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ABSTRACT. The purpose of this paper is to introduce and study the concepts of fuzzy $e$-open set, fuzzy $e$-continuity and fuzzy $e$-compactness in intuitionistic fuzzy topological spaces. After giving the fundamental concepts of intuitionistic fuzzy sets and intuitionistic fuzzy topological spaces, we present intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open sets and intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-continuity and other results related topological concepts. Several preservation properties and some characterizations concerning intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compactness have been obtained.

1. Introduction

The fuzzy concept has invaded almost all branches of Mathematics since the introduction of the concept of fuzzy set by Zadeh [11]. Fuzzy sets have applications in many fields such as information [13] and control [14]. The theory of fuzzy topological spaces was introduced and developed by Chang [3] and since then various notions in classical topology have been extended to fuzzy topological spaces. The initiations of $e$-open sets, $e^a$-open sets, $a$-open sets, $e$-continuity and $e$-compactness in topological spaces are due to Ekici [6-10]. In fuzzy topology, $e$-open sets were introduced by Seenivasan in 2014 [12]. In this paper we generalize this notion to intuitionistic fuzzy spaces and also the concepts of intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open sets, intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-continuity and intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compactness and study their properties in detail.
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Intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open set are weaker than intuitionistic fuzzy $\delta$-pre open set, intuitionistic fuzzy $\delta$-semi open set and stronger then intuitionistic fuzzy $\beta$-open sets. It may be possible to obtain stronger forms of the existing results in ordinary topological spaces as well as in fuzzy topological spaces. Our motivation in this paper, using intuitionistic fuzzy sets, we put this concepts in the intuitionistic fuzzy setting, then defining intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open set, intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-continuity and intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compactness are studied. Several preservation properties and some characterizations concerning intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compactness have been obtained.

2. Preliminaries

First we shall present the fundamental definitions obtained by K. Atanassov and D. Coker.

**Definition 2.1** ([2]). Let $X$ be a nonempty fixed set. An intuitionistic fuzzy set (IFS, for short) $A$ is an object having the form $A = \{(x, \mu_A(x), \nu_A(x)) : x \in X\}$ where the functions $\mu_A : X \to I$ and $\nu_A : X \to I$ denote the degree of membership (namely $\mu_A(x)$) and the degree of nonmembership (namely $\nu_A(x)$) of each element $x \in X$ to the set $A$ respectively, and $0 \leq \mu_A(x) + \nu_A(x) \leq 1$ for each $x \in X$.

Obviously, every fuzzy set $A$ on a nonempty set $X$ is an IFS having the form

$$A = \{(x, \mu_A(x), 1 - \mu_A(x)) : x \in X\}.$$  

**Definition 2.2** ([2]). Let $X$ be a nonempty set and the IFS’s $A$ and $B$ be in the form

$$A = \{(x, \mu_A(x), \nu_A(x)) : x \in X\},$$

$$B = \{(x, \mu_B(x), \nu_B(x)) : x \in X\},$$

and let $A = \{A_j : j \in J\}$ be an arbitrary family of IFS’s in $X$, then

(i) $A \leq B$ iff $\forall x \in X \ [\mu_A(x) \leq \mu_B(x)$ and $\nu_A(x) \geq \nu_B(x)];$

(ii) $A = \{(x, \nu_A(x), \mu_A(x)) : x \in X\};$

(iii) $\bigwedge A_j = \{(x, \wedge \mu_{A_j}(x), \vee \nu_{A_j}(x)) : x \in X\};$

(iv) $\bigvee A_j = \{(x, \vee \mu_{A_j}(x), \wedge \nu_{A_j}(x)) : x \in X\};$

(v) $\underline{1} = \{(x, 1, 0) : x \in X\}$ and $\underline{0} = \{(x, 0, 1) : x \in X\};$

(vi) $\overline{A} = A, \overline{\underline{1}} = 1$ and $\overline{\underline{0}} = \underline{0}.$

**Definition 2.3** ([3]). Let $X$ and $Y$ be two nonempty sets and $f : X \to Y$ be a function.

(i) If $B = \{(y, \mu_B(y), \nu_B(y)) : y \in X\}$ is an IFS in $Y$, then the preimage of $B$ under $f$ denoted and defined by

$$f^{-1}(B) = \{(f^{-1}(\mu_B)(x), f^{-1}(\nu_B)(x)) : x \in X\};$$
(ii) If \( A = \{ (x, \lambda_A(x), \nu_A(x)) : x \in X \} \) is an IFS in \( X \), then the image of \( A \) under \( f \) denoted and defined by
\[
f(A) = \{ (y, f(\lambda_A)(y), f(\nu_A)(y)) : y \in Y \},
\]
where
\[
f(\lambda_A)(y) = \begin{cases} 
\sup_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \lambda_A(x), & \text{if } f^{-1}(y) \neq 0, \\
0, & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
\]
and
\[
f(\nu_A)(y) = \begin{cases} 
\inf_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \nu_A(x), & \text{if } f^{-1}(y) \neq 0, \\
1, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

**Corollary 2.4** (\([\mathbb{II}]\)). Let \( A, A_j (j \in J) \) be IFS’s in \( X \), \( B, B_j (j \in J) \) be IFS’s in \( Y \) and \( f : X \rightarrow Y \) be a function. Then
\[
\begin{align*}
(i) & \quad A_1 \leq A_2 \Rightarrow f(A_1) \leq f(A_2); \\
(ii) & \quad B_1 \leq B_2 \Rightarrow f^{-1}(B_1) \leq f^{-1}(B_2); \\
(iii) & \quad A \leq f^{-1}(f(A)) \quad \text{(If } f \text{ is one-to-one, then } A = f^{-1}(f(A)); \\
(iv) & \quad f(f^{-1}(B)) \leq B \quad \text{(If } f \text{ is onto, then } f(f^{-1}(B)) = B); \\
(v) & \quad f^{-1}(\emptyset) = \emptyset \text{ and } f^{-1}(A \cup B) = f^{-1}(A) \cup f^{-1}(B); \\
(vi) & \quad f^{-1}(\emptyset) = \emptyset \text{ if } f \text{ is onto and } f(\emptyset) = \emptyset; \\
(vii) & \quad f^{-1}(B) = f^{-1}(B).
\end{align*}
\]

Now, we mention the definition of intuitionistic fuzzy points and also some basic results related to it.

**Definition 2.5** (\([\mathbb{III}]\)). Let \( X \) be a nonempty set and \( c \in X \) a fixed element in \( X \). If \( a \in (0, 1] \) and \( b \in [0, 1) \) are two fixed real numbers such that \( a + b \leq 1 \), then the IFS \( c(a, b) = \langle x, c, 1 - c \rangle \) is called an intuitionistic fuzzy point (IFP, for short) in \( X \), where \( c \) denotes the degree of membership of \( c(a, b) \), and \( c \in X \) the support of \( c(a, b) \).

**Definition 2.6** (\([\mathbb{III}]\)). Let \( c(a, b) \) be an IFP in \( X \) and \( A = \langle x, \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle \) an IFS in \( X \). Suppose further that \( a, b \in (0, 1), c(a, b) \) is said to be properly contained in \( A \) (\( c(a, b) \in A \) for short) iff \( a < \mu_A(c) \) and \( b > \nu_A(c) \).

