

# Topological representations for frame-valued domains via $L$ -sobriety

Guojun Wu<sup>1,2</sup>, Wei Yao<sup>1,2</sup>, Qingguo Li<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, Nanjing, 210044, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Applied Mathematics Center of Jiangsu Province, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, Nanjing, 210044, China*

<sup>3</sup>*School of Mathematics, Hunan University, Changsha, 410082, China*

---

## Abstract

With a frame  $L$  as the truth value table, we study the topological representations for frame-valued domains. We introduce the notions of locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space and strong locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space. Using these concepts, continuous  $L$ -dcpos and algebraic  $L$ -dcpos are successfully represented via  $L$ -sobriety. By means of Scott  $L$ -topology and specialization  $L$ -order, we establish a categorical isomorphism between the category of the continuous (resp., algebraic)  $L$ -dcpos with Scott continuous maps and that of the locally super-compact (resp., strong locally super-compact)  $L$ -sober spaces with continuous maps. As an application, for a continuous  $L$ -poset  $P$ , we obtain a categorical isomorphism between the category of directed completions of  $P$  with Scott continuous maps and that of the  $L$ -sobrifications of  $(P, \sigma_L(P))$  with continuous maps.

*Key words:* locally super-compact;  $L$ -sobriety; continuous  $L$ -dcpo; algebraic  $L$ -dcpo; directed completion;  $L$ -sobrification

---

## 1 Introduction

Domain Theory [7], developed from continuous lattices introduced by Scott [24] in the 1970s as a denotational model for functional languages. Mutual transformations and infiltrations of the mathematical structures of orders and

topologies are the basic features of domain theory. Sobriety is an important notion in domain theory and non-Hausdorff topology [8], as manifested by its role in the connection between topological structures and ordered structures. The topological representation of various domains is one of the important research topics in domain theory with sober spaces as an essential tool in the study of topological representations for various domains. It is well-known that every injective  $T_0$  space is sober and Scott established a categorical isomorphism between injective  $T_0$  spaces and continuous lattices [24]. In [12,13], it was proved that a  $T_0$  space is sober and has an injective hull if and only if it is homeomorphic to the Scott space of a continuous dcpo. For more discussion of topological representations for various domains, please refer to [28,29,30].

Quantitative domains are the extensions of classical domains by generalizing ordered relations to other more general structures, such as enriched categories, generalized metrics and lattice-valued orders. The lattice-valued order approach to quantitative domain theory called lattice-valued domain theory is originated by Fan and Zhang [6,40], and then mainly developed by Zhang et al [16,36], Yao et al [31,35], Li et al [25,26], Zhao et al [18,19,27], Yue et al [17], Gutiérrez García et al[9], etc. In [34], Yao showed that the category of continuous  $L$ -lattices is isomorphic to that of injective  $T_0$   $L$ -topological spaces. That is to say continuous  $L$ -lattices can be represented by injective objects in  $L\text{-Top}_0$ . It is thus natural to ask what kind of  $T_0$   $L$ -topological spaces can represent continuous  $L$ -dcpos by a categorically isomorphic manner. In the present paper, we will examine the  $L$ -topological representations for continuous  $L$ -dcpos as well as algebraic  $L$ -dcpos.

In theoretical computer science, specifically in domain theory, directed complete posets (or dcpos, for short) play a crucial role in most applications. Given a poset  $P$ , in order to solve the lack of some completeness of  $P$ , one usually considers the corresponding completion of  $P$  which has the universal property [1]. For non-dcpos, Zhao and Fan introduced a new kind of directed completion of posets (called D-completion) and showed that the D-completion is idempotent[41]. Zhang et al. studied the fuzzy directed completion of  $\mathcal{Q}$ -ordered sets [43], which generalized the directed completion of crisp posets. Recently, Zhang provided a uniform approach to dealing with  $\mathcal{Z}$ -directedness in the many-valued context [37]. In [20], Mislove generalized the notion of continuous dcpos to that of continuous posets, and obtain that the category of continuous posets is reflective in that of continuous dcpos. Following that

step, Lawson in [15] studied the round ideal completion of continuous posets. In this paper, we will study the directed completion of continuous  $L$ -posets by utilizing of  $L$ -sobrification. The definition of directed  $L$ -subset we adopt in this paper comes from [31] which is different from that in [37,38,43]. This work will explore the close connections between  $L$ -topologies and  $L$ -orders.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we list basic concepts and results about  $L$ -orders and  $L$ -topologies, and we generalize the notions and results of continuous  $L$ -dcpos to that of continuous  $L$ -posets. In Section 3, we recall some basic facts about  $L$ -sober spaces and obtain some characterizations of  $L$ -sober spaces and  $L$ -sobrifications. In Section 4, we introduce locally super-compact spaces to construct a categorical isomorphism between the category of the continuous  $L$ -dcpos with Scott continuous maps and that of the locally super-compact  $L$ -sober spaces with continuous maps. In Section 5, we establish a categorical isomorphism between the category of the algebraic  $L$ -dcpos with Scott continuous maps and that of the strong locally super-compact  $L$ -sober spaces with continuous maps. In Section 6, we show that the  $L$ -sobrification of a continuous  $L$ -poset is locally super-compact; thus, in the category of continuous  $L$ -posets, we obtain that directed completions coincide with  $L$ -sobrifications.

## 2 Preliminaries

We refer to [7] for the content of lattice theory, to [11] for that of  $L$ -subsets and  $L$ -topological spaces, to [2] for that of category theory, and to [31,34] for that of  $L$ -ordered sets.

In this paper,  $L$  always denotes a frame. A complete lattice  $L$  is called a *frame*, or a *complete Heyting algebra*, if it satisfies the first infinite distributive law, that is,  $a \wedge \bigvee S = \bigvee_{s \in S} a \wedge s$  ( $\forall a \in L, \forall S \subseteq L$ ). The related adjoint pair  $(\wedge, \rightarrow)$  satisfies that  $a \wedge c \leq b \iff c \leq a \rightarrow b$  ( $\forall a, b, c \in L$ ).

Every map  $A : X \rightarrow L$  is called an  $L$ -subset of  $X$ , denoted by  $A \in L^X$ . An  $L$ -subset  $A$  is said to be *nonempty* if  $\bigvee_{x \in X} A(x) = 1$ . Let  $Y \subseteq X$  and  $A \in L^X$ , define  $A|_Y \in L^Y$  by  $A|_Y(y) = A(y)$  ( $\forall y \in Y$ ). For an element  $a \in L$ , the notation  $a_X$  denotes the constant  $L$ -subset of  $X$  with the value  $a$ , i.e.,  $a_X(x) = a$  ( $\forall x \in X$ ). For all  $a \in L$  and  $A \in L^X$ , write  $a \wedge A$  (or,  $A \wedge a$ ), for

the  $L$ -subset given by  $(a \wedge A)(x) = a \wedge A(x)$ .

Let  $f : X \longrightarrow Y$  be a map between two sets. The *Zadeh extensions*  $f^\rightarrow : L^X \longrightarrow L^Y$  and  $f^\leftarrow : L^Y \longrightarrow L^X$  are respectively given by

$$f^\rightarrow(A)(y) = \bigvee_{f(x)=y} A(x) \quad (\forall A \in L^X), \quad f^\leftarrow(B) = B \circ f \quad (\forall B \in L^Y).$$

A subfamily  $\mathcal{O}(X) \subseteq L^X$  is called an  $L$ -topology if (O1)  $A, B \in \mathcal{O}(X)$  implies  $A \wedge B \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ ; (O2)  $\{A_j \mid j \in J\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$  implies  $\bigvee_{j \in J} A_j \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ ; (O3)  $a_X \in \mathcal{O}(X)$  for every  $a \in L$ . The pair  $(X, \mathcal{O}(X))$  is called an  $L$ -topological space; elements of  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  are called open sets. Its standard name is stratified  $L$ -topological space. While in this paper, every  $L$ -topology is always assumed to be stratified, so we omit the word ‘‘stratified’’. As usual, we often write  $X$  instead of  $(X, \mathcal{O}(X))$  for an  $L$ -topological space. The *interior operator*  $(-)^\circ : L^X \longrightarrow L^X$  of an  $L$ -topological space  $X$  is defined by  $A^\circ = \bigvee\{B \in \mathcal{O}(X) \mid B \leq A\}$ .

A subfamily  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$  is called a *base* of  $X$  if for every  $A \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ , there exists  $\{(B_j, a_j) \mid j \in J\} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \times L$  such that  $A = \bigvee_{j \in J} a_j \wedge B_j$ , or equivalently, for every  $A \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ , one has  $A = \bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \text{sub}(B, A) \wedge B$  (cf. Example 2.1(3) for the operation  $\text{sub}$ ). An  $L$ -topological space  $X$  is called  $T_0$  if  $A(x) = A(y) \quad (\forall A \in \mathcal{O}(X))$  implies  $x = y$ . A map  $f : X \longrightarrow Y$  between two  $L$ -topological spaces is called *continuous* if  $f^\leftarrow(B) \in \mathcal{O}(X)$  for every  $B \in \mathcal{O}(Y)$ . So, the continuous map  $f$  can induce the well-defined map  $f^\leftarrow : \mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ .

A map  $e : P \times P \longrightarrow L$  is called an  $L$ -order if for all  $x, y, z \in P$ , (1)  $e(x, x) = 1$ ; (2)  $e(x, y) \wedge e(y, z) \leq e(x, z)$ ; and (3)  $e(x, y) \wedge e(y, x) = 1$  implies  $x = y$ . The pair  $(P, e)$  is called an  $L$ -ordered set. It is customary to write  $P$  for the pair  $(P, e)$ . A map  $f : P \longrightarrow Q$  between two  $L$ -ordered sets is said to be  *$L$ -order-preserving* if for all  $x, y \in P$ ,  $e_P(x, y) \leq e_Q(f(x), f(y))$ . A map  $f : P \longrightarrow Q$  is called an  *$L$ -order-isomorphism* if  $f$  is a bijection and  $e_P(x, y) = e_Q(f(x), f(y))$  for all  $x, y \in P$ , denoted by  $P \cong Q$ .

**Example 2.1** ([34])

(1) Define  $e_L : L \times L \longrightarrow L$  by  $e_L(x, y) = x \rightarrow y \quad (\forall x, y \in L)$ . Then  $e_L$  is an  $L$ -order on  $L$ .

(2) Let  $X$  be a  $T_0$   $L$ -topological space. Define  $e_{\mathcal{O}(X)} : X \times X \longrightarrow L$  by

$$e_{\mathcal{O}(X)}(x, y) = \bigwedge_{A \in \mathcal{O}(X)} A(x) \rightarrow A(y) \quad (\forall x, y \in X).$$

Then  $e_{\mathcal{O}(X)}$  is an  $L$ -order on  $X$ , called the specialization  $L$ -order of  $(X, \mathcal{O}(X))$ .

In this paper, we denote the  $L$ -ordered set  $(X, e_{\mathcal{O}(X)})$  by  $\Omega_L X$ .

(3) Define  $\text{sub}_X : L^X \times L^X \longrightarrow L$  by

$$\text{sub}_X(A, B) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} A(x) \rightarrow B(x) \quad (\forall A, B \in L^X).$$

Then  $\text{sub}_X$  is an  $L$ -order on  $L^X$ , which is called the inclusion  $L$ -order on  $L^X$ .

