Locally γ-compact Spaces Based on Łukasiewicz Logic

O. R. Sayed

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Assiut University, Assiut 71516, EGYPT
E-mail:o_sayed@aum.edu.eg, o_r_sayed@yahoo.com

Abstract:

In this paper, some characterizations of fuzzifying γ-compactness are given, including characterizations in terms of nets and γ-subbases. Several characterizations of locally γ-compactness in the framework of fuzzifying topology are introduced and the mapping theorems are obtained.

Keywords and Phrases:

Łukasiewicz logic; semantics; fuzzifying topology; fuzzifying compactness; γ-compactness; fuzzifying locally compactness; locally γ-compactness.

1. Introduction and preliminaries

In the last few years fuzzy topology, as an important research field in fuzzy set theory, has been developed into a quite mature discipline [6-8, 11-12, 22]. In contrast to classical topology, fuzzy topology is endowed with richer structure, to a certain extent, which is manifested with different ways to generalize certain classical concepts. So far, according to Ref. [7], the kind of topologies defined by Chang [2] and Goguen [3] is called the topologies of fuzzy subsets, and further is naturally called L-topological spaces if a lattice L of membership values has been chosen. Loosely speaking, a topology of fuzzy subsets (resp. an L-topological space) is a family τ of fuzzy subsets (resp. L-fuzzy subsets) of nonempty set X, and τ satisfies the basic conditions of classical topologies [10]. On the other hand, Hohle in [5] proposed the terminology L-fuzzy topology to be an L-valued mapping on the traditional powerset $P(X)$ of X. The authors in [9, 11-12, 16] defined an L-fuzzy topology to be an L-valued mapping on the L-powerset L^X of X.

In 1952, Rosser and Turquette [17] proposed emphatically the following problem: If there are many-valued theories beyond the level of predicates calculus, then what are the detail of such theories? As an attempt to give a partial answer to this problem in the case of point set topology, Ying in 1991-1993 [23-25] used a semantical method of continuous-valued logic to develop systematically fuzzifying topology. Briefly speaking,

a fuzzifying topology on a set X assigns each crisp subset of X to a certain degree of being open, other than being definitely open or not. Roughly speaking, the semantical analysis approach transforms formal statements of interest, which are usually expressed as implication formulas in logical language, into some inequalities in the truth value set by truth valuation rules, and then these inequalities are demonstrated in an algebraic way and the semantic validity of conclusions is thus established. So far, there has been significant research on fuzzifying topologies [13-15, 18-21, 26]. For example, Ying [26] introduced the concepts of compactness and established a generalization of Tychonoff's theorem in the framework of fuzzifying topology. In [21] the concept of local compactness in fuzzifying topology is introduced and some of its properties are established. Generalzied open sets play a very important role in General Topology and they are now the research topics of many topologists worldwide. Indeed a significant theme in General Topology and Real Analysis is the study of variously modified forms of continuity, separation axioms etc. by utilizing generalized open sets. One of the most well known notions and also an inspiration source is the notion of b-open [1] sets introduced by Andrijevic in 1996. In [4] Hanafy used the term γ-open sets instead of b-open sets and studied the concepts of γ-open sets and γ-continuity in fuzzy topology [2]. In [13] the concepts of fuzzifying γ-open sets and fuzzifying γ-continuity were introduced and studied. Also, Sayed [19] introduced some concepts of fuzzifying γ-separation axioms and clarified the relations of these axioms with each other as well as the relations with other fuzzifyign separation axioms. Furthermore, in [20], Sayed characterized the concepts of fuzzifying γ-irresolute functions and used the finite intersection property to give a characterization of fuzzifying γ-compact spaces. In this paper, the concepts of γ-base and γ-subbase of fuzzifying γ-topology are introduced. Other characterizations of fuzzifying γ-compactness are given, including characterizations in terms of nets and γ-subbase. Several characterizations of locally γ-compactness in the framework of fuzzifying topology are introduced and the mapping theorems are obtained. Thus we fill a gap in the existing literature on fuzziyfing topology. We use the terminologies and notations in [13, 19-25] without any explanation. We note that the set of truth values is the unit interval and we do often not distinguish the connectives and their truth value functions and state strictly our results on formalization as Ying does. We will use the symbol $\otimes$ instead of the second "AND" operation $\wedge$ as dot is hardly visible. This mean that $[\gamma] \leq [\varphi \to \psi] \Leftrightarrow [\gamma] \otimes [\varphi] \leq [\psi]$. All of the contributions in general topology in this paper which are not referenced may be original. We now give some definitions and results which are useful in the rest of the present paper. The family of all fuzzifying γ-open sets [13], denoted by $\tau_\gamma \in \Im(P(X))$, is defined as follows:

$$A \in \tau_\gamma := \forall x \left(x \in A \to x \in \left(\mathrm{Cl}\left(\mathrm{Int}(A)\right) \cup \mathrm{Int}\left(\mathrm{Cl}(A)\right)\right)\right),$$

$$\text{i.e., } \tau_\gamma(A) = \bigwedge_{x \in A} \left(\mathrm{Cl}\left(\mathrm{Int}(A)\right)(x) \vee \mathrm{Int}\left(\mathrm{Cl}(A)\right)(x)\right).$$

The family of all fuzzifying γ-closed sets [13], denoted by $\mathcal{F}_\gamma \in \Im(P(X))$, is defined as $A \in \mathcal{F}_\gamma := X - A \in \tau_\gamma$. The fuzzifying γ-neighborhood system of a point $x \in X$ [13] is denoted by $N_x^{\gamma^X}$ (or N_x^γ) $\in \Im(P(X))$ and defined as $N_x^\gamma(A) = \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \tau_\gamma(B)$. The

fuzzifying γ -closure of a set $A \subseteq X$ [13], denoted by $\mathrm{Cl}_\gamma \in \Im(X)$, is defined as $\mathrm{Cl}_\gamma (A)(x) = 1 - N_x^\gamma (X - A)$. If (X, τ) is a fuzzifying topological space and $N(x)$ is the class of all nets in X, then the binary fuzzy predicates $\rhd^\gamma, \propto^\gamma \in \Im(N(X) \times X)$ [18] are defined as $S \rhd^\gamma x := \forall A\left(A \in N_x^{\gamma^X} \to S \,\tilde{\subset}\, A\right)$, $S \propto^\gamma x := \forall A\left(A \in N_x^{\gamma^X} \to S \,\tilde{\sqsubset}\, A\right)$, where "$S \rhd^\gamma x$", "$S \propto^\gamma x$" stand for "$S\gamma$ -converges to x", "x is an γ -accumulation point of S", respectively; and "$\tilde{\subset}$", "$\tilde{\sqsubset}$" are the binary crisp predicates "almost in", "often in", respectively. The degree to which x is an γ -adherence point of S is $adh_\gamma S(x) = \left[S \propto^\gamma x\right]$. If (X, τ) and (Y, σ) are two fuzzifying topological spaces and $f \in Y^X$, the unary fuzzy predicates $C_\gamma, I_\gamma \in \Im(Y^X)$, called fuzzifying γ -continuity [13], fuzzifying γ -irresoluteness [20], are given as $C_\gamma(f) := \forall B\left(B \in \sigma \to f^{-1}(B) \in \tau_\gamma\right)$, $I_\gamma(f) := \forall B\left(B \in \sigma_\gamma \to f^{-1}(B) \in \tau_\gamma\right)$, resepctivley. Let Ω be the class of all fuzzifying topological spaces. A unary fuzzy predicate $T_2^\gamma \in \Im(\Omega)$, called fuzzifying γ - Hausdorffness [19], is given as follows:

$$T_2^\gamma (X, \tau) = \forall x \forall y \big((x \in X \wedge y \in X \wedge x \neq y) \to$$
$$\exists B \exists C \left(B \in N_x^\gamma \wedge C \in N_y^\gamma \wedge B \cap C \equiv \phi\right)\big)$$

A unary fuzzy predicate $\Gamma \in \Im(\Omega)$, called fuzzifying compactness [20], is given as follows: $\Gamma(X, \tau) := (\forall \Re)\left(K_\circ(\Re, X) \to (\exists \wp)\left((\wp \leq \Re) \wedge K(\wp, A) \otimes FF(\wp)\right)\right)$ and if $A \subseteq X$, then $\Gamma(A) := \Gamma(A, \tau/A)$. For K, $K_\circ$ (resp. $\leq$ and FF) see [24, Definition 4.4] (resp. [24, Theorem 4.3] and [26, Definition 1.1 and lemma 1.1]). A unary fuzzy predicate $fI \in \Im(\Im(P(X)))$, called fuzzy finite intersection property [26], is given as $fI(\Re) := \forall \wp\left((\wp \leq \Re) \wedge FF(\wp) \to \exists x \forall B(B \in \wp \to x \in B)\right)$. A fuzzifying topological space (X, τ) is said to be fuzzifying γ -topological space [20] if $\tau_\gamma (A \cap B) \geq \tau_\gamma (A) \wedge \tau_\gamma (B)$. A binary fuzzy predicate $K_\gamma \in \Im(\Im(P(X)) \times P(X))$, called fuzzifying γ - open covering [20], is given as $K_\gamma(\Re, A) := K(\Re, A) \otimes (\Re \subseteq \tau_\gamma)$. A unary fuzzy predicate $\Gamma_\gamma \in \Im(\Omega)$, called fuzzifying γ -compactness [20], is given as follows: $(X, \tau) \in \Gamma_\gamma := (\forall \Re)\left(K_\gamma(\Re, X) \to (\exists \wp)\left((\wp \leq \Re) \wedge K(\wp, X) \otimes FF(\wp)\right)\right)$ and if $A \subseteq X$, then $\Gamma_\gamma(A) := \Gamma_\gamma(A, \tau/A)$. It is obvious that $\Gamma_\gamma(X, \tau) := \Gamma(X, \tau_\gamma)$, $\Gamma_\gamma(A, \tau/A) := \Gamma(A, \tau_\gamma/A)$ and $\vDash K_\circ(\Re, A) \to K_\gamma(\Re, A)$. A unary fuzzy predicate $LC \in \Im(\Omega)$, called fuzzifying locally compactness [21], is given as follows: $(X, \tau) \in LC := (\forall x)(\exists B)\big((x \in \mathrm{Int}(B) \otimes \Gamma(B, \tau/B))\big)$.

2. Fuzzifying γ -base and γ -subbase

Definition 2.1. Let (X, τ) be a fuzzifying topological space and $\beta_\gamma \subseteq \tau_\gamma$. Then β_γ is called an γ -base of τ_γ if β_γ fulfils the condition: $\vDash A \in N_x^{\gamma^X} \rightarrow \exists B\big((B \in \beta_\gamma) \wedge (x \in B \subseteq A)\big)$.

Theorem 2.1. β_γ is an γ -base of τ_γ if and only if $\tau_\gamma = \beta_\gamma^{(\cup)}$, where $\beta_\gamma^{(\cup)}(A) = \bigvee_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = A} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta_\gamma(B_\lambda)$.

Proof. Suppose that β_γ is an γ -base of τ_γ. If $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\gamma = A$,then from Theorem 3.1 (1) (b) in [13], $\tau_\gamma(A) = \tau_\gamma\left(\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda\right) \geq \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \tau_\gamma(B_\lambda) \geq \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta_\gamma(B_\lambda)$. Consequently, $\tau_\gamma(A) \geq \bigvee_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = A} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta_\gamma(B_\lambda)$. To prove that $\tau_\gamma(A) \leq \bigvee_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = A} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta_\gamma(B_\lambda)$, we first prove $\tau_\gamma(A) = \bigwedge_{x \in A} \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \tau_\gamma(B)$. (Indeed, assume $\delta_x = \{B : x \in B \subseteq A\}$. Then for any $f \in \prod_{x \in A} \delta_x$, $\bigcup_{x \in A} f(x) = A$, and furthermore $\tau_\gamma(A) = \tau_\gamma\left(\bigcup_{x \in A} f(x)\right) \geq \bigwedge_{x \in A} \tau_\gamma\big(f(x)\big) \geq \bigvee_{f \in \prod_{x \in A} \delta_x} \bigwedge_{x \in A} \tau_\gamma\big(f(x)\big) = \bigwedge_{x \in A} \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \tau_\gamma(B)$. Also $\tau_\gamma(A) \leq \bigwedge_{x \in A} \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \tau_\gamma(B)$. Therefore $\tau_\gamma(A) = \bigwedge_{x \in A} \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \tau_\gamma(B)$.