**Definition 2.7** (\([\mathbb{III}]\)),
\[
(i) \quad \text{An IFP } c(a, b) \text{ in } X \text{ is said to be quasi-coincident with the IFS } A = \langle x, \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle, \text{ denoted by } c(a, b)qA, \text{ iff } a > \nu_A(c) \text{ or } b < \mu_A(c).
\]
\[
(ii) \quad \text{Let } A = \langle x, \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle \text{ and } B = \langle x, \mu_B, \nu_B \rangle \text{ be two IFS’s in } X. \text{ Then, } A \text{ and } B \text{ are said to be quasi-coincident, denoted by } AqB, \text{ iff there exists an element } x \in X \text{ such that } \mu_A(x) > \nu_B(x) \text{ or } \nu_A(x) < \mu_B(x).
\]

**Proposition 2.8.** Let \( f : X \rightarrow Y \) be a function and \( c(a, b) \) be an IFP in \( X \).
(i) If for IFS B in Y we have \(f(c(a, b))qB\), then \(c(a, b)qf^{-1}(B)\).
(ii) If for IFS A in X we have \((c(a, b)qA)\), then \(f(c(a, b))qf(A)\).

Proof. 
(i) Let \(f(c(a, b))qB\) for IFS B in Y. Then \(a > \nu_B(f(c))\) or \(b < \mu_B(f(c))\). (equivalently, \((f(c))_a > \nu_B\) or \((1 - f(c))_b < \mu_B\). This gives that \(a > f^{-1}(\nu_B)(c)\) or \(b < f^{-1}(\mu_B)(c)\) (equivalently, \(c_a > f^{-1}(\nu_B)\) or \(1 - c_b < f^{-1}(\mu_B)\) which implies \(c(a, b)qf^{-1}(B)\).
(ii) Let \(c(a, b)qA\), for IFS A in X. Then \(a > \nu_A(c)\) or \(b < \mu_A(c)\). This implies \(a > \inf_{x \in f^{-1}(f(c))} \nu_A(x)\) or \(b < \sup_{x \in f^{-1}(f(c))} \mu_A(x)\) which gives \(a > \inf_{(\nu_A)(f)} c\) or \(b < \sup_{(\mu_A)(f)} c\). Thus we have \(f(c(a, b))qf(A)\).

\[\square\]

Proposition 2.9. Let A be an IFS in IFTS in X and \((c(a, b))\) be an IFP in X. If \((c(a, b)) \in A\), then \((c(a, b))qA\).

Proof. Let \((c(a, b)) \in A\), then \(a < \mu_A(c)\) and \(b > \nu_A(c)\) which implies \((c(b, a))qA\).

\[\square\]

Here we give the definitions of intuitionistic fuzzy topological space and some types of intuitionistic fuzzy continuity introduced by Coker [5]. Also, some of results is of interest.

Definition 2.10 ([5]). An intuitionistic fuzzy topology (IFT, for short) on a nonempty set X is a family \(\Psi\) of IFS’s in X satisfying the following axioms:

(i) \(\emptyset, 1 \in \Psi\);
(ii) \(A_1 \land A_2 \in \Psi\) for any \(A_1, A_2 \in \Psi\);
(iii) \(\lor A_j \in \Psi\) for any \(\{A_j : j \in J\} \subseteq \Psi\).

In this case the pair \((X, \Psi)\) is called an intuitionistic fuzzy topological space (IFTS, for short) and each IFS in \(\Psi\) is known as an intuitionistic fuzzy open set (IFOS, for short) in X.

Definition 2.11 ([5]). The complement \(\overline{A}\) of IFOS A in IFTS(X, \(\Psi)\) is called an intuitionistic fuzzy closed set (IFCS, for short).

Definition 2.12 ([5]). Let \((X, \Psi)\) be an IFTS and \(A = (x, \mu_A(x), \nu_A(x))\) be an IFS in X. Then the fuzzy closure and fuzzy interior of A are denoted and defined by: \(cl(A) = \land\{K : K\ \text{is an IFCS in X and} \ A \leq K\}\) and \(int(A) = \lor\{G : G\ \text{is an IFOS in X and} \ A \leq G\}\).

Definition 2.13 ([17]). Let A be IFS in an IFTS \((X, \Psi)\). A is called an

(i) intuitionistic fuzzy regular open set (briefly IFROS) if \(A = intel(A)\).
(ii) intuitionistic fuzzy regular closed set (briefly IFRCS) if \( A = clint(A) \).

**Definition 2.14.** Let \((X, \Psi)\) be an IFTS and \( A = \langle x, \mu_A(x), \nu_A(x) \rangle \) be a family in \( X \). Then the fuzzy \( \delta \)-closure of \( A \) are denoted and defined by 
\[
cl_\delta(A) = \bigwedge \{ K : K \text{ is an IFRCS in } X \text{ and } A \subseteq K \}
\]
and 
\[
int_\delta(A) = \bigvee \{ G : G \text{ is an IFROS in } X \text{ and } G \subseteq A \}.
\]

**Definition 2.15.** Let \((X, \Psi)\) and \((Y, \phi)\) be IFTS’s. A function \( f : (X, \Psi) \to (Y, \phi) \) is called intuitionistic fuzzy continuous [1] if \( f^{-1}(B) \) is an IFRS for every \( B \in \Phi \).

**Definition 2.16 ( [1] ).** Let \( X \) be an IFTS. A family \( \{ \langle x, \mu_G, \nu_G \rangle | i \in I \} \) of IFOS’s in \( X \) satisfying the condition \( \bigcup \{ \langle x, \mu_G, \nu_G \rangle | i \in I \} = 1 \) is called an intuitionistic fuzzy open cover of \( X \).

A finite subfamily of an intuitionistic fuzzy open cover \( \{ \langle x, \mu_G, \nu_G \rangle | i \in I \} \) which is also an intuitionistic fuzzy open cover of \( X \) is called a finite subcover of \( \{ \langle x, \mu_G, \nu_G \rangle | i \in I \} \).

An IFTS \( X \) is called intuitionistic fuzzy compact if and only if every intuitionistic fuzzy open cover has a finite subcover.

**Definition 2.17 ( [1] ).** Let \( A \) be an IFS in an IFTS \( X \). A family \( \{ \langle x, \mu_G, \nu_G \rangle | i \in I \} \) of IFOS’s in \( X \) satisfying the condition \( A \subseteq \bigcup \{ \langle x, \mu_G, \nu_G \rangle | i \in I \} \) is called an intuitionistic fuzzy open cover of \( A \).

A finite subfamily of an intuitionistic fuzzy open cover \( \{ \langle x, \mu_G, \nu_G \rangle | i \in I \} \) of \( A \) which is also an intuitionistic fuzzy open cover of \( A \) is called a finite subcover of \( \{ \langle x, \mu_G, \nu_G \rangle | i \in I \} \).

An IFS \( A = \langle x, \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle \) in an IFTS \( X \) is called intuitionistic fuzzy compact if and only if every intuitionistic fuzzy open cover of \( A \) have a finite subcover.

3. **Intuitionistic Fuzzy \( e \)-open Sets**

Now we introduce the following definition.

**Definition 3.1.** Let \( A \) be an IFS in an IFTS \((X, \Psi)\). \( A \) is called an intuitionistic fuzzy \( \delta \)-semiopen (resp. \( \delta \)-preopen, \( \beta \)-open) set (IF\( \delta \)SO (resp. IF\( \delta \)PO, IF\( \beta \)O), for short), if \( A \leq cl(int_\delta(A)) \) (resp. \( A \leq int(cl_\delta(A)) \), \( A \leq cl(int(cl_\delta(A))) \)). \( A \) is called an intuitionistic fuzzy \( \delta \)-semiclosed (resp. \( \delta \)-preclosed, \( \beta \)-closed) set (IF\( \delta \)SC (resp. IF\( \delta \)PC, IF\( \beta \)C) (for short)) if \( A \geq int(cl_\delta(A)) \) (resp. \( A \geq cl(int_\delta(A)) \), \( A \geq int(cl(int_\delta(A))) \)).

