

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24297/jam.v21i.9271>

On hyper Z-algebras

Sahar Jaafar Mahmood I¹, Dhirgam Allawy Hussein II²¹ (Department of Multimedia, College of Computer Science and Information Technology, University of AlQadisiyah, P.O. Box 88, Al Diwaniyah, Al-Qadisiyah, Iraq, sahar.jaafar@qu.edu.iq.)² II (Directorate of Education in Al-Qadisiyah , Diwaniyah , Iraq, dhirgam.allawy@qu.edu.iq)**Abstract:**

This study introduces the concept of hyperZ-algebra and investigates its features. In addition, we establish and prove a number of theorems about the relation between $(R\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z, \mathfrak{C}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z, \mathfrak{D}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z, \mathfrak{T}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z, \mathfrak{V}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z)$. Moreover, we explain the hyper subalgebra, a weak hyper Z-ideal and a strong hyper V-ideal, as well as their relationship. Finally, the hyper homomorphism Z-algebra is constructed and the isomorphism theorems are examined.

Keywords: Z-algebra, hyper Z-algebra, hyper Z-subalgebra, weak hyper Z-ideal, strong hyper Z-ideal, hyperZ-homomorphism.

1. Introduction

Marty's talk about hypergroups at the Eighth Congress of Scandinavian Mathematicians in [1] 1934 was the first step in the study of hyperstructures. Since then, a lot of mathematicians and scientists have looked at the hyperstructure idea from both an applied and a theoretical point of view and expanded it to a wide range of fields. It has been applied in several fields, including Euclidian and non-Euclidian geometries, probability, information sciences, etc. The book [2] has several intriguing uses of hyper-structures that are shown throughout.

In the paper [3], Jun et al. They came up with the idea of a hyperBCK-algebra, that's also extension of a BCK-algebra, and looked at the different properties it has. Borzooei et al. [4] presented and researched hyperK-algebras. In 2006, Xin came up with the idea of hyperBCI-algebras, which are just an extension of hyperBCK-algebras. He showed that any hyperBCK-algebra is also a hyperBCI-algebra [5].

Borzooei et al. have created the concept of hyperBCC-algebra as an extension of BCC-algebras and they have specifically investigated and defined the various types of hyperBCC-ideals in [6]. J.C. Endam introduced the idea of hyperB-algebra That is an extension of B-algebra and defined the subhyperB-algebras in [7]. A.L.O.Vicedo et al.[8] Proposed and analyzed (weak, strong) hyperB-ideals. In addition, they investigated the relationships between hyperB-ideals and subhyper B-algebras, as well as a few relationships between hyperB-algebras and hypergroups. S.Niazian[9] introduced the idea of hyperstructure to BI-algebras and he defined the types of hyperBI-algebras.

Z-algebra is a unique algebraic structure based on logic that was first proposed in 2017 by Chandramouleeswaran et al. [10].

This papers is structured following: in Part 2 We present some definitions and first observations regarding Z-algebras that will be used in the next Part. Hyper Z-algebra is a concept that is introduced and some of its characteristics are looked at in Part 3.

2.Preliminaries:

Denition 2.1: [8] The map $\odot: Z \times Z \rightarrow P(Z)$ named a hyperoperation on $Z \neq \emptyset$, where $P(Z)$ is the powerset of Z . And Z with \odot is called a hypergroupoid. If $\emptyset \neq K \subseteq Z, \emptyset \neq F \subseteq Z$, then $K \odot F$ means for any $k \in K$ and $t \in F$:

$$K \odot F = \bigcup_{k \in K, t \in F} (k \odot t), k \odot F = \{k\} \odot F = K \odot t = K \odot \{t\}$$

Definition2.2: [10] let $Z \neq \emptyset$ and $*$ is a binary operation with constant 0 then the algebra $(Z, *, 0)$ named Z-Algebra if satisfying the following axiom:

$$Z_1: \mathfrak{T} * 0 = 0$$

$$Z_2: 0 * \mathfrak{T} = \mathfrak{T}$$

$$Z_3: \mathfrak{T} * \mathfrak{T} = \mathfrak{T}$$



$Z_4: \mathbb{T} * \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} * \mathbb{T}$ When $\mathbb{T} \neq 0$ and $\mathbb{R} \neq 0, \forall \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R} \in Z$.

3. HyperZ-algebras:

Definition 3.1: The triple $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is named a hyperZ-algebra (briefly, $\check{h}Z$) where $Z \neq \emptyset, \odot$ hyperoperation and 0 is a constant if $\forall \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R} \in Z$, the following conditions hold:

$(HZ_1) \mathbb{T} \ll 0$

$(HZ_2) \mathbb{T} \in \mathbb{T} \odot 0$

$(HZ_3) \mathbb{T} \in \mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{T}$

$(HZ_4) \mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \odot \mathbb{T}, \forall \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R} \in Z, \mathbb{T} \neq 0, \mathbb{R} \neq 0$

Where $\mathbb{T} \ll \mathbb{R}$ if $0 \in \mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R}$.