Now, since $N_x^{\gamma^X}(A) \leq \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \beta_\gamma(B)$, $\tau_\gamma(A) = \bigwedge_{x \in A} \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \tau_\gamma(B) = \bigwedge_{x \in A} N_x^{\gamma^X}(A) \leq \bigwedge_{x \in A} \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \beta_\gamma(B) = \bigvee_{f \in \prod_{x \in A} \delta_x} \bigwedge_{x \in A} \beta_\gamma\big(f(x)\big)$. Then $\tau_\gamma(A) \leq \bigvee_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = A} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta_\gamma(B_\lambda)$. Therefore $\tau_\gamma(A) = \bigvee_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = A} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta_\lambda(B_\lambda)$. In the other side, we assume $\tau_\gamma(A) = \bigvee_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = A} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta_\gamma(B_\lambda)$ and we will show that β_γ is an γ -base of τ_γ, i.e., for any $A \subseteq X$, $N_x^{\gamma^X}(A) \leq \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \beta_\gamma(B)$. Indeed, if $x \in B \subseteq A$, $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = B$, then there exists $\lambda_\circ \in \Lambda$ such that $x \in B_{\lambda_\circ}$ and $\bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta_\gamma(B_\lambda) \leq \beta_\gamma(B_{\lambda_\circ}) \leq \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \beta_\gamma(B)$. Therefore
$$N_x^{\gamma^X}(A) = \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \tau_\gamma(B) = \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \bigvee_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = A} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta_\gamma(B_\lambda) \leq \bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \beta_\gamma(B).$$

Theorem 2.2. Let $\beta_\gamma \in \Im\big(P(X)\big)$. Then β_γ is an γ -base for some fuzzifying γ -topology τ_γ if and only if it has the following properties:

(1) $\beta_\gamma^{(\cup)}(X) = 1$;

(2) $\vDash (A \in \beta_\gamma) \wedge (B \in \beta_\gamma) \wedge (x \in A \cap B) \rightarrow \exists C\big((C \in \beta_\gamma) \wedge (x \in C \subseteq A \cap B)\big)$.

Proof. If β_γ is an γ -base for some fuzzifying γ -topology $\tau_\gamma(X) = \beta_\gamma^{(\cup)}(X)$. Clearly, $\beta_\gamma^{(\cup)}(X) = 1$. In addition, if $x \in A \cap B$, then $\beta_\gamma(A) \wedge \beta_\gamma(B) \leq \tau_\gamma(A) \wedge \tau_\gamma(B) \leq \tau_\gamma(A \cap B) \leq N_x^{\gamma^X}(A \cap B) \leq \bigvee_{x \in C \subseteq A \cap B} \beta_\gamma(C)$. Conversely, if β_γ satisfies (1) and (2), then we have τ_γ is a fuzzifying γ -topology. In fact, $\tau_\gamma(X) = 1$. For any $\{A_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \subseteq P(X)$, we get $\delta_\lambda = \left\{\big\{B_{\Phi_\lambda} : \Phi_\lambda \in \Lambda_\lambda\big\} : \bigcup_{\Phi_\lambda \in \Lambda_\lambda} B_{\Phi_\lambda} = A_\lambda\right\}$. Then for any $f \in \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \delta_\lambda$

$\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \bigcup_{B_{\Phi_\lambda} \in f(\lambda)} B_{\Phi_\lambda} = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda$. Therefore $\tau_\gamma \left(\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda \right) = \bigvee_{\substack{\bigcup_{\Phi \in \Lambda} B_\Phi = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda}} \bigwedge_{\Phi \in \Lambda} \beta_\gamma (B_\Phi) \geq \bigvee_{f \in \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \delta_\lambda}$

$\bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \bigwedge_{B_{\Phi_\lambda} \in f(\lambda)} \beta_\gamma \left(B_{\Phi_\lambda} \right) \geq \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \bigvee_{\{B_{\Phi_\lambda} : \Phi_\lambda \in \Lambda_\lambda\} \in \delta_\lambda} \bigwedge_{\Phi_\lambda \in \Lambda_\lambda} \beta_\gamma \left(B_{\Phi_\lambda} \right) = \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \tau_\gamma (A_\lambda)$.

Finally, we need to prove that $\tau_\gamma (A \cap B) \geq \tau_\gamma (A) \wedge \tau_\gamma (B)$. If $\tau_\gamma (A) > t$, $\tau_\gamma (B) > t$, then there exists $\{B_{\lambda_1} : \lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1\}$, $\{B_{\lambda_2} : \lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2\}$ such that $\bigcup_{\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1} B_{\lambda_1} = A$, $\bigcup_{\lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2} B_{\lambda_2} = B$ and for any $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1$, $\beta_\lambda \left(B_{\lambda_1} \right) > t$, for any $\lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2$, $\beta_\gamma \left(B_{\lambda_2} \right) > t$. Now, for any $x \in A \cap B$, there exists $\lambda_{1x} \in \Lambda_1$, $\lambda_{2x} \in \Lambda_2$ such that $x \in B_{\lambda_{1x}} \cap B_{\lambda_{2x}}$. From the assumption, we know that $t < \beta_\gamma \left(B_{\lambda_{1x}} \right) \wedge \beta_\gamma \left(B_{\lambda_{2x}} \right) \leq \bigvee_{x \in C \subseteq B_{\lambda_{1x}} \cap B_{\lambda_{2x}}} \beta_\gamma (C)$ and furthermore, there exists C_x such that $x \in C_x \subseteq B_{\lambda_{1x}} \cap B_{\lambda_{2x}} \subseteq A \cap B$, $\beta_\gamma (C_x) > t$. Since $\bigcup_{x \in A \cap B} C_x = A \cap B$, we have $t \leq \bigwedge_{x \in A \cap B} \beta_\gamma (C_x) \leq \bigvee_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = A \cap B} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta_\gamma (B_\lambda) = \tau_\gamma (A \cap B)$. Now, let $\tau_\gamma (A) \wedge \tau_\gamma (B) = k$. For any natural number n, we have $\tau_\gamma (A) > k - 1/n$, $\tau_\gamma (B) > k - 1/n$ and so $\tau_\gamma (A \cap B) \geq k - 1/n$. Therefore $\tau_\gamma (A \cap B) \geq k = \tau_\gamma (A) \wedge \tau_\gamma (B)$.

Definition 2.2. $\varphi_\gamma \in \Im(P(X))$ is called an γ-subbase of τ_γ if $\varphi_\gamma^\cap$ is an γ-base of τ_γ, where $\varphi_\gamma^\cap \left(\bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda \right) = \bigvee_{\bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = A} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \varphi_\lambda (B_\lambda)$, $\{B_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \Subset P(X)$, with " $\Subset$ " standing for "a finite subset of".

Theorem 2.3. $\varphi_\gamma \in \Im(P(X))$ *is an γ-subbase of some fuzzifying γ-topology if and only if* $\varphi_\gamma^{(\cup)} (X) = 1$.

Proof. We only demonstrate that $\varphi_\gamma^\cap$ satisfies the second condition of Theorem 2.2, and others are obvious. In fact $\varphi_\gamma^\cap (A) \wedge \varphi_\gamma^\cap (B) = \left(\bigvee_{\substack{\bigcap_{\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1} B_{\lambda_1} = A}} \bigwedge_{\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1} \varphi_\gamma \left(B_{\lambda_1} \right) \right) \wedge \left(\bigvee_{\substack{\bigcap_{\lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2} B_{\lambda_2} = B}} \right.$

$\left. \bigwedge_{\lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2} \varphi_\gamma \left(B_{\lambda_2} \right) \right) = \bigvee_{\substack{\bigcap_{\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1} B_{\lambda_1} = A \\ \bigcap_{\lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2} B_{\lambda_2} = B}} \left(\bigwedge_{\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1} \varphi_\gamma \left(B_{\lambda_1} \right) \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{\lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2} \varphi_\gamma \left(B_{\lambda_2} \right) \right) \leq \bigvee_{\substack{\bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = A \cap B}} \left(\bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \varphi_\gamma \right.$

$\left(B_\lambda \right) \Big) = \varphi_\gamma^\cap (A \cap B)$. Therefore if $x \in A \cap B$, then $\varphi_\gamma^\cap (A) \wedge \varphi_\gamma^\cap (B) \leq \varphi_\gamma^\cap (A \cap B) \leq \bigvee_{x \in C \subseteq A \cap B} \varphi_\gamma^\cap (C)$.

3. Fuzzifying γ-compact spaces

Theorem 3.1. *Let (X, τ) be a fuzzifying topological space, φ_γ be an γ-subbase of τ_γ, and*

$\beta_1 := (\forall \Re)\Big(K_{\varphi_\gamma}(\Re, X) \to \exists \wp\big(\wp \leq \Re\big) \wedge K(\wp, X) \otimes FF(\wp)\big)\Big)$,   where $K_{\varphi_\gamma}(\Re, X)$
$:= K(\Re, X) \otimes \big(\Re \subseteq \varphi_\gamma\big)$;

$\beta_2 := (\forall S)$ $\big(S$ is a universal net in $X\big) \to \exists x\big((x \in X) \wedge (S \rhd^\gamma x)\big)$;

$\beta_3 := (\forall S)$ $\Big(S \in N(X) \to (\exists T)(\exists x)(T < S) \wedge (x \in X) \wedge \big(T \rhd^\gamma x\big)\Big)$, where " $T < S$ "
stands for " T is a subnet of S ";

$\beta_4 := (\forall S)$ $\Big(S \in N(X) \to \neg\big(adh_\gamma S \equiv \phi\big)\Big)$;

$\beta_5 :=$ $(\forall \Re)$ $\Big(\Re \in \mathcal{F}\big(P(X)\big) \wedge \Re \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\gamma \otimes fI(\Re) \to \exists x \forall A\big(A \in \Re \to x \in A\big)\Big)$. *Then*
$\models (X, \tau) \in \Gamma_\gamma \leftrightarrow \beta_i$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, 5$.

Proof. (1) Since $\varphi_\gamma \subseteq \tau_\gamma$, $\big[\Re \subseteq \varphi_\gamma\big] \leq \big[\Re \subseteq \tau_\gamma\big]$ for any $\Re \in \Im\big(P(X)\big)$. Then
$\Big[K_{\varphi_\gamma}(\Re, X)\Big] \leq \Big[K_\gamma(\Re, X)\Big]$. Therefore $\Gamma_\gamma(X, \tau) \leq \big[\beta_1\big]$.

(2) $\big[\beta_2\big] = \wedge\Big\{\bigvee_{x \in X}\big[S \rhd^\gamma x\big] : S$ is a universal net in $X\Big\}$.

(2.1) Assume X is finite. We set $X = \{x_1, \cdots, x_m\}$. For any universal net S in X ,
there exists $i_\circ \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$ with $S \tilde{\subseteq} \{x_{i_\circ}\}$. In fact, if not, then for any $i \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$,
$S \tilde{\not\subseteq} \{x_{i_\circ}\}$, $S \tilde{\subseteq} X - \{x_{i_\circ}\}$ and $S \tilde{\subseteq} \bigcap_{i=1}^{m}\big(X - \{x_{i_\circ}\}\big) = \phi$, a contradiction. Therefore
$x_{i_\circ} \notin A$ and $N_{x_{i_\circ}}^\gamma(A) = 0$ (see [13], Theorem 4.2 (1)) provided $S \tilde{\not\subseteq} A$, and
furtheremore $\big[S \rhd^\gamma x_{i_\circ}\big] = \wedge_{S \tilde{\not\subseteq} A}\big(1 - N_{x_{i_\circ}}^\gamma(A)\big) = 1$.

Therefore $\big[\beta_2\big] = 1 \geq \big[\beta_1\big]$.

(2.2) In general, to prove that $\big[\beta_1\big] \leq \big[\beta_2\big]$ we prove that for any $\lambda \in [0,1]$, if $\big[\beta_2\big] < \lambda$,
then $\big[\beta_1\big] < \lambda$. Assume for any $\lambda \in [0,1]$, $\big[\beta_2\big] < \lambda$. Then there exists a universal net S
in X such that $\bigvee_{x \in X}\big[S \rhd^\gamma x\big] < \lambda$ and for any $x \in X$, $\big[S \rhd^\gamma x\big] = \wedge_{S \tilde{\not\subseteq} A}\big(1 - N_x^\gamma(A)\big) < \lambda$,
i.e., there exists $A \subseteq X$ with $S \tilde{\not\subseteq} A$ and $N_x^\gamma(A) > 1 - \lambda$. Since φ_γ is an γ -subbase of
τ_γ , $\varphi_\gamma^\cap$ is an γ -base of τ_γ and from Definition 2.1, we have $\bigvee_{x \in B \subseteq A} \varphi_\gamma^\cap(B) \geq N_x^\gamma(A)$
$> 1 - \lambda$, i.e., there exists $B \subseteq A$ such that $x \in B \subseteq A$ and $\vee\Big\{\min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \varphi_\gamma(B_\lambda) : \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda$
$= B, B_\lambda \subseteq X, \lambda \in \Lambda\Big\} = \varphi_\gamma^\cap(B) > 1 - \lambda$, where Λ is finite. Therefore there exists a finite
set Λ and $B_\lambda \subseteq X (\lambda \in \Lambda)$ such that $\bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = B$ and for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $\varphi_\gamma(B_\lambda) > 1 - \lambda$.
Since $S \tilde{\not\subseteq} A$ and Λ is finite, there exists $\lambda(x) \in \Lambda$ such that $S \tilde{\not\subseteq} B_{\lambda(x)}$. We set
$\Re_\circ\big(B_{\lambda(x)}\big) = \bigvee_{x \in A} \varphi_\gamma\big(B_{\lambda(x)}\big)$. If $\wp \leq \Re_\circ$, then for any $\delta > 0$, $\wp_\delta \subseteq \Big\{B_{\lambda(x)} : x \in X\Big\}$.
Consequently, for any $B \in \wp_\delta$, $S \tilde{\not\subseteq} B$ and $S \tilde{\subseteq} B^c$ because S is a universal net. If
$\big[FF(\wp)\big] = 1 - \inf\big\{\delta \in [0,1] : F(\wp_\delta)\big\} = t$,then for any $n \in w$ (the non-negative integer),
$\inf\big\{\delta \in [0,1] : F(\wp_\delta)\big\} < 1 - t + 1/n$, and there exists $\delta_\circ < 1 - t + 1/n$ such that $F(\wp_{\delta_\circ})$.