**Definition 3.2.** Let \( A \) be an IFS in an IFTS \((X, \Psi)\). The intuitionistic fuzzy \( \delta \)-semi-closure (\( \delta \)-semi-interior) (resp. \( \delta \)-pre-closure (\( \delta \)-pre-interior)) of \( A \) is denoted by \( scl_\delta(A) \) (\( sint_\delta(A) \)) (resp. \( pcl_\delta(A) \) (\( pint_\delta(A) \))) and defined as follows:
(i) $\text{scl}_\delta(A)(\text{pcl}_\delta(A)) = \{ K : K \text{ is an IF} \delta \text{SCS (resp. IF} \delta \text{PCS) in } X \text{ and } A \leq K \}$,
(ii) $\text{sint}_\delta(A)(\text{pint}_\delta(A)) = \{ G : G \text{ is an IF} \delta \text{SOS (resp. IF} \delta \text{POS) in } X \text{ and } G \leq A \}$.

It is clear that $A$ is an IF$\delta$SCS (resp. IF$\delta$PCS, IF$\delta$SOS, IF$\delta$POS) iff $A = \text{scl}_\delta(A)$ (resp. $A = \text{pcl}_\delta(A)$, $A = \text{sint}_\delta(A)$, $A = \text{pint}_\delta(A)$).

**Theorem 3.3.** Let $A$ be an IFS in an IFTS $(X, \Psi)$, then
(i) $\text{pcl}_\delta(A) \geq A \lor \text{cl} (\text{int}_\delta(A))$ and $\text{pint}_\delta(A) \leq A \land \text{int} (\text{cl}_\delta(A));$
(ii) $\text{scl}_\delta(A) \geq A \lor \text{int} (\text{cl}_\delta(A))$ and $\text{sint}_\delta(A) \leq A \land \text{cl} (\text{int}_\delta(A)).$

**Proof.** We will prove only the first statement of (i) and the second is similar. Since $\text{pcl}_\delta(A)$ is IF$\delta$PCS, we have
$\text{cl}(\text{int}_\delta(A)) \leq \text{clint}_\delta(\text{pcl}_\delta(A)) \leq \text{pcl}_\delta(A)$. Thus $A \lor \text{cl}(\text{int}_\delta(A)) \leq \text{pcl}_\delta(A)$. □

**Definition 3.4.** Let $(X, \Psi)$ and $(Y, \phi)$ be IFTS’s. A function $f : (X, \Psi) \rightarrow (Y, \Phi)$ is called intuitionistic fuzzy $\delta$-semicontinuous (resp. $\delta$-precontinuous, $\beta$-continuous) (IF$\delta$semi-cont. (resp. IF$\delta$pre-cont., IF$\beta$-cont. for short)) if $f^{-1}(B)$ is an IF$\delta$SO (resp. IF$\delta$PO, IF$\beta$OS) for every $B \in \Phi$.

In the sequel, we introduce and study in IFTS’s the concept of fuzzy e-open (closed) sets which generalized the concepts of IFOS’s (IFCS’s).

**Definition 3.5.** Let $A$ be an IFS in an IFTS $(X, \Psi)$. $A$ is called
(i) an intuitionistic fuzzy e-open set (IFeOS, for short) in $X$ if $A \leq \text{clint}_\delta(A) \lor \text{intcl}_\delta(A),$
(ii) an intuitionistic fuzzy e-closed set (IFeCS, for short) in $X$ if $A \geq \text{clint}_\delta(A) \land \text{int}_\delta(A),$
(iii) an intuitionistic fuzzy $e^*$-open set (IFe$^*$OS, for short) in $X$ if $A \leq \text{clint}_\delta(A),$
(iv) an intuitionistic fuzzy $a$-open set (IFaOS, for short) in $X$ if $A \leq \text{intclint}_\delta(A).$

**Remark 3.6.** From the above definition and some types of IFOS’s, we have the following diagram:

The converse of the above implications need not be true in general as shown by the following examples:
Example 3.7. Let $X = \{a, b\}$ and

\[ A = \left\langle x, \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.3}{0.2} \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.5}{0.5} \end{array} \right) \right\rangle, \]
\[ B = \left\langle x, \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.3}{0.5} \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.7}{0.2} \end{array} \right) \right\rangle. \]

Then the family $\Psi = \{0, 1, A\}$ is an IFT on $X$. Since $B \leq \text{clintl}(B) = \overline{A}$ and $B \leq \text{clintl}_\delta(B) = \overline{A}$ then $B$ is an IF\(\beta\)OS and IFeOS in $X$, but not IFeOS since $B \not\subseteq \text{clintl}_\delta(B) \cup \text{intcl}_\delta(B) = 0 \cup A = A$.

Example 3.8. Let $X = \{a, b\}$ and

\[ A = \left\langle x, \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.2}{0.1} \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.7}{0.5} \end{array} \right) \right\rangle, \]
\[ B = \left\langle x, \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.3}{0.5} \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.7}{0.2} \end{array} \right) \right\rangle. \]

Then the family $\Psi = \{0, 1, A\}$ is an IFT on $X$. Since $B \leq \text{clintl}_\delta(B) \cup \text{intcll}_\delta(B) = \overline{A} \cup A = \overline{A}$, $B$ is an IFeOS, and IF\(\beta\)OS but not IF\(\delta\)POS, and IFeOS hence $B \not\subseteq \text{clintl}_\delta(B) = A$ and $B \not\subseteq \text{intcll}_\delta(B) = A$.

Example 3.9. Let $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and

\[ A = \left\langle x, \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0}{0.2} \\ \frac{0}{0.7} \\ \frac{0}{1} \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ b \\ c \\ d \end{array} \right) \right\rangle, \]
\[ B = \left\langle x, \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0}{0.2} \\ \frac{0}{0.7} \\ \frac{0}{1} \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ b \\ c \\ d \end{array} \right) \right\rangle, \]
\[ C = \left\langle x, \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0}{0.2} \\ \frac{0}{0.7} \\ \frac{0}{1} \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ b \\ c \\ d \end{array} \right) \right\rangle. \]

Then the family $\Psi = \{0, 1, A, B, A \cup B\}$ is an IFT on $X$. Since $C \leq \text{clintl}_\delta(C) \cup \text{intcll}_\delta(C) = 0 \cup 1 = 1$, $C$ is an IFeOS, but not IF\(\delta\)OS, hence $C \not\subseteq \text{clintl}_\delta(C) = 0$.

Example 3.10. Let $X = \{a, b\}$ and

\[ A = \left\langle x, \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.5}{0.5} \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.3}{0.5} \end{array} \right) \right\rangle, \]
\[ B = \left\langle x, \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.7}{0.2} \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ \frac{0.3}{0.2} \end{array} \right) \right\rangle. \]

Then the family $\Psi = \{0, 1, A\}$ is an IFT on $X$. Since $B \leq \text{clintl}(B) = 1$ then $B$ is an IF\(\beta\)OS in $X$ but not IFeOS. Since $B \not\subseteq \text{clintl}_\delta(B) = 0$.

Example 3.11. Refer to Example 3.8. C \leq \text{intcll}_\delta(C) = 1$, $C$ is an IF\(\delta\)POS, but not IFOS.
Example 3.12. Refer to Example 3.8. \(B \leq clint_\delta(B) = \overline{A}, B\) is an IF\(\delta\)SOS, but not IF\(\delta\)OS.

Remark 3.13. (i) It is clear that the union of any family of IFeOS’s is IFeOS.
(ii) The intersection of two IFeOS’s need not be IFeOS as illustrated by the following example.