If the background set is clear, then we always drop the subscript in  $\text{sub}_X$ .

Define  $\uparrow A, \downarrow A \in L^P$  respectively by

$$\uparrow A(x) = \bigvee_{y \in P} A(y) \wedge e(y, x), \quad \downarrow A(x) = \bigvee_{y \in P} A(y) \wedge e(x, y),$$

and define  $\uparrow x$  and  $\downarrow x$  respectively by  $\uparrow x(y) = e(x, y)$ ,  $\downarrow x(y) = e(y, x)$  ( $\forall x, y \in P$ ). An  $L$ -subset  $S \in L^P$  is called a *lower set* (resp., an *upper set*) if  $S(x) \wedge e(y, x) \leq S(y)$  (resp.,  $S(x) \wedge e(x, y) \leq S(y)$ ) for all  $x, y \in P$ . Clearly,  $\downarrow A$  and  $\downarrow x$  (resp.,  $\uparrow A$  and  $\uparrow x$ ) are lower (resp., upper) sets for all  $A \in L^P$  and  $x \in P$ .

Let  $P$  be an  $L$ -ordered set. An element  $x \in P$  is called a *supremum* of  $A \in L^P$ , in symbols  $x = \sqcup A$ , if  $e(x, y) = \text{sub}(A, \downarrow y)$  ( $\forall y \in P$ ). Dually, an element  $x$  is called an *infimum* of  $A \in L^P$ , in symbols  $x = \sqcap A$ , if  $e(y, x) = \text{sub}(A, \uparrow y)$  ( $\forall y \in P$ ). If the supremum (resp., infimum) of an  $L$ -subset exists, then the supremum (resp., infimum) must be unique.

Let  $P$  be an  $L$ -ordered set. A nonempty  $L$ -subset  $D \in L^P$  is said to be *directed* if  $D(x) \wedge D(y) \leq \bigvee_{z \in X} D(z) \wedge e(x, z) \wedge e(y, z)$  ( $\forall x, y \in P$ ). An  $L$ -subset  $I \in L^P$  is called an *ideal* of  $P$  if it is a directed lower set. Denote by  $\mathcal{D}_L(P)$  (resp.,  $\text{Idl}_L(P)$ ) the set of all directed  $L$ -subsets (resp., ideals) of  $P$ . We denote the collection of all the directed  $L$ -subsets (resp., ideals) with a supremum by  $\mathcal{D}_L^*(P)$  (resp.,  $\text{Idl}_L^*(P)$ ). An  $L$ -ordered set  $P$  is called an  $L$ -dcpo if every directed  $L$ -subset has a supremum, or equivalently, every ideal has a supremum.

In the following, we generalize the notions and conclusions of  $L$ -dcpo (see [31,35]) to those of  $L$ -posets. The only difference between the definitions we

will make following and the earlier notions of  $L$ -dcpos is that we no longer assume the underlying  $L$ -posets are  $L$ -dcpos. The verification of the results of  $L$ -posets is analogous to that of the corresponding results of  $L$ -dcpos, so we omit it.

**Definition 2.2** *A map  $f : P \rightarrow Q$  between two  $L$ -posets is called Scott continuous if for every  $D \in \mathcal{D}_L^*(P)$ , then the supremum of  $f^\rightarrow(D)$  exists and  $f(\sqcup D) = \sqcup f^\rightarrow(D)$ .*

The above definition is equivalent to that for every  $I \in \text{Idl}_L^*(P)$ , the supremum of  $f^\rightarrow(I)$  exists and  $f(\sqcup I) = \sqcup f^\rightarrow(I)$ .

**Definition 2.3** *Let  $P$  be an  $L$ -poset. For every  $x \in P$ , define  $\downarrow x \in L^P$  by*

$$\begin{aligned} \downarrow x(y) &= \bigwedge_{I \in \text{Idl}_L^*(P)} e(x, \sqcup I) \rightarrow I(y) \\ &= \bigwedge_{D \in \mathcal{D}_L^*(P)} e(x, \sqcup D) \rightarrow \left( \bigvee_{d \in P} D(d) \wedge e(y, d) \right). \end{aligned}$$

*A  $L$ -poset  $P$  is said to be continuous if  $\downarrow x$  is directed and  $\sqcup \downarrow x = x$  for every  $x \in P$ . A continuous  $L$ -poset  $P$  is called a continuous  $L$ -dcpo, or an  $L$ -domain, if  $P$  is a  $L$ -dcpo.*

**Proposition 2.4** ([31]) *Let  $P$  be an  $L$ -poset. Then (1)  $\forall x \in P, \downarrow x \leq x$ ; and (2)  $\forall x, u, v, y \in P, e(u, x) \wedge \downarrow y(x) \wedge e(y, v) \leq \downarrow v(u)$ . Thus for every  $x \in P, \downarrow x$  is a lower set.*

**Proposition 2.5** ([31]) *If  $P$  is a continuous  $L$ -poset, then  $\downarrow y(x) = \bigvee_{z \in P} \downarrow y(z) \wedge \downarrow z(x)$  for all  $x, y \in P$ .*

**Definition 2.6** *For an  $L$ -poset  $P, A \in L^P$  is called a Scott open set if  $A$  is an upper set and  $A(\sqcup D) = \bigvee_{x \in P} A(x) \wedge D(x)$  for every  $D \in \mathcal{D}_L^*(P)$ . The family  $\sigma_L(P)$  of all Scott open sets of  $P$  forms an  $L$ -topology, called the Scott  $L$ -topology on  $P$ . In this paper, we use  $\Sigma_L P$  to denote  $(P, \sigma_L(P))$ .*

**Proposition 2.7** ([35]) *Let  $P$  be a continuous  $L$ -poset. Then*

(1) *for all  $x \in P, \uparrow x$  is a Scott open set, where  $\uparrow x \in L^P$  is defined by  $\uparrow x(y) = \downarrow y(x)$  ( $\forall y \in P$ );*

(2) *for every  $x \in P, (\uparrow x)^\circ = \uparrow x$ ;*

(3) every Scott open set  $U$  can be represented as  $U = \bigvee_{x \in P} U(x) \wedge \uparrow x$ ; in other words,  $\{\uparrow x \mid x \in P\}$  is a base for  $\sigma_L(P)$ ;

(4)  $(P, \sigma_L(P))$  is  $T_0$ .

**Proposition 2.8** ([34, Proposition 4.5]) (1) Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be two  $L$ -posets. If a map  $f : P \rightarrow Q$  is Scott continuous, then  $f : \Sigma_L P \rightarrow \Sigma_L Q$  is continuous.

(2) Let  $P$  be a continuous  $L$ -poset and let  $Q$  be a continuous  $L$ -dcpo. If a map  $f : \Sigma_L P \rightarrow \Sigma_L Q$  is continuous, then  $f : P \rightarrow Q$  is Scott continuous.

**Lemma 2.9** ([34]) The  $L$ -ordered set  $(L, e_L)$  is a continuous  $L$ -dcpo. Every member in  $\sigma_L(L)$  has the form  $(a_L \wedge id_L) \vee b_L$  for a unique pair  $(b, a) \in L \times L$  with  $b \leq a$ .

### 3 $L$ -sober spaces and $L$ -sobrification

Since  $L$ -sobriety plays a crucial role in this paper, we recall the notions about  $L$ -sober spaces in this section and give some equivalent characterizations about  $L$ -sobrification and  $L$ -sober spaces. The notions and classic results presented in this section can be found in [33,42] for readers.

From [33,42], one knows that  $L$ -sobriety can be described via an adjunction

$$\mathcal{O} \dashv \text{pt}_L : L\text{-Top} \rightarrow L\text{-Frm}^{op}$$

between the category of  $L$ -topological spaces and opposite of the category of  $L$ -frames. For each  $L$ -topological space  $X$ ,  $(\mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$  is an  $L$ -frame. The functor  $\mathcal{O} : L\text{-Top} \rightarrow L\text{-Frm}^{op}$  sends every  $L$ -topological space  $X$  to  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  and sends every continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  to  $\mathcal{O}(f) : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(Y)$ , where  $\mathcal{O}(f)^{op} = f^{\leftarrow} : \mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ . The family  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  refers to all  $L$ -frame homomorphisms from  $(\mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$  to  $(L, e_L)$ . In [33], Yao calls each member of  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  an  $L$ -fuzzy point of  $(\mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$ . In this paper, we call  $L$ -fuzzy points as points for short. By [32, Proposition 5.2], we restate the definition of points as follows.

**Definition 3.1** A map  $p : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow L$  is called a point of  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  if it satisfies that (1)  $p(A \wedge B) = p(A) \wedge p(B)$  ( $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ ); (2)  $p(\bigvee_{i \in I} A_i) = \bigvee_{i \in I} p(A_i)$

$(\forall \{A_i \mid i \in I\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X))$ ; and (3)  $p(a_X) = a$  ( $\forall a \in L$ ). The collection of all points of  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  is denoted by  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ .

**Proposition 3.2** *Let  $X$  be an  $L$ -topological space.*

- (1) For  $p \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ ,  $p$  is an upper set in  $(\mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$ ;
- (2)  $(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub}_{\mathcal{O}(X)})$  is an  $L$ -dcpo.

**Proof.** (1) It is clear that every point of  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  is a stratified  $L$ -filter. By [35, Proposition 2.16],  $p$  is an upper set in  $(\mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$ .

(2) Let  $\mathbb{D} : \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow L$  be a directed  $L$ -subset of  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ . Similar to the proof of [31, Example 5.5], we have  $\sqcup \mathbb{D} = \bigvee_{p \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{D}(p) \wedge p$ .  $\square$

In this paper, when we see  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  as an  $L$ -ordered set, we always assume that  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is equipped with the inclusion  $L$ -order. For simplicity, we often write  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  for  $(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$ .

**Example 3.3** (1) *Let  $X$  be an  $L$ -topological space. For every  $x \in X$ , define  $[x] : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow L$  by  $[x](A) = A(x)$ . It is easy to check  $[x] \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ .*

(2) *Let  $X = [0, 1)$  and  $L = [0, 1]$ . Then  $\mathcal{O}(X) = \{(a_X \wedge id_X) \vee b_X \mid \exists a, b \in X, b \leq a\}$  is an  $L$ -topology on  $X$ . Intuitively, every member in  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  has the form shown in Figure 3.1. Define  $p : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow L$  by  $p((a_X \wedge id_X) \vee b_X) = a$  for every  $(a_X \wedge id_X) \vee b_X \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ . It is routine to check that  $p$  is a point. For  $A = (1_X \wedge id_X) \vee (\frac{1}{2})_X \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ , we have  $p(A) = 1$ . But  $A(x) < 1$  for every  $x \in X$ . Thus for every  $x \in X$ ,  $p \neq [x]$ .*




Fig. 3.1:  $(a_X \wedge id_X) \vee b_X$

We now list some basic facts about the adjunction  $\mathcal{O} \dashv \text{pt}_L$  below, which can be found in [33,42].