If $\delta_\circ = 0$, then $P(X) = \wp_{\delta_\circ}$ is finite and it is proved in (2.1). If $\delta_\circ > 0$, then for any $B \in \wp_{\delta_\circ}$, $S \tilde{\subset} B^c$. Since $F(\wp_{\delta_\circ})$, we have $S \tilde{\subset} \bigcap \{ B^c : B \in \wp_{\delta_\circ} \} \neq \phi$. I.e., $\bigcup_{\wp_{\delta_\circ}} \neq X$ and there exist $x_\circ \in X$ such that for any $B \in \wp_{\delta_\circ}$, $x_\circ \notin B$. Therefore, if $x_\circ \in B$, then $B \notin \wp_{\delta_\circ}$, i.e., $\wp(B) < \delta_\circ$, $K(\wp, X) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} \bigvee_{x \in B} \wp(B) \leq \bigvee_{x_\circ \in B} \wp(B) \leq \delta_\circ < 1 - t + 1/n$. Let $n \to \infty$. We obtain $K(\wp, X) \leq 1 - t$ and $\left[K(\wp, X) \otimes FF(\wp) \right] = 0$. In addition, $\left[K_{\varphi_\gamma}(\mathfrak{R}_\circ, X) \right] \geq 1 - \lambda$. In fact, $\left[\mathfrak{R}_\circ \subseteq \varphi_\gamma \right] = 1$ and $\left[K(\mathfrak{R}_\circ, X) \right] = \bigwedge_{x \in X} \bigvee_{x \in B} \mathfrak{R}_\circ(B) \geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} \mathfrak{R}_\circ \left(B_{\lambda(x)} \right) \geq \bigwedge_{x \in X} \varphi_\gamma \left(B_{\lambda(x)} \right) \geq 1 - \lambda$ because $x \in B_{\lambda(x)}$. Now, we have $[\beta_1] = (\forall \mathfrak{R})$ $\left(K_{\varphi_\gamma}(\mathfrak{R}, X) \to \exists \wp \left((\wp \leq \mathfrak{R}) \wedge K(\wp, X) \otimes FF(\wp) \right) \right) \leq K_{\varphi_\gamma}(\mathfrak{R}_\circ, X) \to \exists \wp \left((\wp \leq \mathfrak{R}_\circ) \wedge K(\wp, X) \otimes FF(\wp) \right) = \min \left(1, 1 - K_{\varphi_\gamma}(\mathfrak{R}_\circ, X) + \bigvee_{\wp \leq \mathfrak{R}_\circ} \left[K(\wp, X) \otimes FF(\wp) \right] \right) \leq \lambda$. By noticing that λ is arbitrary, we have $[\beta_1] \leq [\beta_2]$.

(3) It is immediate that $[\beta_2] \leq [\beta_3]$.

(4) To prove that $[\beta_3] \leq [\beta_4]$, first we prove that $\left[\exists T \left((T<S) \wedge (T \rhd^\gamma x) \right) \right] \leq \left[S \propto^\gamma x \right]$, where $\left[\exists T \left((T<S) \wedge (T \rhd^\gamma x) \right) \right] = \bigvee_{T<S} \bigwedge_{T \tilde{\not\subset} A} \left(1 - N_x^\gamma(A) \right)$ and $\left[S \propto^\gamma x \right] = \bigwedge_{S \tilde{\not\sqsubset} A} \left(1 - N_x^\gamma (A) \right)$. Indeed, for any $T < S$ on can deduce $\{ A : S \tilde{\not\sqsubset} A \} \subseteq \{ A : T \tilde{\not\subset} A \}$ as follows. Suppose $T = S \circ K$. If $S \tilde{\not\sqsubset} A$, then there exists $m \in D$ such that $S(n) \notin A$ when $n \geq m$, where $\geq$ directs the domain D of S. Now, we will show that $T \tilde{\not\subset} A$. If not, then there exists $p \in E$ such that $T(q) \in A$ when $q \geq p$, where $\geq$ directs the domain E of T. Moreover, there exists $n_1 \in E$ such that $K(n_1) \geq m$ because $T < S$, and there exists $n_2 \in E$ such that $n_2 \geq n_1$, p because $(E, \geq)$ is directed. So, $K(n_2) \geq K(n_1) \geq m$, $S \circ K(n_2) \notin A$ and $S \circ K(n_2) = T(n_2) \in A$. They are contrary. Hence $\{ A : S \tilde{\not\sqsubset} A \} \subseteq \{ A : T \tilde{\not\subset} A \}$. Therefore $\left[\exists T \left((T<S) \wedge (T \rhd^\gamma x) \right) \right] = \bigvee_{T<S} \bigwedge_{T \tilde{\not\subset} A} \left(1 - N_x^\gamma(A) \right) = \bigvee_{T<S} \bigwedge_{\{A : T \tilde{\not\subset} A\}} \left(1 - N_x^\gamma(A) \right) \leq \bigwedge_{\{A : S \tilde{\not\sqsubset} A\}} \left(1 - N_x^\gamma(A) \right) = \bigwedge_{S \tilde{\not\sqsubset} A} \left(1 - N_x^\gamma(A) \right) = \left[S \propto^\gamma x \right]$. Therefore for any $x \in X$ and $S \in N(X)$ we have $[\beta_3] = \bigwedge_{S \in N(X)} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left[\exists T \left((T<S) \wedge (T \rhd^\gamma x) \right) \right] \leq \bigwedge_{S \in N(X)} \bigvee_{x \in X} \left[S \propto^\gamma x \right] = \bigwedge_{S \in N(X)} \neg \left(\bigwedge_{x \in X} \left(1 - \left[S \propto^\gamma x \right] \right) \right) = \bigwedge_{S \in N(X)} \left[\neg \left(adh_\gamma S \equiv \phi \right) \right] = [\beta_4]$.

(5) We want to show that $[\beta_4] \leq [\beta_5]$. For any $\mathfrak{R} \in F(P(X))$, assume $\left[fI(\mathfrak{R}) \right] = \lambda$. Then for any $\delta > 1 - \lambda$, if $A_1, \cdots, A_n \in \mathfrak{R}_\delta$, $A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \cdots \cap A_n \neq \phi$. In fact, we get $\wp(A_i) = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{R}(A_i)$. Then $\wp \leq \mathfrak{R}$ and $FF(\wp) = 1$. By putting $\varepsilon = \lambda + \delta - 1 > 0$, we obtain $\lambda - \varepsilon < \lambda \leq \left[FF(\wp) \to (\exists x)(\forall B)(B \in \wp \to x \in B) \right] = \bigvee_{x \in X} \bigwedge_{x \notin B} \left(1 - \wp(B) \right)$. There exists $x_\circ \in X$ such that $\lambda - \varepsilon < \bigwedge_{x_\circ \notin B} \left(1 - \wp(B) \right)$, $x_\circ \notin B$ implies $\wp(B) < 1 - \lambda + \varepsilon = \delta$

and $x_{\circ} \in \bigcap \wp_{\delta} = A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \cdots \cap A_n$. Now, we get $\vartheta_{\delta} = \{A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \cdots \cap A_n : n \in N, A_1,$ $\cdots, A_n \in \Re_{\delta}\}$ and $S : \vartheta_{\delta} \to X$, $B \mapsto x_B \in B$, $B \in \vartheta_{\delta}$ and know that $(\vartheta_{\delta}, \subseteq)$ is a directed set and S is a net in X. Therefore $[\beta_4] \leq \left[\neg\left(adh_{\gamma} S \equiv \phi\right)\right] = \bigvee_{x \in X} \bigwedge_{S \tilde{\pitchfork} A} (1 - N_x^{\gamma}(A))$. Assume $\left[\Re \subseteq F_{\gamma}\right] = \mu$. Then for any $B \in P(X)$, $\Re(B) \leq 1 + F_{\gamma}(B) - \mu$, and $\left[\Re \subseteq F_{\gamma} \otimes fI(A) \to (\exists x)(\forall A) \quad ((A \in \Re) \to x \in A)\right] = \min(1, 2 - \mu - \lambda + \bigvee_{x \in X} \bigwedge_{x \notin A}(1 - \Re(A)))$ Therefore, it suffices to show that for any $x \in X$, $\bigwedge_{S \tilde{\pitchfork} A}\left(1 - N_x^{\gamma}(A)\right)$ $\leq 2 - \mu - \lambda + \bigwedge_{x \notin A}\left(1 - \Re(A)\right)$, i.e., $\bigvee_{x \notin A} \Re(A) \leq 2 - \mu - \lambda + \bigvee_{S \tilde{\pitchfork} A} N_x^{\gamma}(A)$ for some $\delta > 1 - \lambda$. For any $t \in [0,1]$, if $\bigvee_{x \notin A} \Re(A) > t$, then there exists $A_{\circ}$ such that $x_{\circ} \notin A_{\circ}$ and $\Re(A_{\circ}) > t$.

Case 1. $t \leq 1 - \lambda$, then $t \leq 2 - \mu - \lambda + \bigvee_{S \tilde{\pitchfork} A} N_x^{\gamma}(A)$.

Case 2. $t > 1 - \lambda$. Here we set $\delta = 1/2(t + 1 - \lambda)$ and have $A_{\circ} \in \Re_{\delta}$, $A_{\circ} \in \vartheta_{\delta}$. In addition, $t < \Re(A_{\circ}) \leq 1 + F_{\gamma}(A_{\circ}) - \mu$, $t + \mu - 1 \leq F_{\gamma}(A_{\circ}) = \tau_{\gamma}(A_{\circ}^c)$. Since $A_{\circ} \in \vartheta_{\delta}$, we know that $S_B \in A_{\circ}$, i.e., $S_B \notin A_{\circ}^c$ when $B \subseteq A_{\circ}$ and $S \tilde{\pitchfork} A_{\circ}^c$. Therefore, $2 - \mu - \lambda + \bigvee_{S \tilde{\pitchfork} A} N_x^{\gamma}(A) \geq 2 - \mu - \lambda + N_x^{\gamma}(A_{\circ}^c) \geq 2 - \mu - \lambda + \tau_{\gamma}(A_{\circ}^c) \geq t + (1 - \lambda) \geq t$. By noticing that t is arbitrary, we have complete the proof.

(6) To prove that $[\beta_5] = \left[(X, \tau) \in \Gamma_{\gamma}\right]$ see [20] Theorem 4.3.

The above theorem is a generalization of the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *The following are equivalent for a topological space* (X, τ).

(a) X *is an* γ *-compact space.*

(b) *Every cover of* X *by members of an* γ *-subbase of* τ_{γ} *has a finite subcover.*

(c) *Every universal net in* $X \gamma$ *-converges to a point in* X.

(d) *Each net in* X *has a subnet that* γ *-converges to some point in* X.

