR}$ , we have

$$(x, y) \sim (z, t) \iff \begin{cases} z^- + y^- = x^- + t^-, \\ z^+ + y^+ = x^+ + t^+. \end{cases}$$

If we put  $z^- = z^+ = 0$ , then

$$\begin{cases} t^- = y^- - x^-, \\ t^+ = y^+ - x^+. \end{cases}$$

with the necessary condition  $t^+ > t^-$ . We obtain  $l(x) < l(y)$ . So we have

$$\overline{(x, y)} = \overline{(0, [y^- - x^-, y^+ - x^+])}.$$

**Lemma 4.** Consider  $\overline{(x, y)} \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  with  $l(y) < l(x)$ , then

$$(x, y) \sim ([x^- - y^-, x^+ - y^+], 0).$$

*Proof.* For all  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{IR}$ , we have

$$(x, y) \sim (z, 0) \iff \begin{cases} z^- + y^- = x^- \\ z^+ + y^+ = x^+ \end{cases}.$$

or

$$\begin{cases} z^- = x^- - y^- \\ z^+ = x^+ - y^+ \end{cases}$$

with the condition  $z^+ > z^-$  which gives  $l(y) < l(x)$ . So  $\overline{(x, y)} = \overline{([x^- - y^-, x^+ - y^+], 0)}$ .

**Lemma 5.** Consider  $\overline{(x, y)} \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  with  $l(x) = l(y)$ , then

$$(x, y) \sim (\alpha, 0)$$

with  $\alpha = x^- - y^-$ .

These three lemmas describe the three cases of Proposition 2.

**Definition 6.** Any element  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(A, 0)}$  with  $A \in \mathbb{IR} \setminus \mathbb{R}$  is said positive and we write  $\mathcal{X} > 0$ . Any element  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(0, A)}$  with  $A \in \mathbb{IR} \setminus \mathbb{R}$  is said negative and we write  $\mathcal{X} < 0$ . We write  $\mathcal{X} \geq \mathcal{X}'$  if  $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}' \geq 0$ .

For example if  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{X}'$  are positive,

$$\mathcal{X} \geq \mathcal{X}' \iff l(\mathcal{X}) \geq l(\mathcal{X}').$$

The elements  $\overline{(\alpha, 0)}$  with  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^*$  are neither positive nor negative.

**Remark.** This structure of abelian group on  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  has yet been defined by Markov [5]. In his paper he presents the Kaucher arithmetic using the completion of the semigroup  $\mathbb{IR}$ . Up to now we have sum up this study. In the following section we will develop a topological vectorial structure. The goal is to define a good differential calculus.

**2.3. Vector space structure on  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ .** We are going to construct a real vector space structure on the group  $(\overline{\mathbb{IR}}, +)$ . We recall that if  $A = [a, b] \in \mathbb{IR}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , the product  $\alpha A$  is the interval  $[\alpha a, \alpha b]$ . We consider the external multiplication:

$$\cdot : \mathbb{R} \times \overline{\mathbb{IR}} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$$

defined, for all  $A \in \mathbb{IR}$ , by

$$\begin{cases} \alpha \cdot \overline{(A, 0)} = \overline{(\alpha A, 0)}, \\ \alpha \cdot \overline{(0, A)} = \overline{(0, \alpha A)}, \end{cases}$$

for all  $\alpha > 0$ . If  $\alpha < 0$  we put  $\beta = -\alpha$ . So we take:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha \cdot \overline{(A, 0)} = \overline{(0, \beta A)}, \\ \alpha \cdot \overline{(0, A)} = \overline{(\beta A, 0)}. \end{cases}$$

We denote  $\alpha \mathcal{X}$  instead of  $\alpha \cdot \mathcal{X}$ .

**Lemma 7.** For any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{X} \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  we have:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha(\setminus \mathcal{X}) = \setminus(\alpha \mathcal{X}), \\ (-\alpha)\mathcal{X} = \setminus(\alpha \mathcal{X}). \end{cases}$$

Indeed, if  $\alpha \geq 0$  and  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(A, 0)}$  with  $A \in \mathbb{IR}$  then  $\setminus \mathcal{X} = \overline{(0, A)}$  and

$$\alpha(\setminus \mathcal{X}) = \overline{(0, \alpha A)} = \setminus(\overline{\alpha A, 0}) = \setminus(\alpha \mathcal{X}).$$

In the same way  $(-\alpha)\mathcal{X} = (-\alpha)\overline{(A, 0)} = \overline{(0, \alpha A)} = \setminus(\alpha \mathcal{X})$ . If  $\alpha \leq 0$  and  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(A, 0)}$  so  $\alpha(\setminus \mathcal{X}) = \alpha\overline{(0, A)} = \overline{(-\alpha A, 0)}$  and  $\setminus(\alpha \mathcal{X}) = \setminus(\overline{0, -\alpha A}) = \overline{(-\alpha A, 0)}$ . The calculus is the same for  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(0, A)}$ .

**Proposition 8.** For all  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ , and for all  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}' \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ , we have

$$\begin{cases} (\alpha + \beta)\mathcal{X} = \alpha\mathcal{X} + \beta\mathcal{X}, \\ \alpha(\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}') = \alpha\mathcal{X} + \alpha\mathcal{X}', \\ (\alpha\beta)\mathcal{X} = \alpha(\beta\mathcal{X}). \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We are going to study the different cases.

1) The result is trivial when  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ .

2) Suppose  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\beta < 0$  and  $\alpha + \beta > 0$ . We assume  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(A, 0)}$  and  $A \in \mathbb{IR}$ . We put  $\gamma = -\beta$ . So

$$(\alpha + \beta)\mathcal{X} = \overline{((\alpha + \beta)A, 0)}$$

and

$$\alpha\mathcal{X} + \beta\mathcal{X} = \overline{(\alpha A, 0)} + \overline{(0, \gamma A)} = \overline{(\alpha A - \gamma A, 0)} = \overline{((\alpha - \gamma)A, 0)} = \overline{((\alpha + \beta)A, 0)}.$$

The calculus is the same for  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(0, A)}$ . So we have  $(\alpha + \beta)\mathcal{X} = \alpha\mathcal{X} + \beta\mathcal{X}$  for all  $\mathcal{X} \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ .

3) If  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\beta < 0$  and  $\alpha + \beta < 0$ , the proof is the same that the previous case.

4) If  $\beta > 0$  and  $\alpha < 0$ , we refer to the cases 2) et 3).

5) If  $\alpha, \beta < 0$ , we put  $\beta_1 = -\beta$  and  $\alpha_1 = -\alpha$ . Thus  $\alpha_1, \beta_1 > 0$ , and we find again the first case.

So we have the result:

**Theorem 9.** The triplet  $(\overline{\mathbb{IR}}, +, \cdot)$  is a real vector space.

**2.4. Basis and dimension.** We consider the vectors  $\mathcal{X}_1 = \overline{([0, 1], 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2 = \overline{([1, 1], 0)}$  of  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ .

**Theorem 10.** The family  $\{\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2\}$  is a basis of  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ . So  $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \overline{\mathbb{IR}} = 2$ .

*Proof.* We have the following decompositions:

$$\begin{cases} \overline{([a, b], 0)} = (b - a)\mathcal{X}_1 + a\mathcal{X}_2, \\ \overline{(0, [c, d])} = (c - d)\mathcal{X}_1 - c\mathcal{X}_2. \end{cases}$$

The linear map

$$\varphi : \overline{\mathbb{IR}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$$

defined by

$$\begin{cases} \varphi(\overline{([a, b], 0)}) = (b - a, a), \\ \varphi(\overline{(0, [c, d])}) = (c - d, -c) \end{cases}$$

is a linear isomorphism and  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  is canonically isomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

**Remark.** Let  $E$  be the subspace generated by  $\mathcal{X}_2$ . The vectors of  $E$  correspond to the elements which have a non defined sign. Then the relation  $\leq$  defined in the paragraph 1.2 gives an order relation on the quotient space  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}/E$ .

**2.5. A Banach structure on  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ .** Let us begin to define a norm on  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ . Any element  $\mathcal{X} \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  is written  $\overline{(A, 0)}$  or  $\overline{(0, A)}$ . We define its length  $l(\mathcal{X})$  as the length of  $A$  and its center as  $c(A)$  or  $-c(A)$  in the second case.

**Theorem 11.** *The map  $\|\cdot\| : \overline{\mathbb{IR}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by*

$$\|\mathcal{X}\| = l(\mathcal{X}) + |c(\mathcal{X})|$$

for any  $\mathcal{X} \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  is a norm.

*Proof.* We have to verify the following axioms:

$$\begin{cases} 1) \|\mathcal{X}\| = 0 \iff \mathcal{X} = 0, \\ 2) \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \|\lambda\mathcal{X}\| = |\lambda|\|\mathcal{X}\|, \\ 3) \|\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}'\| \leq \|\mathcal{X}\| + \|\mathcal{X}'\|. \end{cases}$$

1) If  $\|\mathcal{X}\| = 0$ , then  $l(\mathcal{X}) = |c(\mathcal{X})| = 0$  and  $\mathcal{X} = 0$ .

2) Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . We have

$$\|\lambda\mathcal{X}\| = l(\lambda\mathcal{X}) + |c(\lambda\mathcal{X})| = |\lambda|l(\mathcal{X}) + |\lambda||c(\mathcal{X})| = |\lambda|\|\mathcal{X}\|.$$

3) We consider that  $I$  refers to  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $J$  refers to  $\mathcal{X}'$  thus  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(I, 0)}$  or  $\overline{(0, I)}$ . We have to study the two different cases:

i) If  $\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}' = \overline{(I + J, 0)}$  or  $\overline{(0, I + J)}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}'\| &= l(I + J) + |c(I + J)| = l(I) + l(J) + |c(I) + c(J)| \leq l(I) + |c(I)| + l(J) + |c(J)| \\ &= \|\mathcal{X}\| + \|\mathcal{X}'\|. \end{aligned}$$

ii) Let  $\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}' = \overline{(I, J)}$ . If  $\overline{(I, J)} = \overline{(K, 0)}$  then  $K + J = I$  and

$$\|\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}'\| = \|\overline{(K, 0)}\| = l(K) + |c(K)| = l(I) - l(J) + |c(I) - c(J)|$$

that is

$$\|\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}'\| \leq l(I) + |c(I)| - l(J) + |c(J)| \leq l(I) + |c(I)| + l(J) + |c(J)| = \|\mathcal{X}\| + \|\mathcal{X}'\|.$$

So we have a norm on  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ .

Now we shall show that  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  is a Banach space that is all Cauchy sequences converge in  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ .

**Theorem 12.** *The normed vector space  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  is a Banach space.*

*Proof.* We recall that a sequence  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\mathcal{X}_n \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  is a Cauchy sequence if

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n, m \geq N, \|\mathcal{X}_n \setminus \mathcal{X}_m\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

We have to verify that all Cauchy sequences in  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  converge in  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ . Let  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a Cauchy sequence. We suppose that for all  $n, m \geq N$  we have  $\mathcal{X}_n = \overline{(A_n, 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{X}_m = \overline{(A_m, 0)}$ . So we have  $\mathcal{X}_n \setminus \mathcal{X}_m = \overline{(A_n, A_m)}$  and

$$\|\mathcal{X}_n \setminus \mathcal{X}_m\| = |l(A_n) - l(A_m)| + |c(A_n) - c(A_m)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then for  $n, m > N$ ,  $|l(A_n) - l(A_m)| \leq \varepsilon$  and  $|c(A_n) - c(A_m)| \leq \varepsilon$ . The sequences  $(l(A_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(c(A_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are Cauchy sequences in  $\mathbb{R}$ , which is a complete space, thus the two sequences converge. Let  $l$  and  $c$  be their limits. It exists an unique  $L$  so that  $l(L) = l$  and  $c(L) = c$ . Thus we can thus deduce that  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $L$ . It is the same if all terms of the sequence are of type  $\mathcal{X}_n = \overline{(0, A_n)}$ . We suppose now that the sequence  $(\mathcal{X}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is not of constant sign from a certain rank. So

$$\exists n, m > N \text{ such that } \mathcal{X}_n = \overline{(A_n, 0)} \text{ and } \mathcal{X}_m = \overline{(0, A_m)},$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{X}_n \setminus \mathcal{X}_m\| = \|\overline{(A_n + A_m, 0)}\| = l(A_n) + l(A_m) + |c(A_n) + c(A_m)| \leq \varepsilon. \quad (*)$$

We deduce that  $l(A_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0$ . Moreover, we can consider the subsequence whose terms are of type  $\overline{(A_n, 0)}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . It converges to  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $l(\mathcal{X}) = 0$  thus  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(\alpha, 0)}$ . In the same way we can consider the subsequence of terms are  $\overline{(0, A_n)}$ . It converges to  $\mathcal{X}' = \overline{(0, \beta)}$  since  $l(\mathcal{X}') = 0$ . But the Inequation (\*) implies  $\alpha + \beta \leq \varepsilon$  for all  $\varepsilon$  thus  $\mathcal{X}' = \overline{(0, -\alpha)} = \mathcal{X}$ . It follows that  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  is complete.

**2.6. Description of a  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood of  $\mathcal{X}_0 \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ .** We assume that  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{([a, b], 0)}$  with  $0 < a < b$ . Let  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{([x, y], 0)}$ . Then  $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{([x, y], [a, b])}$ .

(1)  $x - a < y - b$  that is  $l(\mathcal{X}_0) < l(\mathcal{X})$ . Then  $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{([x - a, y - b], 0)}$  and

$$\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| = y - b - x + a + \left| \frac{y - b + x - a}{2} \right|.$$

- $y + x > b + a$ . We have  $\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| = \frac{3y - x - 3b + a}{2}$  and  $\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| < \varepsilon$  is represented by the convex set defined by

$$\begin{cases} y > x + b - a, \\ y > -x + b + a, \end{cases}$$

that

$$x + 3b - a - 2\varepsilon < 3y < x + 3b - a + 2\varepsilon.$$

It is a triangle whose vertices are  $A(a - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, b + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ ,  $B(a + \varepsilon, b + \varepsilon)$ ,  $C(a, b)$ .

- $y + x > b + a$ . We have  $\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| = \frac{y - 3x - b + 3a}{2}$  and  $\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| < \varepsilon$  is represented by the convex set defined by

$$\begin{cases} y > x + b - a, \\ y < -x + b + a, \end{cases}$$

that

$$3x + 3b - 3a - 2\varepsilon < y < 3x + b - 3a + 2\varepsilon.$$

It is a triangle whose vertices are  $A, B'(a - \varepsilon, b - \varepsilon), C$ .

(2)  $x - a > y - b$  that is  $l(\mathcal{X}_0) < l(\mathcal{X})$ . Then  $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{(0, [a - x, b - y])}$  and

$$\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| = b - y - a + x + \left| \frac{b - y + a - x}{2} \right|.$$

- $y + x > b + a$ , we have  $\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| = \frac{3x - y + b - 3a}{2}$  and  $\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| < \varepsilon$  is represented by the convex set defined by

$$\begin{cases} y < x + b - a, \\ y > -x + b + a, \end{cases}$$

that

$$-3x - b + 3a - 2\varepsilon < -y < -3x - b + 3a + 2\varepsilon.$$

It is a triangle whose vertices are  $B, B''(a + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, b - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), C$ .

- $y + x > b + a$ , we have  $\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| = \frac{x - 3y + 3b - a}{2}$  and  $\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| < \varepsilon$  is represented by the triangle whose vertices are  $B', B'', C$ .

If  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(0, [x, y])}$ , then  $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{(0, [x + a, y + b])}$  and

$$\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| = \frac{3y - x + 3b - a}{2} = \|\mathcal{X}\| + \|\mathcal{X}_0\| \not< \varepsilon.$$

Such a point cannot be in a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{X}_0$ .

**Proposition 13.** *An  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{([a, b], 0)}$  with  $0 \leq a \leq b$  is represented by the parallelogram whose vertices are  $A_1 = (a - \varepsilon, b - \varepsilon), A_2 = (a + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, b - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), A_3 = (a + \varepsilon, b + \varepsilon), A_4 = (a - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, b + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ .*

### 3. A 4-DIMENSIONAL ASSOCIATIVE ALGEBRA ASSOCIATED TO $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$

**3.1. Classical product of intervals.** We consider  $X, Y \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ . The multiplication of intervals is defined by

$$X \cdot Y = [\min(x^- y^-, x^- y^+, x^+ y^-, x^+ y^+), \max(x^- y^-, x^- y^+, x^+ y^-, x^+ y^+)].$$

Let  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(X, 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{X}' = \overline{(Y, 0)}$  be in  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ . We put

$$\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}' = \overline{(XY, 0)}.$$

For this product we have:

**Proposition 14.** *For all  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(X, 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{X}' = \overline{(Y, 0)}$  in  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ , we have*

$$\|\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}'\| \leq \|\mathcal{X}\| \|\mathcal{X}'\|.$$



*Proof.* In the following table, the boxes represent  $||\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}'||$  following the values of  $||\mathcal{X}||$  and  $||\mathcal{X}'||$ .

If  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{([x_1, x_2], 0)}$  then

$$\begin{cases} ||\mathcal{X}|| = \frac{3x_2 - x_1}{2} & \text{if } c(\mathcal{X}) > 0, \\ ||\mathcal{X}|| = \frac{x_2 - 3x_1}{2} & \text{if } c(\mathcal{X}) < 0. \end{cases}$$

Considering the different situations, we obtain

$$||\mathcal{X}|| ||\mathcal{X}'|| - ||\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}'|| = \frac{3}{4}l(\mathcal{X})l(\mathcal{X}')$$

or  $\frac{1}{2}||\mathcal{X}||l(\mathcal{X}')$  or  $\frac{1}{2}||\mathcal{X}'||l(\mathcal{X})$ . These expressions are always positive. We have  $||\mathcal{X}|| ||\mathcal{X}'|| = ||\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}'||$  if  $\mathcal{X}$  or  $\mathcal{X}'$  are reduce to one point.

**Proposition 15.** *We consider  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(X, 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{X}' = \overline{(Y, 0)}$  in  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ . We have*

$$X \subset Y \Rightarrow ||\mathcal{X}|| \leq ||\mathcal{X}'||.$$

*Proof.* Consider  $X = [x_1, x_2]$  and  $Y = [y_1, y_2]$ .

*First case:*  $y_1 \geq 0$ . So  $2||\mathcal{X}'|| = 3y_2 - y_1$ . As  $X \subset Y$ , then  $2||\mathcal{X}|| = 3x_2 - x_1$  and  $||\mathcal{X}|| \leq ||\mathcal{X}'||$ .

*Second case:*  $y_1 < 0, y_2 > 0$ . If  $c(Y) \geq 0$ , so  $2||\mathcal{X}'|| = 3y_2 - y_1$ . If  $c(X) \geq 0$ , from the first case  $||\mathcal{X}|| \leq ||\mathcal{X}'||$ . Otherwise  $2||\mathcal{X}|| = x_2 - 3x_1$ . Thus  $||\mathcal{X}|| \leq ||\mathcal{X}'||$  if and only if  $3y_2 - y_1 \geq x_2 - 3x_1$ , that is  $3(y_2 + x_1) \geq x_2 + y_1$  which is true.