Example 3.14. Refer to Example 3.8. \(B\) is an IF eOS and also
\[C = \langle x, \left(\frac{a}{0.1}, \frac{b}{0.2}\right), \left(\frac{a}{0.1}, \frac{b}{0.1}\right) \rangle,\]
is an IFeOS, since \(C \leq clint_\delta(C) \vee intcl_\delta(C) = \overline{A} \vee A = \overline{A}.\) But
\[B \wedge C = \langle x, \left(\frac{a}{0.1}, \frac{b}{0.2}\right), \left(\frac{a}{0.7}, \frac{b}{0.2}\right) \rangle,\]
is not IFeOS, since \(B \wedge C \not\leq clint_\delta(B \wedge C) \vee intcl_\delta(B \wedge C) = \emptyset \vee A = A.\)

Proposition 3.15. Let \(A\) be an IFS in an IFTS \((X, \Psi)\).
(i) If \(A\) is an IFeOS and \(int_\delta(A) = \emptyset\), then \(A\) is an IF\(\delta\)POS.
(ii) If \(A\) is an IFeOS and \(cl_\delta(A) = \emptyset\), then \(A\) is an IF\(\delta\)SOS.
(iii) If \(A\) is an IFeOS and IF\(\delta\)CS, then \(A\) is an IF\(\delta\)SOS.
(iv) If \(A\) is an IF\(\delta\)SOS and IF\(\delta\)CS, then \(A\) is an IFeOS.

Proof. (i) Let \(A\) be an IFeOS, that is
\[A \leq clint_\delta(A) \vee intcl_\delta(A) = \emptyset \vee intcl_\delta(A) = intcl_\delta(A).\]
Hence \(A\) is an IF\(\delta\)POS.
(ii) Follows from (i).
(iii) Let \(A\) be an IFeOS and IF\(\delta\)CS, that is
\[A \leq clint_\delta(A) \vee intcl_\delta(A) = clint_\delta(A) \vee int(A) = clint_\delta(A).\]
Hence \(A\) is an IF\(\delta\)SOS.
(iv) Let \(A\) be an IF\(\delta\)SOS and IF\(\delta\)CS, that is
\[A \leq clint_\delta(A) \leq clint_\delta(A) \vee intcl_\delta(A).\]
Hence \(A\) is an IFeOS.
\[\square\]

Theorem 3.16. Let \(A\) be an IFS in an IFTS \((X, \Psi)\), \(A\) is an IFeOS if and only if \(A = pint_\delta(A) \vee sint_\delta(A).\)

Proof. Let \(A\) be an IFeOS. Then \(A \leq cl(int_\delta(A)) \vee int(cl_\delta(A)).\) By Theorem 3.3, we have
\[pint_\delta(A) \vee sint_\delta(A) = (A \wedge int(cl_\delta(A))) \vee (A \wedge cl(int_\delta(A)))\]
\[= A \wedge (int(cl_\delta(A)) \vee cl(int_\delta(A)))\]
\[= A.\]
Conversely, if \( A = \text{pint}_\delta(A) \lor \text{sint}_\delta(A) \) then, by Theorem 3.18,
\[
A = \text{pint}_\delta(A) \lor \text{sint}_\delta(A) \\
= (A \land \text{int}(\text{cl}_\delta(A))) \lor (A \land \text{cl}(\text{int}_\delta(A))) \\
= A \land (\text{int}(\text{cl}_\delta(A)) \lor \text{cl}(\text{int}_\delta(A))) \\
\leq \text{int}(\text{cl}_\delta(A)) \lor \text{cl}(\text{int}_\delta(A)),
\]
and hence \( A \) is an IFeOS.

**Definition 3.17.** Let \((X, \Psi)\) be an IFTS and \( A = \langle x, \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle \) be an IFS in \( X \). Then the intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-interior and intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-closure are defined and denoted by:

\[
\text{cl}_e(A) = \land \{ K : K \text{ is an IFeCS in } X \text{ and } A \leq K \},
\]
and

\[
\text{int}_e(A) = \lor \{ G : G \text{ is an IFeOS in } X \text{ and } G \leq A \}.
\]

It is clear that \( A \) is an IFeCS (IFeOS) in \( X \) iff \( A = \text{cl}_e(A)(A = \text{int}_e(A)) \).

**Proposition 3.18.** For any IFS \( A \) in an IFTS \((X, \Psi)\) we have:

(i) \( \text{cl}_e(A) = \overline{\text{int}_e(A)} \), \( \text{int}_e(A) = \overline{\text{cl}_e(A)} \).

(ii) \( \text{cl}_e(A \lor B) \geq \text{cl}_e(A) \lor \text{cl}_e(B) \), \( \text{int}_e(A \lor B) \geq \text{int}_e(A) \lor \text{int}_e(B) \).

(iii) \( \text{cl}_e(A \land B) \leq \text{cl}_e(A) \land \text{cl}_e(B) \), \( \text{int}_e(A \land B) \leq \text{int}_e(A) \land \text{int}_e(B) \).

**Remark 3.19.** The inclusion of the results (ii) and in the above Proposition can not be replaced by equality. In the following example we shall shown one of them.

**Example 3.20.** Let \( X = \{a, b, c, d\} \) and

\[
A = \left\{ x, \left( \frac{a}{1 \cdot 0 \cdot 0.2 \cdot 0}, \frac{b}{0.1 \cdot 0.7 \cdot 1} \right), \left( \frac{a}{0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0.2 \cdot 0}, \frac{b}{0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0.7 \cdot 1} \right) \right\},
\]
\[
B = \left\{ x, \left( \frac{a}{1 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 1}, \frac{b}{0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0.2 \cdot 0} \right), \left( \frac{a}{0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 1}, \frac{b}{0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0.2 \cdot 0} \right) \right\},
\]
\[
C = \left\{ x, \left( \frac{a}{1 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 1}, \frac{b}{0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0.2 \cdot 0} \right), \left( \frac{a}{0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0.2 \cdot 0}, \frac{b}{0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0.7 \cdot 1} \right) \right\},
\]
\[
D = \left\{ x, \left( \frac{a}{1 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 1}, \frac{b}{0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0.2 \cdot 0} \right), \left( \frac{a}{0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 1}, \frac{b}{0 \cdot 0 \cdot 0.2 \cdot 0} \right) \right\}.
\]

Then the family \( \Psi = \{0, 1, A, B, A \lor B\} \) is an IFT on \( X \). Notice that \( C \) and \( D \) are IFeCS’s in \( X \), then \( \text{cl}_e(C) = C \) and \( \text{cl}_e(D) = D \). But \( \text{cl}_e(C \lor D) = 1 \) (obviously, \( C \lor D \) is not IFeCS). Then

\( 1 = \text{cl}_e(C \lor D) \nsubsetneq \text{cl}_e(C) \lor \text{cl}_e(D) = C \lor D \).

**Proposition 3.21.** For any IFS \( A \) in an IFTS \((X, \Psi)\), we have:

(i) \( \text{cl}_e(A) \geq \text{cl} \text{int}_\delta(A) \land \text{int}_\delta(A) \).
(ii) \( \text{int}_e(A) \subseteq \text{clint}_\delta(A) \lor \text{intcl}_\delta(A) \).

**Proof.**

(i) \( \text{cl}_e(A) \) is an IFeCS and \( A \subseteq \text{cl}_e(A) \), then
\[
\text{cl}_e(A) \geq \text{clint}_\delta \text{cl}_e(A) \land \text{intcl}_\delta \text{cl}_e(A) \geq \text{clint}_\delta(A) \land \text{intcl}_\delta(A).
\]

(ii) Follows from (i) by taking the complementation.