(e) *Each net in* X *has an* γ *-adherent point.*

(f) *Each family of* γ *-closed sets in* X *that has the finite intersection property has a non-void intersection.*

Definition 3.1. Let $\{(X_s, \tau_s) : s \in S\}$ be a family of fuzzifying topological spaces, $\prod_{s \in S} X_s$ be the Cartesian product of $\{X_s : s \in S\}$ and $\varphi = \{p_s^{-1}(U_s) : s \in S, U_s \in P(X_s)\}$, where $p_t : \prod_{s \in S} X_s \to X_t (t \in S)$ is a projection. For $\Phi \subseteq \varphi$, $S(\Phi)$ stands for the set of indices of elements in Φ. The γ -base $\beta_{\gamma} \in \Im\left(\prod_{s \in S} X_s\right)$ of $\prod_{s \in S}\left(\tau_{\gamma}\right)_s$ is defined as

$$V \in \beta_{\gamma} := (\exists \Phi)\left(\Phi \in \varphi \wedge \left(\bigcap \Phi = V\right)\right) \to \forall s\left(s \in S(\Phi) \to V_s \in \left(\tau_{\gamma}\right)_s\right), \text{ i.e.,}$$

$$\beta_\gamma (V) = \bigvee_{\Phi \in \varphi, \bigcap \Phi = V} \bigwedge_{s \in S(\Phi)} (\tau_\gamma)_s (V_s).$$

Definition 3.2. Let (X, τ), (Y, σ) be two fuzzifying topological space. A unary fuzzy predicate $O_\gamma \in F(Y^X)$, is called fuzzifying γ -openness, is given as: $O_\gamma (f) := \forall U (U \in \tau_\gamma \to f(U) \in \sigma_\gamma)$. Intuitively, the degree to which f is γ -open is $[O_\gamma (f)] = \wedge_{B \subseteq X} \min (1, 1 - \tau_\gamma (U) + \sigma_\gamma (f(U)))$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (X, τ) and (Y, σ) be two fuzzifying topological space. For any* $f \in Y^X$, $O_\gamma (f) := \forall B (B \in \beta_\gamma^X \to f(B) \in \sigma_\gamma)$, *where β_γ^X is an γ -base of τ_γ.*

Proof. Clearly, $[O_\gamma(f)] \le [\forall U (U \in \beta_\gamma^X \to f(U) \in \sigma_\gamma)]$. Conversely, for any $U \subseteq X$, we are going to prove $\min (1, 1 - \tau_\gamma (U) + \sigma_\gamma (f(U))) \ge [\forall V (V \in \beta_\gamma^X \to f(V) \in \sigma_\gamma)]$. If $\tau_\gamma (U) \le \sigma_\gamma (f(U))$, it is hold clearly. Now assume $\tau_\gamma (U) > \sigma_\gamma (f(U))$. If $\Re \subseteq P(X)$ with $\bigcup \Re = U$, then $\bigcup_{V \in \Re} f(V) = f(\bigcup \Re) = f(U)$. Therefore $\tau_\gamma (U) - \sigma_\gamma (f(U)) =$

$$\bigvee_{\Re \subseteq P(X), \bigcup \Re = U} \bigwedge_{V \in \Re} \beta_\gamma^X (V) - \bigvee_{\wp \subseteq P(Y), \bigcup \wp = f(U)} \bigwedge_{W \in \wp} \sigma_\gamma (W) \le \bigvee_{\Re \subseteq P(X), \bigcup \Re = U} \bigwedge_{V \in \Re} \beta_\gamma^X (V) -$$

$$\bigvee_{\Re \subseteq P(X), \bigcup \wp = U} \bigwedge_{V \in \Re} \sigma_\gamma (f(V)) \le \bigvee_{\Re \subseteq P(X), \bigcup \Re = U} \bigwedge_{V \in \Re} (\beta_\gamma^X (V) - \sigma_\gamma (f(V))), \quad \min (1, 1 - \tau_\gamma (U)$$

$$+ \sigma_\gamma (f(U))) \ge \bigvee_{\Re \subseteq P(X), \bigcup \Re = U} \bigwedge_{V \in \Re} \min (1, 1 - \beta_\gamma^X (V) + \sigma_\gamma (f(V))) \ge [\forall V (V \in \beta_\gamma^X \to f(V)$$

$$\in \sigma_\gamma)].$$

Lemma 3.2. *For any family $\{(X_s, \tau_s) : s \in S\}$ of fuzzifying topological spaces.*

(1) $\models (\forall s)(s \in S \to p_s \in O_\gamma)$;

(2) $\models (\forall s)(s \in S \to p_s \in C_\gamma)$.

Proof. (1) For any $t \in S$, we have $O_\gamma (p_t) = \wedge_{U \in P(\Pi_{s \in S} X_s)} \min (1, 1 - (\Pi_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s) (U) + (\tau_\gamma)_t (p_t (U)))$. Then it suffices to show that for any $U \in P(\Pi_{s \in S} X_s)$, we have $(\tau_\gamma)_t (p_t (U)) \ge (\Pi_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s)(U)$.

Assume $(\Pi_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s)(U) = \bigvee_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = U} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \bigvee_{\Phi_\lambda \in \varphi, \bigcap \Phi_\lambda = B_\lambda} \bigwedge_{s \in S(\Phi_\lambda)} (\tau_\gamma)_s (V_s) > \mu$, where $\Phi_\lambda = \{p_s^{-1} (V_s) : s \in S(\Phi_\lambda)\}(\lambda \in \Lambda)$.

Hence there exists $\{B_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \subseteq P(\Pi_{s \in S} X_s)$ such that $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = U$ and furthermore, for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, there exists $\Phi_\lambda \Subset \varphi$ such that $\bigcap \Phi_\lambda = B_\lambda$ and $\bigcap_{s \in S(\Phi_\lambda)} p_s^{-1} (V_s) =$

B_λ, where for any $s \in S(\Phi_\lambda)$ we have $(\tau_\gamma)_s (V_s) > \mu$. Thus $pt(U) = pt\left(\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \bigcap_{s \in S(\Phi_\lambda)} p_s^{-1}(V_s)\right)$.

(1) If for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $\bigcap_{s \in S(\Phi_\lambda)} p_s^{-1}(V_s) = \phi$, then $U = \phi$, $pt(U) = \phi$ and $(\tau_\gamma)_t (p_t(U)) = 1$. Therefore $(\tau_\gamma)_t (p_t(U)) \geq \left(\prod_{s \in S}(\tau_\gamma)_s\right)(U)$.

(2) If there exists $\lambda_\circ \in \Lambda$, such that $\phi \neq \bigcap_{s \in S(\Phi_{\lambda_\circ})} p_s^{-1}(V_s) = B_{\lambda_\circ}$,

(i) If $t \notin S(\Phi_{\lambda_\circ})$, i.e., $t \in S - S(\Phi_{\lambda_\circ})$, $p_t(B_{\lambda_\circ}) = X_t$. Therefore $(\tau_\gamma)_t (p_t(B_{\lambda_\circ})) = (\tau_\gamma)_t (X_t) = 1$.

(ii) If $t \in S(\Phi_{\lambda_\circ})$, then $p_t(B_{\lambda_\circ}) = V_t \subseteq X_t$. Thus $p_t(U) = p_t\left(\left(\bigcup_{t \in S(\Phi_{\lambda_\circ})} B_{\lambda_\circ}\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{t \notin S(\Phi_{\lambda_\circ})} B_{\lambda_\circ}\right)\right) = \left(\bigcup_{t \in S(\Phi_{\lambda_\circ})} p_t(B_{\lambda_\circ})\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{t \notin S(\Phi_{\lambda_\circ})} p_t(B_{\lambda_\circ})\right) = V_t \cup X_t = X_t$. Hence $(\tau_\gamma)_t (p_t(U)) = (\tau_\gamma)_t (X_t) = 1$ or $(\tau_\gamma)_t (p_t(U)) = (\tau_\gamma)_t (V_t) > \lambda$. Therefore $(\tau_\gamma)_t (p_t(U)) \geq \left(\prod_{s \in S}(\tau_\gamma)_s\right)(U)$. Thus $O_\gamma(p_t) = 1$.

(2) Form Lemma 3.1 in [25] we have $\vDash (\forall s)(s \in S \to p_s \in C')$. Furthermore, s for any two fuzzifying topological spaces (X, τ) and (Y, σ) and $f \in Y^X$, we have $C(f) \leq C'_\gamma(f)$ (Theorem 3.3 in [13]). Therefore $\vDash (\forall s)(s \in S \to p_s \in C_\gamma)$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let* $\{(X_s, \tau_s) : s \in S\}$ *be the family of fuzzifying topological spaces, then* $\vDash \exists U\left(U \subseteq \prod_{s \in S} X_s \wedge \Gamma_\gamma(U, \tau/U) \wedge \exists x\left(x \in \mathrm{Int}_\gamma(U)\right) \to \exists T\left(T \subseteq S \wedge \forall t\left(t \in S - T \wedge \Gamma_\gamma(X_t, \tau_t)\right)\right)\right)$.

Proof. It suffices to show that $\bigvee_{U \in P\left(\prod_{s \in S} X_s\right)} \left(\Gamma_\gamma(U, \tau/U) \wedge \bigvee_{x \in \prod_{s \in S} X_s} N_x^\gamma(U)\right) \leq \bigvee_{T \subseteq S} \bigwedge_{t \in S - T}$

$\Gamma_\gamma(X_t, \tau_t)$. Indeed, if $\bigvee_{U \in P\left(\prod_{s \in S} X_s\right)} \left(\Gamma_\gamma(U, \tau/U) \wedge \bigvee_{x \in \prod_{s \in S} X_s} N_x^\gamma(U)\right) > \mu > 0$, then there

exists $U \in P\left(\prod_{s \in S} X_s\right)$ such that $\Gamma_\gamma(U, \tau/U) > \mu$ and $\bigvee_{x \in \prod_{s \in S} X_s} N_x^\gamma(U) > \mu$, where $N_x^\gamma(U) = \bigvee_{x \in V \subseteq U} \left(\prod_{s \in S}(\tau_\gamma)_s\right)(V)$. Furthermore, there exists V such that $x \in V \subseteq U$ and $\left(\prod_{s \in S}(\tau_\gamma)_s\right)(V) > \mu$. Since β_γ is an γ-base of $\prod_{s \in S}(\tau_\gamma)_s$, $\left(\prod_{s \in S}(\tau_\gamma)_s\right)(V) = \bigvee_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = V} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta_\gamma(B_\lambda) = \bigvee_{\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda = V} \bigwedge_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \bigvee_{\Phi_\lambda \in \varphi, \cap \Phi_\lambda = B_\lambda} \bigwedge_{s \in S(\Phi_\lambda)} (\tau_\gamma)_s(V_s) > \mu$, where $\Phi_\lambda = \left\{p_s^{-1}(V_s) : s \in S(\Phi_\lambda)\right\} (\lambda \in \Lambda)$.

Hence there exists $\{B_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \subseteq P(\prod_{s\in S} X_s)$ such that $\bigcup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} B_\lambda = V$. Furthermore, for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, there exists $\Phi_\lambda \Subset \varphi$ such that $\bigcap \Phi_\lambda = B_\lambda$ and for any $s \in S(\Phi_\lambda)$, we have $(\tau_\gamma)_s (V_s) > \mu$. Since $x \in V$, there exists B_{λ_x} such that $x \in B_{\lambda_x} \subseteq V \subseteq U$. Hence there exists $\Phi_{\lambda_x} \Subset \varphi$ such that $\bigcap \Phi_{\lambda_x} = B_{\lambda_x}$ and $\bigcap_{s\in S(\Phi_\lambda)} p_s^{-1}(V_s) = B_{\lambda_x} \subseteq \prod_{s\in S} X_s$ and for any $s \in S(\Phi_\lambda)$, we have $(\tau_\gamma)_s (V_s) > 1-\mu$. By $\bigcap_{s\in S(\Phi_\lambda)} p_s^{-1}(V_s) = B_{\lambda_x}$, we have $P_\delta (B_{\lambda_x}) = V_\delta \subseteq X_\delta$, if $\delta \in S(\Phi_{\lambda_x})$; $P_\delta (B_{\lambda_x}) = X_\delta$, if $\delta \in S - S(\Phi_{\lambda_x})$. Since $B_{\lambda_x} \subseteq U$, for any $\delta \in S - S(\Phi_{\lambda_x})$, we have $P_\delta(U) \supseteq P_\delta(B_{\lambda_x}) = X_\delta$ and $P_\delta(U) = X_\delta$. On the other hand, since for any $s \in S$ and $U_s \in P(X_s)$, $(\prod_{t\in S} (\tau_\gamma)_t)(p_s^{-1}(U_s)) \geq (\tau_\gamma)_s (U_s)$, we have, for any $s \in S$, $I_\gamma (p_s) = \bigwedge_{U_s\in P(X_s)} \min\left(1, 1-(\tau_\gamma)_s (U_s) + \prod_{t\in S} (\tau_\gamma)_t \ (p_s^{-1}(U_s))\right)$ $= 1$. Furthermore, since by Theorem 3.5 [20], we have $\vDash \Gamma_\gamma(X,\tau) \otimes I_\gamma(f) \to \Gamma_\gamma(f(X))$, then $\Gamma_\gamma(U, \tau/U) = \Gamma_\gamma(U, \tau/U) \otimes I_\gamma(p_s) \leq \Gamma_\gamma(P_\delta(U), \tau_\delta) = \Gamma_\gamma(X_\delta, \tau_\delta)$. Therefore, $\bigvee_{T\Subset S} \bigwedge_{t\in S-T} \Gamma_\gamma(X_t, \tau_t) \geq \bigwedge_{\delta\in S-S(\Phi_\lambda)} \Gamma_\gamma(X_\delta, \tau_\delta) \geq \Gamma_\gamma \ (U, \tau/U) > \mu$.

The above theorem is a generalization of the following corollary.

