

FILTERS ON SOME CLASSES OF QUANTUM B-ALGEBRAS

MICHAL BOTUR, JAN PASEKA

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we continue the study of quantum B-algebras with emphasis on filters on integral quantum B-algebras. We then study filters in the setting of pseudo-hoops. First, we establish an embedding of a cartesian product of polars of a pseudo-hoop into itself. Second, we give sufficient conditions for a pseudohoop to be subdirectly reducible. We also extend the result of Kondo and Turunen to the setting of noncommutative residuated \vee -semilattices that, if prime filters and \vee -prime filters of a residuated \vee -semilattice A coincide, then A must be a pseudo MTL-algebra.

Keywords and phrases: quantale, quantum B-algebra, filter, prime filter, pseudo-hoop, pseudo MTL-algebra.

AMS Subject Classification: 03G12, 03G27, 06F07, 06F15, 06A35

1. INTRODUCTION

The term *quantale* was suggested by C.J. Mulvey at the Oberwolfach Category Meeting (see [23]) as "a quantization" of the term *locale*. Locales form an order-theoretic counterpart of topological spaces and are therefore able to describe commutative C^* -algebras. The main aim of C.J. Mulvey has been to find a substitute of locales which could play the same rôle for general C^* -algebras to establish a generalized Gelfand–Naimark duality for all C^* -algebras and study non-commutative topology. Quantales are also applied in linear and other substructural logics and automaton theory. An important moment in the development of the theory of quantales was the realization that quantales give a semantics for propositional linear logic in the same way as Boolean algebras give a semantics for classical propositional logic (see [18]). Quantales arise naturally as lattices of ideals, subgroups, or other suitable substructures of algebras, and then they are called *spectra*.

By definition, a *quantale* is a complete lattice Q with an associative multiplication \cdot that distributes over arbitrary joins. By the completeness of Q , there are left and right adjoint operations (called *residuals*) \rightarrow and \rightsquigarrow of \cdot such that

$$x \leq y \rightarrow z \text{ if and only if } x \cdot y \leq z \text{ if and only if } y \leq x \rightsquigarrow z. \quad (\text{R})$$

Both authors acknowledge the support by Austrian Science Fund (FWF): project I 1923-N25 and by ESF Project CZ.1.07/2.3.00/20.0051 Algebraic methods in Quantum Logic of the Masaryk University.



Note that, as was mentioned in [26] and [27], in any quantale the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned}
 y \rightarrow z &\leq (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z) \\
 y \rightsquigarrow z &\leq (x \rightsquigarrow y) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightsquigarrow z) \\
 y \leq z &\implies x \rightarrow y \leq x \rightarrow z \\
 x \leq y \rightarrow z &\iff y \leq x \rightsquigarrow z.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{QB}$$

This lead Rump and Yang in [27] to introduce *quantum B-algebras* which formalize the implicational part of the logic of quantales. Note that quantum B-algebras encompass pseudo-BCK algebras, partially ordered monoids with two residuals satisfying (R) and generalized pseudoeffect algebras. Moreover, in [27] they established a one-to-one correspondence between quantum B-algebras and so-called logical quantales.

In this paper, we continue the study of quantum B-algebras from [27, 26] with emphasis on filters on integral quantum B-algebras. Namely, the filter theory of logical algebras (see e.g. [15, 28]) plays an significant role in studying these algebras and the completeness of the corresponding non-classical logics. It is natural to consider filters of algebras which are corresponding to congruences and to investigate quotient algebras by such filters. Recall that, from a logical point of view, filters correspond to sets of provable formulas.

During the last decade study of many-valued reasoning a lot of noncommutative generalizations, which generalize MV-algebras developed by C.C. Chang [7], were introduced. Let us mention for example pseudo MV-algebras [16] (independently introduced also in [24] as generalized MV-algebras), pseudo BL-algebras [9, 10] and pseudo-hoops,[17]. We recall that pseudo BL-algebras are also a noncommutative generalization of P. Hájek's BL-algebras: a variety that is an algebraic counterpart of fuzzy logic [19]. Therefore, a pseudo BL-algebra is an algebraic presentation of a non-commutative generalization of fuzzy logic. These structures are studied also in the area of quantum structures, see [22].

However, as it was recently recognized, many of these notions have a very close connections with notions introduced already by B. Bosbach in his pioneering papers on various classes of semigroups: among others he introduced complementary semi-groups (today known as pseudo-hoops). A deep investigation of these structures can be found in his papers [2, 3]; more information is available in his recent papers [4, 5]. Nowadays, all these structures can be also studied under one common roof, as residuated lattices, [14]. The theory of filters, representations and normal-valued basic pseudo-hoops was studied in [6]. Now all these structures are intensively studied by many experts (see [20],[11], [1], [12]).

The paper is organized as follows. After introducing several necessary algebraic concepts as quantale or quantum B-algebra in Section 2 we introduce following [27, 26] a multiplication \cdot on the complete lattice $U(A)$ of upper subsets of a quantum B-algebra A that makes $U(A)$ a quantale. Filters on an integral quantum B-algebra A are exactly idempotent elements of $U(A)$.

In Section 3 we show that, for a filter F of an integral quantum B-algebra A , the set $U(F)$ of upper subsets of the filter F is a subquantale of the quantale $U(A)$ using a map $\mu_F : U(A) \rightarrow U(A)$. Further, we establish basic properties of the map μ_F .

In Section 4 we study filters in the setting of pseudo-hoops. First, we establish an embedding of a cartesian product of polars of a pseudo-hoop into itself. Second, we give sufficient conditions for a pseudohoop to be subdirectly reducible.

In Section 5 we extend the result of Kondo and Turunen (see [21]) to the setting of noncommutative residuated \vee -semilattices that, if prime filters and \vee -prime filters of a residuated \vee -semilattice A coincide, then A must be a pseudo MTL-algebra.

The terminology and symbols used here coincide in general with those used in [13].

2. BASIC NOTIONS

Now, let us proceed by stating the definitions, some of them well known.

A *quantum B-algebra* is a poset A with two binary operations \rightarrow and \rightsquigarrow satisfying conditions

$$\begin{aligned} y \rightarrow z &\leq (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow z) \\ y \rightsquigarrow z &\leq (x \rightsquigarrow y) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightsquigarrow z) \\ y \leq z &\implies x \rightarrow y \leq x \rightarrow z \end{aligned}$$

and the equivalence

$$x \leq y \rightarrow z \iff y \leq x \rightsquigarrow z$$

for all $x, y, z \in A$. A quantum B-algebra A is *unital* if A admits an element u , the *unit element*, which satisfies $u \rightarrow x = u \rightsquigarrow x = x$ for all $x \in A$. A unit element is unique.