$\forall A, B \subseteq Z$, then $A \ll B \Leftrightarrow \exists a \in A, b \in B$ such that $a \ll b$. We signify $A \ll \{\mathbb{R}\} (\{\mathbb{T}\} \ll B)$ by $A \ll \mathbb{R} (\mathbb{T} \ll B)$

Example 3.2: Let $= \{0, \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}, \lambda\}$, the following table represents the hyperoperatic \odot on Z .

| \odot | 0 | \mathbb{T} | \mathbb{R} | λ |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 0 | $\{0\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{R}\}$ | $\{\lambda\}$ |
| \mathbb{T} | $\{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}, \mu\}$ |
| \mathbb{R} | $\{0\}$ | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{R}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{R}, \lambda\}$ |
| λ | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}, \lambda\}$ | $\{\mathbb{R}, \lambda\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}, \lambda\}$ |

Then $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is ($\check{h}Z$)

Example 3.3: A Z -algebra $(Z, *, 0)$ with a hyperoperation \odot defined on Z as $\mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R} = \{\mathbb{T} * \mathbb{R}\} \forall \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R} \in Z$ then $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is ($\check{h}Z$).

Proposition 3.4: Let $(Z, \odot, 0)$ be a ($\check{h}Z$), then $\forall \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R} \in Z, \forall (A, B, C, D) \neq \emptyset, (A, B, C, D) \subseteq Z$ the following axioms hold:

- (1) $(\mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R}) [(\mathbb{R} \odot \mathbb{T}) \odot (\mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R})] = \mathbb{R} \odot \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T} \neq 0, \mathbb{R} \neq 0$
- (2) $0 \odot A = A$
- (3) $A \ll \{0\}$
- (4) $A \odot 0 = \{0\}$
- (5) $A \subseteq B \Rightarrow A \ll B$
- (6) $A \subseteq B$ and $A \ll C \Rightarrow B \ll C$
- (7) $A \subseteq B$ and $C \subseteq D \Rightarrow A \odot C \Rightarrow B \odot D$

Definition 3.5:

- 1) If $0 \odot \mathbb{T} = \{\mathbb{T}\}, \forall \mathbb{T} \in Z$ then $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is named Row hyperZ-algebra (briefly $\check{R}\text{-}\check{h}Z$).
- 2) If $\mathbb{T} \odot 0 = \{0\}, \forall \mathbb{T} \in Z$ then $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is named Column hyperZ-algebra (briefly $\check{C}\text{-}\check{h}Z$).
- 3) If $\mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{T} = \{\mathbb{T}\}, \forall \mathbb{T} \in Z$ then $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is named Diagonal hyperZ-algebra (briefly $\check{D}\text{-}\check{h}Z$).
- 4) If $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is satisfies (1 and 2) then $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is named Thin hyperZ-algebra (briefly $\check{T}\text{-}\check{h}Z$).
- 5) If $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is satisfies (1, 2 and 3) then $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is named Verythin hyperZ-algebra. (briefly $\check{V}\text{-}\check{h}Z$).

Example 3.6: (1) Let $Z = \{0, \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}, \lambda\}$, the following table represents the hyperoperatic \odot on Z .

| \odot | 0 | \mathbb{T} | \mathbb{R} | λ |
|--------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0 | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{R}\}$ | $\{\lambda\}$ |
| \mathbb{T} | $\{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}, \lambda\}$ |
| \mathbb{R} | $\{0, \mathbb{R}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{R}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{R}, \lambda\}$ |
| λ | $\{0, \lambda\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}, \lambda\}$ | $\{\mathbb{R}, \lambda\}$ | $\{0, \lambda\}$ |

$(Z, \odot, 0)$ is an ($\check{R}\text{-}\check{h}Z$), it is obvious that $(Z, \odot, 0)$ isn't a ($\check{C}\text{-}\check{h}Z$) and ($\check{D}\text{-}\check{h}Z$), since $\forall \mathbb{T} \in Z, \mathbb{T} \odot 0 \neq \{0\}, \mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{T} \neq \{\mathbb{T}\}$.

(2) Let $Z = \{0, \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}, \lambda\}$, the following table represents the hyperoperatic \odot on Z :



| \odot | 0 | \mathbb{T} | \mathbb{U} | \mathbb{X} |
|--------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 0 | $\{0\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{X}\}$ |
| \mathbb{T} | $\{0\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{X}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{U}\}$ |
| \mathbb{U} | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{X}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}\}$ |
| \mathbb{X} | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{X}\}$ |

Then $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is a $(\check{C}\text{-}\check{h}Z)$, it is obvious that $(Z, \odot, 0)$ isn't a $(\mathbb{R}\text{-}\check{h}Z)$ and $(\mathbb{D}\text{-}\check{h}Z)$, since $\forall \mathbb{T} \in Z, 0 \odot \mathbb{T} \neq \{\mathbb{T}\}, \mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{T} \neq \{\mathbb{T}\}$.

(3) Let $Z = \{0, \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{U}, \mathbb{X}\}$, the following table represents the hyperoperatic \odot on Z :

| \odot | 0 | \mathbb{T} | \mathbb{U} | \mathbb{X} |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 0 | $\{0\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{X}\}$ |
| \mathbb{T} | $\{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{X}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{U}\}$ |
| \mathbb{U} | $\{0, \mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{X}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ |
| \mathbb{X} | $\{0, \mathbb{X}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{X}\}$ |

Then $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is a $(\mathbb{D}\text{-}\check{h}Z)$, it is obvious that $(Z, \odot, 0)$ isn't an $(\mathbb{R}\text{-}\check{h}Z)$ and $(\check{C}\text{-}\check{h}Z)$, since $\forall \mathbb{T} \in Z, 0 \odot \mathbb{T} \neq \{\mathbb{T}\}, \mathbb{T} \odot 0 \neq \{0\}$.