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 3.22.** Let \( A \) be an IFS in an IFTS \((X, \Psi)\), then
\[
\text{cl}_e(A) = \text{pcl}_\delta(A) \land \text{scl}_\delta(A).
\]

**Proof.** It is obvious that, \( \text{cl}_e(A) \subseteq \text{pcl}_\delta(A) \land \text{scl}_\delta(A) \). Conversely, from Definition 3.17 we have
\[
\text{cl}_e(A) \geq \text{cl}(\text{int}_\delta(\text{cl}_e(A))) \land \text{int}(\text{cl}_\delta(\text{cl}_e(A))) \geq \text{cl}(\text{int}_\delta(A)) \land \text{int}(\text{cl}_\delta(A)).
\]

Since \( \text{cl}_e(A) \) is IFeOS, by Theorem 3.21, we have
\[
\text{pcl}_\delta(A) \land \text{scl}_\delta(A) = (A \lor \text{cl}(\text{int}_\delta(A))) \land (A \lor \text{int}(\text{cl}_\delta(A)))
= A \lor (\text{cl}(\text{int}_\delta(A)) \land \text{int}(\text{cl}_\delta(A)))
= A \leq \text{cl}_e(A).
\]

\[ \square \]

4. **Intuitionistic Fuzzy \( e \)-continuity**

**Definition 4.1.** A function \( f : (X, \Psi) \to (Y, \Phi) \) is called an

(i) intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-continuous (IFe-cont., for short) if \( f^{-1}(B) \)

is an IFeOS in \( X \), for every \( B \in \Phi \).

(ii) intuitionistic fuzzy \( e^* \)-continuous (IFe*-cont., for short) if \( f^{-1}(B) \)

is an IFe*OS in \( X \), for every \( B \in \Phi \).

(iii) intuitionistic fuzzy \( a \)-continuous (IFa-cont., for short) if \( f^{-1}(B) \)

is an IFaOS in \( X \), for every \( B \in \Phi \).

From the above definition and some known types of intuitionistic fuzzy continuity, one can show the following diagram:

Now, the following examples shows that the converses of these implications are not true in general.
Example 4.2. Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$, $Y = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and

$$A = \langle x, \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ 0.3 & 0.1 & 0.4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.4 \end{pmatrix} \rangle,$$

$$B = \langle x, \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ 0.3 & 0.2 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.4 \end{pmatrix} \rangle,$$

$$C = \langle y, \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ 0.4 & 0.4 & 0.3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ 0.4 & 0.5 & 0.4 \end{pmatrix} \rangle.$$

Now, the family $\Psi = \{0, 1, A, B\}$ of IFS’s in $X$ is an IFT on $X$ and the family $\Phi = \{0, 1, C\}$ of IFS’s in $Y$ is an IFT on $Y$. If we define the function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ by $f(a) = 3$, $f(b) = 1$, $f(c) = 2$ then

$$f^{-1}(C) = \langle y, \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ 0.4 & 0.4 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix} \rangle,$$

$$f^{-1}(C) \subseteq clint_\delta (f^{-1}(C)) = \overline{A},$$

$$f^{-1}(C) \subseteq intcl_\delta (f^{-1}(C)) \cup 0.$$

But

$$f^{-1}(C) \not\subseteq clint_\delta (f^{-1}(C)) \cup intcl_\delta (f^{-1}(C)) = \emptyset \cup A = A,$$

and

$$f^{-1}(C) \not\subseteq intclint_\delta (f^{-1}(C)) = \emptyset.$$

Thus $f$ is IF$\beta$-cont. and IF$\delta^*$-continuous but not IF$\varepsilon$-cont. and IF$\alpha$-continuous.

Example 4.3. Let $X = Y = \{a, b\}$ and

$$A = \langle x, \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0.2 & 0.1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0.7 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix} \rangle,$$

$$B = \langle x, \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0.3 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0.7 & 0.2 \end{pmatrix} \rangle.$$

Consider the IFT’s $\Psi = \{0, 1, A\}$ and $\Phi = \{0, 1, B\}$ on $X$. Then the identity function $f : (X, \Psi) \rightarrow (Y, \Phi)$ is IF$\varepsilon$-continuous, but not IF$\delta$ cont. and IF$\alpha$-continuous (Indeed, $B \leq intcl_\delta(B) \cup clint_\delta(B) = A \cup \overline{A} = \overline{A}$, but $B \not\subseteq intcl_\delta(B) = A$ and $B \not\subseteq intclint_\delta(B) = A$).

Example 4.4. Let $X = Y = \{a, b\}$ and

$$A = \langle x, \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0.5 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0.3 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix} \rangle,$$

$$B = \langle x, \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0.7 & 0.2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0.3 & 0.2 \end{pmatrix} \rangle.$
Consider the IFT’s $\Psi = \{0, 1, A\}$ and $\Phi = \{0, 1, B\}$ on $X$. Then the identity function $f : (X, \Psi) \rightarrow (Y, \Phi)$ is IF$\beta$-continuous, but not IF$e^*$-cont. (Indeed, $B \leq \text{clint}(B) = 1$, but $B \not\subseteq \text{clint}_d(B) = \emptyset$).

**Example 4.5.** Let $X = Y = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and

\[
A = \left\langle x, \left(\begin{array}{cccc}
    a & b & c & d \\
    0 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\
    0 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\
    0 & 1 & 0 & 2
\end{array}\right) \right\rangle,
\]

\[
B = \left\langle x, \left(\begin{array}{cccc}
    a & b & c & d \\
    0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & 1 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right) \right\rangle,
\]

\[
C = \left\langle x, \left(\begin{array}{cccc}
    a & b & c & d \\
    1 & 1 & 0.2 & 0 \\
    1 & 1 & 0.2 & 0 \\
    0 & 0 & 0.7 & 0.1
\end{array}\right) \right\rangle.
\]

Now, the family $\Psi = \{0, 1, A, B, A \lor B\}$ of IFS’s in $X$ is an IFT on $X$ and the family $\Phi = \{0, 1, C\}$ of IFS’s in $Y$ is an IFT on $Y$. Then the identity function $f : (X, \Psi) \rightarrow (Y, \Phi)$ is IF$e$-continuous, but not IF$S$ cont. (Indeed, $C \leq \text{intcl}_d(C) \lor \text{clint}_d(C) = 1 \lor \emptyset = 1$, but $C \not\subseteq \text{clint}_d(C) = \emptyset$).

**Example 4.6.** Refer to Example 4.3, the identity function $f : (X, \Psi) \rightarrow (Y, \Phi)$ is IF$\delta$P-continuous, but not IF cont. (Indeed, $C \leq \text{intcl}_d(C) = 1$, but $C$ is not open in $(X, \Psi)$).

**Example 4.7.** Refer to Example 3.3, the identity function $f : (X, \Psi) \rightarrow (Y, \Phi)$ is IF$\delta$S-continuous, but not IF cont. (Indeed, $B \leq \text{clint}_d(B) = \overline{A}$, but $B$ is not open in $(X, \Psi)$).

**Definition 4.8.** Let $(X, \Psi)$ be an IFTS on $X$ and $c(a, b)$ an IFP in $X$. An IFS $N$ is called $ee$-nbld (eeq-nbld) of $(a, b)$ if there exists an IF$_e$OS $G$ in $X$ such that $c(a, b) \in G \leq N$ $(c(a, b)qG \leq A)$.

The family of all ee-nbld (eeq-nbld) of $(a, b)$ will be denoted by $N^e_e(c(a, b))$.

**Theorem 4.9.** An IFS $A$ of an IFTS$(X, \Psi)$ is an IF$_e$OS iff for every IFPe$(a, b)qA$, $A \in N^e_e(c(a, b))$.

**Proof.** $A = \langle x, \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle$ be an IF$_e$OS of $X$ and $c(a, b)qA$. Then $c(a, b)qA \leq A$. Hence $A \in N^e_e(c(a, b))$.

Conversely, let $c(a, b) \in A$, this implies $a < \mu_A(c)$ and $b > \nu_A(c)$. Since $a, b \in (0, 1)$ and $a + b \leq 1$, we have $c(a, b)qA$ and by hypothesis $A \in N^e_e(c(b, a))$, then there exists an IF$_e$OS $G$ such that $c(a, b)qG \leq A$ which implies $c(a, b) \in G \leq A$. Hence by Remark 4.3 (i), we have that $A$ is an IF$_e$OS.