The unit element reduces the relation \leq to the operations \rightarrow and \rightsquigarrow :

$$x \leq y \iff u \leq x \rightarrow y \iff u \leq x \rightsquigarrow y.$$

Thus, if the unit element u is the greatest element of A , the relation $x \leq y$ just means that $x \rightarrow y$ is true.

An *integral quantum B-algebra* or a *pseudo BCK-algebra* is a unital quantum B-algebra A such that u is the top element of A , i.e. $u = 1$.

A *residuated poset* is a partially ordered semigroup $(A; \cdot)$ with two binary operations \rightarrow and \rightsquigarrow which satisfy

$$x \cdot y \leq z \iff x \leq y \rightarrow z \iff y \leq x \rightsquigarrow z.$$

Every residuated poset is a quantum B-algebra. A residuated poset $(A; \cdot, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, \leq)$ is called *2-sided* if $x \cdot y \leq x$ and $x \cdot y \leq y$ for all $x, y \in A$. We say that residuated poset $(A; \cdot, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, \leq)$ is a *residuated \vee -semilattice* if $(A; \vee)$ is a semilattice with respect to the order \leq .

A *quantale* is a complete lattice Q with an associative binary multiplication satisfying

$$x \cdot \bigvee_{i \in I} x_i = \bigvee_{i \in I} x \cdot x_i \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\bigvee_{i \in I} x_i \right) \cdot x = \bigvee_{i \in I} x_i \cdot x$$

for all $x, x_i \in Q, i \in I$ (I is a set).

An element $x \in Q$ is called *idempotent* if $x \cdot x = x$. 1 denotes the greatest element of Q , 0 is the smallest element of Q . The set of all idempotent elements of a quantale Q is denoted by $\mathcal{E}(Q)$. We shall say that a quantale Q is said to be idempotent if $Q = \mathcal{E}(Q)$. In the event that Q has only one element we shall speak about a *trivial quantale*.

Since the operators $a \cdot -$ and $- \cdot b : Q \rightarrow Q, a, b \in Q$ preserve arbitrary suprema they have right adjoints. We shall denote them by $a \rightsquigarrow -$ and $b \rightarrow -$ respectively.

Let $a, b, c, a_i \in Q$. Then

$$a \rightsquigarrow (b \rightarrow c) = b \rightarrow (a \rightsquigarrow c),$$

$$\begin{aligned} a \rightarrow (b \rightarrow c) &= (ab) \rightarrow c, & b \rightsquigarrow (a \rightsquigarrow c) &= (ab) \rightsquigarrow c, \\ \left(\bigvee a_i\right) \rightarrow c &= \bigwedge (a_i \rightarrow c), & \left(\bigvee a_i\right) \rightsquigarrow c &= \bigwedge (a_i \rightsquigarrow c). \end{aligned}$$

Evidently, any quantale is a residuated poset and hence a quantum B-algebra.

Since every quantale Q is a complete lattice, the *inverse residuals*

$$\begin{aligned} a \rightarrow b &:= \bigwedge \{x \in Q \mid x \cdot a \geq b\} \\ a \rightsquigarrow b &:= \bigwedge \{x \in Q \mid a \cdot x \geq b\} \end{aligned}$$

are well-defined, too.

A non-zero element $c \in Q$ is *balanced* if it satisfies

$$c \cdot \bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i = \bigwedge_{i \in I} c \cdot x_i \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i\right) \cdot c = \bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i \cdot c$$

for all $x_i \in Q$, $i \in I$ (I is a set).

An element c of a complete lattice L is said to be *supercompact* if for any non-empty subset $X \subseteq L$, the inequality $c \leq \bigvee X$ implies that $c \leq x$ for some $x \in X$.

For every quantum B-algebra A , the upper sets $X \subseteq A$ (i. e. the subsets X with $a \geq b \in X$ implies $a \in X$) can be made into a quantale $U(A)$ by defining

$$X \cdot Y := \{a \in A \mid (\exists y \in Y)(y \rightarrow a) \in X\}.$$

It can be shown [27] that this gives an associative multiplication which distributes over set-theoretic joins. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} X \rightsquigarrow Z &:= \{y \in A \mid (\forall x \in X)(\forall z \in A)(x \rightsquigarrow z \geq y \implies z \in Z)\} \\ \text{and} \\ Y \rightarrow Z &:= \{x \in A \mid (\forall y \in Y)(\forall z \in A)(y \rightarrow z \geq x \implies z \in Z)\}. \end{aligned}$$

If A is a residuated poset then

$$\begin{aligned} X \cdot Y &= \{a \in A \mid (\exists x \in X)(\exists y \in Y)(x \cdot y \leq a)\}, \\ X \rightsquigarrow Z &:= \{y \in A \mid (\forall x \in X)(\forall z \in A)(x \cdot y \leq z \implies z \in Z)\} \\ \text{and} \\ Y \rightarrow Z &:= \{x \in A \mid (\forall y \in Y)(\forall z \in A)(x \cdot y \leq z \implies z \in Z)\}. \end{aligned}$$

In this case, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$ and any $x \in A$ we put $x^1 = x$ and $x^{n+1} = x^n \cdot x = x \cdot x^n$.

A *filter* F of a quantum B-algebra A is a non-empty set $F \in U(A)$ such that $F \cdot F \subseteq F$. Note that this is equivalent with $z \in A, y \in F, y \rightarrow z \in F$ yields $z \in F$ and that F is a non-empty upper subset of A . Recall also that any non-empty set $F \in U(A)$ that is idempotent is a filter. We denote by $\mathcal{F}(A)$ the set of all filters of A . Recall that any non-empty intersection of filters is again a filter and any directed union of filters is a filter.

For every non-empty subset $X \subseteq A$, the smallest filter of A containing X (i.e., the intersection of all filters $F \in \mathcal{F}(A)$ such that $X \subseteq F$) is called the *filter generated by* X and will be denoted by $[X]$.