(4) Let $Z = \{0, \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{U}, \mathbb{X}\}$, the following table represents the hyperoperatic \odot on Z :

| \odot | 0 | \mathbb{T} | \mathbb{U} | \mathbb{X} |
|--------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 0 | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{X}\}$ |
| \mathbb{T} | $\{0\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{X}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{U}\}$ |
| \mathbb{U} | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{X}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}\}$ |
| \mathbb{X} | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{0, \mathbb{X}\}$ |

Then $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is a $(\mathbb{T}\text{-}\check{h}Z)$, it is obvious that $(Z, \odot, 0)$ isn't a $(\mathbb{V}\text{-}\check{h}Z)$, since it isn't a $(\mathbb{D}\text{-}\check{h}Z)$.

(5) Let $Z = \{0, \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{U}, \mathbb{X}\}$, the following table represents the hyperoperatic \odot on Z :

| \odot | 0 | \mathbb{T} | \mathbb{U} | \mathbb{X} |
|--------------|---------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 0 | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{X}\}$ |
| \mathbb{T} | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{X}\}$ |
| \mathbb{U} | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{U}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{X}\}$ |
| \mathbb{X} | $\{0\}$ | $\{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{X}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{X}\}$ | $\{\mathbb{X}\}$ |

Then $(Z, \odot, 0)$ is a \mathbb{V} -hyper Z -algebra.

Definition 3.7: A hyper sub Z -algebra of Z is the set $S \neq \emptyset, S \subseteq Z, 0 \in S$, which $(S, \odot, 0)$ is a $(\check{h}Z)$ w.r.t hyperoperation \odot .

Remark 3.8: Let $S \neq \emptyset, S \subseteq Z$, If $Z \odot \uparrow \subseteq S, \forall Z, \uparrow \in S \Rightarrow 0 \in S$.

Theorem 3.9: Let $S \neq \emptyset, S \subseteq Z$, then S is a hyper sub Z -algebra of Z if and only if $If \mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{U} \subseteq S, \forall \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{U} \in S$.

Proof: \Rightarrow Let S is a hypersub Z -algebra of $Z \Rightarrow (S, \odot, 0)$ is a $(\check{h}Z)$ w.r.t hyperoperation \odot then $\mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{U} \subseteq S, \forall \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{U} \in S$.

\Leftarrow Let $\mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{U} \subseteq S, \forall \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{U} \in S$, then $0 \in S$. by (Remark 3.8)

Then $0 \in \mathbb{T} \odot 0 \Rightarrow (HZ_1)$ valid in S . So also, It is possible to show that the $(HZ_2), (HZ_3)$ & (HZ_4) are valid in S .

$\Rightarrow S$ is a hypersub Z -algebra of Z .

Definition 3.10: If $\mathbb{T} \odot S = S = S \odot \mathbb{T}, \forall \mathbb{T} \in S$ where S is a hypersub Z -algebra of Z , in this case S is named a stronghyper sub Z -algebra of Z .

Example 3.11:

(1) Let $Z = \{0, \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{U}, \mathbb{X}\}$ in (Example 3.2) and let $S_1 = \{0\}, S_2 = \{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ and $S_3 = \{0, \mathbb{X}\}$, then S_1, S_2 is a stronghyper sub Z -algebras of Z , but S_3 isn't a hyper sub Z -algebra of Z since $\mathbb{X} \odot \mathbb{X} = \{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{U}, \mathbb{X}\} \notin S_3$.

(2) Let Z in (Example 3.3) then every sub Z -algebra of Z is a stronghyper sub Z -algebra of Z .

(3) Let $Z = \{0, \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{A}\}$, the following table represents the hyperoperatic \odot on Z :

| \odot | 0 | \mathbb{T} | \mathbb{R} | \mathbb{A} |
|--------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 0 | {0, \mathbb{T} , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{A} } | { \mathbb{T} } | { \mathbb{R} } | { \mathbb{A} } |
| \mathbb{T} | {0} | { \mathbb{T} } | { \mathbb{T} , \mathbb{R} } | { \mathbb{T} , \mathbb{A} } |
| \mathbb{R} | {0} | { \mathbb{T} , \mathbb{R} } | { \mathbb{R} } | { \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{A} } |
| \mathbb{A} | {0} | { \mathbb{T} , \mathbb{A} } | { \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{A} } | { \mathbb{A} } |

Which is a Z , and $S = \{0\}$ is not a stronghyper sub Z -algebras of Z .

Remark 3.12: $S = \{0\}$ is a stronghyper sub Z -algebras of Z , if Z satisfied(5) in Definition3.5.

Definition 3.13: Let $I \neq \emptyset, I \subseteq Z, I$ is named a hyper Z -ideal of Z if

$$(HZI_1) 0 \in I$$

$$(HZI_2) \mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R} \ll I \ \& \ \mathbb{R} \in I \Rightarrow \mathbb{T} \in I, \forall \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R} \in Z.$$

Definition 3.14: Let $I \neq \emptyset, I \subseteq Z, I$ is named a weakhyper Z -ideal of Z if

$$(HZI_1) 0 \in I$$

$$(HZWI_2) \mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R} \subseteq I \ \& \ \mathbb{R} \in I \Rightarrow \mathbb{T} \in I, \forall \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R} \in Z.$$

Theorem 3.15: Every hyper Z -ideal of Z is a weakhyper Z -ideal of Z .

Definition 3.16: Let $I \neq \emptyset, I \subseteq Z, I$ is named a stronghyper Z -ideal of Z if

$$(HZI_1) 0 \in I$$

$$(HZSI_2) (\mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R}) \cap I \neq \emptyset \ \& \ \mathbb{R} \in I \Rightarrow \mathbb{T} \in I, \forall \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R} \in Z.$$

Example 3.17:

(1) Let Z in (Example 3.3) then every ideal I of Z is a hyper Z -ideal(weakhyper Z -ideal, stronghyper Z -ideal) of Z .