Corollary 3.2. *If there exists a coordinate neighborhood γ-compact subset U of some point $x \in X$ of the product space, then all except a finite number of coordinate spaces are γ-compact.*

Lemma 3.3. *For any fuzzifying topological space (X, τ), $A \subseteq X$,*

$$\vDash T_2^\gamma (X, \tau) \to T_2^\gamma (A, \tau/A).$$

Proof. $\left[T_2^\gamma (X, \tau) \right] = \bigwedge_{x,y\in X, x\neq y} \bigvee_{U,V\in P(X), U\cap V=\phi} \left(N_x^\gamma (U), N_y^\gamma (V) \right) \leq \bigwedge_{x,y\in X, x\neq y} \bigvee_{(U\cap A)\cap(V\cap A)=\phi}$ $\left(N_x^{\gamma A} (U\cap A), N_y^{\gamma A} (V\cap A) \right) \leq \bigwedge_{x,y\in A, x\neq y} \bigvee_{U'\cap V'=\phi, U', V'\in P(A)} \left(N_x^{\gamma A} (U'), N_y^{\gamma A} (V') \right) = T_2^\gamma (A,$ $\tau/A)$, where $N_x^{\gamma A} (U) = \bigvee_{x\in C\subseteq U} \tau_\gamma / A(C)$ and $\tau_\gamma / A(B) = \bigvee_{B=V\cap A} \tau_\gamma(V)$.

Lemma 3.4. *For any fuzzifying γ-topological space (X, τ),*

$$\vDash T_2^\gamma (X, \tau) \otimes \Gamma_\gamma (X, \tau) \to T_4^\gamma (X, \tau).$$

For the definition of $T_4^\gamma (X, \tau)$ see [19, Definition 3.1].

Proof. If $\left[T_2^\gamma (X, \tau) \otimes \Gamma_\gamma (X, \tau) \right] = 0$, then the result holds. Now, suppose that $\left[T_2^\gamma (X, \tau) \otimes \Gamma_\gamma (X, \tau) \right] > \lambda > 0$. Then $T_2^\gamma (X, \tau) + \Gamma_\gamma (X, \tau) - 1 > \lambda > 0$. Therefore from Theorem 5.4 [20], $T_2^\gamma (X, \tau) \otimes (\Gamma_\gamma (A) \wedge \Gamma_\gamma (B)) \wedge (A\cap B = \phi) \vDash^{ws} T_2^\gamma (X, \tau) \to$ $(\exists U)(\exists V)\left((U \in \tau_\gamma) \wedge (V \in \tau_\gamma) \wedge (A \subseteq U) \wedge (B \subseteq V) \wedge (A \cap B = \phi) \right)$. Then for any

$A, B \subseteq X$, $A \cap B = \phi$, $T_2^{\gamma}(X, \tau) \otimes \left(\Gamma_{\gamma}(A) \wedge \Gamma_{\gamma}(B) \right) \leq \vee_{U \cap V = \phi, A \subseteq U, B \subseteq V} \min \left(\tau_{\gamma}(U), \right.$ $\tau_{\gamma}(V) \Big)$ or equivalently $T_2^{\gamma}(X, \tau) \leq \Gamma_{\gamma}(A) \wedge \Gamma_{\gamma}(B) \rightarrow \vee_{U \cap V = \phi, A \subseteq B, B \subseteq V} \min \left(\tau_{\gamma}(U), \right.$ $\tau_{\gamma}(V) \Big)$.

Hence for any $A, B \subseteq X$, $A \cap B = \phi$, $1 - \left[\Gamma_{\gamma}(A) \wedge \Gamma_{\gamma}(B) \right] + \vee_{U \cap V = \phi, A \subseteq U, B \subseteq V}$ $\min \left(\tau_{\gamma}(U), \tau_{\gamma}(V) \right) + \Gamma_{\gamma}(X, \tau) - 1 > \lambda$. From Theorem 5.1 in [20] we have $\vDash \Gamma_{\gamma}(X, \tau)$ $\otimes A \in \mathcal{F}_{\gamma} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\gamma}(A)$. Then $\Gamma_{\gamma}(X, \tau) + \left[\tau_{\gamma}(A^c) \wedge \tau_{\gamma}(B^c) \right] - 1 = \left(\Gamma_{\gamma}(X, \tau) + \tau_{\gamma}(A^c) - 1 \right) \wedge$ $\left(\Gamma_{\gamma}(X, \tau) + \tau_{\gamma}(B^c) - 1 \right) \leq \left(\Gamma_{\gamma}(X, \tau) \otimes \tau_{\gamma}(A^c) \right) \wedge \left(\Gamma_{\gamma}(X, \tau) \otimes \tau_{\gamma}(B^c) \right) \leq \left[\Gamma_{\gamma}(A) \wedge \Gamma_{\gamma}(B) \right]$. Thus $\Gamma_{\gamma}(X, \tau) - \left[\Gamma_{\gamma}(A) \wedge \Gamma_{\gamma}(B) \right] - 1 \leq - \left[\tau_{\gamma}(A^c) \wedge \tau_{\gamma}(B^c) \right]$. So, $1 - \left[\tau_{\gamma}(A^c) \wedge \tau_{\gamma}(B^c) \right]$ $+ \vee_{U \cap V = \phi, A \subseteq U, B \subseteq V} \min \left(\tau_{\gamma}(U), \tau_{\gamma}(V) \right) > \lambda$,i.e., $T_4^{\gamma}(X, \tau) = \wedge_{A \cap B = \phi} \min \left(1, 1 - \left[\tau_{\gamma}(A^c) \wedge \right. \right.$ $\tau_{\gamma}(B^c) \Big] + \vee_{U \cap V = \phi, A \subseteq U, B \subseteq V} \min \left(\tau_{\gamma}(U), \tau_{\gamma}(V) \right) \Big) > \lambda$.

The above lemma is a generalization of the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *Every γ -compact γ -Hausdorff topological space is γ -normal.*

Lemma 3.5. *For any fuzzifying γ -topological space (X, τ), $\vDash T_2^{\gamma}(X, \tau) \otimes \Gamma_{\gamma}(X, \tau)$ $\rightarrow T_3^{\gamma}(X, \tau)$. For the definition of $T_3^{\gamma}(X, \tau)$ see [19, Definition 3.1].*

Proof. Immediate, set $A = \{x\}$ in the above lemma.

The above lemma is a generalization of the following corollary.

Corollary 3.4. *Every γ -compact γ -Hausdorff topological space is γ -regular.*

Theorem 3.3. *For any fuzzifying topological space (X, τ) and $A \subseteq X$,*

$$\vDash T_2^{\gamma}(X, \tau) \otimes \Gamma_{\gamma}(A) \rightarrow A \in \mathcal{F}_{\gamma}.$$

Proof. For any $\{x\} \subset A^c$, we have $\{x\} \cap A = \phi$ and $\Gamma_{\gamma}(\{x\}) = 1$. By Theorem 5.4 [20], $\left[T_2^{\gamma}(X, \tau) \otimes \left(\Gamma_{\gamma}(A) \wedge \Gamma_{\gamma}(\{x\}) \right) \right] \leq \vee_{G \cap H_x = \phi, A \subseteq G, x \in H_x} \min \left(\tau_{\gamma}(G), \tau_{\gamma}(H_x) \right)$. Assume $\beta_x = \{H_x : A \cap H_x = \phi, x \in H_x\}$, $\cup_{x \in X \backslash A} f(x) \supseteq A^c$ and $\cup_{x \in A^c} f(x) \cap A =$ $\cup_{x \in A^c} \left(f(x) \cap A \right) = \phi$. So, $\cup_{x \in A^c} f(x) = A^c$. Therefore $\left[T_2^{\gamma}(X, \tau) \otimes \Gamma_{\gamma}(A) \right] \leq$ $\vee_{G \cap H_x = \phi, A \subseteq G, x \in H_x} \tau_{\gamma}(H_x) \leq \wedge_{x \in A^c} \vee_{A \cap H_x = \phi, x \in H_x} \tau_{\gamma}(H_x) = \vee_{f \in \Pi_{x \in A^c} \beta_x} \wedge_{x \in A^c} \tau_{\gamma}(f(x)) \leq$ $\vee_{f \in \Pi_{x \in A^c} \beta_x} \tau_{\gamma} \left(\cup_{x \in A^c} f(x) \right) = \vee_{f \in \Pi_{x \in X \backslash A} \beta_x} \tau_{\gamma}(A^c) = \mathcal{F}_{\gamma}(A)$.

The above theorem is a generalization of the following corollary.

Corollary 3.5. *γ -compact subspace of an γ -Hausdorff topological space is γ - closed.*

4. Fuzzifying locally γ -compactness

Definition 4.1. Let Ω be a class of fuzzifying topological spaces. A unary fuzzy predicate $L_\gamma C \in \Im(\Omega)$, called fuzzifying locally γ -compactness, is given as follows: $(X,\tau) \in L_\gamma C := (\forall x)(\exists B)\big(x \in \text{Int}_\gamma(B) \otimes \Gamma_\gamma(B, \tau/B)\big)$. Since $\big[x \in \text{Int}_\gamma(X)\big] = N_x^\gamma(X)$ $= 1$, then $L_\gamma C(X,\tau) \geq \Gamma_\gamma(X,\tau)$. Therefore, $\vDash (X,\tau) \in \Gamma_\gamma \to (X,\tau) \in L_\gamma C$.

Also, since $\vDash (X,\tau) \in \Gamma \to (X,\tau) \in LC$ [21] and $\vDash (X,\tau) \in \Gamma_\gamma \to (X,\tau) \in \Gamma$ [20], $\vDash (X,\tau) \in \Gamma_\gamma \to (X,\tau) \in LC$.

Theorem 4.1. *For any fuzzifying topological space* (X,τ) *and* $A \subseteq X$,

$$\vDash (X,\tau) \in L_\gamma C \otimes A \in F_\gamma \to (A, \tau/A) \in L_\gamma C.$$

Proof. We have $L_\gamma C(X,\tau) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} \bigvee_{B \subseteq X} \max\big(0, N_x^{\gamma X}(B) + \Gamma_\gamma(B, \tau/B) - 1\big)$ and $L_\gamma C(A, \tau/A) = \bigwedge_{x \in A} \bigvee_{G \subseteq A} \max\big(0, N_x^{\gamma A}(G) + \Gamma_\gamma(G, (\tau/A)/G) - 1\big)$. Now, suppose that $\big[(X,\tau) \in L_\gamma C \otimes A \in F_\gamma\big] > \lambda > 0$. Then for any $x \in A$, there exists $B \subseteq C$ such that

$$N_x^{\gamma X}(B) + \Gamma_\gamma(B, \tau/B) + \tau_\gamma(X - A) - 2 > \lambda. \qquad (*)$$

Set $E = A \cap B \in P(A)$. Then $N_x^{\gamma A}(E) = \bigvee_{E = C \cap B} N_x^{\gamma X}(C) \geq N_x^{\gamma X}(B)$ and for any $U \in P(E)$, we have $(\tau_\gamma/A)_\gamma/E(U) = \bigvee_{U = C \cap E} \tau_\gamma/A(C) = \bigvee_{U = C \cap E} \bigvee_{C = D \cap A} \tau_\gamma(D) = \bigvee_{U = D \cap A \cap E} \tau_\gamma(D) = \bigvee_{U = D \cap E} \tau_\gamma(D)$. Similarly, $(\tau_\gamma/B)_\gamma/E(U) = \bigvee_{U = D \cap E} \tau_\gamma(D)$. Thus, $(\tau_\gamma/B)_\gamma/E = (\tau_\gamma/A)_\gamma/E$ and $\Gamma_\gamma(E, (\tau/A)/E) = \Gamma_\gamma(E, (\tau/B)/E)$. Furthermore, $\big[E \in F_\gamma/B\big] = \tau_\gamma/B(B - E) = \tau_\gamma/B(B \cap E^c) = \bigvee_{B \cap E^c = B \cap D} \tau_\gamma(D) \geq \tau_\gamma(X - A)$ $= F_\gamma(A)$. Since $\vDash (X,\tau) \in \Gamma_\gamma \to (A, \tau/A) \in \Gamma_\gamma$ (see [20], Theorem 5.1), from (*) we have for any $x \in A$ that $\bigvee_{G \subseteq A} \max\big(0, N_x^{\gamma A}(G) + \Gamma_\gamma(G, (\tau/A)/G) - 1\big) \geq N_x^{\gamma A}(E) + \Gamma_\gamma(E,$ $(\tau/A)/E) - 1 \quad = N_x^{\gamma A}(E) + \Gamma_\gamma(E, (\tau/B)/E) - 1 \geq N_x^{\gamma A}(B) + \big[\Gamma_\gamma(B, \tau/B) \otimes E \in F_\gamma$ $/B\big] - 1 \geq N_x^{\gamma X}(B) + \Gamma_\gamma(B, \tau/B) + \big[E \in F_\gamma/B\big] - 2 \quad \geq N_x^{\gamma X}(B) + \Gamma_\gamma(B, \tau/B) + \big[A \in$ $F_\gamma\big] - 2 > \lambda$. Therefore $L_\gamma C(A, \tau/A) = \bigwedge_{x \in A} \bigvee_{G \subseteq A} \max\big(0, N_x^{\gamma A}(G) + \Gamma_\gamma(G, (\tau/A)/G)$ $-1\big) > \lambda$. Hence $\big[(X,\tau) \in L_\gamma C \otimes A \in F_\gamma\big] \leq L_\gamma C(A, \tau/A)$.