If  $c(Y) \leq 0$ , then  $2||\mathcal{X}'|| = y_2 - 3y_1$ . If  $c(X) \leq 0$ , thus  $2||\mathcal{X}|| = x_2 - 3x_1$  and  $||\mathcal{X}|| \leq ||\mathcal{X}'||$ . If  $c(X) \geq 0$ ,  $||\mathcal{X}|| \leq ||\mathcal{X}'||$  is equivalent to  $y_2 - 3y_1 \geq 3x_2 - x_1$ . But  $c(Y) \leq 0$  implies  $y_1 + y_2 \leq 0$  and  $y_2 - 3y_1 \geq 4y_2$ . Similarly  $3x_2 - x_1 \leq 4x_2$ , thus  $y_2 - 3y_1 \geq 3x_2 - x_1$  because  $x_2 \leq y_2$ .

*Third case:*  $y_1 < 0, y_2 < 0$ . Similar computations give the result.

**Remark.** If  $\mathcal{X} > 0$ , i.e  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(X, 0)}$ , and  $\mathcal{X}' < 0$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{X}' = \overline{(0, Y)}$ , so  $\setminus\mathcal{X}' > 0$  and if  $X \subset Y$  we deduce  $||\mathcal{X}|| \leq ||\setminus\mathcal{X}'|| = ||\mathcal{X}'||$ .

**3.2. Definition of  $\mathcal{A}_4$ .** Recall that by an algebra we mean a real vector space with an associative ring structure. Consider the 4-dimensional associative algebra whose product in a basis  $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$  is given by

	$e_1$	$e_2$	$e_3$	$e_4$
$e_1$	$e_1$	0	0	$e_4$
$e_2$	0	$e_2$	$e_3$	0
$e_3$	0	$e_3$	$e_2$	0
$e_4$	$e_4$	0	0	$e_1$

The unit is the vector  $e_1 + e_2$ . This algebra is a direct sum of two ideals:  $\mathcal{A}_4 = I_1 + I_2$  where  $I_1$  is generated by  $e_1$  and  $e_4$  and  $I_2$  is generated by  $e_2$  and  $e_3$ . It is not an integral domain, that is, we have divisors of 0. For example  $e_1 \cdot e_2 = 0$ .

**Proposition 16.** *The ring  $\mathcal{A}_4$  is principal that is every ideal is generated by one element.*

*Proof.* In fact we have only two ideals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  and  $I_1$  is generated by  $e_4$  and  $I_2$  is generated by  $e_3$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{A}_4^*$  the group of invertible elements. We compute this group. The cartesian expression of this product is, for  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$  and  $y = (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4)$  in  $\mathcal{A}_4$ :

$$x \cdot y = (x_1y_1 + x_4y_4, x_2y_2 + x_3y_3, x_3y_2 + x_2y_3, x_4y_1 + x_1y_4).$$

We consider the equation

$$x \cdot y = (1, 1, 0, 0).$$

We obtain

$$\begin{cases} x_1y_1 + x_4y_4 = 1, \\ x_2y_2 + x_3y_3 = 1, \\ x_3y_2 + x_2y_3 = 0, \\ x_4y_1 + x_1y_4 = 0. \end{cases}$$

For a given vector  $x$ , we obtain a solution  $y$  if and only if:

$$(x_1^2 - x_4^2)(x_2^2 - x_3^2) \neq 0.$$

**Proposition 17.** *The multiplicative group  $\mathcal{A}_4^*$  is the set of elements  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$  such that*

$$\begin{cases} x_4 \neq \pm x_1, \\ x_3 \neq \pm x_2. \end{cases}$$

If  $x \in \mathcal{A}_4^*$  we have:

$$x^{-1} = \left( \frac{x_1}{x_1^2 - x_4^2}, \frac{x_2}{x_2^2 - x_3^2}, \frac{x_3}{x_2^2 - x_3^2}, \frac{x_4}{x_1^2 - x_4^2} \right).$$

**3.3. An embedding of  $\mathbb{IR}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_4$ .** We define a correspondence between  $\mathbb{IR}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_4$ . Let  $\varphi$  be the map

$$\varphi : \mathbb{IR} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_4$$

defined by:

$$\varphi(X) = \begin{cases} (x_1, x_2, 0, 0) & \text{if } x_1, x_2 \geq 0, \\ (0, x_2, -x_1, 0) & \text{if } x_1 \leq 0 \text{ and } x_2 \geq 0, \\ (0, 0, -x_1, -x_2) & \text{if } x_1, x_2 \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

for every  $X = [x_1, x_2]$  in  $\mathbb{IR}$ .

**Theorem 18.** *Let  $X = [x_1, x_2]$  and  $Y = [y_1, y_2]$  be in  $\mathbb{IR}$ .*

- If  $x_1x_2 > 0$  or  $y_1y_2 > 0$ , then

$$\varphi(XY) = \varphi(X) \cdot \varphi(Y).$$

- If  $x_1x_2 < 0$  and  $y_1y_2 < 0$ , then

$$\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(XY)) \subset \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(X) \cdot \varphi(Y)).$$

*Proof.* For the first case we have the following table:

	$\varphi(X)$	$\varphi(Y)$	$\varphi(XY)$
$\begin{cases} x_1, x_2 > 0 \\ y_1, y_2 > 0 \end{cases}$	$(x_1, x_2, 0, 0)$	$(y_1, y_2, 0, 0)$	$(x_1y_1, x_2y_2, 0, 0)$
$\begin{cases} x_1, x_2 > 0 \\ y_1 < 0, y_2 > 0 \end{cases}$	$(x_1, x_2, 0, 0)$	$(0, y_2, -y_1, 0)$	$(0, x_2y_2, -x_2y_1, 0)$
$\begin{cases} x_1, x_2 > 0 \\ y_1, y_2 < 0 \end{cases}$	$(x_1, x_2, 0, 0)$	$(0, 0, -y_1, -y_2)$	$(0, 0, -x_2y_1, -x_1y_2)$
$\begin{cases} x_1, x_2 < 0 \\ y_1 < 0, y_2 > 0 \end{cases}$	$(0, 0, -x_1, -x_2)$	$(0, y_2, -y_1, 0)$	$(0, x_1y_1, -x_1y_2, 0)$
$\begin{cases} x_1, x_2 < 0 \\ y_1, y_2 < 0 \end{cases}$	$(0, 0, -x_1, -x_2)$	$(0, 0, -y_1, -y_2)$	$(x_2y_2, x_1y_1, 0, 0)$

and we see that in each case we have  $\varphi(XY) = \varphi(X) \cdot \varphi(Y)$ . In the second case,

$$\varphi(X) = (0, x_2, -x_1, 0) \text{ and } \varphi(Y) = (0, y_2, -y_1, 0).$$

Then  $\varphi(X) \cdot \varphi(Y) = (0, x_2y_2 + x_1y_1, -x_1y_2 - x_2y_1, 0)$ . But  $XY$  can be equal to one of the following intervals

$$XY = \begin{cases} [x_1y_2, x_2y_2], \\ [x_2y_1, x_2y_2], \\ [x_1y_2, x_1y_1], \\ [x_2y_1, x_1y_1]. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\varphi(XY) \in \{(0, x_2y_2, -x_1y_2, 0), (0, x_2y_2, -x_2y_1, 0), (0, x_1y_1, -x_1y_2, 0), (0, x_1y_1, -x_2y_1, 0)\}$$

and

$$\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(X) \cdot \varphi(Y)) = [x_1y_2 + x_2y_1, x_2y_2 + x_1y_1] \supset \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(XY)).$$

**Remark.** This inclusion is, in some sense, universal because it contains all the cases and it is the minimal expression satisfying this property. For a computational use of this product, this is not a problem because the result  $\varphi(X) \cdot \varphi(Y)$  contains the classical product (it is a constraint asked by the arithmetic programming).

**3.4. An embedding of  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_4$ .** From the map

$$\varphi : \mathbb{IR} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_4$$

we would like to define  $\overline{\varphi} : \overline{\mathbb{IR}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_4$  such that

$$\overline{\varphi}(\overline{K, 0}) = \varphi(K).$$

To define  $\overline{\varphi}(\overline{0, K})$ , we put

$$\overline{\varphi}(\overline{0, K}) = -\overline{\varphi}(\overline{K, 0}).$$

If we consider  $K = [x_1, x_2]$ , then we have

$$\overline{\varphi}(\overline{0, K}) = \begin{cases} -x_1, -x_2, 0, 0 & \text{if } x_1 \geq 0, \\ (0, -x_2, -x_1, 0) & \text{if } x_1x_2 \leq 0, \\ (0, 0, -x_1, -x_2) & \text{if } x_2 \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus the image of  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_4$  is constituted of the elements

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (x_1, x_2, 0, 0) \text{ with } 0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \text{ which corresponds to } ([x_1, x_2], 0), \\ (0, x_2, -x_1, 0) \text{ with } x_1 \leq 0 \leq x_2 \text{ which corresponds to } ([x_1, x_2], 0), \\ (0, 0, -x_1, -x_2) \text{ with } x_1 \leq x_2 \leq 0 \text{ which corresponds to } ([x_1, x_2], 0), \\ (-x_1, -x_2, 0, 0) \text{ with } 0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \text{ which corresponds to } (0, [x_1, x_2]), \\ (0, -x_2, x_1, 0) \text{ with } x_1 \leq 0 \leq x_2 \text{ which corresponds to } (0, [x_1, x_2]), \\ (0, 0, x_1, x_2) \text{ with } x_1 \leq x_2 \leq 0 \text{ which corresponds to } (0, [x_1, x_2]). \end{array} \right.$$