Define  $\phi(A) : \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow L$  ( $p \mapsto p(A)$ ) for all  $A \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ . The family  $\{\phi(A) \mid A \in \mathcal{O}(X)\}$  is a  $T_0$   $L$ -topology on  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ . In this paper, we call it the *spectral  $L$ -topology* on  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ . When we consider  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  as an  $L$ -topological space, the related  $L$ -topology is always assumed to be the spectral  $L$ -topology. So we often write  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  with omitting the related spectral  $L$ -topology. For each continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , the continuous map  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(f) : \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(Y)$  is given by  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(f)(p) = p \circ f^\leftarrow$ .

The map  $\eta_X : X \rightarrow \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  ( $x \mapsto [x]$ ) is the component of the unit of the adjunction. The counit of this adjunction gives rise to a map  $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{O}(X)}^{\text{op}} : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  ( $A \mapsto \phi(A)$ ), where  $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{O}(X)}^{\text{op}}$  is an isomorphism in  $L\text{-Frm}$ . By [3, 3.4. Idempotent pair of adjoints], one sees that the adjunction  $\mathcal{O} \dashv \text{pt}_L$  is idempotent.

**Definition 3.4** ([42]) *The  $L$ -topological space  $X$  is said to be  $L$ -sober if  $\eta_X : X \rightarrow \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is a bijection, hence a homeomorphism.*

The definition of  $L$ -sober spaces first appeared in [42]. These spaces are renamed modified  $L$ -sober space in [23]. For an  $L$ -sober space, it follows from Example 2.1(2) that

$$\Omega_L X \cong (\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub}).$$

By Proposition 3.2(2), we have  $\Omega_L X$  is an  $L$ -dcpo. This result belongs to Yao (see [33, Proposition 5.5]), but in fact, we just provided a more concise proof. This result is useful in this paper.

It is well-known that  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is  $L$ -sober. In classical domain theory, one knows that the Scott space of a continuous dcpo is sober. In the frame-valued setting, Yao obtains the corresponding result. For the ease of cite, we list it as a lemma below.

**Lemma 3.5** ([33]) *If  $P$  is a continuous  $L$ -dcpo, then  $\Sigma_L P$  is  $L$ -sober.*

By [3, 3.6. Idempotent pairs and equivalences], or by [22, Theorem 7.1] one obtains an adjunction  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O} \vdash i : L\text{-Top} \rightarrow L\text{-SobTop}$ , where  $i$  is the inclusion functor. In other words,  $L\text{-SobTop}$  is a reflective full subcategory of  $L\text{-Top}$ . The monad arising from  $\mathcal{O} \dashv \text{pt}_L$  coincides with that arising from  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O} \vdash i$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{pt}_L$ . One sees that  $\mathbf{pt}_L$  is an idempotent monad. By [10, Lemma 8.2], the algebras of the monad  $\mathbf{pt}_L$  are precisely the  $L$ -sober spaces.

**Definition 3.6** Let  $X$  be an  $L$ -topological space, let  $X^S$  be an  $L$ -sober space and let  $j : X \rightarrow X^S$  be a continuous map. Then  $(X^S, j)$ , or  $X^S$  is called an  $L$ -sobrification of  $X$  if for every  $L$ -sober space  $Y$  and every continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , there exists a unique continuous map  $\bar{f} : X^S \rightarrow Y$  such that  $f = \bar{f} \circ j$ .

It is well-known that  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $(X, \mathcal{O}(X))$ . By the universal property of  $L$ -sobrification,  $L$ -sobrifications of an  $L$ -topological space are unique up to homeomorphisms.

Monograph [7] introduces the definitions of quasihomomorphism and strict embedding (see [7, Definition V-5.8]). By [7, Exercise V-5.32], one knows that in the category of  $T_0$  topological spaces, quasihomomorphisms and strict embeddings are equivalent. In the following, we extend the notions of quasihomomorphism and strict embedding to those in  $L\text{-Top}$ .

**Definition 3.7** Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a map between two  $L$ -topological spaces. Then  $f$  is called a quasihomomorphism if  $f^\leftarrow : \mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$  is a bijection;  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is called a strict embedding if it is both a quasihomomorphism and a subspace embedding.

**Remark 3.8** (1) For a quasihomomorphism  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , since  $f^\leftarrow$  is both a morphism in  $L\text{-Frm}$  and a bijection, it follows that  $f^\leftarrow : \mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$  is an isomorphism in  $L\text{-Frm}$ .

(2) For every  $L$ -topological space  $X$ ,  $\eta_X : X \rightarrow \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is a quasihomomorphism. In fact, for every  $A \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ ,  $\eta_X^\leftarrow(\phi(A)) = A$  and  $\phi \circ \eta_X^\leftarrow(\phi(A)) = \phi(A)$ . Thus  $\eta_X^\leftarrow \circ \phi = \text{id}_{\mathcal{O}(X)}$  and  $\phi \circ \eta_X^\leftarrow = \text{id}_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{pt}} \mathcal{O}(X)}$ .

(3) Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a map between two  $T_0$   $L$ -topological spaces. It is routine to check that  $f$  is a subspace embedding if and only if  $f^\leftarrow : \mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$  is a surjection. Thus in the category of  $T_0$   $L$ -topological spaces, quasihomomorphisms coincide with strict embeddings.

In what follows, we give some characterizations of  $L$ -sobrification.

**Theorem 3.9** Let  $X$  be an  $L$ -topological space and let  $Y$  be an  $L$ -sober space. Then the following are equivalent:

(1)  $Y$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $X$ ;

(2) *there exists a quasihomomorphism  $j : X \longrightarrow Y$ ;*

(3) *the open set lattices  $(\mathcal{O}(X), \leq)$  and  $(\mathcal{O}(Y), \leq)$  are lattice-isomorphic.*

**Proof.** (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2): Since  $Y$  and  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  are  $L$ -sobrifications of  $X$ , we know that  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is homeomorphic to  $Y$ . Notice that  $\eta_X : X \longrightarrow \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is a quasihomomorphism. Hence there exists a quasihomomorphism  $j : X \longrightarrow Y$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3): Since  $j^{\leftarrow} : (\mathcal{O}(Y), \leq) \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}(X), \leq)$  is both a lattice-homomorphism and a bijection, we have  $j^{\leftarrow}$  is a lattice-isomorphism.

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1): By Definition 3.4 and the constructions of  $\mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  and  $\mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(Y)$ , we have

$$(Y, \mathcal{O}(Y)) \cong (\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(Y), \mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(Y)) \cong (\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X), \mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)).$$

Notice that  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $X$ . Hence  $Y$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $X$ .  $\square$

In the classical setting, Lawson takes Theorem 3.9(2) as the definition of sobrification (see [14]). The following example and the example in Section 6 show that by using Theorem 3.9(3), one can easily identify the  $L$ -sobrification of an  $L$ -topological space.

**Example 3.10** *Let  $X, L$  and let  $\mathcal{O}(X)$  be the same as that in Example 3.3(2). By Lemma 2.9, it is easy to see that  $(\mathcal{O}(X), \leq) \cong (\sigma_L(L), \leq)$ . It follows from Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 3.5 that  $(L, \sigma_L(L))$  is an  $L$ -sober space. So, by Theorem 3.9,  $(L, \sigma_L(L))$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $(X, \mathcal{O}(X))$ .*

**Proposition 3.11** *Let  $X, Y$  be two  $L$ -topological spaces and let  $f : X \longrightarrow Y$  be a continuous map. Then following are equivalent:*

(1)  *$f$  is a quasihomomorphism;*

(2)  *$\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(f) : \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X) \longrightarrow \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(Y)$  is a homeomorphism.*

**Proof.** (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2): It is clear since  $\mathcal{O}(f)$  is an isomorphism in  $L\text{-Frm}^{op}$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1): Since  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(f)$  is a homeomorphism, it follows that  $\mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(f) : \mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(Y)$  is an isomorphism in  $L\text{-Frm}^{op}$ . In  $L\text{-Frm}$ , the

adjunction  $\mathcal{O} \dashv \text{pt}_L$  gives rise to the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{O}(Y) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\varepsilon_{\mathcal{O}(Y)}^{op}} & \mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(Y) \\
\mathcal{O}(f)^{op} \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong (\mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(f))^{op} \\
\mathcal{O}(X) & \xrightarrow[\varepsilon_{\mathcal{O}(X)}^{op}]{\cong} & \mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X)
\end{array}$$

Therefore,  $\mathcal{O}(f)^{op} = (\varepsilon_{\mathcal{O}(X)}^{op})^{-1} \circ (\mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(f))^{op} \circ \varepsilon_{\mathcal{O}(Y)}^{op}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{O}(f)^{op} = f^{\leftarrow}$  is an isomorphism in  $L\text{-Frm}$ . It follows that  $f$  is a quasihomeomorphism.  $\square$

Readers can refer to [7, Section II-3] for the notion of  $J$ -injective object in terms of category. We use  $L\text{-Top}_0$  to denote the category of  $T_0$   $L$ -topological spaces. In  $L\text{-Top}_0$ , let  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  be the class of all subspace embeddings and all strict embeddings respectively. Then a  $T_0$   $L$ -topological space  $X$  is said to be *injective* (resp., *strictly injective*) if  $X$  is  $J_1$ -injective (resp.,  $J_2$ -injective) in the category  $L\text{-Top}_0$ . In the following, we will show that  $L$ -sober spaces are equivalent to strictly injective  $T_0$   $L$ -topological spaces. It is a lattice-type of Escardó and Flagg's corresponding result (see [5]). But Escardó and Flagg did not give a direct proof.

**Theorem 3.12** *The  $L$ -topological space  $X$  is a strictly injective  $T_0$   $L$ -topological space if and only if  $X$  is an  $L$ -sober space.*

**Proof. Necessity.** It follows from Remark 3.8(2)(3) that  $\eta_X$  is a strict embedding. Since  $X$  is strictly injective, there exists a continuous map  $r : \text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow X$  such that  $r \circ \eta_X = id_X$ . By [33, Proposition 5.8],  $X$  is  $L$ -sober.

**Sufficiency.** Let  $X$  be an  $L$ -sober space and let  $j : Y \rightarrow Z$  be a strict embedding between two  $T_0$   $L$ -topological spaces. Then  $\eta_X : X \rightarrow \text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X)$  is a bijection. By Proposition 3.11,  $\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(j) : \text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(Z)$  is a homeomorphism. For every continuous map  $f : Y \rightarrow X$ , construct  $\bar{f} : Z \rightarrow X$  as follows:

$$\bar{f} : Z \xrightarrow{\eta_Z} \text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(Z) \xrightarrow{(\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(j))^{-1}} \text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(Y) \xrightarrow{\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(f)} \text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X) \xrightarrow{(\eta_X)^{-1}} X.$$

By the naturality of  $\eta$ , one has

$$\bar{f} \circ j = (\eta_X)^{-1} \circ \text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(f) \circ (\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(j))^{-1} \circ \eta_Z \circ j$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (\eta_X)^{-1} \circ \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(f) \circ (\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(j))^{-1} \circ \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(j) \circ \eta_Y \\
&= (\eta_X)^{-1} \circ \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(f) \circ \eta_Y \\
&= (\eta_X)^{-1} \circ \eta_X \circ f = f.
\end{aligned}$$

So,  $\bar{f} \circ j = f$ . To sum up,  $X$  is strictly injective. □

By the naturality of  $\eta$ , one readily verifies that the map  $\bar{f}$  constructed in the above proof is unique.