**Theorem 4.10.** Let $f : (X, \Psi) \rightarrow (Y, \Phi)$ be a function. Then the following are equivalent:
(i) \( f \) is IFe-continuous.
(ii) for every \( B \in N^{eq}_2(c(a,b)) \), there exists \( A \in N^{eq}_e(c(a,b)) \) such that \( f(A) \leq B \).

Proof. (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii) Let \( c(a,b) \) be any IFP in \( X \) and \( B \in N^{eq}_e(f(c(a,b))) \). Then there exists an IFOS \( G \) of \( Y \) such that \( f(c(a,b))qG \leq B \). Since \( f \) is IFe-continuous, \( f^{-1}(G) \) is an IFeOS of \( X \) with \( c(a,b)qf^{-1}(G) \) (by Proposition 1.8). Let \( A = f^{-1}(G) \) then \( A \in N^{eq}_e(c(a,b)) \) such that \( f(A) = ff^{-1}(G) \leq G \leq B \).

(ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (i) Let \( B \) be an IFOS in \( Y \) and \( c(a,b) \in f^{-1}(B) \). This implies that \( f(c(a,b)) \in B \). Thus by Proposition 4.10 \( f(c(a,b))qB \), i.e., \( B \in N^q(f(c(a,b))) \). So there exists \( A \in N^{eq}_e(b(a),a) \) such that \( f(A) \leq B \). Then there exists an IFeOS \( H \) of \( X \) such that \( c(a,b)qH \leq A \leq f^{-1}(B) \). This implies that \( c(a,b) \in H \leq f^{-1}(B) \). Hence by Remark 4.10 (i), \( f^{-1}(B) \) is an IFeOS.

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 4.11.** Let \( f : (X, \Psi) \rightarrow (Y, \Phi) \) be a function. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) \( f \) is an IFe-continuous.
(ii) \( f^{-1}(B) \) is an IFeCS in \( X \), for every \( B \in \Phi \).
(iii) \( f(cl_e(A)) \leq cl(f(A)) \) for every IFS \( A \) in \( X \).
(iv) \( cl_e(f^{-1}(B)) \leq f^{-1}(cl(B)) \), for every IFS \( B \) in \( Y \).

Proof. (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii) Obvious.

(ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (iii) Let \( A \) be an IFS in \( X \). Then \( cl(f(A)) \) is an IFCS in \( Y \). By (ii), \( f^{-1}(cl(f(A))) \) is an IFeCS in \( X \), and so

\[ f^{-1}(cl(f(A))) = cl_e(f^{-1}(cl(f(A)))) . \]

Since \( A \leq f^{-1}f(A) \), we have

\[ cl_e(A) \leq cl_e(f^{-1}f(A)) \]
\[ \leq cl_e(f^{-1}(clf(A))) \]
\[ = f^{-1}(clf(A)). \]

Hence \( f(cl_e(A)) \leq cl(f(A)) \).

(iii) \( \Rightarrow \) (iv) Let \( B \) be an IFOS in \( Y \). By (iii), we have

\[ f(cl_e(f^{-1}B))) \leq cl(ff^{-1}(B)). \]

Hence

\[ cl_e(f^{-1}(B)) \leq f^{-1}(cl(ff^{-1}(B))) \leq f^{-1}(cl(B)). \]

(iv) \( \Rightarrow \) (i) Let \( B \) be an IFOS in \( Y \). Then \( B \) is an IFCS. By (iv), we have

\[ cl_e(f^{-1}(B)) \leq f^{-1}(cl(B)) = f^{-1}(B) \]

\[ \square \]
which implies

\[ f^{-1}(B) \geq cl_e(f^{-1}B) = int_e(f^{-1}B). \]

Hence \( f^{-1}(B) \) is an IFeOS in \( X \).

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 4.12.** Let \( f : (X, \Psi) \to (Y, \Phi) \) be a function. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) \( f \) is an IFe-continuous.

(ii) \( clint_\delta(f^{-1}(B)) \land icnt_\delta(f^{-1}(B)) \leq f^{-1}(cl(B)), \) for every IFS \( B \) in \( Y \).

**Proof:** (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii) Let \( B \) be an IFS in \( Y \). Then \( cl(B) \) is an IFCS. By (i) and using Theorem 4.11, we have \( f^{-1}(cl(B)) \) is an IFeCS in \( X \). Hence

\[ f^{-1}(cl(B)) \geq clint_\delta(f^{-1}(cl(B))) \land icnt_\delta(f^{-1}(cl(B))) \geq clint_\delta(f^{-1}(B)) \land icnt_\delta(f^{-1}(B)). \]

(ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (i) Let \( B \) be an IFCS in \( Y \). Then by (ii)

\[ clint_\delta(f^{-1}(B)) \land icnt_\delta(f^{-1}(B)) \leq f^{-1}(cl(B)) = f^{-1}(B), \]

which implies \( f^{-1}(B) \) is an IFeCS in \( X \).

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 4.13.** Let \( (X, \Psi), (Y, \Phi) \) and \( (Z, \Omega) \) be IFTS’s. If \( f : X \to Y \) is IFe-continuous and \( g : Y \to Z \) is IF-continuous, then \( g \circ f \) is IFe-continuous.

**Proof.** Obvious.

\[ \square \]

**Remark 4.14.** The composition of two IFe-continuous functions need not be IFe-continuous as shown by the following example.
Example 4.15. Let $X = Y = Z = \{a, b, c\}$ and

$$A = \langle x, \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.3 & 0.1 & 0.4 \\ \end{array}\right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.4 \\ \end{array}\right) \rangle,$$

$$B = \langle x, \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.3 & 0.2 & 0.5 \\ \end{array}\right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.4 \\ \end{array}\right) \rangle,$$

$$C = \langle x, \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.4 & 0.3 & 0.4 \\ \end{array}\right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.4 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\ \end{array}\right) \rangle,$$

$$D = \langle x, \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.5 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\ \end{array}\right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.5 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\ \end{array}\right) \rangle,$$

$$E = \langle x, \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.5 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\ \end{array}\right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.4 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\ \end{array}\right) \rangle,$$

$$F = \langle x, \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.4 & 0.3 & 0.4 \\ \end{array}\right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.5 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\ \end{array}\right) \rangle,$$

$$G = \langle x, \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.4 \\ \end{array}\right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & c \\ 0.4 & 0.4 & 0.5 \\ \end{array}\right) \rangle.$$

Then the family $\Psi = \{\emptyset, \emptyset, A, B\}$, $\Phi = \{\emptyset, \emptyset, C, D, E, F\}$ and $\Omega = \{\emptyset, \emptyset, G\}$ are IFS’s in $X$ respectively. If we define the identity functions $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \rightarrow Z$, it is clear that $f$ and $g$ is IFe-cont., but $g \circ f$ is not IFe-cont..

5. Intuitionistic Fuzzy e-Compact Spaces

Definition 5.1. Let $X$ be an IFTS. A family $\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \}$ of IFeOS’s in $X$ satisfying the condition

$$\bigcup \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \} = 1,$$

is called an intuitionistic fuzzy e-open cover of $X$.

A finite subfamily of an intuitionistic fuzzy e-open cover

$$\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \},$$

which is also an intuitionistic fuzzy e-open cover of $X$ is called a finite subcover of $\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \}$.