The map  $\overline{\varphi} : \overline{\mathbb{IR}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_4$  is not linear. For example, if  $\mathcal{X}_1 = \overline{([2, 4], 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2 = \overline{(0, [1, 6])}$ , then

$$\mathcal{X}_1 + \mathcal{X}_2 = \overline{([2, 4], [1, 6])} = \overline{(0, [-1, 2])},$$

and

$$\overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_1 + \mathcal{X}_2) = (0, -2, -1, 0).$$

Moreover

$$\overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_1) + \overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_2) = (2, 4, 0, 0) + (-1, -6, 0, 0) = (1, -2, 0, 0),$$

and  $(1, -2, 0, 0)$  is not in the image of  $\overline{\varphi}$ . Let us introduce in  $\mathcal{A}_4$  the following equivalence relation  $\mathcal{R}$  given by

$$(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \sim (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) \iff \begin{cases} x_1 - y_1 = x_3 - y_3, \\ x_2 - y_2 = x_4 - y_4 \end{cases}$$

and consider the map

$$\overline{\varphi} : \overline{\mathbb{IR}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{A}_4} = \frac{\mathcal{A}_4}{\mathcal{R}}$$

given by  $\overline{\overline{\varphi}} = \Pi \circ \overline{\varphi}$  where  $\Pi$  is a canonical projection. This map is surjective. In fact we have the correspondence

- $x_1 - x_3 \geq 0, x_2 - x_4 \geq 0, x_1 - x_3 \leq x_2 - x_4$   
 $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \sim (x_1 - x_3, x_2 - x_4, 0, 0) = \overline{\varphi}([x_1 - x_3, x_2 - x_4], 0).$
- $x_1 - x_3 \geq 0, x_2 - x_4 \geq 0, x_1 - x_3 \geq x_2 - x_4$   
 $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \sim (0, 0, x_3 - x_1, x_4 - x_2) = \overline{\varphi}(0, [x_3 - x_1, x_4 - x_2]).$
- $x_1 - x_3 \geq 0, x_2 - x_4 \leq 0$   
 $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \sim (0, x_2 - x_4, x_3 - x_1, 0) = \overline{\varphi}(0, [x_3 - x_1, x_4 - x_2]).$
- $x_1 - x_3 \leq 0, x_2 - x_4 \geq 0$   
 $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \sim (0, x_2 - x_4, x_3 - x_1, 0) = \overline{\varphi}([x_3 - x_1, x_2 - x_4], 0).$
- $x_1 - x_3 \leq 0, x_2 - x_4 \leq 0, x_1 - x_3 \geq x_2 - x_4$   
 $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \sim (x_1 - x_3, x_2 - x_4, 0, 0) = \overline{\varphi}(0, [x_3 - x_1, x_4 - x_2]).$
- $x_1 - x_3 \leq 0, x_2 - x_4 \leq 0, x_1 - x_3 \leq x_2 - x_4$   
 $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \sim (0, 0, x_3 - x_1, x_4 - x_2) = \overline{\varphi}([x_3 - x_1, x_2 - x_4], 0).$

This correspondence defines a map

$$\psi : \overline{\mathcal{A}_4} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{IR}}.$$

In the following, to simplify notation, we write  $\overline{\varphi}$  instead of  $\overline{\overline{\varphi}}$ .

**Definition 19.** For any  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}' \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ , we put

$$\mathcal{X} \bullet \mathcal{X}' = \psi(\overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X})} \bullet \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}')}).$$

This multiplication is distributive with respect to the addition. In fact

$$(\mathcal{X}_1 + \mathcal{X}_2) \bullet \mathcal{X}' = \psi(\overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 + \mathcal{X}_2)} \bullet \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}')}).$$

Suppose that  $\overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 + \mathcal{X}_2)} \neq \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1)} + \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2)}$ . In this case this means that  $\overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1)} + \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2)} \notin \text{Im}\overline{\varphi}$ . But by construction  $\overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 + \mathcal{X}_2)} \in \text{Im}\overline{\varphi}$  and this coincides with  $\overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 + \mathcal{X}_2)}$ .

**3.5. On the monotony of the product.** We define on  $\mathcal{A}_4$  a partial order relation by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (x_1, x_2, 0, 0) \leq (y_1, y_2, 0, 0) \iff y_1 \leq x_1 \text{ and } x_2 \leq y_2, \\ (x_1, x_2, 0, 0) \leq (0, y_2, y_3, 0) \iff x_2 \leq y_2, \\ (0, x_2, x_3, 0) \leq (0, y_2, y_3, 0) \iff x_3 \leq y_3 \text{ and } x_2 \leq y_2, \\ (0, 0, x_3, x_4) \leq (0, y_2, y_3, 0) \iff x_3 \leq y_3, \\ (0, 0, x_3, x_4) \leq (0, 0, y_3, y_4) \iff x_3 \leq y_3 \text{ and } y_4 \leq x_4. \end{array} \right.$$

**Proposition 20. Monotony property:** Let  $\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ . Then

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{X}_1 \subset \mathcal{X}_2 \implies \mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z} \text{ for all } \mathcal{Z} \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}. \\ \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1)} \leq \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2)} \implies \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} \leq \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} \end{array} \right.$$

*Proof.* Let us note that the second property is equivalent to the first. It is its translation in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}_4}$ . For any  $\mathcal{X} \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ , we denote by  $\overline{\mathcal{X}} = \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X})}$  its image in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}_4}$ . Let  $\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2$  and  $\mathcal{Z}$  be in  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$ . We denote by  $(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)$  the image of  $\mathcal{Z}$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}_4}$ , this implies  $z_i \geq 0$  and  $z_1 z_3 = z_2 z_4 = 0$ . We assume that  $\overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1)} \leq \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2)}$ .

*First case.*  $\overline{\mathcal{X}_1} = (x_1, x_2, 0, 0), \overline{\mathcal{X}_2} = (y_1, y_2, 0, 0)$ . We have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} = (x_1 z_1, x_2 z_2, x_2 z_3, x_1 z_4), \\ \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} = (y_1 z_1, y_2 z_2, y_2 z_3, y_1 z_4). \end{array} \right.$$

As  $y_1 z_1 \leq x_1 z_1$  and  $x_2 z_2 \leq y_2 z_2$ , then  $\overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} \leq \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z})}$ .

*Second case.*  $\overline{\mathcal{X}_1} = (x_1, x_2, 0, 0), \overline{\mathcal{X}_2} = (0, y_2, y_3, 0)$ . We have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} = (x_1 z_1, x_2 z_2, x_2 z_3, x_1 z_4), \\ \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} = (0, y_2 z_2 + y_3 z_3, y_2 z_3 + y_3 z_2, 0). \end{array} \right.$$

If  $z_1 \neq 0$  we have  $y_2 z_2 + y_3 z_3 \geq x_2 z_2$ . If  $z_1 = 0$  and  $z_2 \neq 0$ , we have  $y_2 z_3 + y_3 z_2 \geq x_2 z_3$  and  $y_2 z_2 + y_3 z_3 \geq x_2 z_2$ . If  $z_1 = z_2 = 0$ , we have  $x_2 z_3 \leq y_2 z_3$ . This implies that in any case  $\overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} \leq \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z})}$ .

*Third case.*  $\overline{\mathcal{X}_1} = (0, x_2, x_3, 0), \overline{\mathcal{X}_2} = (0, y_2, y_3, 0)$ . We have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} = (0, x_2 z_2 + x_3 z_3, x_2 z_3 + x_3 z_2, 0), \\ \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} = (0, y_2 z_2 + y_3 z_3, y_2 z_3 + y_3 z_2, 0). \end{array} \right.$$

Thus

$$\overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} \leq \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} \iff \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (x_2 - y_2)z_2 + (x_3 - y_3)z_3 \leq 0, \\ (x_2 - y_2)z_3 + (x_3 - y_3)z_2 \leq 0. \end{array} \right.$$

But  $(x_2 - y_2), (x_3 - y_3) \leq 0$  and  $z_2, z_3 \geq 0$ . This implies  $\overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z})} \leq \overline{\varphi(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z})}$ .

*Fourth case.*  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_1 = (0, 0, x_3, x_4)$ ,  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_2 = (0, y_2, y_3, 0)$ . We have

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z}) = (x_4 z_4, x_3 z_3, x_3 z_2, x_4 z_1), \\ \overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z}) = (0, y_2 z_2 + y_3 z_3, y_2 z_3 + y_3 z_2, 0). \end{cases}$$

If  $z_4 \neq 0$ , then  $z_2 = 0$  and  $x_3 z_3 \leq y_3 z_3$ . If  $z_4 = 0$  and  $z_3 \neq 0$ , we have  $x_3 z_3 \leq y_2 z_2 + y_3 z_3$  and  $x_3 z_2 \leq y_2 z_3 + y_3 z_2$ . If  $z_4 = z_3 = 0$  then  $x_3 z_2 \leq x_3 z_2$ . This implies that in any case  $\overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z}) \leq \overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z})$ .

*Fifth case.*  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_1 = (0, 0, x_3, x_4)$ ,  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_2 = (0, 0, y_3, y_4)$ . We have

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z}) = (x_4 z_4, x_3 z_3, x_3 z_2, x_4 z_1), \\ \overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z}) = (y_4 z_4, y_3 z_3, y_3 z_2, y_4 z_1). \end{cases}$$

But  $\overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_1 \bullet \mathcal{Z}) \leq \overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}_2 \bullet \mathcal{Z})$  is equivalent to  $\begin{cases} x_3 z_2 \leq y_3 z_2, \\ y_4 z_1 \leq x_4 z_1, \end{cases}$  and this is always satisfied.