#### 4 Topological representations of $L$ -continuous dcpos

In [34], Yao showed that every continuous  $L$ -lattice (called fuzzy continuous lattice in [34]) equipped with Scott  $L$ -topology is an injective  $T_0$   $L$ -topological space, and conversely, the specialization  $L$ -ordered set of an injective  $T_0$   $L$ -topological space is a continuous  $L$ -lattice. These transformations form a categorical isomorphism between the category of continuous  $L$ -lattices and that of injective  $T_0$   $L$ -topological spaces. Thus one has the following corresponding classes of  $L$ -ordered sets and  $T_0$   $L$ -topological spaces:

$$(4.1) \quad \{\text{continuous } L\text{-lattices}\} \iff \{\text{injective } T_0 \text{ } L\text{-topological spaces}\}$$

It is thus natural to wonder what kind of  $T_0$   $L$ -topological spaces can continuous  $L$ -dcpos be categorical isomorphic to.

In [29], Xu and Mao provided a representation for various domains via the so-called formal points related to super-compact quasi-bases of sober spaces. In this section, we replace the formal points by the points (equivalently, completely prime filter) of the open set lattice. These replacements will make the corresponding proofs more concise, and thus we will smoothly generalize the corresponding results to those in the frame-valued setting. In [29], Xu and Mao did not explore the relationship between various domains and locally super-compact sober spaces from a categorical perspective. In this section, we will establish an isomorphism between continuous  $L$ -dcpos and locally super-compact sober spaces.

We first introduce the notions of super-compact  $L$ -subsets and locally super-compact  $L$ -topological spaces.

**Definition 4.1** Let  $X$  be an  $L$ -topological space.

(1) An  $L$ -subset  $A \in L^X$  is called a super-compact  $L$ -subset, if  $\bigvee_{x \in X} A(x) = 1$ , and for every family  $\{V_i \mid i \in I\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ ,

$$\text{sub}(A, \bigvee_{i \in I} V_i) = \bigvee_{i \in I} \text{sub}(A, V_i).$$

Denote all the super-compact  $L$ -subsets of  $(X, \mathcal{O}(X))$  by  $\text{SC}(X)$ .

(2) The space  $X$  is called locally super-compact, if for every  $A \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ ,

$$A = \bigvee_{B \in \text{SC}(X)} \text{sub}(B, A) \wedge B^\circ.$$

It is clear that the family  $\{B^\circ \mid B \in \text{SC}(X)\}$  is a base of the locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space  $X$ .

For  $A \in L^X$ , define  $[A] : \mathcal{O}(X) \longrightarrow L$  by

$$[A](B) = \text{sub}(A, B) \quad (\forall B \in \mathcal{O}(X)).$$

It is clear that for each  $C \in \text{SC}(X)$ ,  $[C] \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ .

The following shows that every continuous  $L$ -poset can induce a locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space.

**Proposition 4.2** Let  $P$  is a continuous  $L$ -poset. Then  $\Sigma_L P$  is a locally super-compact space. Thus if  $P$  is a continuous  $L$ -dcpo, then  $\Sigma_L P$  is a locally super-compact  $L$ -sober space.

**Proof.** For every  $y \in P$ , we have  $\bigvee_{x \in P} \uparrow y(x) \geq \uparrow y(y) = 1$ . Since every Scott open set is an upper set, we have

$$\text{sub}(\uparrow y, \bigvee_{i \in I} V_i) = \bigvee_{i \in I} V_i(y) = \bigvee_{i \in I} \text{sub}(\uparrow y, V_i).$$

Therefore  $\uparrow y$  is super-compact. For every  $A \in \sigma_L(P)$ , by Proposition 2.7, we have

$$A = \bigvee_{y \in P} A(y) \wedge \uparrow y = \bigvee_{y \in P} \text{sub}(\uparrow y, A) \wedge (\uparrow y)^\circ.$$

Consequently  $(P, \sigma_L(P))$  is a locally super-compact space.  $\square$

The following example indicates that in a topological space, there may be nonempty  $L$ -subsets that are not locally super-compact.

**Example 4.3** Let  $L = \{0, a, b, c, 1\}$  be a lattice with  $0 \leq a \leq c \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq b \leq c \leq 1$  and  $a \parallel b$ . Clearly,  $L$  is a frame. For  $A = id_L \vee c_L$ ,  $B = id_L \vee a_L$  and  $C = id_L \vee b_L$ , by Lemma 2.9,  $A, B, C \in \sigma_L(L)$ . Clearly,  $\bigvee_{x \in L} A(x) = 1$ , but

$$\text{sub}(A, B) \vee \text{sub}(A, C) = a \vee b = c;$$

and

$$\text{sub}(A, B \vee C) = \text{sub}(A, A) = 1.$$

It shows that  $A$  is not a locally super-compact  $L$ -subset.

**Lemma 4.4** ([25, Proposition 4.3]) Let  $P$  be an  $L$ -dcpo and  $x \in P$ . If there exists a directed  $L$ -subset  $D \in L^P$  such that  $D \leq \downarrow x$  and  $\sqcup D = x$ , then  $\downarrow x$  is directed and  $x = \sqcup \downarrow x$ .

**Proposition 4.5** Let  $X$  be a locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space. Then in  $(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$ ,  $\downarrow[x]$  is directed and  $[x] = \sqcup \downarrow[x]$  for every  $x \in X$ .

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.4, we only need to show that for every  $x \in X$ , there exists a directed  $L$ -subset  $\mathbb{D}_x : \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow L$  such that  $\mathbb{D}_x \leq \downarrow[x]$  and  $\sqcup \mathbb{D}_x = [x]$ . For every  $x \in X$ , define  $\mathbb{D}_x : \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow L$  by

$$\mathbb{D}_x(p) = \bigvee \{A^\circ(x) \mid A \in \text{SC}(X), p = [A]\} \quad (\forall p \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)).$$

It is easy to see  $\bigvee_{p \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{D}_x(p) = \bigvee_{A \in \text{SC}(X)} A^\circ(x) = 1$ . Let  $p_1, p_2 \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ . Without loss of generality we assume that there exist  $A, B \in \text{SC}(X)$  such that  $p_1 = [A]$  and  $p_2 = [B]$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{D}_x(p_1) \wedge \mathbb{D}_x(p_2) \\ &= \bigvee_{p_1=[C_1], C_1 \in \text{SC}(X)} C_1^\circ(x) \wedge \bigvee_{p_2=[C_2], C_2 \in \text{SC}(X)} C_2^\circ(x) \\ &= \bigvee \{C_1^\circ(x) \wedge C_2^\circ(x) \mid C_1, C_2 \in \text{SC}(X), p_1 = [C_1], p_2 = [C_2]\} \\ &= \bigvee \left\{ \bigvee_{C \in \text{SC}(X)} C^\circ(x) \wedge \text{sub}(C, C_1^\circ \wedge C_2^\circ) \mid C_1, C_2 \in \text{SC}(X), p_1 = [C_1], p_2 = [C_2] \right\} \\ &\leq \bigvee \left\{ \bigvee_{C \in \text{SC}(X)} C^\circ(x) \wedge \text{sub}(C, C_1) \wedge \text{sub}(C, C_2) \mid C_1, C_2 \in \text{SC}(X), p_1 = [C_1], p_2 = [C_2] \right\} \\ &\leq \bigvee_{C \in \text{SC}(X)} \mathbb{D}_x([C]) \wedge \text{sub}(p_1, [C]) \wedge \text{sub}(p_2, [C]) \\ &= \bigvee_{p \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{D}_x(p) \wedge \text{sub}(p_1, p) \wedge \text{sub}(p_2, p). \end{aligned}$$

That is to say  $\mathbb{D}_x$  is directed.

Now we show that  $\mathbb{D}_x \leq \Downarrow[x]$ . Let  $p \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ . Without loss of generality we assume that there exist  $A \in \text{SC}(X)$  such that  $p = [A]$ . For every ideal  $\mathbb{I} : \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow L$  and  $B \in \text{SC}(X)$  with  $p = [B]$ . By Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{sub}([x], \sqcup \mathbb{I}) &\leq [x](B^\circ) \rightarrow \sqcup \mathbb{I}(B^\circ) \\
&= B^\circ(x) \rightarrow \bigvee_{q \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{I}(q) \wedge q(B^\circ) \\
&\leq B^\circ(x) \rightarrow \bigvee_{q \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{I}(q) \wedge \text{sub}([B], q) \\
&\leq B^\circ(x) \rightarrow \mathbb{I}([B]) \\
&= B^\circ(x) \rightarrow \mathbb{I}(p).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$B^\circ(x) \leq \text{sub}([x], \sqcup \mathbb{I}) \rightarrow \mathbb{I}(p).$$

By the arbitrariness of  $\mathbb{I}$  and  $B$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{D}_x(p) &= \bigvee \{B^\circ(x) \mid B \in \text{SC}(X), p = [B]\} \\
&\leq \bigwedge_{\mathbb{I} \in \text{Idl}_L(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X))} \text{sub}([x], \sqcup \mathbb{I}) \rightarrow \mathbb{I}(p) \\
&= \Downarrow[x](p).
\end{aligned}$$

To the end, we need show that  $\sqcup \mathbb{D}_x = [x]$ . For every  $A \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqcup \mathbb{D}_x(A) &= \bigvee_{p \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{D}_x(p) \wedge p(A) \\
&= \bigvee_{p \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \bigvee \{B^\circ(x) \wedge [B](A) \mid B \in \text{SC}(X), p = [B]\} \\
&= \bigvee_{B \in \text{SC}(X)} B^\circ(x) \wedge \text{sub}(B, A) \\
&= A(x) = [x](A),
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

The following shows that every locally super-compact  $L$ -sober space can induce a continuous  $L$ -dcpo.

**Proposition 4.6** *Let  $X$  be a locally super-compact  $L$ -sober space. Then  $\Omega_L X$  is a continuous  $L$ -dcpo.*

**Proof.** It follows from the  $L$ -sobriety of  $X$  that  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X) = \{[x] \mid x \in X\}$  is



an  $L$ -dcpo. Then by Proposition 4.5,  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is a continuous  $L$ -dcpo. Since  $\Omega_L X \cong (\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$ ,  $\Omega_L X$  is a continuous  $L$ -dcpo.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.7** (1) *Let  $X$  be a locally super-compact  $L$ -sober space. Then  $\Sigma_L \Omega_L X = (X, \mathcal{O}(X))$ .*

(2) *Let  $P$  be a continuous  $L$ -dcpo. Then  $\Omega_L \Sigma_L(P, e) = (P, e)$ .*

**Proof.** It follows from [33, Proposition 5.5] that  $\mathcal{O}(X) \subseteq \sigma_L(\Omega_L X)$ . In the following, we only need to show that  $\sigma_L(\Omega_L X) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ .

Let  $x \in X$ . Then  $\sqcup \mathbb{D}_x = [x]$ , where  $\mathbb{D}_x$  is the one constructed in the proof of Proposition 4.5. Define  $D_x \in L^X$  by  $D_x(a) = \mathbb{D}_x([a])$  ( $\forall a \in X$ ). By the  $L$ -sobriety of  $X$ ,  $D_x$  is well-defined. Since  $\Omega_L X \cong (\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$ , it is easy to see that  $D_x$  is directed and  $\sqcup D_x = x$ . Let  $A \in \Sigma_L \Omega_L X$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
A(x) &= A(\sqcup D_x) \\
&= \bigvee_{a \in X} D_x(a) \wedge A(a) \\
&= \bigvee_{a \in X} \mathbb{D}_x([a]) \wedge [a](A) \\
&= \bigvee_{a \in X} \bigvee_{[a]=[B], B \in \text{SC}(X)} B^\circ(x) \wedge [B](A) \\
&= \bigvee_{B \in \text{SC}(X)} B^\circ(x) \wedge [B](A) \\
&= \bigvee_{B \in \text{SC}(X)} B^\circ(x) \wedge \text{sub}(B, A),
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$A = \bigvee_{B \in \text{SC}(X)} B^\circ \wedge \text{sub}(B, A) \in \mathcal{O}(X).$$

Thus  $\sigma_L(\Omega_L X) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ , as desired.

(2) The proof is similar to that of [34, Theorem 4.8].  $\square$

Let  $L\text{-LSCSob}$  denote the category of locally super-compact  $L$ -sober spaces and continuous maps, and let  $L\text{-CDom}$  denote the category of all continuous  $L$ -dcpo's and Scott continuous maps. In the following theorem, we prove that locally super-compact  $L$ -sober spaces and continuous  $L$ -dcpo's are the same thing up to a categorical isomorphism.

**Theorem 4.8** *The categories  $L\text{-LSCSob}$  and  $L\text{-CDom}$  are isomorphic.*

**Proof.** Define assignment  $\Sigma_L : L\text{-CDom} \rightarrow L\text{-LSCSob}$  by

$$(f : P \rightarrow Q) \mapsto (f : \Sigma_L P \rightarrow \Sigma_L Q).$$

It follows from Proposition 4.2 and Proposition 2.8(1) that  $\Sigma_L$  is a functor. Define assignment  $\Omega_L : L\text{-LSCSob} \rightarrow L\text{-CDom}$  by

$$(f : X \rightarrow Y) \mapsto (f : \Omega_L X \rightarrow \Omega_L Y).$$

Let  $X, Y$  be two locally super-compact  $L$ -sober spaces and let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a continuous map. By Proposition 4.6,  $\Omega_L X$  and  $\Omega_L Y$  are continuous  $L$ -dcpo. It follows from Theorem 4.7(1) and Proposition 2.8(2) that  $f : \Omega_L X \rightarrow \Omega_L Y$  is Scott continuous. Thus  $\Omega_L$  is a functor. By Theorems 4.7, it is clear that  $\Sigma_L \circ \Omega_L = id_{L\text{-LSCSob}}$  and  $\Omega_L \circ \Sigma_L = id_{L\text{-CDom}}$ . Thus  $L\text{-LSCSob}$  and  $L\text{-CDom}$  are isomorphic.  $\square$

## 5 Topological representations of algebraic $L$ -dcpo

In this section, we will search for a special kind of locally super-compact  $L$ -topological spaces to give representations for algebraic  $L$ -dcpo. We first recall some notions about algebraic  $L$ -dcpo.

**Definition 5.1** ([26]) *Let  $P$  be an  $L$ -dcpo. The element  $x \in P$  is said to be compact if and  $\downarrow x(x) = 1$ . The set of all compact elements of  $P$  is denoted by  $K(P)$ . Define  $k(x) \in L^P$  by*

$$k(x)(y) = e(y, x) \wedge \chi_{K(P)}(y) \quad (\forall y \in P).$$

*If for every  $x \in P$ ,  $k(x) \in \mathcal{D}_L(P)$  and  $x = \sqcup k(x)$ , then  $P$  is called an algebraic  $L$ -dcpo.*

**Remark 5.2** (1)  $\downarrow x(x) = 1$  iff  $I(x) = e(x, \sqcup I)$  ( $\forall I \in Idl_L(P)$ ) iff

$$e(x, \sqcup D) = \bigvee_{d \in P} D(d) \wedge e(x, d) \quad (\forall D \in \mathcal{D}_L(P)).$$

(2) An  $L$ -dcpo  $P$  is algebraic if and only if for every  $x \in P$ ,  $k(x)|_{K(P)} \in \mathcal{D}_L(K(P))$  and  $\sqcup k(x) = x$ , where  $k(x)|_{K(P)}(y) = e(y, x)$  for every  $y \in K(P)$ .

(3) Clearly, for every algebraic  $L$ -dcpo  $P$ ,  $k(x) \leq \downarrow x$ . It follows directly from Lemma 4.4 that every algebraic  $L$ -dcpo  $P$  is a continuous  $L$ -dcpo. But in the following, we will show that an algebraic  $L$ -dcpo may not be a continuous  $L$ -dcpo.

**Example 5.3** (1) Let  $L = [0, 1]$ . Then  $(L, e_L)$  is a continuous  $L$ -dcpo. Then by the proof of [34, Theorem 3.5], we have  $\uparrow x = id_L$  for every  $x \in (0, 1]$  and  $\uparrow 0 = 1_L$ . Thus for every  $a \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$\downarrow a(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x = 0; \\ a, & x \in (0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

It follows that  $K(L) = \{0, 1\}$ . Thus

$$k(a)(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x = 0; \\ 0, & x \in (0, 1); \\ a, & x = 1. \end{cases}$$

For every  $y \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$\text{sub}(k(a), \downarrow y) = (k(a)(0) \rightarrow e_L(0, y)) \wedge (k(a)(1) \rightarrow e_L(1, y)) = a \rightarrow y = e_L(a, y).$$

This shows that  $\sqcup k(a) = a$ . Thus  $(L, e_L)$  is an algebraic  $L$ -dcpo.

(2) Let  $X = [0, 1] \cup \{\perp\}$  and let  $L = \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$  be the truth value table. Define an  $L$ -order  $e$  on  $X$  as follows:

$$e(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & x, y \in [0, 1], x \leq y; \\ 1, & x = \perp, y \in X; \\ \frac{1}{2}, & x, y \in [0, 1], y < x; \\ 0, & y = \perp, x \in [0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

It is routine to check that every  $I \in \text{Idl}_L(X)$  is shaped like the following three

types of  $L$ -subsets, where  $a \in [0, 1]$ .

$$I_1(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in [0, 1]; \\ 1, & x = \perp, \end{cases} \quad I_2(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & x \in [a, 1]; \\ 1, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad I_3(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & x \in (a, 1]; \\ 1, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that  $\sqcup I_1 = \perp$  and  $\sqcup I_2 = \sqcup I_3 = a$ .

For  $\perp \in X$  and for every  $a \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$\downarrow \perp(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in [0, 1]; \\ 1, & x = \perp, \end{cases} \quad \downarrow a(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & x \in [a, 1]; \\ 1, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Thus  $(X, e)$  is a continuous  $L$ -dcpo and  $K(X) = \{\perp\}$ . For every  $a \in [0, 1]$ ,  $k(a) = I_1$ . Noticing that  $\sqcup k(a) = \perp \neq a$ , we know that  $(X, e)$  is not an algebraic  $L$ -dcpo.

In [29], Xu and Mao made use of the topological space with a super-compact quasi-base to give representations for algebraic dcpos. This inspires us to introduce the notion of strong locally super-compact  $L$ -topological spaces as follows.

**Definition 5.4** Let  $X$  be an  $L$ -topological space. If  $X$  has a base  $\mathcal{B}$  consisting of super-compact open sets, i.e.,  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \text{SC}(X)$ , then  $X$  is said to be strong locally super-compact.

**Proposition 5.5** A strong locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space  $X$  is a locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space.

**Proof.** Assume  $\mathcal{B}$  is a base of  $X$  which consist of super-compact open sets. For every  $A \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ , we have

$$A = \bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B \wedge \text{sub}(B, A) \leq \bigvee_{C \in \text{SC}(X)} C^\circ \wedge \text{sub}(C, A) \leq A.$$

Therefore  $A = \bigvee_{C \in \text{SC}(X)} C^\circ \wedge \text{sub}(C, A)$ . Thus  $X$  is locally super-compact.  $\square$

The following shows that every algebraic  $L$ -dcpo can induce a strong locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space.

**Proposition 5.6** Let  $P$  be an algebraic  $L$ -dcpo. Then  $\Sigma_L P$  is a strong locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space.

**Proof.** We first show that  $\{\uparrow k \mid k \in K(P)\}$  is a base of  $\Sigma_L P$ . Let  $x \in K(P)$ . Then for every  $D \in \mathcal{D}_L(P)$ , we have

$$\uparrow x(\sqcup D) = e(x, \sqcup D) = \bigvee_{d \in P} e(x, d) \wedge D(d).$$

Thus  $\uparrow x \in \sigma_L(P)$ . Since  $P$  is an algebraic  $L$ -dcpo, for every  $A \in \sigma_L(P)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A(x) &= A(\sqcup k(x)) = \bigvee_{y \in P} A(y) \wedge k(x)(y) \\ &= \bigvee_{y \in P} A(y) \wedge e(y, x) \wedge \chi_{K(X)}(y) \\ &= \bigvee_{k \in K(P)} A(k) \wedge \uparrow k(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\{\uparrow k \mid k \in K(P)\}$  is a base of  $\Sigma_L P$ . Since for every  $k \in K(P)$ ,  $\uparrow k$  is a super-compact open set,  $\Sigma_L P$  is strong locally super-compact.  $\square$

Conversely, the following shows that every strong locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space can induce an algebraic  $L$ -dcpo.

**Theorem 5.7** *Let  $X$  be a strong locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space. Then  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is an algebraic  $L$ -dcpo.*

We first prove two lemmas.