If A is a residuated poset then

$$[X] = \{y \in A \mid y \geq x_1 \cdot x_2 \cdots x_n \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1 \text{ and } x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in X\}.$$

Moreover, for an 2-sided residuated poset A such that F is a filter and $a \in A$, $a \notin F$ we have that

$$[F \cup \{a\}] = \{y \in A \mid y \geq x_1 \cdot a \cdot x_2 \cdot a \cdots a \cdot x_n \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1 \\ \text{and } x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in F\}.$$

Furthermore, the set of supercompact elements of $U(A)$ coincides with the image of the embedding $A \hookrightarrow U(A)$ given by $x \mapsto \uparrow x$, and every balanced element of $U(A)$ is supercompact. Similarly, the embedding $U(A) \hookrightarrow U(U(A))$ is given by $X \mapsto \uparrow X$. A quantale Q is called *unital* if there is an element $e \in Q$ such that

$$e \cdot a = a = a \cdot e$$

for all $a \in Q$.

A *subquantale* S of Q is a subset of Q closed under all suprema and \cdot . S is said to be a trivial subquantale if $S = \{0\}$ or $S = Q$. A *quantic (nucleus) conucleus* on Q is a (closure) coclosure operator g such that $g(a) \cdot g(b) \leq g(a \cdot b)$ for all $a, b \in Q$. A quantic conucleus g is said to be trivial if $g(a) = a$ or $g(a) = 0$ for all $a \in Q$.

If g is a quantic conucleus on Q , then $Q_g = \{a \in Q \mid g(a) = a\}$ is a subquantale of Q . Moreover, if S is any subquantale of Q , then $S = Q_g$ for some quantic conucleus g .

3. FILTERS IN QUANTUM B-ALGEBRAS

In this section we show that, for a filter F of an integral quantum B-algebra A , the set $U(F)$ of upper subsets of the filter F is a subquantale of the quantale $U(A)$ using a map $\mu_F : U(A) \rightarrow U(A)$. Further, we establish basic properties of the map μ_F .

Let us put, for any $F \in U(A)$ and $X \in U(A)$, $\mu_F(X) = F \cap X$. Then, for any $F \in U(A)$, $\mu_F : U(A) \rightarrow U(A)$ is an order preserving idempotent map. Evidently, if $X, Y \in U(A)$, $X \subseteq Y$ then $\mu_F(X) = \mu_F(Y) \cap X = \mu_{\mu_F(Y)}(X)$ and $\mu_F(X) = F \cap X = F \cap (F \cap X) = \mu_F(\mu_F(X))$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let A be a quantum B-algebra, $X, Y, F \in U(A)$, F a filter of A . Then $\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(Y) \subseteq \mu_F(X \cdot Y)$. Moreover μ_F is a conucleus on $U(A)$ and the set $U(F) = \{U \in U(A) \mid U \subseteq F\} = \{\mu_F(X) \mid X \in U(A)\}$ equipped with the multiplication $\cdot_F = \cdot / U(F)$ is a subquantale of $U(A)$.*

Proof. Assume that $a \in A$ and $a \in \mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(Y)$. Then there is $y \in F \cap Y$ such that $y \rightarrow a \in F \cap X$. It follows that $a \in F \cdot F \subseteq F$ and $a \in X \cdot Y$. Therefore $a \in F \cap (X \cdot Y)$. The remaining part is evident. \square

In what follows let A be an integral quantum B-algebra. Note also that, for any $F \in U(A)$ and $X \in U(A)$ such that $1 \in X \cap F$, $F \cdot X \supseteq F \cup X$, $1 \in \mu_F(X) \rightarrow X$ and $1 \in \mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X$. In particular, F is a filter if and only if $F \cdot F = F$ and $1 \in F$. Moreover, for any $X \in U(A)$, $X = \{1\} \cdot X = X \cdot \{1\}$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let A be an integral quantum B-algebra, $X, Y, F \in U(A)$, F a filter of A . Then the following holds:*

- (1) $\mu_F(X) = \mu_{\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(X)}(X)$;
- (2) If $1 \in \mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$ then $\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X)) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(X) = \mu_F(X)$;
- (3) $\mu_F(X)$ is a filter of A iff $1 \in \mu_F(X) \cap \mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$.

Proof. (1) Let $z \in \mu_{\mu_F(X), \mu_F(X)}(X) = (\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(X)) \cap X$. Then $z \in X$ and $z \in (F \cap X) \cdot (F \cap X) \subseteq F$. Hence $z \in \mu_F(X)$. Conversely, let $z \in \mu_F(X)$. Then $1 \in \mu_F(X)$ and $z \in [z] \cdot [1] \subseteq (F \cap X) \cdot (F \cap X)$ and $z \in X$. It follows that $z \in \mu_{\mu_F(X), \mu_F(X)}(X)$.

(2) Evidently, $\mu_F(X) \subseteq \mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)) \cdot \mu_F(X)$. To show the converse direction let us compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)) \cdot \mu_F(X) &\subseteq \\ \mu_F(X) \cdot (\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)) \cdot \mu_F(X) &\subseteq \mu_F(X) \cdot (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \subseteq F. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu_F(X) \subseteq F$ and $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)) \subseteq F$ we get that $\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)) \cdot \mu_F(X) \subseteq F$. It follows that

$$\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)) \cdot \mu_F(X) \subseteq \mu_F(X).$$

(3) Evidently, if $1 \in \mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$ then $\{1\} \subseteq \mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$. This yields that $\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(X) = \mu_F(X) \cdot \{1\} \cdot \mu_F(X) \subseteq \mu_F(X) \cdot (\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)) \cdot \mu_F(X) \subseteq \mu_F(X)$. Since $1 \in \mu_F(X)$ we get that $\mu_F(X)$ is a filter of A .

Conversely, let $\mu_F(X)$ be a filter of A . Then $\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(X) \subseteq \mu_F(X) \subseteq X$. It follows that $\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(X) \subseteq \mu_F(X) \subseteq \mu_F(X) \rightarrow X$. By the same reasoning $1 \in \mu_F(X) \subseteq \mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Let A be an integral quantum B-algebra, $X, Y, F \in U(A)$, F a filter of A and $1 \in X \cap F$. Then the following holds*

- (1) $\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) = \mu_F(X) = \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(X)$;
- (2) $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \rightarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) = \mu_F(X) \rightarrow X$;
- (3) $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) \rightsquigarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) = \mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X$;
- (4) $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) = \mu_F(X) \rightarrow X$;
- (5) $(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) = \mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X$;
- (6) $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) = \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$ and $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$ is a filter of A whenever $1 \in \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$.
- (7) $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) = \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X)$ and $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X)$ is a filter of A whenever $1 \in \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X)$.