(2) If $Z = \{0, \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}\}$, the following table represents the hyperoperatic \odot on Z :

| \odot | 0 | \mathbb{T} | \mathbb{R} |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 0 | {0, \mathbb{T} } | {0, \mathbb{T} } | {0, \mathbb{R} } |
| \mathbb{T} | {0} | {0, \mathbb{T} } | {0, \mathbb{T} } |
| \mathbb{R} | {0} | {0, \mathbb{T} } | {0, \mathbb{T} , \mathbb{R} } |

Which is a Z , and $I_1 = \{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ is a hyper Z -ideal(weakhyper Z -ideal) of Z , and converse of (theorem3.15) isn't true,

let $I_2 = \{0, \mathbb{R}\}$ is a weakhyper Z -ideal of Z but isn't hyper Z -ideal because

$$\mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R} = \{0, \mathbb{T}\} \ll I_2 \text{ and } \mathbb{R} \in I_2 \text{ but } \mathbb{T} \notin I_2, \text{ and } I_3 = \{0\}, \text{ and } I_4 = Z \text{ are only strong hyper}Z - \text{ideal of } Z.$$

Theorem 3.18: Let I is a stronghyper Z - ideal of Z , then

$$(1) I \text{ is a weakhyper}Z - \text{ideal of } Z.$$

$$(2) I \text{ is a hyper}Z - \text{ideal of } Z.$$

And converse is not true.

Proof : from Theorem 3.15, it is sufficient to show (2)

Let $\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R} \in Z$ such that $\mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R} \ll I$ and $\mathbb{R} \in I$,

Then $\forall \omega \in \mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R} \exists \varphi \in I$, such that $\omega \ll \varphi \Rightarrow 0 \in \omega \odot \varphi \Rightarrow 0 \in \omega \odot \varphi \cap I \neq \emptyset$,

Then by $(HZSI_2)$

$$\omega \in I \Rightarrow \mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R} \subseteq I \text{ and so } \mathbb{T} \odot \mathbb{R} \cap I \neq \emptyset,$$

using $(HZSI_2) \Rightarrow \mathbb{T} \in I, \Rightarrow I$ is a hyper Z - ideal of Z .

Let $I = \{0, \mathbb{T}\}$ in Example 3.17 (2) is a hyper Z -ideal (weakhyper Z -ideal) of Z but isn't a stronghyper Z -ideal of Z because $\mathbb{R} \odot \mathbb{T} \cap I = \{0, \mathbb{T}\} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{T} \in I$ but $\mathbb{R} \notin I$.

Theorem 3.19: Let $\{I_\gamma : \gamma \in S\}$ and $I_\gamma \neq \emptyset$ be a collection of subsets of a (hZ) , such that $0 \in I_\gamma, \forall \gamma \in S$.

(1) if I_γ a hyperZ – ideal of $Z, \forall \gamma \in S \Rightarrow \bigcap_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$ a hyperZ – ideal of Z .

(2) if I_γ a weakhyperZ – ideal of $Z, \forall \gamma \in S \Rightarrow \bigcap_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$ a weakhyperZ – ideal of Z .

(3) if I_γ a stronghyperZ – ideal of $Z, \forall \gamma \in S \Rightarrow \bigcap_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$ a stronghyperZ – ideal of Z .

Proof: We only prove (3). (1) and (2) are easy to prove.

Suppose that $I_\gamma (\forall \gamma \in S)$ is a strong hyperZ – ideal of Z ,

since $0 \in I_\gamma, \forall \gamma \in S \Rightarrow 0 \in \bigcap_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$, and so $\bigcap_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma \neq \phi$.

suppose that $\forall \mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R} \in Z, (\mathfrak{T} \odot \mathfrak{R}) \cap \bigcap_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma \neq \phi$ and $\mathfrak{R} \in \bigcap_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$

since $\bigcap_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma \subseteq I_\gamma, \forall \gamma \in S$. by $(A \cap B \neq \phi \text{ and } B \subseteq C \Rightarrow A \cap C \neq \phi) \Rightarrow$

$(\mathfrak{T} \odot \mathfrak{R}) \cap I_\gamma \neq \phi$ and $\mathfrak{R} \in I_\gamma, \forall \gamma \in S$,

since $I_\gamma (\forall \gamma \in S)$ is a strong hyperZ – ideal of Z

$\Rightarrow \mathfrak{T} \in I_\gamma, \forall \gamma \in S \Rightarrow \mathfrak{T} \in \bigcap_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma \Rightarrow \bigcap_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$ is a strong hyperZ – ideal of Z .

Theorem 3.20: Let $\{I_\gamma : \gamma \in S\}$ and $I_\gamma \neq \phi$ be a collection of subsets of a $(\mathfrak{h}Z)$, such that $I_1 \subseteq I_2 \subseteq \dots$

(1) if I_γ a hyperZ – ideal of $Z, \forall \gamma \in S \Rightarrow \bigcup_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$ a hyperZ – ideal of Z .

(2) if I_γ a weakhyperZ – ideal of $Z, \forall \gamma \in S \Rightarrow \bigcup_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$ a weakhyperZ – ideal of Z .

(3) if I_γ a stronghyperZ – ideal of $Z, \forall \gamma \in S \Rightarrow \bigcup_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$ a stronghyperZ – ideal of Z .

Proof: We only prove (3). (1) and (2) are easy to prove.