As a crisp result of the above theorem we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.1. *Let* A *be an* γ -*closed subset of locally* γ -*compact space* (X,τ). *Then* A *with the relative topology* τ/A *is locally* γ -*compact.*

The following theorem is a generalization of the statement "If X is an γ -Hausdorff topological space and A is an γ -dense γ -locally compact subspace, then A is γ -

open", where A is an γ-dense in a topological space X if and only if the γ-closure of A is X.

Theorem 4.2. *For any fuzzifying* γ*-topological space* (X,τ) *and* $A \subseteq X$,

$$\vDash T_2^{\gamma}(X,\tau) \otimes L_{\gamma}C(A,\tau/A) \otimes \left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(A) \equiv X\right) \to A \in \tau_{\gamma}.$$

Proof. Assume $\left[T_2^{\gamma}(X,\tau) \otimes L_{\gamma}C(A,\tau/A) \otimes \left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(A) \equiv X\right)\right] > \lambda > 0$. Then $L_{\gamma}C(A, \tau/A) > \lambda - \left[T_2^{\gamma}(X,\tau) \otimes \left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(A) \equiv X\right)\right] + 1 = \lambda' > \lambda$, i.e, $\bigwedge_{x \in A} \bigvee_{B \subseteq A} \max \; (0, N_x^{\gamma A}(B) + \Gamma_{\gamma}(B,(\tau/A)/B) - 1) > \lambda'$. Thus for any $x \in A$, there exists $B_x \subseteq A$ such that $N_x^{\gamma A}(B_x) + \Gamma_{\gamma}(B_x,(\tau/A)/B_x) - 1 > \lambda'$, i.e., $\bigvee_{H \cap A = B_x} \bigvee_{x \in K \subseteq H} \tau_{\gamma}(K) + \Gamma_{\gamma}(B_x,(\tau/A)/B_x) - 1 > \lambda'$. Hence there exists K_x such that $K_x \cap A = B_x$, $\tau_{\gamma}(K_x) + \Gamma_{\gamma}(B_x,(\tau/A)/B_x) - 1 > \lambda'$. Therefore $\tau_{\gamma}(K_x) > \lambda'$.

(1) If for any $x \in A$ there exists K_x such that $x \in K_x \subseteq B_x \subseteq A$, then $\bigcup_{x \in A} K_x = A$ and $\tau_{\gamma}(A) = \tau_{\gamma}\left(\bigcup_{x \in A} K_x\right) \geq \bigwedge_{x \in A} \tau_{\gamma}(K_x) \geq \lambda' > \lambda$.

(2) If there exists $x_\circ \in A$ such that $K_{x_\circ} \cap \left(B_{x_\circ}^c\right) \neq \phi$, $\tau_{\gamma}\left(K_{x_\circ}\right) + \Gamma_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ},(\tau/A)/B_{x_\circ}\right) - 1 > \lambda'$. From the hypothesis $\left[T_2^{\gamma}(X,\tau) \otimes L_{\gamma}C(A,\tau/A) \otimes \left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(A) \equiv X\right)\right] > \lambda > 0$, we have $\left[T_2^{\gamma}(X,\tau) \otimes \left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(A) \equiv X\right)\right] \neq 0$. So $\tau_{\gamma}\left(K_{x_\circ}\right) + \Gamma_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ},(\tau/A)/B_{x_\circ}\right) - 1 + \left[T_2^{\gamma}(X,\tau) \otimes \left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(A) \equiv X\right)\right] - 1 > 0$. Therefore $\tau_{\gamma}\left(K_{x_\circ}\right) + \Gamma_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ},(\tau/A)/B_{x_\circ}\right) - 1 + T_2^{\gamma}(X,\tau) + \left[\left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(A) \equiv X\right)\right] - 1 - 1 > \lambda$. Since $\left(\tau_{\gamma}/A\right)_{\gamma}\big/B_{x_\circ}(U) = \bigvee_{U = C \cap B_{x_\circ}} \tau_{\gamma}/A(C) = \bigvee_{U = C \cap B_{x_\circ}} \bigvee_{C = D \cap A} \tau_{\gamma}(D) = \bigvee_{U = D \cap B_{x_\circ}} \tau_{\gamma}(D) = \tau_{\gamma}/B_{x_\circ}(U)$, $\Gamma_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ},(\tau/A)/B_{x_\circ}\right) = \Gamma_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ},\tau/B_{x_\circ}\right)$. From Theorem 3.3. we have $\tau_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ}^c\right) \geq T_2^{\gamma}(X,\tau) \otimes \Gamma_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ},\tau/B_{x_\circ}\right) \geq T_2^{\gamma}(X,\tau) + \Gamma_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ}, \tau/B_{x_\circ}\right) - 1$. Hence $\tau_{\gamma}\left(K_{x_\circ}\right) + \tau_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ}^c\right) + \left[\mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(A) \equiv X\right] - 2 > \lambda$. Now, for any $y \in A^c$ we have $\left[\mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(A) \equiv X\right] = \bigwedge_{x \in X}\left(1 - N_x^{\gamma X}(A^c)\right) \leq 1 - N_y^{\gamma X}(A^c)$. Since (X,τ) is a fuzzifiying γ-topological space, $\tau_{\gamma}\left(K_{x_\circ}\right) + \tau_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ}^c\right) - 1 \leq \tau_{\gamma}\left(K_{x_\circ}\right) \otimes \tau_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ}^c\right) \leq \tau_{\gamma}\left(K_{x_\circ}\right) \wedge \tau_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ}^c\right) \leq \tau_{\gamma}\left(K_{x_\circ} \cap B_{x_\circ}^c\right) \leq N_y^{\gamma X}\left(K_{x_\circ} \cap B_{x_\circ}^c\right) \leq N_y^{\gamma X}\left(A^c\right)$, where $y \in K_{x_\circ} \cap B_{x_\circ}^c \subseteq H_{x_\circ} \cap \left(H_{x_\circ} \cap A\right)^c = H_{x_\circ} \cap \left(H_{x_\circ}^c \cup A^c\right) = H_{x_\circ} \cap A^c \subseteq A^c$. Therefore $0 < \lambda < \tau_{\gamma}\left(K_{x_\circ}\right) + \tau_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ}^c\right) + \left[\mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(A) \equiv X\right] - 2 = \tau_{\gamma}\left(K_{x_\circ}\right) + \tau_{\gamma}\left(B_{x_\circ}^c\right) - 1 + \left[\mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(A) \equiv X\right] - 1 \leq N_y^{\gamma X}\left(A^c\right) + 1 - N_y^{\gamma X}\left(A^c\right) - 1 = 0$, a contradiction. So, case (2) does not hold. We complete the proof.

Theorem 4.3. *For any fuzzifying* γ*-topological space* (X,τ),

$$\vDash T_2^{\gamma}(X,\tau) \otimes \left(L_{\gamma}C(X,\tau)\right)^2 \to \forall x \forall U \left(U \in N_x^{\gamma X} \to \exists V \left(V \in N_x^{\gamma X} \wedge \mathrm{Cl}_{\gamma}(V) \subseteq U \wedge \Gamma_{\gamma}(V)\right)\right),$$

where $\left(L_\gamma C(X,\tau)\right)^2 := L_\gamma C(X,\tau)\otimes L_\gamma C(X,\tau)$.

  Proof. We need to show that for any x and U, $x\in U$, $T_2^\gamma(X,\tau)\otimes\left(L_\gamma C(X,\tau)\right)^2\otimes$
$N_x^{\gamma X}(U)\leq\vee_{V\subseteq X}\left(N_x^{\gamma X}(V)\wedge\wedge_{y\in U^c}N_x^{\gamma X}(V^c)\wedge\Gamma_\gamma(V,\tau/V)\right)$. Assume that $T_2^\gamma(X,\tau)$
$\otimes\left(L_\gamma C(X,\tau)\right)^2\otimes N_x^{\gamma X}(U)>\lambda>0$. Then for any $x\in X$ there exists C such that

$$T_2^\gamma(X,\tau)+N_x^{\gamma X}(C)+\left(L_\gamma C(X,\tau)\right)^2+N_x^{\gamma X}(U)-3>\lambda \qquad (*)$$

  Since (X,τ) is fuzzifying γ-topological space, $N_x^{\gamma X}(C)+N_x^{\gamma X}(U)-1\leq N_x^{\gamma X}(C)$
$\otimes N_x^{\gamma X}(U)\leq N_x^{\gamma X}(C)\wedge N_x^{\gamma X}(U)\leq N_x^{\gamma X}(C\cap U)=\vee_{x\in W\subseteq C\cap U}\tau_\gamma(W)$. Therefore there
exists W such that $x\in W\subseteq C\cap U$ and $T_2^\gamma(X,\tau)+\left(L_\gamma C(X,\tau)\right)^2+\tau_\gamma(W)-2>\lambda$.
By Lemma 3.3 and 3.5 we have $T_2^\gamma(X,\tau)\leq T_2^\gamma(C,\tau/C)$ and $T_2^\gamma(C,\tau/C)+\Gamma_\gamma(C,\tau/C)$
$-1\leq T_2^\gamma(C,\tau/C)\otimes\Gamma_\gamma(C,\tau/C)\leq T_3^\gamma(C,\tau/C)$. Thus $T_3^\gamma(X,\tau)+\Gamma_\gamma(C,\tau/C)+\tau_\gamma(W)$
$-2>\lambda$. Since for any $x\in W\subseteq U$, we have $T_3^\gamma(C,\tau/C)\leq1-\tau_\gamma/C(W)+\vee_{G\subseteq C}\left(\left(N_x^{\gamma C}\right.\right.$
$(G)\wedge\wedge_{y\in C-W}N_y^{\gamma C}(C-G))$, so there exists G, $x\in G\subseteq W$ such that $\left(\left(N_x^{\gamma C}(G)\wedge\right.\right.$
$\wedge_{y\in C-W}N_y^{\gamma C}(C-G))\geq T_3^\gamma(C,\tau/C)+\tau_\gamma/C(W)-1\geq T_3^\gamma(C,\tau/C)+\tau_\gamma(W)-1$ and
$\left(\left(N_x^{\gamma C}(G)\wedge\wedge_{y\in C-W}N_y^{\gamma C}(C-G)\right)\right)+\Gamma_\gamma(C,\tau/C)-1>\lambda$. Thus $N_x^{\gamma C}(G)=\vee_{D\cap C=G}$
$N_x^{\gamma X}(D)=N_x^{\gamma X}(G\cup C^c)>\lambda'=\lambda+1-\Gamma_\gamma(C,\tau/C)\geq\lambda$. Furthermore, for any $y\in$
$C-W$, $N_y^{\gamma C}(C-G)=\vee_{D\cap C=C\cap G^c}N_y^{\gamma X}(G^c\cup C^c)=N_y^{\gamma X}(G^c)>\lambda'$ and $N_x^{\gamma X}(G)=$
$N_x^{\gamma X}\left((G\cup C^c)\cap C\right)\geq N_x^{\gamma X}(G\cup C^c)\wedge N_x^{\gamma X}(C)>\lambda'$. Since $N_y^{\gamma X}(G^c)=\vee_{x\in B^c\subseteq G^c}$
$\tau_\gamma(B^c)>\lambda'$, for any $y\in C-W$, there exists B_y^c such that $y\in B_y^c\subseteq G^c$ and $\tau_\gamma(B_y^c)$
$>\lambda'$. Set $B^c=\bigcup_{y\in C-W}B_y^c$. Then $C-W\subseteq B^c\subseteq G^c$ and $\tau_\gamma(B^c)\geq\wedge_{y\in C-W}\tau_\gamma(B_y^c)$
$\geq\lambda'$. Again, set $V=B\cap C$, then $V\subseteq(C-W)^c\cap C=(C^c\cup W)\cap C=C\cap W=$
$W\subseteq U\cap C$ and $V^c=B^c\cup C^c$. Since (X,τ) is fuzzifying γ-topological space,

$$N_x^{\gamma X}(V)=N_x^{\gamma X}(B\cap C)\geq N_x^{\gamma X}(B)\wedge N_x^{\gamma X}(C)\geq N_x^{\gamma X}(G)\wedge N_x^{\gamma X}(C)>\lambda. \quad (1)$$

  By (*) and Theorem 3.3, $\tau_\gamma(C^c)\geq T_2^\gamma(X,\tau)\otimes\Gamma_\gamma(C,\tau/C)\geq T_2^\gamma(X,\tau)+\Gamma_\gamma(C,\tau/C)$
$-1\geq\lambda'$. So $\tau_\gamma(V^c)=\tau_\gamma(B^c\cup C^c)\geq\tau_\gamma(B^c)\wedge\tau_\gamma(C^c)\geq\lambda'$, i.e.,
$\tau_\gamma(V^c)+\Gamma_\gamma(C,\tau/C)-1\geq\lambda$ and

$$\Gamma_\gamma(V,\tau/V)=\Gamma_\gamma\left(V,(\tau/C)/V\right)\geq\tau_\gamma/C(C-V)+$$
$$\Gamma_\gamma(C,\tau/C)-1\geq\tau_\gamma(V^c)+\Gamma_\gamma(C,\tau/C)-1\geq\lambda \qquad (2)$$

  Finally,

$$\bigwedge_{y\in U^c} N_y^{\gamma X}\left(V^c\right) \geq \bigwedge_{y\in V^c} N_y^{\gamma X}\left(V^c\right) = \tau_\gamma\left(V^c\right) \geq \lambda \qquad (3)$$

Thus by (1), (2) and (3), for any $x\in U$, there exists $V\subseteq U$ such that $N_x^{\gamma X}(V) > \lambda$, $\bigwedge_{y\in U^c} N_y^{\gamma X}\left(V^c\right) \geq \lambda$ and $\Gamma_\gamma\left(V,\tau/V\right) \geq \lambda$. So $\bigvee_{V\subseteq X}\left(N_x^{\gamma X}(V)\wedge\bigwedge_{y\in U^c} N_y^{\gamma X}\left(V^c\right)\wedge \Gamma_\gamma\left(V,\tau/V\right)\right) \geq \lambda$.