Proof. (1) Since $1 \in \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) \cap \mu_F(X)$ we obtain that $\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) \supseteq \mu_F(X)$. Conversely, we have $\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) \subseteq (\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(X) \subseteq X$ and $\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) \subseteq F \cdot F \subseteq F$. It follows that $\mu_F(X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X) \subseteq \mu_F(X)$. The remaining part follows by analogous considerations.

(2) $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \rightarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) = (\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(X)) \rightarrow X = \mu_F(X) \rightarrow X$.

(3) As in (2).

(4) Since $1 \in \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cap (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$ we get $(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \supseteq \mu_F(X) \rightarrow X$. To prove the converse direction let us compute:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) &= \\ (\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \rightarrow (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) &\subseteq \\ \mu_F(X) \rightarrow X. & \end{aligned}$$

Whence $(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) = \mu_F(X) \rightarrow X$.

(5) As in (4).

(6) Evidently, $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \supseteq \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$. Conversely, we have

$$\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \subseteq \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot (\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) = \mu_F(X) \rightarrow X$$

and $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \subseteq F \cdot F \subseteq F$. Consequently, we obtain that $1 \in \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) = \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$. It follows that $\mu_F(\mu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$ is a filter of A .

(7) As in (6). \square

4. FILTERS ON PSEUDO-HOOPS

In the present section we study filters in the setting of pseudo-hoops. First, we establish an embedding of a cartesian product of polars of a pseudo-hoop \mathbf{A} into \mathbf{A} . Second, we give sufficient conditions for a pseudo-hoop to be subdirectly reducible.

We recall that according to [17], a *pseudo-hoop* is an algebra $\mathbf{M} = (M; \cdot, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$ of type $\langle 2, 2, 2, 0 \rangle$ such that, for all $x, y, z \in M$,

- (i) $x \cdot 1 = x = 1 \cdot x$;
- (ii) $x \rightarrow x = 1 = x \rightsquigarrow x$;
- (iii) $(x \cdot y) \rightarrow z = x \rightarrow (y \rightarrow z)$;
- (iv) $(x \cdot y) \rightsquigarrow z = y \rightsquigarrow (x \rightsquigarrow z)$;
- (v) $(x \rightarrow y) \cdot x = (y \rightarrow x) \cdot y = x \cdot (x \rightsquigarrow y) = y \cdot (y \rightsquigarrow x)$ (divisibility).

It can be easily checked that any pseudo-hoop is a residuated poset, see e.g. [8, Proposition 2.1].

If \cdot is commutative (equivalently $\rightarrow = \rightsquigarrow$), \mathbf{M} is said to be a *hoop*. If we set $x \leq y$ iff $x \rightarrow y = 1$ (this is equivalent to $x \rightsquigarrow y = 1$), then \leq is a partial order such that $x \wedge y = (x \rightarrow y) \cdot x = x \cdot (x \rightsquigarrow y)$ and \mathbf{M} is a \wedge -semilattice.

We say that a pseudo-hoop \mathbf{M}

- (i) is *bounded* if there is a least element 0, otherwise, \mathbf{M} is *unbounded*,
- (ii) satisfies *prelinearity* if, given $x, y \in M$, $(x \rightarrow y) \vee (y \rightarrow x)$ and $(x \rightsquigarrow y) \vee (y \rightsquigarrow x)$ are defined in \mathbf{M} and they are equal 1,
- (iii) is *cancellative* if $x \cdot y = x \cdot z$ and $s \cdot x = t \cdot x$ imply $y = z$ and $s = t$,
- (iv) is a *pseudo BL-algebra* if \mathbf{M} is a bounded lattice satisfying prelinearity.

For a pseudo BL-algebra, we define $x^- = x \rightarrow 0$ and $x^\sim = x \rightsquigarrow 0$. A pseudo BL-algebra is said to be a pseudo MV-algebra if $x^{-\sim} = x = x^{\sim-}$ for every $x \in M$.

From (v) of the definition of pseudo-hoops we have that a pseudo hoop is cancellative iff $x \cdot y \leq x \cdot z$ and $s \cdot x \leq t \cdot x$ imply $y \leq z$ and $s \leq t$.

Let us have a pseudo-hoop $\mathbf{A} = (A; \cdot, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$. Then we for any set $M \subseteq A$ define the set $M^\perp = \{x \in A \mid x \vee y = 1 \text{ for any } y \in M\}$. One can easily check that following conditions hold:

- 1) $M \subseteq N$ yields $N^\perp \subseteq M^\perp$,
- 2) $M \subseteq M^{\perp\perp}$,
- 3) $M^\perp = M^{\perp\perp\perp}$.

Consequently, ${}^{\perp\perp}$ is a closure operator on the subsets of A . If $x_1 \vee y = x_2 \vee y = 1$ then we can compute $x_1 x_2 \vee y = x_1 x_2 \vee x_1 y \vee y = x_1(x_2 \vee y) \vee y = x_1 \vee y = 1$. Thus, the set M^\perp is a filter for any $M \subseteq A$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathbf{A} = (A; \cdot, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$ be a pseudo-hoop and let $x, y \in A$ be such that $x \vee y = 1$ then $x \cdot y = x \wedge y = y \cdot x$ and $x \rightarrow y = x \rightsquigarrow y = y$.*

Proof. Assume that $x, y \in A$ are such that $x \vee y = 1$. Then, for any $z \in A$, we have $z \leq y$ iff $z \leq 1 \rightarrow y$ iff $z \leq (x \vee y) \rightarrow y$ iff $z \cdot (x \vee y) \leq y$ iff $z \cdot x \vee z \cdot y \leq y$ iff $z \cdot x \leq y$ iff $z \leq x \rightarrow y$. It follows that $y = x \rightarrow y$. By symmetry, $x = y \rightarrow x$.

Due to divisibility we can compute $y \cdot x = (x \rightarrow y) \cdot x = x \wedge y = (y \rightarrow x) \cdot y = x \cdot y$. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\mathbf{A} = (A; \cdot, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$ be a pseudo-hoop and let us have any set $M \subseteq A$. Then the mapping $f : M^\perp \times M^{\perp\perp} \rightarrow A$ defined by $f(x, y) = x \wedge y$ is a embedding from $\mathbf{M}^\perp \times \mathbf{M}^{\perp\perp}$ to \mathbf{A} .*

Proof. If $f(x_1, y_1) = f(x_2, y_2)$ for any $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in M^\perp \times M^{\perp\perp}$ then $x_1 \wedge y_1 = x_2 \wedge y_2$ and also $x_i \vee y_j = 1$ for any $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$.