Suppose that I_γ (for some $\gamma \in S$) is a strong hyperZ – ideal of Z ,

since $0 \in I_\gamma$, for some $\gamma \in S \Rightarrow 0 \in \bigcup_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$ and so $\bigcup_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma \neq \phi$.

Let $\forall \mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R} \in Z, (\mathfrak{T} \odot \mathfrak{R}) \cap \bigcup_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma \neq \phi$ and $\mathfrak{R} \in \bigcup_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$

since $I_\gamma \subseteq \bigcup_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma, \forall \gamma \in S$, and $I_1 \subseteq I_2 \subseteq \dots \Rightarrow$

$(\mathfrak{T} \odot \mathfrak{R}) \cap I_\gamma \neq \phi$ and $\mathfrak{R} \in I_\gamma$, for some $\gamma \in S$,

since I_γ is a strong hyperZ – ideal of Z

$\Rightarrow \mathfrak{T} \in I_\gamma, \forall \gamma \in S \Rightarrow \mathfrak{T} \in \bigcup_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$,

$\Rightarrow \bigcup_{\gamma \in S} I_\gamma$ is a strong hyperZ – ideal of Z .

Example 3.21: This example demonstrates that a hyper subZ-algebra and a hyper Z-ideal (weak hyper Z-ideal) of Z are different concepts..

(1) Let $Z = \{0, \mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}\}$,

| \otimes | 0 | \mathfrak{U} | \mathfrak{V} |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 0 | {0} | {0, \mathfrak{U} } | {0, \mathfrak{V} } |
| \mathfrak{U} | {0, \mathfrak{U} } | {0, \mathfrak{U} } | {0, \mathfrak{V} } |
| \mathfrak{V} | {0} | {0, \mathfrak{V} } | {0, \mathfrak{V} } |

Which is a Z, $S = \{0, \mathfrak{V}\}$ is a hyper subZ-algebra, but S isn't a hyperZ-ideal(weakhyper Z-ideal) of Z because $\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} = \{0, \mathfrak{V}\} \subseteq S$ and $\mathfrak{V} \in S$ and $\mathfrak{U} \notin S$.

(2) Let $Z = \{0, \mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}\}$, the following table represents the hyperoperatic \otimes on Z:

| \otimes | 0 | \mathfrak{U} | \mathfrak{V} |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 0 | {0} | {0, \mathfrak{U} } | {0, \mathfrak{V} } |
| \mathfrak{U} | {0, \mathfrak{U} } | { $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}$ } | { $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}$ } |
| \mathfrak{V} | {0, \mathfrak{V} } | { $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}$ } | { $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}$ } |

Which is a Z, and $I = \{0, \mathfrak{V}\}$ is a hyperZ-ideal(weakhyper Z-ideal) of Z, but I isn't a hyper subZ-algebra because $\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} = \{\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}\} \not\subseteq I$.

Theorem 3.22: Let S a hyper subZ-algebra of Z then

(1) S is a weakhyper Z-ideal of Z $\Leftrightarrow \forall \mathfrak{U} \in Z - S$, and $\mathfrak{V} \in S$ we have $\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} \subseteq S$.

(2) S is a hyperZ-ideal of Z $\Leftrightarrow \forall \mathfrak{U} \in Z - S$, and $\mathfrak{V} \in S$ we have $(\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \cap S = \emptyset$.

Proof:

(1) Suppose S be a weakhyper Z-ideal of Z, $\mathfrak{U} \in Z - S$ and $\mathfrak{V} \in S$.

Let $\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} \subseteq S$, by hypothesis we have $\mathfrak{U} \in S$ which is contradictory. $\Rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} \not\subseteq S$.

Conversely, Suppose $\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} \subseteq S$ and $\mathfrak{V} \in S$, let $\mathfrak{U} \notin S$ then by hypothesis $\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} \not\subseteq S$. which is contradictory. $\Rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \in S \Rightarrow S$ is a weakhyper Z-ideal of Z.

(2) If S a hyperZ-ideal of Z, $\mathfrak{U} \in Z - S$ & $\mathfrak{V} \in S$.

Let $(\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \cap S \neq \emptyset$, since $\mathfrak{V} \in S$ & S is a hyperZ-ideal of Z, we have $\mathfrak{U} \in S$ Which is contradictory $\Rightarrow (\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \cap S = \emptyset$.

Conversely, let for any $\mathfrak{U} \in Z - S$, $\mathfrak{V} \in S$, and $(\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \cap S = \emptyset$,

If $(\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \cap S \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \exists k \in (\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V})$ and $k \in S$ since S a hyper subZ-algebra of Z $\Rightarrow (\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \in S \Rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \in S$ which is contradictory $\Rightarrow S$ is a hyperZ-ideal of Z.

Definition 3.23: Let $X \neq \emptyset$, $X \subseteq Z$ is named a downset if $\mathfrak{U} \ll \mathfrak{V}$ and $\mathfrak{V} \in X \Rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \in X, \forall \mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V} \in Z$.

Remark 3.24: If X is a hyperZ-ideal of Z $\Rightarrow X$ is a downset. Because if $\mathfrak{U} \ll \mathfrak{V}$ and $\mathfrak{V} \in X$. Then $\mathfrak{U} \in (\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \cap X$. Since $\mathfrak{V} \in X$ and X is a hyperZ-ideal of Z, we get $\mathfrak{U} \in X$.