**3.6. Application.** To work in the intervals set, we propose the following program:

1. Translate the problem in  $\mathcal{A}_4$  through  $\overline{\mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}}$ .
2. Solve the problem in  $\mathcal{A}_4$  (which is a normed associative algebra).
3. Return to  $\overline{\mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}}$  and then to  $\mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}$ .

The last condition require the use of  $\psi$ .

**3.7. Remark.** In the first version of this paper we have considered an another product in  $\mathcal{A}_4$  but this product was not minimal.

#### 4. DIVISIBILITY AND AN EUCLIDEAN DIVISION

We have computed the invertible elements of  $\mathcal{A}_4$ . If  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \mathcal{A}_4$  and if  $\Delta = (x_1^2 - x_4^2)(x_2^2 - x_3^2) \neq 0$  then

$$x^{-1} = \left( \frac{x_1}{x_1^2 - x_4^2}, \frac{x_2}{x_2^2 - x_3^2}, \frac{x_3}{x_2^2 - x_3^2}, \frac{x_4}{x_1^2 - x_4^2} \right).$$

The elements associated to  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(K, 0)}$  are of the form

$$\begin{cases} (x_1, x_2, 0, 0) \text{ if } 0 < x_1 < x_2, \\ (0, x_2, -x_1, 0) \text{ if } x_1 < 0 < x_2, \\ (0, 0, -x_1, -x_2) \text{ if } x_1 < x_2 < 0, \end{cases}$$

and to  $\mathcal{X} \in \overline{(0, K)}$

$$\begin{cases} (0, 0, x_1, x_2) \text{ if } 0 < x_1 < x_2, \\ (-x_1, 0, 0, x_2) \text{ if } x_1 < 0 < x_2, \\ (-x_1, -x_2, 0, 0) \text{ if } x_1 < x_2 < 0. \end{cases}$$

The inverse of  $(x_1, x_2, 0, 0)$  with  $0 < x_1 < x_2$  is  $\left( \frac{1}{x_1}, \frac{1}{x_2}, 0, 0 \right)$ .

The inverse of  $(0, 0, -x_1, -x_2)$  with  $x_1 < x_2 < 0$  is  $\left( 0, 0, -\frac{1}{x_1}, -\frac{1}{x_2} \right)$ .

The inverse of  $(0, 0, x_1, x_2)$  with  $0 < x_1 < x_2$  is  $\left( 0, 0, \frac{1}{x_1}, \frac{1}{x_2} \right)$ .

The inverse of  $(-x_1, -x_2, 0, 0)$  with  $x_1 < x_2 < 0$  is  $\left(-\frac{1}{x_1}, -\frac{1}{x_2}, 0, 0\right)$ .

For  $\mathcal{X} = (0, x_2, -x_1, 0)$  or  $(-x_1, 0, 0, x_2)$  with  $x_1 x_2 < 0$ , then  $\Delta = 0$  and  $\mathcal{X}$  is not invertible. Then if  $\Delta \neq 0$  the inverse is always represented by an element of  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}$  through  $\psi$ .

**4.1. Division by an invertible element.** We denote by  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}^+$  the subset  $\overline{(X, 0)}$  with  $X = [x_1, x_2]$  and  $0 \leq x_1$ .

**Proposition 21.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(X, 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \overline{(Y, 0)}$  be in  $\overline{\mathbb{IR}}^+$  with  $X = [x_1, x_2]$ ,  $Y = [y_1, y_2]$ . If  $\frac{y_2}{y_1} \geq \frac{x_2}{x_1}$  then there exists a unique  $\mathcal{Z} = \overline{(Z, 0)} \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}}^+$  such that  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}\mathcal{Z}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{Z}$  be defined by  $c(\mathcal{Z}) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{y_2}{x_2} + \frac{y_1}{x_1} \right)$  and  $l(\mathcal{Z}) = \left( \frac{y_2}{x_2} - \frac{y_1}{x_1} \right)$ . Then  $l(\mathcal{Z}) \geq 0$  if and only if  $\frac{y_2}{x_2} \geq \frac{y_1}{x_1}$  that is  $\frac{y_2}{y_1} \geq \frac{x_2}{x_1}$ . Thus we have  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}\mathcal{Z}$ . In fact

$$(\overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}))^{-1} = \overline{\left( \frac{1}{x_1}, \frac{1}{x_2}, 0, 0 \right)} = \psi \left( \overline{\left( 0, \left[ -\frac{1}{x_1}, -\frac{1}{x_2} \right] \right)} \right).$$

Thus

$$\overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{Y}) \cdot \overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})^{-1} = (y_1, y_2, 0, 0) \cdot \left( \frac{1}{x_1}, \frac{1}{x_2}, 0, 0 \right) = \left( \frac{y_1}{x_1}, \frac{y_2}{x_2}, 0, 0 \right).$$

As  $\frac{y_1}{x_1} \leq \frac{y_2}{x_2}$ ,

$$\psi(\overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{Y}) \cdot \overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})^{-1}) = \overline{\left( \left[ \frac{y_1}{x_1}, \frac{y_2}{x_2} \right], 0 \right)}.$$

We can note also that

$$\overline{\left( 0, \left[ -\frac{1}{x_1}, -\frac{1}{x_2} \right] \right)} \bullet \overline{\left( [y_1, y_2], 0 \right)} = \overline{\left( \left[ \frac{y_1}{x_1}, \frac{y_2}{x_2} \right], 0 \right)}.$$

Then the divisibility corresponds to the multiplication by the inverse element.

**4.2. Division by a non invertible element.** Let  $X = [-x_1, x_2]$  with  $x_1, x_2 > 0$ . We have seen that  $\varphi(X) = (0, x_2, x_1, 0)$  is not invertible in  $\mathcal{A}_4$ . For any  $M = (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) \in \mathcal{A}_4$  we have

$$\varphi(X) \cdot M = (0, x_2 y_2 + x_1 y_3, x_1 y_2 + x_2 y_3, 0)$$

and this point represents a non invertible interval. Thus we can solve the equation  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} \bullet \mathcal{Z}$  for  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{([-x_1, x_2], 0)}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y} = \overline{([-y_1, y_2], 0)}$  with  $x_1, x_2 > 0$  and  $y_1, y_2 > 0$ . Putting  $\varphi(\mathcal{Z}) = (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)$ , we obtain

$$(0, y_2, y_1, 0) = (0, x_2, x_1, 0) \cdot (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4),$$

that is

$$\begin{cases} y_2 = x_2 z_2 + x_1 z_3, \\ y_1 = x_2 z_3 + x_1 z_2, \end{cases}$$

or

$$\begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ x_2 & x_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z_2 \\ z_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If  $x_1^2 - x_2^2 \neq 0$ ,

$$\begin{cases} z_2 = \frac{x_1 y_1 - x_2 y_2}{x_1^2 - x_2^2}, \\ z_3 = \frac{-x_2 y_1 + x_1 y_2}{x_1^2 - x_2^2}. \end{cases}$$

If  $x_1^2 - x_2^2 = 0$  then  $x_1 = x_2$  and the center of  $X = [-x_1, x_1]$  is 0. Let us assume that  $x_1 \neq x_2$ . If  $x_1^2 - x_2^2 < 0$  that is  $x_1 < x_2$  then

$$\begin{cases} x_1 y_1 - x_2 y_2 < 0, \\ x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1 < 0, \end{cases}$$

and  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_2}{y_1}$ ,  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_1}{y_2}$ . If  $\alpha = \frac{x_1}{x_2} < 1$  we have  $y_2 > \alpha y_1$ ,  $y_1 > \alpha y_2$  then  $y_2 > \alpha^2 y_2$  and  $1 - \alpha^2 > 0$ . This case admits solution.

**Proposition 22.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{[-x_1, x_2], 0}$  with  $x_1, x_2 > 0$  and  $x_1 < x_2$ . Then for any  $\mathcal{Y} = \overline{[-y_1, y_2], 0}$  with  $y_1, y_2 > 0$  and  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_2}{y_1}$ ,  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_1}{y_2}$ , there is  $\mathcal{Z} = \overline{[-z_1, z_2], 0}$  such that  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} \bullet \mathcal{Z}$ .*

Suppose now that  $x_1^2 - x_2^2 > 0$  that is  $x_1 > x_2$ . In this case we have

$$\begin{cases} x_1 y_1 - x_2 y_2 > 0, \\ x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1 > 0, \end{cases}$$

that is  $\frac{y_2}{y_1} < \frac{x_1}{x_2}$  and  $\frac{y_1}{y_2} < \frac{x_1}{x_2}$ .

**Proposition 23.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{[-x_1, x_2], 0}$  with  $x_1, x_2 > 0$  and  $x_1 > x_2$ . For any  $\mathcal{Y} = \overline{[-y_1, y_2], 0}$  with  $y_1, y_2 > 0$ ,  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} > \frac{y_2}{y_1}$ ,  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} > \frac{y_1}{y_2}$ , there is  $\mathcal{Z} = \overline{[-z_1, z_2], 0}$  such that  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} \bullet \mathcal{Z}$ .*

**Example.**  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{[-4, 2], 0}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y} = \overline{[-2, 3], 0}$ . We have  $\frac{x_2}{x_1} = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} = 2$  and  $\frac{3}{2} < 2 < 6$ . Then

$\mathcal{Z}$  exists and it is equal to  $\mathcal{Z} = \overline{[-\frac{8}{12}, \frac{2}{12}], 0}$ .