Definition 5.2. Let $X$ be an IFTS. A family $\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \}$ of IFeCS’s in $X$ has the finite intersection property if every finite sub-family $\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}$ satisfies the condition

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^{n} \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \} \neq \emptyset.$$

Definition 5.3. An IFTS $X$ is called intuitionistic fuzzy e-compact if and only if every intuitionistic fuzzy e-open cover has a finite subcover.
Example 5.4. Consider the IFTS \((X, \tau)\), where \(X = \{a, b\}\), 
\[
A_n = \langle x, \left(\frac{a}{n+1}, \frac{b}{n+2}\right), \left(\frac{a}{n+2}, \frac{b}{n+3}\right) \rangle
\]
and \(\tau = \{0, 1\} \cup \{A_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}\). Note that \(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n\) is an open cover for \(X\), but this cover has no finite subcover. Consider 
\[
A_1 = \langle x, \left(\frac{a}{5}, \frac{b}{6}\right), \left(\frac{a}{3}, \frac{b}{25}\right) \rangle,
\]
\[
A_2 = \langle x, \left(\frac{a}{6}, \frac{b}{75}\right), \left(\frac{a}{25}, \frac{b}{2}\right) \rangle,
\]
\[
A_3 = \langle x, \left(\frac{a}{75}, \frac{b}{8}\right), \left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{b}{16}\right) \rangle,
\]
and observe that \(A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3 = A_3\). So, for any finite subcollection \(\{A_n : i \in I\}, \) where \(I\) is a finite subset of \(\mathbb{N}\), \(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_n = A_m \neq 1\), where \(m = \max\{n_i : n_i \in I\}\). Therefore IFTS \((X, \tau)\) is not compact.

Theorem 5.5. An IFTS \(X\) is intuitionistic fuzzy e-compact if and only if every family \(\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I\}\) of IFeCS’s with the finite intersection property has a nonempty intersection.

Proof. Suppose \(X\) is intuitionistic fuzzy e-compact and \(\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I\}\) is any family of IFeCS’s in \(X\) such that 
\[
\bigcap \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I\} = \emptyset.
\]
Therefore \(\bigwedge \{\mu_{G_i} | i \in I\} = 0\) and \(\bigcup \{\nu_{G_i} | i \in I\} = 1\). Then 
\[
\bigvee \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I\} = 1,
\]
so \(\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I\}\) is a intuitionistic fuzzy e-open cover of \(X\). Since \(X\) is intuitionistic fuzzy e-compact there is a finite subcover
\[
\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}.
\]
Then 
\[
\bigcup_{k=1}^{n} \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I\} = 1.
\]
Hence 
\[
\bigvee \{\nu_{G_i(x)} | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\} = 1,
\]
and 
\[
\bigwedge \{\mu_{G_i(x)} | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\} = 0.
\]
Finally 
\[
\bigcap_{k=1}^{n} \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I\} = \emptyset.
We have proved that if $X$ is intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact space, then given any family $\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i \in I \}$ of IFeCS’s whose intersection is empty, the intersection of some finite subfamily is empty. Conversely, let $X$ has the finite intersection property. It means that if the intersection of any family of IFeCS’s is empty, the intersection of each finite subfamily is empty. Suppose $\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i \in I \}$ is any intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open cover of $X$. Then

$$\bigcup \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i \in I \} = \mathbb{1}.\$$

Therefore,

$$\bigvee \{\mu_{G_i}(x) \mid i \in I \} = \mathbb{1}, \quad \bigwedge \{\nu_{G_i}(x) \mid i \in I \} = \mathbb{0}.$$

Hence

$$\bigcap \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i \in I \} = \mathbb{0},$$

so $\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i \in I \}$ is a family of IFeCS’s whose intersection is empty. According to the assumption, we can find finite subfamily

$$\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \},$$

such that

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^{n} \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i \in I \} = \mathbb{0}.$$ 

Then

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^{n} \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i \in I \} = \mathbb{1},$$

so $\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}$ is a finite subcover of

$$\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i \in I \}.$$

Therefore, $X$ is intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact. \qed

**Remark 5.6.** Since every IFOS is an IFeOS, from the definition above we may conclude that every intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact IFTS is intuitionistic fuzzy compact.

**Theorem 5.7.** Let $f : X \to Y$ be an intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-irresolute mapping from an IFTS $X$ onto IFTS $Y$. If $X$ is intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact, then $Y$ is intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact, as well.

**Proof.** Let $\{\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i \in I \}$ be any intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open cover of $Y$. Then

$$\bigcup \{\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i \in I \} = \mathbb{1}.$$

From the relation

$$f^{-1} \left( \bigcup \{\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle \mid i \in I \} \right) = \mathbb{1},$$
follows that
\[ \bigcup \{ (y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i}) \mid i \in I \} = 1, \]
so \( \{ f^{-1}(\{ (y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i}) \mid i \in I \}) \} \) is an intuitionistic fuzzy e-open cover of \( X \). Since \( X \) is intuitionistic fuzzy e-compact, there exists a finite subcover
\[ \{ f^{-1}(\{ (x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i}) \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}) \}. \]
Therefore
\[ \bigcup \{ f^{-1}(\{ (y, \mu_{G_i}) \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}) \} = 1. \]
Hence
\[ f \left( \bigcup \{ f^{-1}(\{ (y, \mu_{G_i}) \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}) \} \right) = 1, \]
so
\[ \bigcup \{ f(\{ (y, \mu_{G_i}) \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}) \} = 1. \]
From
\[ \bigcup \{ (y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i}) \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \} = 1, \]
follows that \( Y \) is intuitionistic fuzzy e-compact. \( \square \)

**Theorem 5.8.** Let \( f : X \to Y \) be an intuitionistic fuzzy e-continuous mapping from an IFTS \( X \) onto IFTS \( Y \). If \( X \) is intuitionistic fuzzy e-compact, then \( Y \) is fuzzy compact.

**Proof.** It is similar to the proof of the Theorem 5.7. \( \square \)

**Definition 5.9.** Let \( A \) be an IFS in an IFTS \( X \). A family
\[ \{ (x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i}) \mid i \in I \}, \]
of IFeOS's in \( X \) satisfying the condition \( A \subseteq \bigcup \{ (x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i}) \mid i \in I \} \) is called intuitionistic fuzzy e-open cover of \( A \).

A finite subfamily of a intuitionistic fuzzy e-open cover
\[ \{ (x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i}) \mid i \in I \} \]
of \( A \) which is also a intuitionistic fuzzy e-open cover of \( A \) is called a finite subcover of \( \{ (x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i}) \mid i \in I \} \). 

**Definition 5.10.** An IFS \( A = \langle x, \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle \) in an IFTS \( X \) is called intuitionistic fuzzy e-compact if and only if every intuitionistic fuzzy e-open cover of \( A \) has a finite subcover.

**Theorem 5.11.** An IFS \( A = \langle x, \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle \) in an IFTS \( X \) is intuitionistic fuzzy e-compact if and only if for each family \( \{ (x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i}) \mid i \in I \} \) of IFeOS’s with properties
\[ \mu_A \leq \vee \{ \mu_{G_i} \mid i \in I \}, \quad 1 - \nu_A \leq \vee \{ 1 - \nu_{G_i} \mid i \in I \}, \]
there exists a finite subfamily \( \{ (x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i}) \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \} \) such that
\[ \mu_A = \vee \{ \mu_{G_i} \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}, \quad 1 - \nu_A = \vee \{ 1 - \nu_{G_i} \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}. \]
Proof. Suppose $A = \langle x, \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle$ is a intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact set in IFTS $X$ and $\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \}$ be any family of IFeCS’s in $X$ satisfies the condition

$$\mu_A \leq \vee \{\mu_{G_i} | i \in I \}, \quad 1 - \nu_A \leq \vee \{1 - \nu_{G_i} | i \in I \}.$$ 

Then $1 - \nu_A \leq 1 - \wedge \{\nu_{G_i} | i \in I \}$, so $\nu_A \geq \wedge \{\nu_{G_i} | i \in I \}$. Hence

$$A \subseteq \bigcup \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \}.$$ 