Definition 3.25: A mapping $f: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$ where $(Z_1, \otimes, 0)$ & $(Z_2, \otimes, 0)$ be two (hZ),

is named a "hyperZ -homomorphism" if, $\forall \mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V} \in Z_1$ we have

$$(1) f(0) = 0 \quad (2) f(\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) = f(\mathfrak{U}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{V}), \forall \mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V} \in Z_1$$

If f is 1-1 and onto $\Rightarrow f$ is named a hyper Z-isomorphism

kernel of f (briefly) $\text{Ker}(f) = \{\mathfrak{U} \in Z_1: f(\mathfrak{U}) = 0\}$, image of f (briefly) $\text{Im}(f) = \{f(\mathfrak{U}): \mathfrak{U} \in Z_1\}$, inverse image of

f (briefly) $\text{Im}(f^{-1}) = \{\mathfrak{U} \in Z_1: f(\mathfrak{U}) \in Z_2\}$.

Example 3.26: Let $Z_1 = \{0, \mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}\}$ and $Z_2 = \{0, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}\}$, define two the hyperoperatians " \otimes, \otimes " on Z_1 and Z_2 respectively as the follows:

| \otimes | 0 | \mathfrak{U} | \mathfrak{V} |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 0 | {0} | { \mathfrak{U} } | { \mathfrak{V} } |
| \mathfrak{U} | {0, \mathfrak{U} } | { \mathfrak{U} } | { $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}$ } |
| \mathfrak{V} | {0, \mathfrak{V} } | { $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}$ } | { \mathfrak{V} } |

| \otimes | \mathcal{O} | \mathfrak{b} | \mathfrak{q} |
|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| \mathcal{O} | $\{\mathcal{O}\}$ | $\{\mathfrak{b}\}$ | $\{\mathfrak{q}\}$ |
| \mathfrak{b} | $\{\mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{b}\}$ | $\{\mathfrak{b}\}$ | $\{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{q}\}$ |
| \mathfrak{q} | $\{\mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{q}\}$ | $\{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{q}\}$ | $\{\mathfrak{q}\}$ |

Then $(Z_1, \otimes, \mathcal{O})$ and $(Z_1, \otimes, \mathcal{O})$ are a hyper Z-algebras.

Let $f: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$ define as $f(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O}, f(\mathfrak{b}) = \mathfrak{b}, f(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{q}$.

Then “ f is a hyper Z-homomorphism”.

Lemma 3.27: If $f: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$ is a hyperZ-“homomorphism”

(1) if $\mathfrak{b} \otimes \mathfrak{q} = \mathcal{O}, \forall \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{q} \in Z_1$ then $f(\mathfrak{b}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathcal{O}$.

(2) $\text{Ker}(f), \text{Im}(f)$ is a hyperZ-ideal (weakhyper Z-ideal) of Z_1, Z_2 respectively.

Theorem 3.28: If $f: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$ is a hyperZ-“homomorphism”, if $\mathfrak{b} \ll \mathfrak{q}$ in Z_1 then

$f(\mathfrak{b}) \ll f(\mathfrak{q})$ in Z_2 .

Proof: Let $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{q} \in Z_1$, if $\mathfrak{b} \ll \mathfrak{q} \Rightarrow \mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{b} \otimes \mathfrak{q}$.

And $f(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O}' \in f(\mathfrak{b} \otimes \mathfrak{q}) = f(\mathfrak{b}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{q}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}' \in f(\mathfrak{b}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{q}) \Rightarrow f(\mathfrak{b}) \ll f(\mathfrak{q})$.

Remark 3.29: Let $f: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$ is onto hyper Z-homomorphism. If Z_1 is a/an $((\mathfrak{C}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z), (\mathfrak{D}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z), (\mathfrak{T}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z), (\mathfrak{V}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z)$ and $(\mathfrak{R}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z))$ therefore Z_2 is as well.

Proof: We just proof $(\mathfrak{R}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z)$, and the explanation in all other cases is same.

Let Z_1 be an $(\mathfrak{R}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z)$ and $\mathfrak{b} \in Z_2 \Rightarrow \exists \mathfrak{b} \in Z_1 \Rightarrow \mathfrak{b} = f(\mathfrak{b})$,

$\mathcal{O}' \otimes \mathfrak{b} = f(\mathcal{O}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{b}) = f(\mathcal{O} \otimes \mathfrak{b}) = \{f(\omega) : \omega \in \mathcal{O} \otimes \mathfrak{b}\} = \{f(\mathfrak{b})\} = \mathfrak{b}$

Then Z_2 is an $(\mathfrak{R}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z)$.

Remark 3.30: Let $f: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$ is 1-1 hyper Z-homomorphism. If Z_2 is a/an

$((\mathfrak{C}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z), (\mathfrak{D}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z), (\mathfrak{T}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z), (\mathfrak{V}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z)$ and $(\mathfrak{R}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z))$ therefore Z_2 is as well.

Proof: We just proof $(\mathfrak{R}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z)$, and the explanation in all other cases is same.

Let Z_2 be an $(\mathfrak{R}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z)$ and $\mathfrak{b} \in Z_1$ and $f(\mathfrak{b}) = \mathfrak{b}$. Then

$$\{f(\omega) : \omega \in \mathcal{O} \otimes \mathfrak{b}\} = f(\mathcal{O} \otimes \mathfrak{b}) = f(\mathcal{O}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{b}) = \mathcal{O}' \otimes \mathfrak{b} = \{\mathfrak{b}\} = \{f(\mathfrak{b})\}$$

Since f is 1-1, we get that $\mathcal{O} \otimes \mathfrak{b} = \{\mathfrak{b}\}$. Therefore, Z_1 is an $(\mathfrak{R}\text{-}\mathfrak{h}Z)$.