**4.3. An Euclidean division.** Consider  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{[x_1, x_2], 0}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \overline{[y_1, y_2], 0}$  in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$ . We

have seen that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is divisible by  $\mathcal{X}$  as soon as  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} \geq \frac{y_1}{y_2}$ . We suppose now that  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_1}{y_2}$ . In this case we have

**Theorem 24.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$  with  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_1}{y_2}$ . There is a unique pair  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{R})$  unique in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$  such that*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} \bullet \mathcal{Z} + \mathcal{R}, \\ l(\mathcal{R}) = 0 \text{ and } c(\mathcal{R}) \text{ minimal.} \end{cases}$$

This pair is given by

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{Z} = \frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1} \overline{[1, 1], 0}, \\ \mathcal{R} = \frac{x_2 y_1 - x_1 y_2}{x_2 - x_1} \overline{[1, 1], 0}. \end{cases}$$



*Proof.* We consider  $\mathcal{Z} = \overline{([z_1, z_2], 0)}$  with  $z_1 > 0$ . Then  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} \bullet \mathcal{Z} + \mathcal{R}$  gives

$$\mathcal{R} = \overline{([y_1, y_2], [z_1x_1, z_2x_2])}.$$

We have  $\mathcal{R} \in \overline{\mathbb{IR}^+}$  if and only if  $0 \leq y_1 - x_1z_1 \leq y_2 - x_2z_2$  that is

$$\begin{cases} z_1 \leq \frac{y_1}{x_1}, \\ z_2 \leq \frac{y_2}{x_2}, \\ z_1 \geq \frac{y_1 - y_2 + x_2z_2}{x_1}. \end{cases}$$

The condition  $z_1 \leq z_2$  implies  $\frac{y_1 - y_2 + x_2z_2}{x_1} \leq z_2$  that is  $z_2 \leq \frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1}$ . Consider the case  $z_2 = \frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1}$ . Then  $z_1 \geq \frac{y_1 - y_2 + x_2z_2}{x_1} = \frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1} = z_2$  and  $z_1 = z_2$ . This case corresponds to

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{Z} = \frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1} \overline{([1, 1], 0)}, \\ \mathcal{R} = \frac{x_2y_1 - x_1y_2}{x_2 - x_1} \overline{([1, 1], 0)}. \end{cases}$$

Let us note that  $y_1x_2 - x_1y_2 > 0$  is equivalent to  $\frac{y_1}{y_2} > \frac{x_1}{x_2}$  which is satisfied by hypothesis.

We have also for this solution  $l(\mathcal{R}) = 0$  and  $c(\mathcal{R}) = \frac{x_2y_1 - x_1y_2}{x_2 - x_1}$ .

Conversely, if  $l(\mathcal{R}) = 0$  then  $y_1 - z_1x_1 = y_2 - z_2x_2$  and  $z_1 = z_2 \frac{x_2}{x_1} + \frac{y_1 - y_2}{x_1}$ . As  $z_1 > 0$ , we obtain  $z_2 > \frac{y_1 - y_2}{x_1}$  and  $z_1 \leq z_2$  implies

$$\frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2} \leq z_2 \leq \frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1}.$$

But  $c(\mathcal{R}) = y_1 - z_1x_1 = y_2 - z_2x_2$ . Thus

$$\frac{x_2y_1 - x_1y_2}{x_2 - x_1} \leq c(\mathcal{R}) \leq y_1.$$

The norm is minimal when  $c(\mathcal{R}) = \frac{x_2y_1 - x_1y_2}{x_2 - x_1}$ .

**Example.** Let  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{([1, 4], 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \overline{([1, 3], 0)}$ . We have  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} = \frac{1}{4} < \frac{y_1}{y_2} = \frac{1}{3}$ . Thus  $\mathcal{Z} = \frac{2}{3} \overline{([1, 1], 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{R} = \frac{1}{3} \overline{([1, 1], 0)}$ . The division writes

$$\overline{([1, 3], 0)} = \overline{([1, 4], 0)} \cdot \overline{([\frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}], 0)} + \overline{([\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}], 0)}.$$

Suppose now that  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are not invertible, that is  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{([-x_1, x_2], 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \overline{([-y_1, y_2], 0)}$  with  $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2$  positive. We have seen that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is divisible by  $\mathcal{X}$  as soon as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{x_1}{x_2} > \frac{y_2}{y_1} \text{ and } \frac{x_1}{x_2} > \frac{y_1}{y_2}, \\ \text{or} \\ \frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_2}{y_1} \text{ and } \frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_1}{y_2}. \end{cases}$$

We suppose now that these conditions are not satisfied. For example we assume that

$$\frac{x_1}{x_2} > \frac{y_2}{y_1} \text{ and } \frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_1}{y_2}$$

(The other case is similar). If  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} \bullet \mathcal{Z} + \mathcal{R}$  then  $\mathcal{R} = \overline{([-r_1, r_2], 0)}$  with  $r_1 \geq 0$  and with  $r_2 \geq 0$  because  $\overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{R}) = (0, r_2, r_1, 0)$ . This shows that we can choose  $\mathcal{Z}$  such that  $\overline{\varphi}(\mathcal{R}) = (0, z_2, z_3, 0)$  and

$$\begin{cases} z_2 = \frac{x_1(y_1 - r_1) - x_2(y_2 - r_2)}{x_1^2 - x_2^2}, \\ z_3 = \frac{x_1(y_2 - r_2) - x_2(y_1 - r_1)}{x_1^2 - x_2^2}, \end{cases}$$

with the condition  $z_2 \geq 0$  and  $z_3 \geq 0$ . If  $x_1 < x_2$  then this is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_2 - r_2}{y_1 - r_1}, \\ \frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_1 - r_1}{y_2 - r_2}. \end{cases}$$

If we suppose that  $\mathcal{R} \leq \mathcal{Y}$ , thus  $0 < r_2 < y_2$  and  $0 < r_1 < y_1$ , we obtain

$$r_1 > \frac{x_2}{x_1}r_2 + \frac{-x_2y_2 + x_1y_1}{x_1} < r_1 < \frac{x_1}{x_2}r_2 + \frac{x_2y_1 - x_1y_2}{x_2}.$$

Then lenght  $l(\mathcal{R}) = r_1 + r_2$  is minimal if and only if  $r_2 = 0$  and in this case  $r_1 = \frac{x_1y_1 - x_2y_2}{x_1}$ .

We obtain

$$\begin{cases} z_2 = 0, \\ z_3 = \frac{y_2}{x_1}. \end{cases}$$

**Theorem 25.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{([-x_1, x_2], 0)}$  with  $x_1, x_2 > 0$  and  $x_1 > x_2$ . If  $\mathcal{Y} = \overline{([-y_1, y_2], 0)}$  with  $y_1, y_2 > 0$ , satisfies  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} > \frac{y_2}{y_1}$  and  $\frac{x_1}{x_2} < \frac{y_1}{y_2}$ , there is a unique pair  $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Z}$  of non invertible elements such that*

$$\begin{cases} l(\mathcal{R}) \text{ minimal}, \\ \mathcal{R} < \mathcal{Y}. \end{cases}$$

*This pair is given by*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{Z} = \overline{([- \frac{y_2}{x_1}, 0], 0)}, \\ \mathcal{R} = \overline{([- \frac{x_1y_1 - x_2y_2}{x_1}, 0], 0)}. \end{cases}$$

## 5. APPLICATIONS

5.1. **Differential calculus on  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ .** As  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is a Banach space, we can describe a notion of differential function on it. Consider  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{(X_0, 0)}$  in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ . The norm  $\|\cdot\|$  defines a topology on  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$  whose a basis of neighborhoods is given by the balls  $\mathcal{B}(X_0, \varepsilon) = \{X \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| < \varepsilon\}$ . Let us characterize the elements of  $\mathcal{B}(X_0, \varepsilon)$ .  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{(X_0, 0)} = \overline{([a, b], 0)}$ .

**Proposition 26.** *Consider  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{(X_0, 0)} = \overline{([a, b], 0)}$  in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ . Then every element of  $\mathcal{B}(X_0, \varepsilon)$  is of type  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(X, 0)}$  and satisfies*

$$l(X) \in B_{\mathbb{R}}(l(X_0), \varepsilon_1) \text{ and } c(X) \in B_{\mathbb{R}}(c(X_0), \varepsilon_2)$$

with  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \geq 0$  and  $\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon$ , where  $B_{\mathbb{R}}(x, a)$  is the canonical open ball in  $\mathbb{R}$  of center  $x$  and radius  $a$ .

*Proof. First case :* Assume that  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(X, 0)} = \overline{([x, y], 0)}$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 &= \overline{(X, X_0)} = \overline{([x, y], [a, b])} \\ &= \begin{cases} \overline{([x-a, y-b], 0)} & \text{if } l(X) \geq l(X_0) \\ \overline{(0, [a-x, b-y])} & \text{if } l(X) \leq l(X_0) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

If  $l(X) \geq l(X_0)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| &= (y-b) - (x-a) + \left| \frac{y-b+x-a}{2} \right| \\ &= l(X) - l(X_0) + |c(X) - c(X_0)|. \end{aligned}$$

As  $l(X) - l(X_0) \geq 0$  and  $|c(X) - c(X_0)| \geq 0$ , each one of this term is less than  $\varepsilon$ . If  $l(X) \leq l(X_0)$  we have

$$\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| = l(X_0) - l(X) + |c(X_0) - c(X)|.$$

and we have the same result.