**Lemma 5.8** *Let  $P$  be an  $L$ -dcpo and  $x \in P$ . If there exists a directed  $L$ -subset  $D$  such that  $D \leq k(x) = \downarrow x \wedge \chi_{K(P)}$  and  $\sqcup D = x$ , then  $k(x)$  is directed and  $x = \sqcup k(x)$ .*

**Proof.** It follows from  $D \leq k(x) \leq \downarrow x$  that  $\sqcup k(x) = x$ . Next, we show that  $k(x)$  is directed. Since  $D$  is directed and  $D \leq k(x)$ , we have  $\bigvee_{y \in P} k(x)(y) = 1$ . For every  $y_1, y_2 \in K(P)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} k(x)(y_1) \wedge k(x)(y_2) &= e(y_1, x) \wedge e(y_2, x) \\ &= e(y_1, \sqcup D) \wedge e(y_2, \sqcup D) \\ &= \left( \bigvee_{d \in P} D(d) \wedge e(y_1, d) \right) \wedge \left( \bigvee_{d \in P} D(d) \wedge e(y_2, d) \right) \\ &= \bigvee_{d_1, d_2 \in P} (D(d_1) \wedge D(d_2) \wedge e(y_1, d_1) \wedge e(y_2, d_2)) \\ &= \bigvee_{d_1, d_2 \in P} \bigvee_{d \in P} (D(d) \wedge e(d_1, d) \wedge e(d_2, d) \wedge e(y_1, d_1) \wedge e(y_2, d_2)) \\ &\leq \bigvee_{d \in P} k(x)(d) \wedge e(y_1, d) \wedge e(y_2, d). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $k(x)$  is directed.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.9** *Let  $X$  be an  $L$ -topological space and  $p \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ . If  $A$  is a super-compact open set, then  $\text{sub}([A], p) = p(A)$ .*

**Proof.** For every  $B \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ , by Proposition 3.2(1),  $p(A) \wedge \text{sub}(A, B) \leq p(B)$ . Thus,

$$p(A) \leq \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{O}(X)} \text{sub}(A, B) \rightarrow p(B) = \text{sub}_{\mathcal{O}(X)}([A], p).$$

Notice that  $A \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ . We have  $\bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{O}(X)} \text{sub}(A, B) \rightarrow p(B) = p(A)$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 5.7.** By Proposition 3.2(2), we only need to show that  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is algebraic. Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a base consisting of super compact open sets. For  $p \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ , define  $\mathbb{D}_p : \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow L$  as follows:

$$\mathbb{D}_p(q) = \begin{cases} p(B), & q = [B], B \in \mathcal{B}; \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that  $\mathbb{D}_p$  is well-defined. We will prove that  $\mathbb{D}_p$  is directed. Since  $\mathcal{B}$  is a base, we have

$$\bigvee_{q \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{D}_p(q) = \bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{B}} p(B) = p\left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B\right) = p(1_X) = 1.$$

For every  $p_1, p_2 \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ , without loss of generality we assume that there exist  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $p_1 = [B_1]$  and  $p_2 = [B_2]$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_p(p_1) \wedge \mathbb{D}_p(p_2) &= p(B_1) \wedge p(B_2) = p(B_1 \wedge B_2) \\ &= p\left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B \wedge \text{sub}(B, B_1 \wedge B_2)\right) \\ &= \bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{B}} p(B) \wedge \text{sub}(B, B_1 \wedge B_2) \\ &= \bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{D}_p([B]) \wedge \text{sub}(B, B_1) \wedge \text{sub}(B, B_2) \\ &= \bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{D}_p([B]) \wedge \text{sub}([B_1], [B]) \wedge \text{sub}([B_2], [B]) \\ &= \bigvee_{q \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{D}_p(q) \wedge \text{sub}(p_1, q) \wedge \text{sub}(p_2, q). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\mathbb{D}_p$  is directed. For every  $A \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqcup \mathbb{D}_p(A) &= \bigvee_{q \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{D}_p(q) \wedge q(A) = \bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{D}_p([B]) \wedge [B](A) \\ &= \bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{B}} p(B) \wedge \text{sub}(B, A) = p\left(\bigvee_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B \wedge \text{sub}(B, A)\right) \\ &= p(A). \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrariness of  $A \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ , we have  $\sqcup \mathbb{D}_p = p$ .

We will show that for every  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,

$$\mathbb{D}_p([B]) = \text{sub}([B], p) \wedge \chi_{K(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X))}([B]).$$

For every  $\mathbb{I} \in \text{Idl}_L(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X))$ , by Lemma 5.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sub}([B], \sqcup \mathbb{I}) &= \text{sub}([B], \bigvee_{q \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{I}(q) \wedge q) = \bigvee_{q \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{I}(q) \wedge q(B) \\ &= \bigvee_{q \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbb{I}(q) \wedge \text{sub}([B], q) \leq \mathbb{I}([B]). \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrariness of  $\mathbb{I} \in \text{Idl}_L(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X))$ , we have  $[B] \in K(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X))$ , i.e.,  $\chi_{K(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X))}([B]) = 1$ . Notice that

$$\mathbb{D}_p([B]) = p(B) = \text{sub}([B], p).$$

We have  $\mathbb{D}_p([B]) = \downarrow p([B]) \wedge \chi_{K(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X))}([B])$ . This shows that  $\mathbb{D}_p \leq \downarrow p \wedge \chi_{K(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X))}$ . It follows from Lemma 5.8 that  $\downarrow p \wedge \chi_{K(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X))}$  is directed and  $\sqcup(\downarrow p \wedge \chi_{K(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X))}) = p$ . By the arbitrariness of  $p \in \text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$ , we have that  $\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X)$  is an algebraic  $L$ -dcpo.  $\square$

**Remark 5.10** *We now obtain a representation for algebraic  $L$ -dcpos. That is, an  $L$ -ordered set  $P$  is an algebraic  $L$ -dcpo if and only if there exists a strong locally super-compact  $L$ -topological space  $X$  such that  $(\text{pt}_L \mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub}) \cong (P, e_p)$ . Furthermore, when we add the condition of sobriety to strong locally super-compact  $L$ -topological spaces, we will obtain an isomorphism of related categories.*

Let  $L\text{-SLSCSob}$  denote the category of strong locally super-compact sober spaces and continuous maps, and let  $L\text{-AlgDom}$  denote the category of algebraic  $L$ -dcpos and Scott continuous maps. Clearly,  $L\text{-SLSCSob}$  and  $L\text{-AlgDom}$  are full subcategories of  $L\text{-LSCSob}$  and  $L\text{-CDom}$  respectively. By Theorems 4.7 and 4.8, it is easy to obtain the following result.

**Theorem 5.11** *The categories  $L\text{-SLSCSob}$  and  $L\text{-AlgDom}$  are isomorphic.*

## 6 The directed completion of continuous $L$ -posets

As an application of the results from the previous sections, in this section, in the category of continuous  $L$ -posets, we study the relationship between directed completions and  $L$ -sobrifications.

Reminder again, in Section 3, one has seen that the family

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{pt}_L}\mathcal{O}(X) = \{\phi(A) \mid A \in \mathcal{O}(X)\}$$

is a  $T_0$   $L$ -topology and called the spectral  $L$ -topology on  $\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X)$ . It is well-known that  $\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X)$  equipped with the spectral  $L$ -topology is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $X$ . When we consider  $\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X)$  as an  $L$ -topological space, the related  $L$ -topology is always assumed to be the spectral  $L$ -topology. So we often write  $\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X)$  with omitting the related spectral  $L$ -topology. It should be noted that when we see  $\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X)$  as an  $L$ -ordered set, we always assume that  $\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X)$  is equipped with the inclusion  $L$ -order. For simplicity, we often write  $\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X)$ , for  $(\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$ .

The following shows that the specialization  $L$ -order of  $\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X)$  is precisely the inclusion  $L$ -order.

**Proposition 6.1**  $\Omega_L\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X) = (\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$ .

**Proof.** For every pair  $p, q$  in  $\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\mathcal{O}_{\text{pt}_L}\mathcal{O}(X)}(p, q) &= \bigwedge_{A \in \mathcal{O}(X)} \phi(A)(p) \longrightarrow \phi(A)(q) \\ &= \bigwedge_{A \in \mathcal{O}(X)} p(A) \longrightarrow q(A) = \text{sub}(p, q). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\Omega_L\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X) = (\text{pt}_L\mathcal{O}(X), \text{sub})$ . □

By Proposition 4.2, we know that the Scott  $L$ -topology of every continuous  $L$ -poset is local super-compact. The following shows that the local super-compactness of a continuous  $L$ -poset is maintained under  $L$ -sobrification.



**Proposition 6.2** *Let  $P$  be a continuous  $L$ -poset. Then  $\text{pt}_L\sigma_L(P)$  is a locally super-compact  $L$ -sober space.*

**Proof.** We only need to prove that  $\text{pt}_L\sigma_L(P)$  is locally super-compact. Let  $A \in \sigma_L(P)$ , by Proposition 2.7(3) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(A)(p) &= p(A) = p\left(\bigvee_{a \in P} A(a) \wedge \uparrow a\right) \\ &= \bigvee_{a \in P} A(a) \wedge \phi(\uparrow a)(p) \\ &\leq \bigvee_{a \in P} \text{sub}(\uparrow[a], \phi(A)) \wedge (\uparrow[a])^\circ(p).\end{aligned}$$

The above uses the facts  $A(a) \leq \text{sub}(\uparrow[a], \phi(A))$  and  $\phi(\uparrow a) \leq (\uparrow[a])^\circ$ . In fact, for every  $q \in \text{pt}_L\sigma_L(P)$ , we have

$$A(a) \wedge \text{sub}([a], q) \leq q(A) = \phi(A)(q).$$

Thus  $A(a) \leq \bigwedge_{q \in \text{pt}_L\sigma_L(P)} \text{sub}([a], q) \longrightarrow \phi(A)(q)$ . Hence the first fact holds.

Now, we show the second fact. For every  $U \in \sigma_L(X)$ , by Proposition 3.2(1),

$$p(\uparrow a) \wedge U(a) \leq p(\uparrow a) \wedge \text{sub}(\uparrow a, U) \leq p(U).$$

By the arbitrariness of  $U$ , we have

$$\phi(\uparrow a)(p) \leq \bigwedge_{U \in \sigma_L(X)} [a](U) \rightarrow p(U) = \text{sub}([a], p) = \uparrow[a](p).$$

So,  $\phi(\uparrow a) \leq \uparrow[a]$ . Since  $\phi(\uparrow a) \in \mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L\sigma_L(P)$ , the second fact holds.

To sum up, we have

$$\phi(A) = \bigvee_{a \in P} \text{sub}(\uparrow[a], \phi(A)) \wedge (\uparrow[a])^\circ.$$

Since every member  $\mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L\sigma_L(P)$  is an upper set. So, for every  $a \in P$ ,  $\uparrow[a]$  is a super-compact set. Hence  $\text{pt}_L\sigma_L(P)$  is a locally super-compact space.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.3** *Let  $P$  be a continuous  $L$ -poset. Then*

(1)  $\text{pt}_L\sigma_L(P)$  is a continuous  $L$ -dcpo.

(2)  $\sigma_L(\text{pt}_L\sigma_L(P)) = \mathcal{O}\text{pt}_L\sigma_L(P)$ . That is to say, the Scott  $L$ -topology on  $(\text{pt}_L\sigma_L(P), \text{sub})$  coincides with the the spectral  $L$ -topology.

**Proof.** (1) It follows directly from Propositions 4.6, 6.1 and 6.2.

(2) By Proposition 6.1, we have  $\Omega_L \text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P) = (\text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P), \text{sub})$ . By Theorem 4.7(1), we have  $\sigma_L(\text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P), \text{sub}) = \mathcal{O}(\text{pt}_L(\sigma_L(P)))$ .  $\square$

Inspired by the Xu and Mao's work (see [21]) and Zhao's work (see [41]), we introduce the notion of continuous  $L$ -posets as follows.