Theorem 3.31: If $f: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$ is a hyperZ-“homomorphism”,

(1) If I a hyperZ-ideal of $Z_2 \Rightarrow f^{-1}(I)$ a hyperZ-ideal of Z_1 .

(2) If I a weakhyper Z-ideal of $Z_2 \Rightarrow f^{-1}(I)$ a weakhyper Z-ideal of Z_1 .

(3) If I a stronghyperZ-ideal of $Z_2 \Rightarrow f^{-1}(I)$ a stronghyperZ-ideal of Z_1 .

Proof:

(1) Since $\mathcal{O}' \in I$ and $f(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O}' \Rightarrow \mathcal{O} \in f^{-1}(I)$

Let $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{q} \in Z_1$, and $\mathfrak{b} \otimes \mathfrak{q} \ll f^{-1}(I), \mathfrak{q} \in f^{-1}(I)$, then $f(\mathfrak{q}) \in I$ and

$\forall \mathfrak{Y} \in \mathfrak{b} \otimes \mathfrak{q} \exists \mathfrak{Y} \in f^{-1}(I) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{Y} \ll \mathfrak{Y} \Rightarrow \mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{Y} \otimes \mathfrak{Y}$, then

$\mathcal{O} = f(\mathcal{O}) \in f(\mathfrak{Y} \otimes \mathfrak{Y}) = f(\mathfrak{Y}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{Y}) \subseteq f(\mathfrak{b} \otimes \mathfrak{q}) \otimes I = f(\mathfrak{b}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{q}) \otimes I$.

So that $f(\mathfrak{b}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{q}) \ll I$ since I a hyperZ-ideal of $Z_2 \Rightarrow$

$f(\mathfrak{b}) \in I \Rightarrow \mathfrak{b} \in f^{-1}(I) \Rightarrow f^{-1}(I)$ a hyperZ-ideal of Z_1 .



(2) Since $O' \in I$ and $f(O) = O' \Rightarrow O \in f^{-1}(I)$

Let $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V} \in Z_1$, and $\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} \subseteq f^{-1}(I)$, $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V} \in f^{-1}(I)$,

$\Rightarrow f(\mathfrak{U}) \in I$ (by Proposition 3.4 (5))

$\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} \ll f^{-1}(I), \forall \Upsilon \in \mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} \Rightarrow \exists \uparrow \in f^{-1}(I)$

Then $\Upsilon \ll \uparrow \Rightarrow O \in \Upsilon \otimes \uparrow$, then

$O = f(O) \in f(\Upsilon \otimes \uparrow) = f(\Upsilon) \otimes f(\uparrow) \subseteq f(\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \otimes I = f(\mathfrak{U}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{V}) \otimes I$.

So that $f(\mathfrak{U}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{V}) \subseteq I$ since I a weakhyper Z-ideal of $Z_2 \Rightarrow$

$f(\mathfrak{U}) \in I \Rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \in f^{-1}(I)$, hence forth $f^{-1}(I)$ a weakhyper Z - ideal Z_1 .

(3) Since $O' \in I$ and $f(O) = O' \Rightarrow O \in f^{-1}(I)$

Let $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V} \in Z_1$, and $(\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \cap f^{-1}(I) \neq \phi$, $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V} \in f^{-1}(I)$, then $f(\mathfrak{U}) \in I$

Since $(\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \cap f^{-1}(I) \neq \phi$

$\phi = f(\phi) \neq f[(\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \cap f^{-1}(I)] \subseteq f(\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V}) \cap f(f^{-1}(I)) \subseteq f(\mathfrak{U}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{V}) \cap I$

$\Rightarrow f(\mathfrak{U}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{V}) \cap I \neq \phi$,

Since $\mathfrak{U} \in f^{-1}(I) \Rightarrow f(\mathfrak{U}) \in I$, I a stronghyper Z - ideal of Z_2 ,

$\Rightarrow f(\mathfrak{U}) \in I \Rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \in f^{-1}(I)$, $\Rightarrow f^{-1}(I)$ a stronghyper Z - ideal of Z_1 .

Theorem 3.32: If $f: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$ be an onto hyper Z -homomorphism,

(1) If I a hyperZ-ideal of Z_1 containing $\ker(f) \Rightarrow f(I)$ a hyperZ-ideal of Z_2 .

(2) If I a weakhyper Z-ideal of Z_1 containing $\ker(f) \Rightarrow f(I)$ a weakhyper Z-ideal of Z_2 .

(3) If I a stronghyper Z - ideal of Z_1 containing $\ker(f) \Rightarrow f(I)$ a stronghyper Z - ideal of Z_2 .

Proof:

(1) Let I a hyperZ - ideal of Z_1 containing $\ker(f) \Rightarrow O \in \ker(f) \subseteq I$

$O' = f(O) \in f(I)$,

Let $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V} \in Z_2$ such that $\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} \ll f(I)$, and $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V} \in f(I)$,

since f is onto $\Rightarrow \exists \uparrow, \omega \in Z_1, f(\uparrow) = \mathfrak{U}, f(\omega) = \mathfrak{V}$. Thus

$f(\uparrow \otimes \omega) = f(\uparrow) \otimes f(\omega) = \mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} \ll f(I)$

then $\forall \mathfrak{h} \in \uparrow \otimes \omega, \exists \mathfrak{q} \in I, f(\mathfrak{h}) \ll f(\mathfrak{q}) \Rightarrow$

$O' \in f(\mathfrak{h}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{q}) = f(\mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathfrak{q})$, then

$\mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathfrak{q} \subseteq \ker(f) \subseteq I$, by Proposition 3.4(5) $\Rightarrow (\mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathfrak{q}) \ll I$

Used (HZI₂) $\Rightarrow \mathfrak{h} \in I$, then

$\uparrow \otimes \omega \subseteq I, \Rightarrow \uparrow \otimes \omega \ll I$, and $\omega \in I$

Used (HZI₂) $\Rightarrow \uparrow \in I$

then $f(\uparrow) = \mathfrak{U} \in f(I) \Rightarrow f(I)$ a hyperZ-ideal of Z_2 .