*Second case :* Consider  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{(0, X)} = \overline{([x, y], 0)}$ . We have

$$\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{(0, X_0 + X)} = \overline{([x+a, y+b])}$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| = l(X_0) + l(X) + |c(X_0) + c(X)|.$$

In this case, we cannot have  $\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| < \varepsilon$  thus  $X \notin \mathcal{B}(X_0, \varepsilon)$ .

**Definition 27.** *A function  $f : \overline{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is continuous at  $\mathcal{X}_0$  if*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \eta > 0 \text{ such that } \|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| < \varepsilon \text{ implies } \|f(\mathcal{X}) \setminus f(\mathcal{X}_0)\| < \varepsilon.$$

Consider  $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2)$  the basis of  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$  given in section 2. We have

$$f(\mathcal{X}) = f_1(\mathcal{X})\mathcal{X}_1 + f_2(\mathcal{X})\mathcal{X}_2 \text{ with } f_i : \overline{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

If  $f$  is continuous at  $\mathcal{X}_0$  so

$$f(\mathcal{X}) \setminus f(\mathcal{X}_0) = (f_1(\mathcal{X}) - f_1(\mathcal{X}_0))\mathcal{X}_1 + (f_2(\mathcal{X}) - f_2(\mathcal{X}_0))\mathcal{X}_2.$$

To simplify notations let  $\alpha = f_1(\mathcal{X}) - f_1(\mathcal{X}_0)$  and  $\beta = f_2(\mathcal{X}) - f_2(\mathcal{X}_0)$ . If  $\|f(\mathcal{X}) \setminus f(\mathcal{X}_0)\| < \varepsilon$ , and if we assume  $f_1(\mathcal{X}) - f_1(\mathcal{X}_0) > 0$  and  $f_2(\mathcal{X}) - f_2(\mathcal{X}_0) > 0$  (other cases are similar), then we have

$$l(\alpha\mathcal{X}_1 + \beta\mathcal{X}_2) = l(\overline{[\beta, \alpha + \beta]}, 0) < \varepsilon$$

thus  $f_1(\mathcal{X}) - f_1(\mathcal{X}_0) < \varepsilon$ . Simillary,

$$c(\alpha\mathcal{X}_1 + \beta\mathcal{X}_2) = c(\overline{[\beta, \alpha + \beta]}, 0) = \frac{\alpha}{2} + \beta < \varepsilon$$

and this implies that  $f_2(\mathcal{X}) - f_2(\mathcal{X}_0) < \varepsilon$ .

**Corollary 28.** *f is continuous at  $\mathcal{X}_0$  if and only if  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are continuous at  $\mathcal{X}_0$ .*

**Examples.**

- $f(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}$ . This function is continuous at any point.
- $f(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}^2$ . Consider  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{(X_0, 0)} = \overline{([a, b], 0)}$  and  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{B}(X_0, \varepsilon)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{X}^2 \setminus \mathcal{X}_0^2\| &= \|(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0)(\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}_0)\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| \|\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}_0\|. \end{aligned}$$

Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $\eta = \frac{\varepsilon}{\|\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}_0\|}$ , thus if  $\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| < \eta$ , we have  $\|\mathcal{X}^2 \setminus \mathcal{X}_0^2\| < \varepsilon$  and  $f$  is continuous.

- Consider  $P = a_0 + a_1X + \dots + a_nX^n \in \mathbb{R}[X]$ . We define  $f : \overline{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  with  $f(\mathcal{X}) = a_0\mathcal{X}_2 + a_1\mathcal{X} + \dots + a_n\mathcal{X}^n$  where  $\mathcal{X}^n = \mathcal{X} \cdot \mathcal{X}^{n-1}$ . From the previous example, all monomials are continuous, it implies that  $f$  is continuous.

**Definition 29.** Consider  $\mathcal{X}_0$  in  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$  and  $f : \overline{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  continuous. We say that  $f$  is differentiable at  $\mathcal{X}_0$  if there is  $g : \overline{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  linear such as

$$\|f(\mathcal{X}) \setminus f(\mathcal{X}_0) \setminus g(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0)\| = o(\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\|).$$

**5.2. Study of the function  $q_2$ .** We consider the function  $q_2 : \overline{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  given by

$$q_2(\overline{[a, b], 0}) = \begin{cases} \overline{([a^2, b^2], 0)} & \text{if } 0 < a < b, \\ \overline{([b^2, a^2], 0)} & \text{if } a < 0 < b, \\ \overline{([0, \sup(a^2, b^2)]]} & \text{if } a < 0 < b. \end{cases}$$

and  $q_2(0, \overline{[a, b]}) = q_2(\overline{[a, b], 0})$ . For any invertible element  $\mathcal{X} \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , we have  $q_2(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X} \bullet \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^2$ . If  $\mathcal{X}$  is not invertible, it writes  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{([a, b], 0)}$  with  $a < 0 < b$  ( we assume that  $\mathcal{X}$  is of type  $\overline{(K, 0)}$ ). In this case  $\mathcal{X} \bullet \mathcal{X} = \overline{([2ab, a^2 + b^2], 0)}$  and  $q_2 \subset \mathcal{X} \bullet \mathcal{X}$ .

**Proposition 30.** *The function  $q_2$  is continuous on  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{X}_0 \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{([a, b], 0)}$  with  $0 < a < b$ . An  $\eta$ -neighborhood is represented by the parallelogram  $(A, B, C, D)$  with  $A = (a - \frac{\eta}{2}, b + \frac{\eta}{2})$ ,  $B = (a - \eta, b - \eta)$ ,  $C = (a + \frac{\eta}{2}, b - \frac{\eta}{2})$ ,  $D = (a + \eta, b + \eta)$ . We have  $q_2(\mathcal{X}_0) = \mathcal{X}_0^2 = \overline{([a^2, b^2], 0)}$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  we consider the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of  $q_2(\mathcal{X}_0)$ . it is represented by the parallelogram  $(A_1, B_1, C_1, D_1)$

with  $A_1 = (a^2 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, b^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ ,  $B_1 = (a^2 - \varepsilon, b^2 - \varepsilon)$ ,  $C_1 = (a^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, b^2 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ ,  $D_1 = (a^2 + \varepsilon, b^2 + \varepsilon)$ . If  $\eta$  satisfy

$$\begin{cases} 2a\eta + \eta^2 < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \\ \eta^2 - 2a\eta > -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \end{cases}$$

the for every point of the  $\eta$ -neighborhood of  $\mathcal{X}_0$ , the image  $q_2(\mathcal{X})$  is contained in the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of  $q_2(\mathcal{X}_0)$ . If  $a \neq 0$ , as  $\varepsilon$  is infinitesimal we have  $\eta = \frac{\varepsilon}{8a}$ . If  $a = 0$ , we have  $\eta = \varepsilon$ . Then  $q_2$  is continuous at the point  $\mathcal{X}_0$ . Is  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{([a, b], 0)}$  with  $a < b < 0$ , taking  $\eta = -\frac{\varepsilon}{8a}$  we prove in a similar way the continuity at  $\mathcal{X}_0$ .

Assume that  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{([a, b], 0)}$  with  $a < 0 < b$  then  $q_2(\mathcal{X}_0) = \overline{([0, \sup(a^2, b^2)])}$ . If  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{([x, y], 0)}$  is an  $\eta$ -neighborhood of  $\mathcal{X}_0$  with  $q_2(\mathcal{X}) = \overline{([0, \sup((x + \eta)^2, (y + \eta)^2)])}$  then  $a - \eta < x < a + \eta$ ,  $b - \eta < y < b + \eta$  and we can find  $\eta$  such that  $\sup(a^2, b^2) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \sup((x + \eta)^2, (y + \eta)^2) < \sup(a^2, b^2) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ . Thus  $q_2$  is also continuous in this point. As  $q_2(\overline{0, K}) = q_2(\overline{K, 0})$ , we have the continuity of any point.

**Theorem 31.** *The function  $q_2$  is not differentiable.*

*Proof.* The function  $q_2$  is differentiable at the point  $\mathcal{X}_0$  if there is a linear map  $L$  such that

$$\lim_{\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\| \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|q_2(\mathcal{X}) \setminus q_2(\mathcal{X}_0) \setminus L(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0)\|}{\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\|} = 0.$$

We consider  $L$  be the linear function given by

$$L(\mathcal{X}) = 2\mathcal{X}_0 \bullet (\mathcal{X}).$$

We assume that  $\mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{([a, b], 0)}$  with  $0 < a < b$ . If  $\mathcal{X}$  is in an infinitesimal neighborhood of  $\mathcal{X}_0$ , then  $\mathcal{X} = \overline{([x, y], 0)}$  with  $0 < x < y$ .

- If  $0 < x - a < y - b$

$$\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 = \overline{([x, y], [a, b])} = \overline{([x - a, y - b], 0)}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Thus } L(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0) &= 2\overline{([a, b], 0)} \bullet \overline{([x - a, y - b], 0)} = 2\overline{([a(x - a), b(y - b)], 0)} \text{ and} \\ q_2(\mathcal{X}) \setminus q_2(\mathcal{X}_0) \setminus L(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0) &= \overline{([x^2, y^2], 0)} \setminus \overline{([a^2, b^2], 0)} \setminus 2\overline{([a(x - a), b(y - b)], 0)}, \\ &= \overline{([x^2 - a^2, y^2 - b^2], 0)} \setminus 2\overline{([a(x - a), b(y - b)], 0)}, \\ &= \overline{([(x - a)^2, (y - b)^2], 0)}. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_2(\mathcal{X}) \setminus q_2(\mathcal{X}_0) \setminus L(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0)\| &= (y - b)^2 - (x - a)^2 + \left| \frac{(y - b)^2 + (x - a)^2}{2} \right|, \\ &= \frac{3(y - b)^2 - (x - a)^2}{2}. \end{aligned}$$


Thus

$$\frac{\|q_2(\mathcal{X}) \setminus q_2(\mathcal{X}_0) \setminus L(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0)\|}{\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\|} = \frac{3(y - b)^2 - (x - a)^2}{3(y - b) - (x - a)}.$$

Then  $\frac{\|q_2(\mathcal{X}) \setminus q_2(\mathcal{X}_0) \setminus L(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0)\|}{\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\|} \leq \varepsilon$  is equivalent to

$$3(y-b)^2 - (x-a)^2 \leq \varepsilon(3(y-b) - (x-a)).$$

The following picture represent the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\mathcal{X}_0$  and the set defined by the previous inequalities (in case of  $\mathcal{X}_0 = ([1, 2], 0)$  and  $\varepsilon = 0, 5$ ).