Firstly we prove that the mapping f is a injection. We can compute $y_1 = y_1 \cdot 1 = y_1 \cdot (x_1 \vee y_2) = y_1 \cdot x_1 \vee y_1 \cdot y_2 = x_2 \cdot y_2 \vee y_1 \cdot y_2 = (x_2 \vee y_1) \cdot y_2 = 1 \cdot y_2 = y_2$. Thus $y_2 = y_1$. By symmetry, $x_1 = x_2$.

Due to the Lemma 4.1 we can compute, for any $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in M^\perp \times M^{\perp\perp}$, $f(x_1, y_1) \cdot f(x_2, y_2) = (x_1 \wedge y_1) \cdot (x_2 \wedge y_2) = (x_1 \cdot y_1) \cdot (x_2 \cdot y_2) = x_1 \cdot (y_1 \cdot x_2) \cdot y_2 = x_1 \cdot x_2 \cdot y_1 \cdot y_2 = (x_1 \cdot x_2) \wedge (y_1 \cdot y_2) = f(x_1 \cdot x_2, y_1 \cdot y_2)$.

Moreover, for any $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in M^\perp \times M^{\perp\perp}$ and any $z \in A$, $z \leq (x_1 \cdot y_1) \rightarrow x_2$ iff $z \cdot x_1 \cdot y_1 \leq x_2$ iff $z \cdot x_1 \leq y_1 \rightarrow x_2$ iff (by Lemma 4.1) $z \cdot x_1 \leq x_2$ iff $z \leq x_1 \rightarrow x_2$. It follows that $(x_1 \cdot y_1) \rightarrow x_2 = x_1 \rightarrow x_2$. Similarly, $(y_1 \cdot x_1) \rightarrow y_2 = y_1 \rightarrow y_2$.

This yields, for any $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in M^\perp \times M^{\perp\perp}$ and any $z \in A$, $z \leq f(x_1, y_1) \rightarrow f(x_2, y_2)$ iff $z \cdot x_1 \cdot y_1 \leq x_2 \wedge y_2$ iff $z \cdot x_1 \cdot y_1 \leq x_2$ and $z \cdot x_1 \cdot y_1 \leq y_2$ iff $z \leq x_1 \cdot y_1 \rightarrow x_2$ and $z \leq x_1 \cdot y_1 \rightarrow y_2$ iff $z \leq x_1 \rightarrow x_2$ and $z \leq y_1 \rightarrow y_2$ iff $z \leq (x_1 \rightarrow x_2) \wedge (y_1 \rightarrow y_2)$. Since $x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \in M^\perp$ and $y_1 \rightarrow y_2 \in M^{\perp\perp}$ we get that $f(x_1, y_1) \rightarrow f(x_2, y_2) = f(x_1 \rightarrow x_2, y_1 \rightarrow y_2)$. Analogously, we can prove $f(x_1, y_1) \rightsquigarrow f(x_2, y_2) = f(x_1 \rightsquigarrow x_2, y_1 \rightsquigarrow y_2)$. \square

The previous Theorem shows that $M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}$ is both a filter and a sub hoop of \mathbf{A} . Moreover, the sub hoop $M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}$ is directly reducible. The idea of our research leads us to decide whether some $a \in A$ belongs to the sub hoop $M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}$ or not. If $a \in M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}$ then $a = x \wedge y$, where x is minimal in M^\perp with $a \leq x$ and analogously y is minimal in $M^{\perp\perp}$ with $a \leq y$. Those facts are motivation for following definition.

Definition 4.3. *Let F be any filter in a pseudo-hoop $\mathbf{A} = (A; \cdot, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$. Then for any $X \subseteq A$ we define $\nu_F(X) := \{a \in F \mid x \leq a \text{ for any } x \in X\}$. If there is the least element of the set $\nu_F(X)$ then we denote it by $\hat{\nu}_F(X)$.*

Note that, for any $X \subseteq A$, $\nu_F(X)$ is a set of upper bounds of X that are in F . It follows that $\nu_F(X) = \mu_F(\{z \in A \mid z \text{ is an upper bound of } X\})$. In particular, $\nu_F(X)$ is an upper set such that $1 \in \nu_F(X)$.

In what follows we denote for any subsets $X, Y \subseteq A$, where $\mathbf{A} = (A; \cdot, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$ is a pseudo-hoop, the following sets

$$\begin{aligned} X \cdot Y &= \{x \cdot y \mid x \in X, y \in Y\}, \\ X \rightarrow Y &= \{x \rightarrow y \mid x \in X, y \in Y\}, \\ X \rightsquigarrow Y &= \{x \rightsquigarrow y \mid x \in X, y \in Y\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.4. *Let F be a filter in the pseudo-hoop $\mathbf{A} = (A; \cdot, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$ and let $X \subseteq A$. Then the sets $\nu_F(\nu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$ and $\nu_F(\nu_F(X) \rightsquigarrow X)$ are a filters.*

If $\hat{\nu}_F(x)$ exists for some $x \in A$ then also $\hat{\nu}_F(\hat{\nu}_F(x) \rightarrow x)$ and $\hat{\nu}_F(\hat{\nu}_F(x) \rightsquigarrow x)$ exist and moreover $\hat{\nu}_F(\nu_F(x) \rightarrow x)$ and $\hat{\nu}_F(\nu_F(x) \rightsquigarrow x)$ are idempotent.

Proof. It is enough to verify the statement for the implication \rightarrow . The remaining case for \rightsquigarrow can be shown dually. Now, let us prove first that

$$\nu_F(\nu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \nu_F(X) = \nu_F(X)$$

for any $X \subseteq A$. Clearly, we have $1 \in \nu_F(\nu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$ and thus $\nu_F(\nu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \nu_F(X) \supseteq \nu_F(X)$ holds.

Conversely, assume that $a \in \nu_F(\nu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$ and $b \in \nu_F(X)$. Then $a, b \in F$ and $b \rightarrow x \leq a$ for all $x \in X$. Consequently $x = x \wedge b = (b \rightarrow x) \cdot b \leq a \cdot b$ for all $x \in X$. Because $a \cdot b \in F$ (both a and b belong to F) also $a \cdot b \in \nu_F(X)$. Hence $\nu_F(\nu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \nu_F(X) \subseteq \nu_F(X)$. Together we obtain $\nu_F(\nu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \nu_F(X) = \nu_F(X)$.