According to the assumption there exists finite subfamily

$$\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \},$$

such that

$$A \subseteq \bigcup \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}.$$ 

It follows that

$$\mu_A = \vee \{\mu_{G_i} | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}, \quad 1 - \nu_A = \vee \{1 - \nu_{G_i} | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}. $$

Conversely, let $A = \langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle$ be any IFS in IFTS $X$ and let $\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \}$ be any family of IFeCS’s in $X$ satisfies the condition

$$\mu_A \leq \vee \{\mu_{G_i} | i \in I \}, \quad 1 - \nu_A \leq \vee \{1 - \nu_{G_i} | i \in I \}.$$ 

From $1 - \nu_A \leq 1 - \wedge \{\nu_{G_i} | i \in I \}$ follows that $\mu_A \geq \wedge \{\nu_{G_i} | i \in I \}$, so

$$A \subseteq \bigcup \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \}.$$ 

Hence $\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \}$ is a intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open cover of IFS $A$. According to the assumption there exists finite subfamily

$$\{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \},$$

such that

$$\mu_A = \vee \{\mu_{G_i} | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}, \quad 1 - \nu_A \leq \vee \{1 - \nu_{G_i} | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}. $$

From

$$\mu_A \leq \vee \{\mu_{G_i} | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}, \quad \nu_A \geq \wedge \{\mu_{G_i} | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \},$$

we obtain that

$$A \subseteq \bigcup \{\langle x, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \}.$$ 

Therefore, $A$ is intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact. □

Remark 5.12. From the definition above it is not difficult to conclude that every intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact IFS in an IFTS is fuzzy compact.
Theorem 5.13. Let $f : X \to Y$ be an intuitionistic fuzzy $e$- irresolute mapping from an IFTS $X$ onto IFTS $Y$. If $A$ is intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact, then $f(A)$ is intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact.

Proof. Let $\{\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \}$ be any intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open cover of $f(A)$. Then

$$f(A) \subseteq \bigcup \{\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \}.$$ 

From the relation

$$A \subseteq f^{-1} \left( \bigcup \{\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle | i \in I \} \right),$$

follows that

$$A \subseteq \bigcup \{f^{-1}(\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle)|i \in I\},$$

so $\{f^{-1}(\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle)|i \in I\}$ is an intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open cover of $A$. Since $A$ is intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact, there exists a finite subcover $\{f^{-1}(\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle)|i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Therefore

$$A \subseteq \bigcup \{f^{-1}(\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle)|i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}.$$ 

Hence

$$f(A) \subseteq f \left( \bigcup \{f^{-1}(\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle)|i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\} \right)$$

$$= \bigcup \{f(f^{-1}(\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle))|i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$$

$$= \bigcup \{\langle y, \mu_{G_i}, \nu_{G_i} \rangle|i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$$

so $f(A)$ is intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact. \hfill \Box

Theorem 5.14. Let $f : X \to Y$ be an intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-continuous mapping from an IFTS $X$ onto IFTS $Y$. If $A$ is intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact, then $f(A)$ is fuzzy compact.

Definition 5.15. An IFTS $X$ is called intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-Lindelöf (fuzzy Lindelöf) if and only if every intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open (fuzzy open) cover of $X$ has a countable subcover.

Definition 5.16. An IFS $A = \langle x, \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle$ in an IFTS $X$ is called intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-Lindelöf (fuzzy Lindelöf) if and only if every intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open (fuzzy open) cover of $X$ has a countable subcover.

Definition 5.17. An IFTS $X$ is called countable intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact (countably fuzzy compact) if and only if every countable intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open (fuzzy open) cover of $X$ has a finite subcover.

Definition 5.18. An IFS $A = \langle x, \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle$ in an IFTS $X$ is called countable intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-compact (countably fuzzy compact) if and only if every countable intuitionistic fuzzy $e$-open (fuzzy open) cover of $A$ has a finite subcover.
Remark 5.19. From the definitions above we may conclude that

(i) Every intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-Lindelöf of IFTS (IFS in IFTS) is fuzzy Lindelöf;
(ii) Every countably intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact of IFTS (IFS in IFTS) is countably fuzzy compact;
(iii) Every countably intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact of IFTS (IFS in IFTS) is intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact.

Theorem 5.20. If an IFTS \(X\) is both intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-Lindelöf and countably intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact, then it is intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact.

Theorem 5.21. If an IFS \(A\) in an IFTS \(X\) is both intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-Lindelöf and fuzzy countably intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact, then \(A\) is intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact.

Theorem 5.22. Let \(X\) be an intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-Lindelöf IFTS. Then \(X\) is countably intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact if and only if \(X\) is intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact.

Proof. In the Remark 5.19 it is mentioned that if \(X\) is intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact, then it is countably intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact. Conversely, let \(\{(x, \mu G_i, \nu G_i) | i \in I\}\) be any intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-open cover of \(X\). Since \(X\) is intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-Lindelöf, there exists a countable subcover \(\{(x, \mu G_i, \nu G_i) | i = 1, 2, \ldots \}\) of \(\{(x, \mu G_i, \nu G_i) | i \in I\}\). Therefore \(\{(x, \mu G_i, \nu G_i) | i = 1, 2, \ldots \}\) is countably intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-open cover of \(X\), so there exists subcover \(\{(x, \mu G_i, \nu G_i) | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}\) of \(\{(x, \mu G_i, \nu G_i) | i = 1, 2, \ldots \}\). Hence \(X\) is intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact.

Theorem 5.23. Let an IFeOS \(A\) be intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-Lindelöf in an IFTS. Then \(A\) is countably intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact if and only if \(A\) is intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of the previous theorem.

Theorem 5.24. Let \(f : X \rightarrow Y\) be an intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-irresolute mapping from an IFTS \(X\) onto IFTS \(Y\). If \(X\) is intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-Lindelöf (countably intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact), then \(Y\) is intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-Lindelöf (countably intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact), as well.

Proof. It is similar to the proof of the Theorem 5.24.

Theorem 5.25. Let \(f : X \rightarrow Y\) be an intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-continuous mapping from an IFTS \(X\) onto IFTS \(Y\). If \(X\) is intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-Lindelöf (countably intuitionistic fuzzy \(e\)-compact), then \(Y\) is fuzzy Lindelöf (countably fuzzy compact).
Proof. It is similar to the proof of the Theorem 5.8. □

Theorem 5.26. Let \( f : X \rightarrow Y \) be an intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-irresolute mapping from an IFTS \( X \) onto IFTS \( Y \). If \( A \) is intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-Lindelöf (countably intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-Lindelöf (countably intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-compact)), then \( f(A) \) is intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-Lindelöf (countably intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-compact), as well.

Proof. It is similar to the proof of the Theorem 5.13. □

Theorem 5.27. Let \( f : X \rightarrow Y \) be an intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-continuous mapping from an IFTS \( X \) onto IFTS \( Y \). If \( A \) is intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-Lindelöf (countably intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-compact), then \( f(A) \) is fuzzy \( e \)-Lindelöf (countably fuzzy compact).

Proof. It is similar to the proof of the Theorem 5.14. □

6. Conclusion

The initiations of \( e \) - open sets, \( e \) - continuity, \( e \) - compactness and related studies in topological spaces are due to [10-11]. This present paper contains the next steps of fuzzy \( e \)-open sets, fuzzy \( e^* \)-open sets, fuzzy \( a \)-open sets, fuzzy \( e \)-continuity and fuzzy \( e \)-compactness in intuitionistic fuzzy topological spaces are studied. After giving the fundamental concepts of intuitionistic fuzzy sets and intuitionistic fuzzy topological spaces, we present intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-open sets and intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-continuity and other results related topological concepts. Several preservation properties and some characterizations concerning intuitionistic fuzzy \( e \)-compactness have been obtained.
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