Then for every point of the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\mathcal{X}_0$ , the  $\varepsilon$  inequality of the differentiability is satisfied. This shows that, if  $q_2$  is differentiable at  $\mathcal{X}_0$ , then the differential is the linear function  $L(\mathcal{X}) = 2\mathcal{X}_0 \bullet \mathcal{X}$ .

- If  $0 < a - x < y - b$ . We find again the previous case.
- If  $0 < y - b < a - x$ , then

$$\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0 = (\overline{[x, y]}, \overline{[a, b]}) = (\overline{[x-a, y-b]}, 0).$$

Thus  $L(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0) = 2(\overline{[a, b]}, 0) \bullet (\overline{[x-a, y-b]}, 0) = 2(\overline{[b(x-a), b(y-b)]}, 0)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} q_2(\mathcal{X}) \setminus q_2(\mathcal{X}_0) \setminus L(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0) &= (\overline{[x^2, y^2]}, 0) \setminus (\overline{[a^2, b^2]}, 0) \setminus 2(\overline{[b(x-a), b(y-b)]}, 0), \\ &= (\overline{[x^2 - a^2, y^2 - b^2]}, 0) \setminus 2(\overline{[b(x-a), b(y-b)]}, 0), \\ &= (\overline{[(x-b)^2 - (a-b)^2, (y-b)^2]}, 0). \end{aligned}$$


We deduce

$$\frac{\|q_2(\mathcal{X}) \setminus q_2(\mathcal{X}_0) \setminus L(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0)\|}{\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\|} = \frac{3(y-b)^2 - (x-b)^2 + (a-b)^2}{(y-b) + 3(a-x)}.$$

Then  $\frac{\|q_2(\mathcal{X}) \setminus q_2(\mathcal{X}_0) \setminus L(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0)\|}{\|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0\|} \leq \varepsilon$  is equivalent to

$$3(y-b)^2 - (x-b)^2 + (a-b)^2 \leq \varepsilon(y-b) + 3(a-x).$$

The following picture represent the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\mathcal{X}_0$  and the set  $E$  defined by the previous inequalities.



We see that the representation of  $E$  doesn't contain any points of the representation of a  $\eta$ -neighborhood of  $\mathcal{X}_0$  for all  $\eta$ . This gives a contradiction of the differentiability at  $\mathcal{X}_0$ .

**5.3. Linear programming on  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ .** We consider the following linear program

$$\begin{cases} Ax = b, \\ \max(f(x)), \end{cases}$$

where  $A$  is a real  $n \times p$  matrix and  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a linear map. We want to translate this problem in the context of intervals. This is easy because the set of intervals is endowed with a vectorial space structure. Then we assume here that each variable  $x_i$  belongs to an interval  $\mathcal{X}_i = \overline{(X_i, 0)}$ . We assume also that the constraints  $b_i$  belongs to  $Y_i = \overline{(B_i, 0)}$  with  $B_i = [b_i^1, b_i^2]$  and  $b_i^1 \geq 0$ . We can extend the linear  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is written  $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum a_i x_i$  by a linear map, denoted by  $\overline{f}$ , given by  $\overline{f}(\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n) = \sum a_i \mathcal{X}_i$ . In  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$  we claim that

$$\mathcal{X} \geq \mathcal{X}' \iff \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}' = \overline{(K, 0)}.$$

We have the following linear programming in terms of intervals:

$$\begin{cases} A\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B} \text{ with } \mathcal{X} \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^n \text{ and } \mathcal{B} \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^p, \\ \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_p) \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_i \geq 0, \\ \max(\overline{f}(\mathcal{X})). \end{cases}$$

To solve this program, we extend the classical simplex algorithm. The simplex method is based on an algorithm using the Gauss elimination. We consider the linear program on the intervals, with  $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^n$  and  $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_p) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^p$ . By hypothesis  $\mathcal{B}_i = \overline{(Y_i, 0)}$  is a positive vector. We have to define the pivot. The column pivot is defined by the largest positive coefficient of the economic function  $\overline{f}$ . In choosing the line, the goal is to keep the second member of positive vectors of  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^p$ . Let  $k$  be the number of the column containing the pivot. We note  $l(Y_j)$  the length of the interval  $Y_j$  and let  $i$  be such that

$$\frac{l(Y_i)}{a_{ik}} = \min_j \left\{ \frac{l(Y_j)}{a_{jk}}, a_{jk} > 0 \right\}.$$

We choose  $a_i^k$  as pivot. The line  $l_j$  is transformed into  $a_{ik}l_j - a_{jk}l_i$ . In this case the second member becomes  $a_{ik}\mathcal{B}_j \setminus a_{jk}\mathcal{B}_i$ . Let us compute this value. We assume  $a_{jk} > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ik}\mathcal{B}_j \setminus a_{jk}\mathcal{B}_i &= \overline{(a_{ik}Y_j, a_{jk}Y_i)} \\ &= \overline{(a_{ik}[Y_j^1, Y_j^2], a_{jk}[Y_i^1, Y_i^2])} \\ &= \overline{([a_{ik}Y_j^1, a_{ik}Y_j^2], [a_{jk}Y_i^1, a_{jk}Y_i^2])} \\ &= \overline{([a_{ik}Y_j^1 - a_{jk}Y_i^1, a_{ik}Y_j^2 - a_{jk}Y_i^2], 0)}. \end{aligned}$$

This is well defined. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} (a_{ik}Y_j^1 - a_{jk}Y_i^1) &< a_{ik}Y_j^2 - a_{jk}Y_i^2 \\ \iff a_{jk}(Y_i^2 - Y_i^1) &< a_{ik}(Y_j^2 - Y_j^1) \\ \iff \frac{l(Y_i)}{a_{ik}} &< \frac{l(Y_j)}{a_{jk}}, \end{aligned}$$

what is assumed by hypothesis. So  $a_{ik}\mathcal{B}_j \setminus a_{jk}\mathcal{B}_i$  is positive. In the case where  $a_{jk} < 0$ ,  $l(Y_j)$  is transformed into  $a_{ik}l(Y_j) - a_{jk}l(Y_i)$  and thus the second member is given by

$$\overline{(a_{ik}Y_j, a_{jk}Y_i)} = \overline{(a_{ik}Y_j, 0)} + \overline{(-a_{jk}Y_i, 0)} = \overline{(a_{ik}Y_j - a_{jk}Y_i, 0)}.$$

This vector is always positive. This process, as in the classical simplex algorithm, gives in terms of intervals the maximum of the economic function.

**5.4. Non Linear programming.** We consider here the following programm

$$\begin{cases} Ax = b, \\ \max(f(x)), \end{cases}$$

where  $A$  is a real  $n \times p$  matrix and  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a non linear differentiable map. We translate this programm in terms of intervals:

$$\begin{cases} A\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B} \text{ with } \mathcal{X} \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^n \text{ and } \mathcal{B} \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^p, \\ \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_p) \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_i \geq 0, \\ \max(\tilde{f}(\mathcal{X})). \end{cases}$$

where  $\tilde{f} : \overline{\mathbb{R}}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is the transferred function. It is differentiable in the previous sense. Assume that the system  $A\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}$  is indeterminate and all the solutions are expressed in term of one parameter  $\mathcal{X}_0$ . In this case, a solution of the non linear programming is given by a root of the equation  $f'(\mathcal{X}_0) = 0$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Goldsztejn. *Définition et Applications des Extensions des Fonctions Réelles aux Intervalles Généralisé s: Nouvelle Formulation de la Théorie des Intervalles Modaux et Nouveaux Résultats*, PhD thesis, University of Nice Sophia Antipolis, 2005.
- [2] M. Goze; N. Goze. *Arithmétique des Intervalles Infiniment Petits*. Preprint Mulhouse, 2008.
- [3] L. Jaulin; M. Kieffer; O. Didrit; E. Walter. *Applied Interval Analysis*. Springer Editors, 2001.
- [4] E. Kaucher. *Interval Analysis in the Extended Interval Space IIR*, Computing Suppl. 2 , pp. 33–49, 1980.
- [5] M. Markov. *Isomorphic Embeddings of Abstract Interval Systems*. Reliable Computing 3: 199–207, 1997.
- [6] N. Revol. *Introduction à l'arithmétique par intervalles*, research report RR 2001-41, LIP, École Normale Supérieure de Lyon and INRIA research report RR-4297, 2001.
- [7] N. Ramdani. *Méthodes Ensemblistes pour l'estimation* , Habilitation à Diriger des Recherches, Université Paris XII, 2005.



*E-mail address:* nicolas.goze@uha.fr, elisabeth.remm@uha.fr

UNIVERSITÉ DE HAUTE ALSACE, LMIA, 4 RUE DES FRÈRES LUMIÈRE, 68093 MULHOUSE