One can easily check that the set equality $A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C) = (A \cdot B) \rightarrow C$ holds. Thus we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_F(\nu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \rightarrow (\nu_F(X) \rightarrow X) &= (\nu_F(\nu_F(X) \rightarrow X) \cdot \nu_F(X)) \rightarrow X \\ &= \nu_F(X) \rightarrow X. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting $Y := \nu_F(X) \rightarrow X$ in the previous equality we obtain

$$\nu_F(\nu_F(Y) \rightarrow Y) = \nu_F(Y),$$

which together with $\nu_F(\nu_F(Y) \rightarrow Y) \cdot \nu_F(Y) = \nu_F(Y)$ gives

$$\nu_F(Y) \cdot \nu_F(Y) = \nu_F(Y).$$

Thus $\nu_F(Y) = \nu_F(\nu_F(X) \rightarrow X)$ is a filter.

If the element $\hat{\nu}_F(x)$ exists and if $x \leq y$ then clearly $y \leq y \vee \hat{\nu}_F(x) \in F$. Moreover, any $a \in F$ such that $y \leq a$ satisfies $x \leq a$ and consequently $\hat{\nu}_F(x) \leq a$. Thus $y \vee \hat{\nu}_F(x) \leq y \vee a = a$ holds and we have proved that $\hat{\nu}_F(y)$ exists and that $\hat{\nu}_F(y) = y \vee \hat{\nu}_F(x)$.

Because $x \leq \hat{\nu}_F(x) \rightarrow x$ then $\hat{\nu}_F(\hat{\nu}_F(x) \rightarrow x) = (\hat{\nu}_F(x) \rightarrow x) \vee \hat{\nu}_F(x)$ exists and it is the least element of the filter $\nu_F(\nu_F(\{x\}) \rightarrow \{x\})$. Thus $\hat{\nu}_F(\hat{\nu}_F(x) \rightarrow x)$ is an idempotent element. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\mathbf{A} = (A; \cdot, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$ be a pseudo-hoop and let $F \subseteq A$ be a filter with a least element then F is a normal filter.*

Proof. If $a = \bigwedge F$ is the least element of the filter F then it is an idempotent element. Using the divisibility we obtain for any $x \in A$

$$\begin{aligned} x \cdot a &= (x \cdot a) \wedge a \\ &= a \cdot (a \rightsquigarrow (x \cdot a)) \\ &= a \cdot a \cdot (a \rightsquigarrow (x \cdot a)) \\ &= a \cdot (a \wedge (x \cdot a)) \\ &= a \cdot x \cdot a. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 a \cdot x &= (a \cdot x) \wedge a \\
 &= (a \rightarrow (a \cdot x)) \cdot a \\
 &= (a \rightarrow (a \cdot x)) \cdot a \cdot a \\
 &= (a \wedge (a \cdot x)) \cdot a \\
 &= a \cdot x \cdot a.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence $a \cdot x = x \cdot a$ holds.

Finally, $x \rightarrow y \in F$ if, and only if, $a \leq x \rightarrow y$ if, and only if, $x \cdot a = a \cdot x \leq y$ if, and only if, $a \leq x \rightsquigarrow y$ if, and only if, $x \rightsquigarrow y \in F$. Thus F is a normal. \square

Theorem 4.6. *Let $\mathbf{A} = (A; \cdot, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$ be a pseudo-hoop and let $M \subseteq A$. If there is an element $x \notin M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}$ such that $\hat{\nu}_{M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}}(x)$ exists then \mathbf{A} is subdirectly reducible.*

Proof. Let us assume that the element $\hat{\nu}_{M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}}(x)$ exists. Then we denote the idempotent

$$y := \hat{\nu}_{M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}}(\hat{\nu}_{M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}}(x) \rightarrow x).$$

We will show that $y \notin M^\perp, M^{\perp\perp}$.

Assume to the contrary that $y \in M^\perp$. Then for any $a \in M^{\perp\perp}$ we have $a \vee (\nu_{M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}}(x) \rightarrow x) = a \vee y = 1$ and thus $\nu_{M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}}(x) \rightarrow x \in M^\perp \subseteq M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}$. Clearly, also $\nu_{M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}}(x) \in M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}$ and thus $(\nu_{M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}}(x) \rightarrow x) \cdot \nu_{M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}}(x) \leq x \in M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}$ which is absurd. Analogously it can be proved that $y \notin M^{\perp\perp}$.

Because $y \in M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}$, there exist elements $1 \neq y_1 \in M^\perp$ and $1 \neq y_2 \in M^{\perp\perp}$ such that $y = y_1 \wedge y_2$ (see Theorem 4.2). Clearly, Theorem 4.2 shows that $\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle$ is an idempotent element in $M^\perp \times M^{\perp\perp}$ (because y is an idempotent in $M^\perp \cdot M^{\perp\perp}$). Consequently, both y_1 and y_2 are idempotent too.

Lemma 4.5 shows that $\mathcal{F}(y_1)$ and $\mathcal{F}(y_2)$ are a normal filters. Moreover $y_1 \vee y_2 = 1$ yields $\mathcal{F}(y_1) \cap \mathcal{F}(y_2) = \{1\}$ and thus \mathbf{A} is subdirectly reducible. \square

5. SEVERAL TYPES OF PRIME FILTERS IN RESIDUATED \vee -SEMILATTICES

In the paper [15] Van Gasse et al. asked whether, for any commutative residuated lattice L , if prime filters and \vee -prime filters coincide, then L must be an MTL-algebra. The affirmative answer was given in [21] by Kondo and Turunen. We extend their result to the setting of noncommutative residuated semilattices.