Theorem 4.4. *For any fuzzifying γ-topological space $\left(X,\tau\right)$,*

$$\vDash T_2^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)\otimes\left(L_\gamma C\left(X,\gamma\right)\right)^2 \to T_3^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)$$

Proof. By Theorem 4.3, for any $x\in U$, we have $\bigvee_{x\in V\subseteq U}\left(N_x^{\gamma X}(V)\wedge\bigwedge_{y\in U^c} N_y^{\gamma X}\left(V^c\right)\right) \geq$ $\left[T_2^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)\otimes\left(\Gamma_\gamma\left(C,\tau/C\right)\right)^2\otimes N_2^{\gamma X}\left(U\right)\right]$. Thus $1-N_x^{\gamma X}(U)+\bigvee_{x\in V\subseteq U}\left(N_x^{\gamma X}(V)\wedge\bigwedge_{y\in U^c}$ $N_y^{\gamma X}\left(V^c\right)\geq\left[T_2^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)\otimes\left(\Gamma_\gamma\left(C,\tau/C\right)\right)^2\right]$, i.e., $\left[T_3^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)\right]\geq\left[T_2^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)\otimes\left(\Gamma_\gamma\left(C,\tau/C\right)\right)^2\right]$.

Theorem 4.5. *For any fuzzifying γ-topological space $\left(X,\tau\right)$,*

$$\vDash T_3^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)\otimes L_\gamma C\left(X,\tau\right)\to\forall A\forall U\Big(U\in N_A^{\gamma X}\otimes\Gamma_\gamma\left(A,\tau/A\right)\to$$
$$\exists V\Big(V\subseteq U\wedge U\in N_A^{\gamma X}\wedge\tau_\gamma\left(V^c\right)\wedge\Gamma_\gamma\left(V,\tau/V\right)\Big)\Big),$$

where $U\in N_A^{\gamma X}:=\left(\forall x\right)\Big(x\in A\wedge U\in N_x^{\gamma X}\Big)$.

Proof. We only need to show that for any $A,U\in P\left(X\right)$, $\Big[T_3^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)\otimes L_\gamma C\left(X,\tau\right)\otimes$ $\Gamma_\gamma\left(A,\tau/A\right)\otimes N_A^{\gamma X}\left(U\right)\Big]\leq\bigvee_{V\subseteq U}\left(N_A^{\gamma X}(V)\wedge\tau_\gamma\left(V^c\right)\wedge\Gamma_\gamma\left(V,\tau/V\right)\right)$. Indeed, if $\Big[T_3^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)$ $\otimes L_\gamma C\left(X,\tau\right)\otimes\Gamma_\gamma\left(A,\tau/A\right)\otimes N_A^{\gamma X}\left(U\right)\Big]>\lambda>0$, then for any $x\in A$, there exists $C\in$ $P\left(X\right)$ such that $\Big[T_3^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)\otimes N_x^{\gamma X}\left(C\right)\otimes\Gamma_\gamma\left(C,\tau/C\right)\otimes\ \Gamma_\gamma\left(A,\tau/A\right)\otimes N_A^{\gamma X}\left(U\right)\Big]>\lambda$. Since $\left(X,\tau\right)$ is fuzzifying γ-topolgoical space, $\bigvee_{x\in W\subseteq C\cap U}\tau_\gamma\left(W\right)=N_x^{\gamma X}\left(C\cap U\right)\geq$ $N_x^{\gamma X}\left(C\right)\wedge N_x^{\gamma X}\left(U\right)\geq N_x^{\gamma X}\left(C\right)\wedge N_x^{\gamma X}\left(U\right)\geq\ N_x^{\gamma X}\left(C\right)\otimes N_x^{\gamma X}\left(U\right)$. Then there exists W such that $x\in W\subseteq C\cap U$, and $\Big[T_3^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)\otimes\tau_\gamma\left(W\right)\otimes\Gamma_\gamma\left(C,\tau/C\right)\otimes\Gamma_\gamma\left(A,\tau/A\right)\Big]$ $>\lambda$. Therefore

$$\Big[T_3^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)\Big]+\tau_\gamma\left(W\right)-1>\lambda+2-\Gamma_\gamma\left(C,\tau/C\right)-\Gamma_\gamma\left(A,\tau/A\right)=\lambda'\geq\lambda \qquad (*)$$

Since for any $x\in W$, $\Big[T_3^\gamma\left(X,\tau\right)\Big]\leq 1-\tau_\gamma\left(W\right)+\bigvee_{B\subseteq W}\left(N_x^{\gamma X}\left(B\right)\wedge\bigwedge_{y\in W^c} N_y^{\gamma X}\left(B^c\right)\right)$, we have $\bigvee_{B\subseteq W}\left(N_x^{\gamma X}\left(B\right)\wedge\bigwedge_{y\in W^c} N_y^{\gamma X}\left(B^c\right)\right)>\lambda'$. Thus there exists B_x such that $x\in B_x\subseteq W\subseteq C\cap U$ and for any $y\in W^c$, we have $N_y^{\gamma X}\left(B_x^c\right)>\lambda'$, $N_x^{\gamma X}\left(B_x\right)>\lambda'$.

Since $N_y^{\gamma X}\left(B_x^c\right)=\vee_{x\in G^c\subseteq B_x^c}\tau_\gamma\left(G^c\right)>\lambda'$, then for any $y\in W^c$, there exists G_{xy} such that $x\in G_{xy}^c\subseteq B_x^c$ and $\tau_\gamma\left(G_{xy}^c\right)>\lambda'$. Set $G_x^c=\cup_{y\in W^c}G_{xy}^c$ then $W^c\subseteq G_{xy}^c\subseteq B_x^c$ and $\tau_\gamma\left(G_x^c\right)\geq\wedge_{y\in W^c}\tau_\gamma\left(G_{xy}^c\right)\geq\lambda'$. Since $G_x\supseteq B_x$, $N_x^{\gamma X}\left(G_x\right)\geq N_x^{\gamma X}\left(B_x\right)>\lambda'$, i.e., $\vee_{x\in H\subseteq G_x}\tau_\gamma\left(H\right)>\lambda'$. Thus there exists H_x such that $x\in H_x\subseteq G_x$ and $\tau_\gamma\left(H_x\right)>\lambda'$. Hence for any $x\in A$, there exists H_x and G_x such that $x\in H_x\subseteq G_x\subseteq U$, $\tau_\gamma\left(H_x\right)>\lambda'$ and $W\supseteq\cup_{x\in A}G_x\supseteq\cup_{x\in A}H_x\supseteq A$. We define $\Re\in\Im\left(P\left(A\right)\right)$ as follows:

$$\Re\left(D\right)=\begin{cases}\bigvee_{H_x\cap A=D}\tau_\gamma\left(H_x\right), & \text{there exists } H_x \text{ such that } H_x\cap A=D,\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Let $\Gamma_\gamma\left(A,\tau/A\right)=\mu>\mu-\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon>0\right)$. Then $1-K_\gamma\left(\Re,A\right)+\vee_{\wp\leq\Re}\left[K\left(\Re,A\right)\otimes FF\left(\wp\right)\right]>\mu-\varepsilon$, where $\left[K\left(\Re,A\right)\right]=\wedge_{x\in A}\vee_{x\in B}\Re\left(B\right)=\wedge_{x\in A}\vee_{x\in D}\Re\left(D\right)=\wedge_{x\in A}\vee_{x\in D}\vee_{H_{x'}\cap A=D}\tau_\gamma\left(H_{x'}\right)\geq\lambda'$ and $\left[\Re\subseteq\tau_\gamma\setminus A\right]=\underset{B\subseteq X}{\wedge}\min\left(1,1-\Re\left(B\right)+\tau_\gamma\setminus A\left(B\right)\right)$

$=\underset{B\subseteq X}{\wedge}\min\left(1,1-\vee_{H_x\cap A=B}\tau_\gamma\left(H_x\right)+\vee_{H\cap A=B}\tau_\gamma\left(H\right)\right)=1$. So, $K_\gamma\left(\Re,A\right)=\left[K\left(\Re,A\right)\right]\geq\lambda'$. By (*), $\left[K\left(\Re,A\right)\otimes FF\left(\wp\right)\right]>\mu-\varepsilon-1+K_\gamma\left(\Re,A\right)\geq\mu-\varepsilon-1+\lambda'\geq\lambda-\varepsilon$.

Thus $\wedge_{x\in A}\vee_{x\in E}\Re\left(E\right)+1-\wedge\left\{\delta:F\left(\wp_\delta\right)\right\}-1>\lambda-\varepsilon$, and $\wedge_{x\in A}\vee_{x\in E}\Re\left(E\right)>\lambda-\varepsilon+\wedge\left\{\delta:F\left(\wp_\delta\right)\right\}$. Hence there exists $\beta>0$ such that $F\left(\wp_\beta\right)$ and $\wedge_{x\in A}\vee_{x\in D}\Re\left(D\right)>\lambda-\varepsilon+\beta$. Therefore for any $x\in A$, there exists $D_x\subseteq A$ such that $\wp\left(D_x\right)>\lambda-\varepsilon+\beta$ and $\cup_{x\in A}D_x\supseteq A$. Suitably choose ε such that $\lambda-\varepsilon>0$, then $\wp\left(D_x\right)>\beta>0$. Since $\Re\left(D_x\right)\geq\wp\left(D_x\right)>0$, $D_x=H_{x'}\cap A$, i.e., $H_{x'}\cap A\in\wp_\beta$. By $F\left(\wp_\beta\right)$, so there exists finite $H_{x'_1},H_{x'_2},\cdots,H_{x'_n}$ such that $\cup_{i=1}^n H_{x'_i}\supseteq A$ and $\cup_{i=1}^n H_{x'_i}\subseteq\cup_{i=1}^n G_{x'_i}$. Set $V=\cup_{i=1}^n G_{x'_i}$, and $V^c=\cap_{i=1}^n G_{x'_i}^c$, $A\subseteq V\subseteq U$, and $\tau_\gamma\left(V^c\right)\geq\wedge_{1\leq i\leq n}\tau_\gamma\left(G_{x'_i}^c\right)\geq\lambda'>\lambda$. Since for any $x\in A$, $G_x\subseteq W\subseteq C\cap U\subseteq C$, we have $V=\cup_{i=1}^n G_{x'_i}\subseteq W\subseteq C$. Because $\tau_\gamma\setminus C\left(C-V\right)=\vee_{D\cap C=C\cap V^c}\tau_\gamma\left(D\right)\geq\tau_\gamma\left(V^c\right)\geq\lambda'$. Thus by (*), $\tau_\gamma\setminus C\left(C-V\right)+\Gamma_\gamma\left(C,\tau/C\right)-1>\lambda$, and by Theorem 5.1 [21], $\Gamma_\gamma\left(V,\tau/V\right)=\Gamma_\gamma\left(V,\tau/C/V\right)\geq\left[\Gamma_\gamma\left(C,\tau/C\right)\otimes\tau_\gamma\setminus C\left(C-V\right)\right]>\lambda$.