(2) Let I a weakhyper Z-ideal of Z_1 containing $\ker(f)$

$\Rightarrow O \in \ker(f) \subseteq I, O' = f(O) \in f(I)$,

Let $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V} \in Z_2$, and $\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} \subseteq f(I)$, $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V} \in f(I)$,

since f is onto $\Rightarrow \exists \omega \in I$ and $\uparrow \in Z_1, f(\uparrow) = \mathfrak{U}, f(\omega) = \mathfrak{V}$,

$\mathfrak{U} \otimes \mathfrak{V} = f(\uparrow) \otimes f(\omega) = f(\uparrow \otimes \omega) \subseteq f(I)$

$\Rightarrow \uparrow \otimes \omega \subseteq I$, since I a weakhyper Z-ideal of Z_1

And $\omega \in I \Rightarrow \uparrow \in I$, $f(\uparrow) \in f(I) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{U} \in f(I)$

$f(I)$ is a weakhyper Z-ideal of Z_2 .

(3) Let I a strong hyper Z - ideal of Z_1 containing $\ker(f)$

$\Rightarrow 0 \in \ker \ker (f) \subseteq I, \sigma \in f(I),$

Let $\tau, \nu \in Z_2$ such that $(\tau \otimes \nu) \cap f(I) \neq \phi$, and $\nu \in f(I),$

since f is onto $\Rightarrow \exists \omega \in I$ and $\dagger \in Z_1, f(\dagger) = \tau, f(\omega) = \nu, \Rightarrow \omega \in I$

$\phi \neq (\tau \otimes \nu) \cap f(I) = (f(\dagger) \otimes f(\omega)) \cap f(I) = f(\dagger \otimes \omega) \cap f(I) \Rightarrow \exists \lambda \in Z_2$

such that $\lambda \in f(\dagger \otimes \omega)$ and $\lambda \in f(I) \Rightarrow \exists \mathfrak{h} \in \dagger \otimes \omega$ and $\mathfrak{q} \in I$, such that

$\lambda = f(\mathfrak{h})$ and $\lambda = f(\mathfrak{q})$, since

$\sigma \in f(\mathfrak{h}) \otimes f(\mathfrak{q}) = f(\mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathfrak{q}) \Rightarrow (\mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathfrak{q})$ contains an element say ϱ such that $f(\varrho) = \sigma$
 $\Rightarrow \varrho \in \ker(f) \subseteq I$ and thus $(\mathfrak{h} \otimes \mathfrak{q}) \cap I \neq \phi$,

Since I a strong hyperZ – ideal of Z_1 , and $\mathfrak{q} \in I \Rightarrow \mathfrak{h} \in I$, since $\mathfrak{h} \in \dagger \otimes \omega$

$\Rightarrow (\dagger \otimes \omega) \cap I \neq \phi$, since I a strong hyperZ – ideal of Z_1 , and $\omega \in I$

$\Rightarrow \dagger \in I$, therefore $\tau = f(\dagger) \in f(I)$, then $f(I)$ is a strong hyperZ – ideal of Z_2 .

Conclusions

This work introduces a new hyper algebra This is an extension of Z-algebra ,and defined hyper(subalgebras, weakhyper Z – ideal , strong hyperZ – ideal, Z-homomorphism), and particular hyperZ-algebra types were studied. isomorphism theorems were finally studied. In future publications, we will study Z-superhyperalgebra and several forms of ideals in Z-superhyperalgebra.

References:

[1] F. Marty, Sur une generalization de la notion de group, 8th Congress Math. Scandinaves, Stockholm, (1934), 45-49.

[2] P. Corsini, Prolegomena of hypergroup theory, (Second Edition), Aviani Editor, 1993.

[3] Y.B. Jun, M.M. Zahedi, X.L. Xin, R.A. Borzooei, On hyper BCK-algebras, Italian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 8 (2000), 127-136.

[4] R.A. Borzooei, A. Hasankhani, M.M. Zahedi, Y.B. Jun, On hyper K-algebras, Japanese Journal of Mathematics, 52(1) (2000), 113-121.

[5] X.L. Xin, Hyper BCI-algebras, Discuss Mathematics Society, 26 (2006), 5-19.

[6] R.A. Borzooei, W.A. Dudek, N. Kouhestani, On hyper BCC-algebras, International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences, (2006), 1-18. DOI:org/10.1155/IJMMS/2006/49703

[7] J.C. Endam, On hyper B-Algebras, Dissertation, MSU-IIT, 2019.

[8] A.L.O. Vicedo, J.P. Vilela, Hyper B-ideals in hyper B-algebra, Journal of Ultra Scientist of Physical Sciences, 29(8) (2017), 339-347. DOI: 10.22147/jusps-A/290805

[9] S. Niaziyan, On hyper BI-algebras , JAHLA ,vol(2),N(1)(2021),P 47-67. DOI:10.52547/HATEF.JAHLA.2.1.4

[10] Chandramouleeswaran M., Muralikrishna P., Sujatha K. and Sabarinathan S., A note on Z-algebra, Italian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics-N.38, 707-714 (2017). [Google Scholar](#).