Definition 5.1. *Let A be a residuated \vee -semilattice. A filter F of A is called a \rightarrow -prime filter (\rightsquigarrow -prime filter) if $x \rightarrow y \in F$ or $y \rightarrow x \in F$ ($x \rightsquigarrow y \in F$ or $y \rightsquigarrow x \in F$) for all $x, y \in A$. A filter F of A is said to be a prime filter if it is both a \rightarrow -prime filter and a \rightsquigarrow -prime filter. A filter F of A is called a \vee -prime filter if $x \vee y \in F$ yields $x \in F$ or $y \in F$ for all $x, y \in A$. By $\mathcal{PF}(A)$ ($\mathcal{PF}_{\rightarrow}(A)$, $\mathcal{PF}_{\rightsquigarrow}(A)$, $\mathcal{PF}_{\vee}(A)$, respectively) we mean the class of all prime filters of L (\rightarrow -prime filters, \rightsquigarrow -prime filters, \vee -prime filters, respectively).*

Lemma 5.2. *Let A be an integral residuated \vee -semilattice. Then*

- (1) $\mathcal{PF}_{\rightarrow}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{PF}_{\vee}(A)$;
- (2) $\mathcal{PF}_{\rightsquigarrow}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{PF}_{\vee}(A)$;

$$(3) \mathcal{PF}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{PF}_\vee(A).$$

Proof. 1. Let $F \in \mathcal{PF}_\rightarrow(A)$, $x, y \in A$, $x \vee y \in F$. Then $x \rightarrow y \in F$ or $y \rightarrow x \in F$. Assume first that $x \rightarrow y \in F$. Clearly, $1 = y \rightarrow y \in F$. Hence also $(x \rightarrow y) \cdot (y \rightarrow y) \leq (x \rightarrow y) \wedge (y \rightarrow y) = (x \vee y) \rightarrow y \in F$. It follows that $((x \vee y) \rightarrow y) \cdot (x \vee y) \leq y \in F$. Similarly, $y \rightarrow x \in F$ yields that $x \in F$.

2. It follows by corresponding reasonings as in (1) applied to \rightsquigarrow .

3. It follows from the fact that $\mathcal{PF}(A) = \mathcal{PF}_\rightarrow(A) \cap \mathcal{PF}_{\rightsquigarrow}(A)$. \square

Definition 5.3. Let A be an integral residuated \vee -semilattice. A is called a \rightarrow -MTL-algebra (a \rightsquigarrow -MTL-algebra, respectively) if $(x \rightarrow y) \vee (y \rightarrow x) = 1$ ($(x \rightsquigarrow y) \vee (y \rightsquigarrow x) = 1$, respectively) for all $x, y \in A$. A is said to be a pseudo MTL-algebra if A is both a \rightarrow -MTL-algebra and a \rightsquigarrow -MTL-algebra.

Lemma 5.4. Let A be an integral residuated \vee -semilattice. Then

- (1) If A is a \rightarrow -MTL-algebra then $\mathcal{PF}_\rightarrow(A) = \mathcal{PF}_\vee(A)$.
- (2) If A is a \rightsquigarrow -MTL-algebra then $\mathcal{PF}_{\rightsquigarrow}(A) = \mathcal{PF}_\vee(A)$;
- (3) If A is a pseudo MTL-algebra then $\mathcal{PF}(A) = \mathcal{PF}_\vee(A)$.

Proof. 1. Let $F \in \mathcal{PF}_\vee(A)$, $x, y \in A$. Since $(x \rightarrow y) \vee (y \rightarrow x) = 1 \in F$ we have that $x \rightarrow y \in F$ or $y \rightarrow x \in F$. It follows that $F \in \mathcal{PF}_\rightarrow(A)$.

2. It follows by corresponding reasonings as in (1) applied to \rightsquigarrow .

3. Let A be a pseudo MTL-algebra. Then we have by (1) and (2) that $\mathcal{PF}_\rightarrow(A) = \mathcal{PF}_\vee(A)$ and $\mathcal{PF}_{\rightsquigarrow}(A) = \mathcal{PF}_\vee(A)$. It follows that $\mathcal{PF}_{\rightsquigarrow}(A) = \mathcal{PF}_\rightarrow(A) = \mathcal{PF}(A) = \mathcal{PF}_\vee(A)$. \square

Theorem 5.5. (The Prime filter theorem for 2-sided residuated \vee -semilattices). Let A be a 2-sided residuated \vee -semilattice, F be a filter of A and $a \notin F$. Then there exists a \vee -prime filter G of A that includes F and does not contain a .

Proof. Let G be a maximal filter containing F that does not contain a . Let us show that G is \vee -prime. Assume that $x, y \in A$, $x \vee y \in G$ and $x, y \notin G$. Then, by maximality of G , we get that

$$a \in [G \cup \{x\}] = \{z \in A \mid z \geq u_1 \cdot x \cdot u_2 \cdot x \cdots x \cdot u_n \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1 \text{ and } u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n \in G\}.$$

and

$$a \in [G \cup \{y\}] = \{z \in A \mid z \geq v_1 \cdot y \cdot v_2 \cdot y \cdots y \cdot v_m \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq 1 \text{ and } v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m \in G\}.$$

This yields that there are $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $m, n \geq 1$ and $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m \in G$ such that $u_1 \cdot x \cdot u_2 \cdot x \cdots x \cdot u_n \leq a$ and $v_1 \cdot y \cdot v_2 \cdot y \cdots y \cdot v_m \leq a$. Let us put $k = \max\{m, n\}$ and $w = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m} u_i \cdot v_j$. Then $w \in G$. We also put $w_i = w$ for all $i \leq k$.

Evidently, $(wx)^k = w_1 \cdot x \cdot w_2 \cdot x \cdots x \cdot w_k \leq u_1 \cdot x \cdot u_2 \cdot x \cdots x \cdot u_n \leq a$ and $(wy)^k = w_1 \cdot y \cdot w_2 \cdot y \cdots y \cdot w_k \leq v_1 \cdot y \cdot v_2 \cdot y \cdots y \cdot v_m \leq a$.

Let us compute the element $c = [w(x \vee y)]^{2k} \in G$. First, for any subset $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, 2k\}$ we put $c_S = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq 2k} (w \cdot z_i)$, where $z_i = x$ if $i \in S$ and $z_i = y$ otherwise. Clearly, if $\text{card}(S) \geq k$ then $c_S \leq (wx)^k \leq a$ and similarly if $\text{card}(S) \leq k$ then $c_S \leq (wy)^k \leq a$. Since $c = \bigvee_{S \subseteq \{1, \dots, 2k\}} c_S$ we get that $c \leq a$, i.e. $a \in G$, a contradiction. \square

We then have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.6. *Any filter of a 2-sided residuated \vee -semilattice is equal to the intersection of the prime filters that include it.*

Theorem 5.7. *Let A be an integral residuated \vee -semilattice. Then*

- (1) *A is a \rightarrow -MTL-algebra if and only if $\mathcal{PF}_{\rightarrow}(A) = \mathcal{PF}_{\vee}(A)$.*
- (2) *A is a \rightsquigarrow -MTL-algebra if and only if $\mathcal{PF}_{\rightsquigarrow}(A) = \mathcal{PF}_{\vee}(A)$;*
- (3) *A is a pseudo MTL-algebra if and only if $\mathcal{PF}(A) = \mathcal{PF}_{\vee}(A)$.*

Proof. 1. \implies : It follows from Lemma 5.4, (i).