Finally, we have for any $x\in A$, $N_x^{\gamma X}\left(V\right)=N_x^{\gamma X}\left(\cup_{i=1}^n G_{x'_i}\right)\geq N_x^{\gamma X}\left(\cup_{i=1}^n H_{x'_i}\right)\geq\tau_\gamma\left(\cup_{i=1}^n H_{x'_i}\right)\geq\wedge_{1\leq i\leq n}\tau_\gamma\left(H_{x'_i}\right)\geq\lambda'>\lambda$. So, $N_A^{\gamma X}\left(V\right)=\wedge_{x\in A}N_x^{\gamma X}\left(V\right)\geq\lambda$. Therefore $N_A^{\gamma X}\left(V\right)\wedge\tau_\gamma\left(V^c\right)\wedge\Gamma_\gamma\left(V,\tau/V\right)\geq\lambda$. Thus $\vee_{V\subseteq U}\left(N_A^{\gamma X}\left(V\right)\wedge\tau_\gamma\left(V^c\right)\wedge\Gamma_\gamma\left(V,\tau/V\right)\right)\geq\lambda$.

Theorem 4.6. *Let (X,τ) and (Y,σ) be two fuzzifying topological space and $f \in Y^X$ be surjective. Then $\models L_\gamma C(X,\tau) \otimes C_\gamma(f) \otimes O(f) \to LC(Y,\sigma)$. For the definition of $O(f)$, see [25].*

Proof. If $\left[L_\gamma C(X,\tau) \otimes C_\gamma(f) \otimes O(f) \right] > \lambda > 0$, then for any $x \in X$, there exists $U \subseteq X$, such that $\left[N_x^{\gamma X}(U) \otimes \Gamma_\gamma(U,\tau/U) \otimes C_\gamma(f) \otimes O(f) \right] > \lambda$. Since $N_x^{\gamma X}(U) = \vee_{x \in V \subseteq U} \tau_\gamma(V)$, so there exists $V' \subseteq X$ such that $x \in V' \subseteq U$ and $\left[\tau_\gamma(V') \otimes \Gamma_\gamma(U,\tau/U) \otimes C_\gamma(f) \otimes O(f) \right] > \lambda$. By Theorem 5.2 in [20], $\left[\Gamma_\gamma(U,\tau/U) \otimes C_\gamma(f) \right] \leq \left[\Gamma(f(U), \sigma/f(U)) \right]$ and $\left[\tau(V') \otimes O(f) \right] = \max(0, \tau(V') + O(f) - 1) = \max\left(0, \tau(V') + \bigwedge_{V \subseteq X} \min(1, 1 - \tau(V') + \sigma(f(V))) - 1\right) \leq \max\left(0, \tau(V') + 1 - \tau(V') + \sigma(f(V)) - 1\right) = \sigma(f(V)) \leq N_{f(x)}^Y(f(V')) \leq N_{f(x)}^Y(f(U))$. Since f is surjective, $LC(Y,\sigma) = LC(f(X),\sigma) = \bigwedge_{y \in f(x) \subseteq f(X)} \bigvee_{U' = f(U) \subseteq f(X)} \left[N_y^Y(U') \otimes \left[\Gamma(U',\sigma/U') \right] \right] \geq \bigwedge_{y \in f(x) \subseteq f(X)} \left[N_{f(x)}^Y(f(U)) \right] \otimes \left[\Gamma(f(U), \sigma/f(U)) \right] \geq \bigwedge_{y \in f(x) \subseteq f(X)} \left[\tau(V') \otimes O(f) \otimes \Gamma_\gamma(U,\tau/U) \otimes C_\gamma(f) \right] \geq \lambda$.

Theorem 4.7. *Let (X,τ) and (Y,σ) be two fuzzifying topological space and $f \in Y^X$ be surjective. Then $\models L_\gamma C(X,\tau) \otimes I_\gamma(f) \otimes O_\gamma(f) \to L_\gamma C(Y,\sigma)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.3 in [20], the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.6. Theorem 4.6 and 4.7 are a generalization of the following corollary.

Corollary 4.2. *Let (X,τ) and (Y,σ) be two topological space and $f:(X,\tau) \to (Y,\sigma)$ be surjective mapping. If f is an γ-continuous (resp. γ-irresolute), open (resp. γ-open) and X is locally γ-compact, then Y is locally compact (resp. locally γ-compact) space.*

Theorem 4.8. *Let $\left\{ (X_s, \tau_s) : s \in S \right\}$ be a family of fuzzifying topological spaces, then*
$$\models L_\gamma C\left(\Pi_{s \in S} X_s, \Pi_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s \right) \to \forall s \left(s \in S \wedge L_\gamma C\left(X_s, (\tau_\gamma)_s \right) \wedge \exists T \left(T \Subset S \wedge \forall t \left(t \in S - T \wedge \Gamma_\gamma(X_t, \tau_t) \right) \right) \right).$$

Proof. It suffices to show that $L_\gamma C\left(\Pi_{s \in S} X_s, \Pi_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s \right) \leq \bigwedge_{s \in S} \left[L_\gamma C\left(X_s, (\tau_\gamma)_s \right) \wedge \bigvee_{T \Subset S} \bigwedge_{t \in S - T} \Gamma_\gamma(X_t, \tau_t) \right]$. From Theorem 4.7 and Lemma 3.1 we have for any $t \in S$, $L_\gamma C\left(\Pi_{s \in S} X_s, \Pi_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s \right) = \left[L_\gamma C\left(\Pi_{s \in S} X_s, \Pi_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s \right) \otimes C_\gamma(p_t) \otimes O_\gamma(p_t) \right] \leq L_\gamma C(X_t, \tau_t)$. So, $\bigwedge_{t \in S - T} L_\gamma C(X_t, \tau_t) \geq L_\gamma C\left(\Pi_{s \in S} X_s, \Pi_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s \right)$ By Theorem 3.2 we have $\bigvee_{T \Subset S} \bigwedge_{t \in S - T} \Gamma_\gamma(X_t,$

$$\tau_t) \geq \left[\bigvee_{U \subseteq \prod_{s \in S} X_s} \Gamma_\gamma \left(U, \prod_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s \setminus U \right) \otimes \bigvee_{X \subseteq \prod_{s \in S} X_s} N_x^{\gamma X}(U) \right) \right] \qquad \geq \bigvee_{U \subseteq \prod_{s \in S} X_s} \bigvee_{X \subseteq \prod_{s \in S} X_s} \left[\Gamma_\gamma \left(U, \right. \right.$$

$$\prod_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s \setminus U) \otimes N_x^{\gamma X}(U)) \right] \qquad \geq \bigwedge_{X \subseteq \prod_{s \in S} X_s} \bigvee_{U \subseteq \prod_{s \in S} X_s} \left[\Gamma_\gamma \left(U, \prod_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s \setminus U \right) \otimes N_x^{\gamma X}(U) \right) \right] = L_\gamma$$

$$C\left(\prod_{s \in S} X_s, \prod_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s \right) \qquad \text{Therefore} \qquad L_\gamma C\left(\Pi_{s \in S} X_s, \Pi_{s \in S} (\tau_\gamma)_s \right) \leq \left[\wedge_{t \in S-T} L_\gamma C(X_t, \tau_t) \wedge \right.$$

$$\left. \vee_{t \in S} \wedge_{t \in S-T} \Gamma_\gamma \left(X_t, \tau_\gamma \right) \right].$$

We can obtain the following corollary in crisp setting.

Corollary 4.3. *Let* $\{ X_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda \}$ *be a family of nonempty topological spaces. If* $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} X_\lambda$ *is locally* γ *-compact, then each* X_λ *is locally* γ *-compact and all but finitely many* X_λ *are* γ *-compact.*

Conclusion.

The present paper investigates topological notions when these are planted into the framework of Ying's fuzzifying topological spaces (in semantic method of continuous valued-logic). It continue various investigations into fuzzy topology in a legitimate way and extend some fundamental results in general topology to fuzzifying topology. An important virtue of our approach (in which we follow Ying) is that we define topological notions as fuzzy predicates (by formulae of Łukasiewicz fuzzy logic) and prove the validity of fuzzy implications (or equivalences). Unlike the (more wide-spread) style of defining notions in fuzzy mathematics as crisp predicates of fuzzy sets, fuzzy predicates of fuzzy sets provide a more genuine fuzzification; furthermore the theorems in the form of valid fuzzy implications are more general than the corresponding theorems on crisp predicates of fuzzy sets. The main contributions of the present paper are to give characterizations of fuzzifying γ-compactness. Also, we define the concept of locally γ-compactness of fuzzifying topological spaces and obtain some basic properties of such spaces. There are some problems for further study:

(1) One obvious problem is: our results are derived in the Łukasiewicz continuous logic. It is possible to generalize them to more general logic setting, like residuated lattice-valued logic considered in [27-28].

(2) What is the justification for fuzzifying locally γ-compactness in the setting of $(2, L)$ topologies.

(3) Obviously, fuzzifying topological spaces in [16] form a fuzzy category. Perhaps, this will become a motivation for further study of the fuzzy category.

(4) What is the justification for fuzzifying locally γ-compactness in (M, L) - topologies etc.

References

[1] D. Andrijevic, On b -open sets, *Math. Vesnik,* 48 (1996), 59-64.

[2] C. L. Chang, Fuzzy topological spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.,* 24 (1968), 182-190.

[3] J. A. Goguen, The fuzzy Tychonoff theorem, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.,* 43 (1973), 182-190.

[4] I. M. Hanafy, Fuzzy γ -open sets and fuzzy γ -continuity, *J. Fuzzy Math.,* 7 (2) (1999), 419-430.

[5] U. Höhle, Uppersemicontinuous fuzzy sets and applications, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.,* 78 (1980), 659-673.

[6] U. Höhle, Many valued topology and its applications, Kluwer academic publishers, Dordrecht, (2001).

[7] U. Höhle and S. E. Rodabaugh, Mathematics of fuzzy sets, Logic, Topology, and Measure theory, in: Handbook of fuzzy sets series, Vol.3, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, (1999).

[8] U. Höhle, S. E. Rodabaugh and A. Šostak, (Eds.), Special Issue on fuzzy topology, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems,* 73 (1995), 1-183.

[9] U. Höhle and A. Šostak, Axiomatic foundations of fixed-basis fuzzy topology, in: U. Höhle, S. E. Rodabaugh, (Eds.), Mathematics of fuzyz sets: Logic, Topology, and Measure Theory, in: Handbook of fuzzy sets series, Vol.3, *Kluwer Academic Publishers,* Dordrecht, (1999), 123-272.

[10] J. L. Kelley, General topology, Van nostrand, New York, (1955).

[11] T. Kubiak, On fuzzy topologies, Ph.D. Thesis, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland, (1985).

[12] Y. M. Liu and M. K. Luo, Fuzzy topology, World scientific, Singapore, (1998).

[13] T. Nori and O. R. Sayed, Fuzzy γ -open sets and fuzzy γ -continuity in fuzzifying topology, *Sci. Math. Japon.,* 2 (2002), 255-263.

[14] D. Qiu, Fuzzifying topological linear spaces, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems,* 147 (2004), 249-272.

[15] D. Qiu, Characterizations of fuzzy finite automata, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems,* 141 (2004), 391-414.

[16] S. E. Rodabaugh, Categorical foundations of variable-basis fuzzy topology, in: U. Höhle, S. E. Rodabaugh, (Eds.), Mathematics of fuzzy sets: Logic, Topology, and Measure theory, in: Handbook of fuzzy sets series, Vol.3, *Kluwer Academic Publishers,* Dordrecht, (1999), 273-388.

[17] J. B. rosser and A. R. turquette, Many-Valued logics, North-Holland, Amsterdam, (1952).

[18] O. R. Sayed, On fuzzifying topological spaces, Ph. D. Thesis, Assiut University, Egypt, (2002).

[19] O. R. Sayed, Fuzzy γ -separation axioms in fuzzifying topology, *J. Fuzzy Math.,* 14 (4) (2006), 767-8110.

[20] O. R. Sayed, γ -compactness in fuzzifying topology, *J. Fuzzy Math.,* 14 (4) (2006), 789-787.

[21] J. Shen, Locally compactness in fuzzifying topology, *J. Fuzzy Math.,* 2 (4) (1994), 695-711.

[22] G. J. Wang, Theory of L -fuzzy topological spaces, Shanxi normal University press, Xi an, (1988), (in Chinese).

[23] M. S. Ying, A new approach for fuzzy topology (I), *Fuzzy Sets and Systems,* 39 (1991), 303-321.

[24] M. S. Ying, A new approach for fuzzy topology (II), *Fuzzy Sets and Systems,* 47 (1992), 221-23.

[25] M. S. Ying, A new approach for fuzzy topology (III), *Fuzzy Sets and Systems,* 55 (1993), 193-207.

[26] M. S. Ying, Compactness in fuzzifying topology, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems,* 55 (1993), 79-92.

[27] M. S. Ying, Fuzzifying topology based on complete residuated lattice-valued logic (I), *Fuzzy Sets and Systems,* 56 (1993), 337-373.

[28] M. S. Ying, Fuzzy topology based on residuated lattice-valued logic, *Acta Mathematica Sinica,* 17 (2001), 89-102.