**Definition 6.4** *Let  $P$  be a continuous  $L$ -poset and  $Q$  be a continuous  $L$ -dcpo. If  $j : P \rightarrow Q$  is Scott continuous, then  $(Q, j)$ , or  $Q$ , is called a directed completion of  $P$  if for every continuous  $L$ -dcpo  $M$  and Scott continuous map  $f : P \rightarrow M$ , there exists a unique Scott continuous map  $\bar{f} : Q \rightarrow M$  such that  $\bar{f} \circ j = f$ , i.e., the following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 P & \xrightarrow{j} & Q \\
 & \searrow f & \downarrow \exists! \bar{f} \\
 & & M
 \end{array}$$

By the universal property of directed completion, directed completions of a continuous  $L$ -poset are unique up to  $L$ -order-isomorphism.

**Theorem 6.5** *Let  $P$  be a continuous  $L$ -poset. Then  $\text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P)$  is a directed completion of  $P$ .*

**Proof.** By Proposition 6.3(2), we have  $\Sigma_L \text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P)$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $\Sigma_L P$ . By Proposition 6.3(1), we have  $(\text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P), \text{sub})$  is a continuous  $L$ -dcpo. For every continuous  $L$ -dcpo  $Q$ , and Scott continuous map  $f : P \rightarrow Q$ , By Proposition 2.8(1) and Lemma 3.5, we know that  $\Sigma_L Q$  is  $L$ -sober and  $f : \Sigma_L P \rightarrow \Sigma_L Q$  is continuous. Since  $\Sigma_L \text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P)$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $\Sigma_L P$ , we know that there exists a unique continuous map  $\bar{f} : \Sigma_L \text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P) \rightarrow \Sigma_L Q$  such that  $\bar{f} \circ \eta_P = f$ . By Proposition 2.8(2),  $\bar{f} : \text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P) \rightarrow Q$  is Scott continuous, as desired.  $\square$

It is clear that every continuous  $L$ -dcpo can be retrieved from its Scott  $L$ -topology. Let  $L\text{-CPos}$  denote the category of all continuous  $L$ -posets and Scott continuous maps. The above result shows that  $L\text{-CPos}$  is reflective in  $L\text{-CDom}$ . This result is a frame-valued type of Mislove's result (see [20, Corollary 4.19]). Our method here is different from Mislove's method. Mislove jointly use Scott open sets and Scott closed sets. But, we use the so-called points in terms of open sets.

In the following, we obtain a characterization of the directed completions of continuous  $L$ -posets via  $L$ -sobrification.

**Theorem 6.6** *Let  $P$  be a continuous  $L$ -poset.*

- (1) *If  $Y$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $\Sigma_L P$ , then  $\Omega_L Y$  is a directed completion of  $P$ ;*
- (2) *If  $Q$  is a directed completion of  $P$ , then  $\Sigma_L Q$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $\Sigma_L P$ .*
- (3) *If  $Q$  is a continuous  $L$ -posets, then  $Q$  is a directed completion of  $P$  if and only if  $\Sigma_L Q$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $\Sigma_L P$ .*

**Proof.** (1) It is clear that

$$(Y, \mathcal{O}(Y)) \cong (\text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P), \mathcal{O} \text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P)).$$

Therefore by Proposition 6.1, we have

$$\Omega_L Y \cong (\text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P), \text{sub}).$$

It follows from Theorem 6.5 that  $\Omega_L Y$  is a directed completion of  $P$ .

(2) It follows from Theorem 6.5 that  $(Q, e_Q) \cong (\text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P), \text{sub})$ . Therefore  $\Sigma_L Q \cong \Sigma_L \text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P)$ . It follows from Propoation 6.3(2) that  $\Sigma_L Q$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $\Sigma_L P$ .

(3) Similar to the proof of [34, Theorem 4.8], we have  $\Omega_L \Sigma_L(Q, e_Q) = (Q, e_Q)$ . Then it follows from Parts (1), (2) that Part (3) holds.  $\square$

**Remark 6.7** (1) *Given a continuous  $L$ -poset  $P$ , now we have the following corresponding classes of directed completions and  $L$ -sobrifications:*

$$\{\text{directed completions of } P\} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Sigma_L} \\ \xleftarrow{\Omega_L} \end{array} \{L\text{-sobrifications of } (P, \sigma_L(P))\}$$

Let  $\mathbf{D}_L(P)$  denote the category of directed completions of  $P$  and let  $\mathbf{S}_L(P)$  denote the category of  $L$ -sobrifications of  $(P, \sigma_L(P))$ . They are full subcategories of  $L\text{-CDom}$  and  $L\text{-LSCSob}$  respectively. By Theorem 6.6, it is routine to check that the functors  $\Sigma_L$  and  $\Omega_L$  lead to a categorical isomorphism between  $\mathbf{D}_L(P)$  and  $\mathbf{S}_L(P)$ .

(2) In the classical setting, by Theorem 6.6(3), we obtain a topological characterization of [41, Remark 3]. That is to say, a poset  $Q$  is a directed completion of a continuous poset  $P$  if and only if  $(Q, \sigma(Q))$  is a sobrification of  $(P, \sigma(P))$ .

We end this section with two examples. The first is a lattice-type of Lawson's example for round ideal completion (see [13, Example 3.5]).

**Example 6.8** Let  $P$  be a continuous  $L$ -poset. Define

$$\mathbf{RI}(P) = \left\{ \bigvee_{x \in P} D(x) \wedge \downarrow x \mid D \in \mathcal{D}_L(P) \right\}.$$

Then  $(\mathbf{RI}(P), \text{sub}) \cong (\text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P), \text{sub})$ . Thus  $(\mathbf{RI}(P), \text{sub})$  is a directed completion of  $P$  and  $\Sigma_L(\mathbf{RI}(P), \text{sub})$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $\Sigma_L P$ .

**Proof.** We divide the proof into three steps.

**Step 1.** For every  $p \in \text{pt}_L(\sigma_L(P))$ , put  $D \in L^P$  by  $D(x) = p(\uparrow x)$ . by Propositions 2.4, 2.5 and 2.7, it is routine to verify that  $D$  is directed.

Now we define a map  $f : \text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P) \rightarrow \mathbf{RI}(P)$  by

$$f(p) = \bigvee_{x \in P} p(\uparrow x) \wedge \downarrow x.$$

It is clear that  $f$  is  $L$ -order-preserving.

**Step 2.** For  $I \in \mathbf{RI}(P)$ , there exists a directed  $L$ -subset  $D_I$  such that  $I = \bigvee_{x \in P} D_I(x) \wedge \downarrow x$ . Define  $\mathbb{D} \in L^{\text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P)}$  by

$$\mathbb{D}(q) = \begin{cases} I(x), & q = [x], x \in P; \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Since  $\Sigma_L P$  is  $T_0$ ,  $\mathbb{D}$  is well-defined. We assert that  $\mathbb{D}$  is directed. In fact, firstly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee_{x \in P} \mathbb{D}([x]) &= \bigvee_{x \in P} I(x) = \bigvee_{x \in P} \left( \bigvee_{y \in P} D_I(y) \wedge \downarrow y \right)(x) \\ &= \bigvee_{y \in P} (D_I(y) \wedge \bigvee_{x \in P} \downarrow y(x)) = \bigvee_{y \in P} D_I(y) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Secondly, for every  $x_1, x_2 \in P$ , by the directedness of  $\downarrow x$  ( $\forall x \in P$ ), we have

$$\mathbb{D}([x_1]) \wedge \mathbb{D}([x_2]) = I(x_1) \wedge I(x_2)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bigvee_{y_1, y_2 \in P} D_I(y_1) \wedge D_I(y_2) \wedge \downarrow y_1(x_1) \wedge \downarrow y_2(x_2) \\
&\leq \bigvee_{y_1, y_2, y_3 \in P} D_I(y_3) \wedge e(y_1, y_3) \wedge e(y_2, y_3) \wedge \downarrow y_1(x_1) \wedge \downarrow y_2(x_2) \\
&\leq \bigvee_{y_3 \in P} D_I(y_3) \wedge \downarrow y_3(x_1) \wedge \downarrow y_3(x_2) \\
&\leq \bigvee_{y_3 \in P} D_I(y_3) \wedge \bigvee_{x_3 \in X} (\downarrow y_3(x_3) \wedge e(x_1, x_3) \wedge e(x_2, x_3)) \\
&= \bigvee_{x_3 \in P} \left( \bigvee_{y_3 \in P} D_I(y_3) \wedge \downarrow y_3(x_3) \right) \wedge e(x_1, x_3) \wedge e(x_2, x_3) \\
&= \bigvee_{x_3 \in P} I(x_3) \wedge e(x_1, x_3) \wedge e(x_2, x_3) \\
&\leq \bigvee_{x_3 \in P} \mathbb{D}([x_3]) \wedge \text{sub}([x_1], [x_3]) \wedge \text{sub}([x_2], [x_3]).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\mathbb{D}$  is directed. By Proposition 3.2(2), we have  $\sqcup \mathbb{D} = \bigvee_{x \in P} I(x) \wedge [x]$ . Hence  $\bigvee_{x \in P} I(x) \wedge [x] \in \text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P)$ . Now we define a map  $g : \mathbf{RI}(P) \rightarrow \text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P)$  by

$$g(I) = \bigvee_{x \in P} I(x) \wedge [x].$$

It is clear that  $g$  is  $L$ -order-preserving.

**Step 3.**  $f$  and  $g$  are inverse to each other. For every  $p \in \text{pt}_L \sigma_L(P)$  and  $A \in \sigma_L(P)$ , by Proposition 2.7(3) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
p(A) &= p\left(\bigvee_{x \in P} A(x) \wedge \uparrow x\right) = \bigvee_{x \in P} A(x) \wedge p(\uparrow x) = \bigvee_{x \in P} \left(\bigvee_{y \in P} A(y) \wedge \uparrow y(x)\right) \wedge p(\uparrow x) \\
&= \bigvee_{y \in P} \left(\bigvee_{x \in P} p(\uparrow x) \wedge \downarrow x(y)\right) \wedge [y](A) = \bigvee_{y \in P} (f(p)(y)) \wedge [y](A) = g(f(p))(A).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus  $gf(p) = p$ .

For every  $I = \bigvee_{y \in P} D(y) \wedge \downarrow y \in \mathbf{RI}(P)$ , for every  $t \in P$ , by Proposition 2.5,

$$\bigvee_{x \in P} I(x) \wedge \downarrow x(t) = \bigvee_{x \in P} \left(\bigvee_{y \in P} D(y) \wedge \downarrow y(x)\right) \wedge \downarrow x(t) = \bigvee_{y \in P} D(y) \wedge \downarrow y(t) = I(t).$$

Therefore,  $I = \bigvee_{x \in P} I(x) \wedge \downarrow x$ . For every  $t \in P$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(g(I))(t) &= f\left(\bigvee_{x \in P} I(x) \wedge [x]\right)(t) = \bigvee_{x, y \in P} I(x) \wedge \uparrow y(x) \wedge \downarrow y(t) \\
&= \bigvee_{x \in P} I(x) \wedge \downarrow x(t) = I(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus  $fg(I) = I$ . □

**Example 6.9** Let  $X = \{x, y\}$  and  $L = \{0, a, b, 1\}$  be a lattice with  $0 \leq a, b \leq 1$  and  $a \parallel b$ . Define an  $L$ -order  $e$  on  $X$  by  $e(x, x) = 1$ ,  $e(x, y) = 1$ ,  $e(y, y) = 1$  and  $e(y, x) = 0$ . The ideals of  $(X, e)$  and relative supremums (if exist) are shown in the following table.