\impliedby : Assume that $\mathcal{PF}_{\rightarrow}(A) = \mathcal{PF}_{\vee}(A)$ and that A is not a \rightarrow -MTL-algebra. Hence there are $a, b \in A$ such that $(a \rightarrow b) \vee (b \rightarrow a) \neq 1$. Let $G_1 = \bigcap \{G \in \mathcal{F}(A) \mid G \neq \{1\}\}$. Assume first that $G_1 = \{1\}$. Then there exists a \vee -prime filter P such that $(a \rightarrow b) \vee (b \rightarrow a) \notin P$. Since P is also a \rightarrow -prime filter we have that $(a \rightarrow b) \in P$ or $(b \rightarrow a) \in P$, i.e., $(a \rightarrow b) \vee (b \rightarrow a) \in P$ which yields a contradiction.

Second, assume that $G_1 \neq \{1\}$. Then $\{1\}$ is a \vee -prime filter, hence a \rightarrow -prime filter. It follows that either $1 \leq a \rightarrow b$ or $1 \leq b \rightarrow a$, i.e., $(a \rightarrow b) \vee (b \rightarrow a) = 1$, a contradiction again.

2. It follows by the same arguments as in part 1.

3. It follows from parts 1 and 2. □

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This is a pre-print of an article published in International Journal of Theoretical Physics. The final authenticated version of the article is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10773-015-2608-0>.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Aglianò and F. Montagna: Varieties of BL-algebras I: general properties, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **181** (2003), 105–129.
- [2] B. Bosbach: Komplementäre Halbgruppen. Axiomatik und Arithmetik, Fund. Math. **64** (1966), 257–287.
- [3] B. Bosbach: Komplementäre Halbgruppen. Kongruenzen and Quotienten, Fund. Math. **69** (1970), 1–14.
- [4] B. Bosbach: Residuation groupoids - again Results in Math. **53** (2009), 27–51.
- [5] B. Bosbach: Divisibility groupoids - again, Results in Math. **57** (2010), 257–285.
- [6] M. Botur, A. Dvurečenskij and T. Kowalski: On normal-valued basic pseudo-hoops, Soft Computing, **16** (2012), 635–644.
- [7] C.C. Chang: Algebraic analysis of many valued logics. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **88** (1958), 467–490.
- [8] L.C. Ciungu: Non-commutative Multiple-Valued Logic Algebras, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, 2014.
- [9] A. Di Nola, G. Georgescu, and A. Iorgulescu: Pseudo-BL algebras I, Multiple Val. Logic **8** (2002), 673–714.
- [10] A. Di Nola, G. Georgescu, and A. Iorgulescu: Pseudo-BL algebras II, Multiple Val. Logic **8** (2002), 715–750.
- [11] A. Dvurečenskij: Aglianò–Montagna type decomposition of linear pseudo-hoops and its applications, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **211** (2007), 851–861.
- [12] A. Dvurečenskij, R. Giuntini, and T. Kowalski: On the structure of pseudo BL-algebras and pseudo-hoops in quantum logics, Found. Phys. **40** (2010), 1519–1542. DOI:10.1007/s10701-009-9342-5
- [13] N. Galatos, P. Jipsen, T. Kowalski and H. Ono: Residuated Lattices: An Algebraic Glimpse at Substructural Logics, Elsevier Studies in Logic and Foundations, 2007.

- [14] N. Galatos and C. Tsinakis: Generalized MV-algebras. *J. Algebra* **283** (2005), 254–291.
- [15] B. Van Gasse, G. Deschrijver, C. Cornelis and E. E. Kerre: Filters of residuated lattices and triangle algebras, *Information Sciences* **180** (2010), 3006–3020.
- [16] G. Georgescu and A. Iorgulescu: Pseudo MV algebras, *Mult.-Valued Log.* **6** (2001), 95–135.
- [17] G. Georgescu, L. Leuştean and V. Preoteasa: Pseudo-hoops, *J. Mult.-Val. Log. Soft Comput.* **11** (2005), 153–184.
- [18] J.-Y. Girard: Linear logic, *Theoretical Computer Science* **50** (1997), 1–102.
- [19] P. Hájek: *Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1998.
- [20] P. Jipsen and F. Montagna: On the structure of generalized BL-algebras, *Algebra Universalis* **55** (2006), 226–237.
- [21] M. Kondo, E. Turunen: Prime Filters on Residuated Lattices, In *IEEE 43rd International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic 2012*, (2013), 89–91, doi:10.1109/ISMVL.2012.40.
- [22] R. Mesiar, O. Nánásiová, Z. Riečanová and J. Paseka: Special issue - Quantum structures: Theory and applications, *Inform. Sci.* **179** (2009), 475–477.
- [23] C. J. Mulvey: §, *Suppl. Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo ser. II* **12** (1986), 99–104.
- [24] J. Rachůnek: A non-commutative generalization of MV-algebras, *Czechoslovak Math. J.* **52** (2002), 255–273.
- [25] K. J. Rosenthal: *Quantales and their applications*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series 234, Longman Scientific & Technical, 1990.
- [26] W. Rump: Quantum B-algebras, *Cent. Eur. J. Math.* **11** (2013), 1881–1899.
- [27] W. Rump and Y. C. Yang: Non-commutative logical algebras and algebraic quantales, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* **165** (2014), 759–785.
- [28] Y. Zhu and Y. Xu, On filter theory of residuated lattices, *Information Sciences*, **180** (2010), 3614–3632.

PALACKÝ UNIVERSITY OLMOUC, FACULTY OF SCIENCES, TR. 17.LISTOPADU 1192/12, OLMOUC
771 46, CZECH REPUBLIC

E-mail address: `michal.botur@upol.cz`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, MASARYK UNIVERSITY,
KOTLÁŘSKÁ 2, 611 37 BRNO, CZECH REPUBLIC

E-mail address: `paseka@math.muni.cz`