	$I_1$	$I_2$	$I_3$	$I_4$
$x$	1	1	1	1
$y$	1	$a$	$b$	0
sup	$y$	$\times$	$\times$	$x$

We see that  $(X, e)$  is not an  $L$ -dcpo. By a routine calculation, we have the following table

	$x$	$y$	sup
$\Downarrow y$	1	1	$y$
$\Downarrow x$	1	0	$x$

Thus  $(X, e)$  is a continuous  $L$ -poset, not a continuous  $L$ -dcpo. By a calculation, we get the Scott open sets of  $(X, e)$  as shown in Figure 5.1, where the pair  $(m, n)$  denote the  $L$ -subset with the value  $m$  on  $x$  and the value  $n$  on  $y$ .




Fig. 5.1.

By a computation, we get the Scott open sets of  $(L, e_L)$  as shown in Figure 5.2, where the pair  $(m, n, p, q)$  denote the  $L$ -subset with the value  $m, n, p, q$  on  $1, a, b, 0$  respectively.




Fig. 5.2.

By Figures 5.1, 5.2, we can see that  $(\sigma_L(L), \leq) \cong (\sigma_L(X), \leq)$ . By Theorem 3.9(3),  $(L, \sigma_L(L))$  is an  $L$ -sobrification of  $(X, \sigma_L(X))$ . Therefore, it follows from Theorem 6.6 that  $(L, e_L)$  is a directed completion of  $(X, e)$ .

## 7 Conclusion

This paper studies the topological representations of frame-valued domains via  $L$ -sobriety for a frame  $L$  as the truth value table. We prove that the category of continuous  $L$ -dcpo's is isomorphic to that of locally super-compact  $L$ -sober spaces; the category of algebraic  $L$ -dcpo's is isomorphic to that of strong locally super-compact  $L$ -sober spaces. By using the  $L$ -sobriety of continuous  $L$ -dcpo's, we know that in the category of continuous  $L$ -posets, directed completions coincide with  $L$ -sobrifications. This research opens a way for finding topological representations of frame-valued domains.

We have generalized Xu and Mao's results (see [29]), Mislove's results (see [20]) and Lawson's results (see [13]) to those in the frame-valued setting, but we didn't follow their proof methods. Moreover, we explored some new results based on their result. The main differences between our work and their work are:

- (1) In [29], Xu and Mao provided a representation for various domains via the so-called formal points related to super-compact quasi-bases of sober spaces. We have replaced the formal points by the points (equivalently, completely prime filters) of the open set lattice. Although a locally super-compact sober space may have more than one super-compact quasi-base, the collection of formal points associated with every super-compact quasi-base is order-isomorphic to that of points of the open set lattice, where the order is set-inclusion order.

These replacements make the corresponding proofs more concise; thus, we have smoothly generalized the corresponding results to those in the frame-valued setting.

(2) In [29], Xu and Mao did not explore the relationship between various domains and locally super-compact sober spaces from the categorical perspective, while we established the isomorphisms of relevant categories in this paper. In the process of obtaining categorical results, Proposition 2.8 plays a key role, which is well-known in the classical case. But in the frame-valued case, this result is new and its proof is similar to that of the corresponding results (see [34, Proposition 4.5]), which relies on the continuity of the way-below relation.

(3) In [20], in order to obtain that the category of continuous dcpos is reflective in that of continuous posets, Mislove jointly used Scott open sets and Scott closed sets. But in the frame-valued context, the table of truth-values does not satisfy the law of double negation, there is no natural way to switch between open sets and closed sets. So different ideas and techniques are needed. Notice that in the classical case, the collection of points and that of irreducible closed sets are order-isomorphic. Therefore, we used the points in terms of open sets to obtain the corresponding results.

(4) The main results in Section 5 are new even for the classical case. The notions of directed completions and round-ideal completions of continuous poset appeared in [21] and [12], respectively. By means of the locally super-compactness of spectral topology, we obtained Theorem 6.6 which reveals the relationship between directed completion and sobrification. Specifically, in the classical setting, we obtain that a poset  $Q$  is a directed completion of a continuous poset  $P$  if and only if  $(Q, \sigma(Q))$  is a sobrification of  $(P, \sigma(P))$ . By Example 6.9, we also obtained the relationship between the directed completion and the round ideal completion. But these connections were not fully revealed in [12], [20] and [21]. Our work has built a bridge between the work of [12], [20] and [21] to some extent.

## Acknowledgment

This paper is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (12231007, 12371462), Jiangsu Provincial Innovative and Entrepreneurial Tal-



ent Support Plan (JSSCRC2021521).

## References

- [1] A. Bishop, A universal mapping property for a lattice completion, *Algebr. Univ.* 6 (1976) 81–84.
- [2] M. Barr, C. Wells, *Category Theory for Computing Science* (3rd edition), Prentice Hall, 1990.
- [3] J. Clarka, R. Wisbauer, Idempotent monads and  $\star$ -functors, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 215 (2011) 145–153.
- [4] A. Day, Filter monads, continuous lattices and closure systems, *Can. J. Math.* 27 (1975) 50–59.
- [5] M.H. Escardó, R.C. Flagg, Semantic Domains, injective spaces and monad: extended abstract, *Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.* 20 (1999) 229–244.
- [6] L. Fan, A new approach to quantitative domain theory, *Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.* 45 (2001) 77–87.
- [7] G. Gierz, et al, *Continuous Lattices and Domains*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [8] J. Goubault-Larrecq, *Non-Hausdorff Topology and Domain Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.
- [9] J. Gutiérrez García, U. Höhle, T. Kubiak, A theory of quantale-enriched dcpos and their topologization, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 444 (2022) 103–130.
- [10] M. Hasegawa, J.P. Lemay, Traced monads and Hopf monads, *Compositionality* 5 (2023) 1–34.
- [11] U. Höhle, *Many-Valued Topology and Its Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, New York, 2001.
- [12] R. Hofmann, Continuous posets, prime spectra of completely distributive lattices and Hausdorff compactifications, in: B. Banaschewski, R. Hoffmann (Eds.), *Continuous Lattices*, *Lect. Notes Math.*, Vol. 871, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1981, pp. 159–208.
- [13] J.D. Lawson, The duality of continuous posets, *Houston J. Math.* 5 (1979) 357–386.

- [14] J.D. Lawson, The round ideal completion via sobrification, *Topol. Proc.* 22 (1997) 261–274.
- [15] J.D. Lawson, Encounters between topology and domain theory, in: K. Keimel et al (Eds.), *Domains and Processes, Semantic Structures in Computation*, Vol. 1, Springer, Dordrecht, 2001, pp. 1–32.
- [16] H. Lai, D. Zhang, G. Zhang, A comparative study of ideals in fuzzy orders, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 382 (2020) 1–28.
- [17] M.Y. Liu, Y.L. Yue, X.W. Wei, Frame-valued Scott open set monad and its algebras, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 460 (2023) 52–71.
- [18] M. Liu, B. Zhao, Two cartesian closed subcategories of fuzzy domains, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 238 (2014) 102–112.
- [19] M. Liu, B. Zhao, A non-frame valued Cartesian closed category of  $\text{liminf}$  complete fuzzy orders, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 321 (2017) 50–54.
- [20] M.W. Mislove, *Topology, domain theory and theoretical computer science*, *Topol. Appl.* 89 (1998) 3–59.
- [21] X.X. Mao, L.S. Xu, Representation theorems for directed completions of consistent algebraic  $L$ -domains, *Algebr. Univ.* 54 (2005) 435–447.
- [22] R. Noor, A.K. Srivastava, The categories  $L\text{-Top}_0$  and  $L\text{-Sob}$  as epireflective hulls, *Soft Comput.* 18 (2014) 1865–1871.
- [23] A. Pultr, S.E. Rodabaugh, Examples for different sobrieties in fixed-basis topology, in: S.E. Rodabaugh, E.P. Klement (Eds.), *Topological and Algebraic Structures in Fuzzy Sets: A Handbook of Recent Developments in the Mathematics of Fuzzy Sets*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 2003, pp. 427–440.
- [24] D.S. Scott, *Continuous lattices, Topos, Algebraic Geometry and Logic*, *Lect. Notes Math.*, Vol. 274, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972, pp. 97–136.
- [25] S.H. Su, Q.G. Li, Algebraic fuzzy directed-complete posets, *Neural Comput. Appl.* 21 (2012) 255–265.
- [26] S.H. Su, Q.G. Li, The category of algebraic  $L$ -closure systems, *J. Intell. Fuzzy Syst.* 33 (2017) 2199–2210.
- [27] K.Y. Wang, B. Zhao, Join-completions of  $L$ -ordered sets, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 199 (2012) 92–107.

- [28] L.C. Wang, X.N. Zhou, Q.G. Li, Topological representations of Lawson compact algebraic L-domains and Scott domains, *Algebr. Univ.* 84 (2023) 23.
- [29] L.S. Xu, X.X. Mao, Formal topological characterizations of various continuous domains, *Comput. Math. Appl.* 56 (2008) 444–452.
- [30] X.Q. Xu, J.B. Yang, Topological representations of distributive hypercontinuous lattices, *Chinese Ann. Math. (Ser., B)* 30 (2009) 199–206.
- [31] W. Yao, Quantitative domains via fuzzy sets: Part I: Continuity of fuzzy directed complete posets, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 161 (2010) 973–987.
- [32] W. Yao, An approach to fuzzy frames via fuzzy posets, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 190 (2011) 75–89.
- [33] W. Yao, A survey of fuzzifications of frames, the Papert-Papert-Isbell adjunction and sobriety, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 190 (2012) 63–81.
- [34] W. Yao, A categorical isomorphism between injective stratified fuzzy  $T_0$ -spaces and fuzzy continuous lattices, *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.* 24 (2016) 131–139.
- [35] W. Yao, F.G. Shi, Quantitative domains via fuzzy sets: Part II: Fuzzy Scott topology on fuzzy directed complete posets, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 173 (2011) 60–80.
- [36] J.C. Yu, D.X. Zhang, Continuous  $[0, 1]$ -lattices and injective  $[0, 1]$ -approach spaces, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 444 (2022) 49–78.
- [37] Z.X. Zhang, A general categorical reflection for various completions of closure spaces and  $\mathcal{Q}$ -ordered sets, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 473 (2023) 1–18.
- [38] D.X. Zhang, Sobriety of quantale-valued cotopological spaces, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 350 (2018) 1–19.
- [39] D.S. Zhao, Partical dcpo's and some applications, *Arch. Math.* 48 (2012) 243–260.
- [40] Q.Y. Zhang, L. Fan, Continuity in quantitative domains, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 154 (2005) 118–131.
- [41] D.S. Zhao, T.H. Fan, Dcpo-completion of posets, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 411 (2010) 2167–2173.
- [42] D.X. Zhang, Y.M. Liu,  $L$ -fuzzy version of Stone's representation theorem for distributive lattices, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 76 (1995) 259–270.
- [43] Z.X. Zhang, F.G. Shi, Q.G. Li, K. Wang, On fuzzy monotone convergence  $\mathcal{Q}$ -cotopological spaces, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 425 (2021) 18–33.