

GRZEGORZ DYMEK

## On pseudo-BCI-algebras

**ABSTRACT.** The notion of normal pseudo-BCI-algebras is studied and some characterizations of it are given. Extensions of pseudo-BCI-algebras are also considered.

**1. Introduction.** Among many algebraic structures, algebras of logic form important class of algebras. Examples of these are (pseudo-)MV-algebras, (pseudo-)BL-algebras, (pseudo-)BCK-algebras, (pseudo-)BCI-algebras and others. They are strongly connected with logic. For example, BCI-algebras introduced in [8] have connections with BCI-logic being the BCI-system in combinatory logic which has application in the language of functional programming.

The notion of pseudo-BCI-algebras has been introduced in [1] as an extension of BCI-algebras. Pseudo-BCI-algebras are algebraic models of some extension of a non-commutative version of the BCI-logic (see [5] for details). These algebras have also connections with other algebras of logic such as pseudo-BCK-algebras, pseudo-BL-algebras and pseudo-MV-algebras. More about those algebras the reader can find in [7].

The paper is devoted to pseudo-BCI-algebras. In Section 2 we give the necessary material needed in the sequel and also some new results concerning p-semisimple part and branches of pseudo-BCI-algebras. In Section 3 we consider normal pseudo-BCI-algebras, that is, pseudo-BCI-algebras  $X$ , which are the sum of their pseudo-BCK-part  $K(X)$  and p-semisimple part

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03G25, 06F35.

*Key words and phrases.* Pseudo-BCI-algebra, normal pseudo-BCI-algebra, extension of pseudo-BCI-algebra.

$M(X)$ . We illustrate this notion by interesting examples and give some characterizations of it. In this section we also construct a new pseudo-BCI-algebra being the sum of a pseudo-BCK-algebra and a p-semisimple pseudo-BCI-algebra (Theorem 3.4). Finally, in Section 4 we study extensions of pseudo-BCI-algebras.

**2. Preliminaries.** A *pseudo-BCI-algebra* is a structure  $(X; \leq, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$ , where  $\leq$  is a binary relation on a set  $X$ ,  $\rightarrow$  and  $\rightsquigarrow$  are binary operations on  $X$  and  $1$  is an element of  $X$  such that for all  $x, y, z \in X$ , we have

- (a1)  $x \rightarrow y \leq (y \rightarrow z) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightarrow z)$ ,  $x \rightsquigarrow y \leq (y \rightsquigarrow z) \rightarrow (x \rightsquigarrow z)$ ,
- (a2)  $x \leq (x \rightarrow y) \rightsquigarrow y$ ,  $x \leq (x \rightsquigarrow y) \rightarrow y$ ,
- (a3)  $x \leq x$ ,
- (a4) if  $x \leq y$  and  $y \leq x$ , then  $x = y$ ,
- (a5)  $x \leq y$  iff  $x \rightarrow y = 1$  iff  $x \rightsquigarrow y = 1$ .

It is obvious that any pseudo-BCI-algebra  $(X; \leq, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$  can be regarded as a universal algebra  $(X; \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$  of type  $(2, 2, 0)$ . Note that every pseudo-BCI-algebra satisfying  $x \rightarrow y = x \rightsquigarrow y$  for all  $x, y \in X$  is a BCI-algebra.

Every pseudo-BCI-algebra satisfying  $x \leq 1$  for all  $x \in X$  is a pseudo-BCK-algebra. A pseudo-BCI-algebra which is not a pseudo-BCK-algebra will be called *proper*.

Throughout this paper we will often use  $X$  to denote a pseudo-BCI-algebra. Any pseudo-BCI-algebra  $X$  satisfies the following, for all  $x, y, z \in X$ ,

- (b1) if  $1 \leq x$ , then  $x = 1$ ,
- (b2) if  $x \leq y$ , then  $y \rightarrow z \leq x \rightarrow z$  and  $y \rightsquigarrow z \leq x \rightsquigarrow z$ ,
- (b3) if  $x \leq y$  and  $y \leq z$ , then  $x \leq z$ ,
- (b4)  $x \rightarrow (y \rightsquigarrow z) = y \rightsquigarrow (x \rightarrow z)$ ,
- (b5)  $x \leq y \rightarrow z$  iff  $y \leq x \rightsquigarrow z$ ,
- (b6)  $x \rightarrow y \leq (z \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (z \rightarrow y)$ ,  $x \rightsquigarrow y \leq (z \rightsquigarrow x) \rightsquigarrow (z \rightsquigarrow y)$ ,
- (b7) if  $x \leq y$ , then  $z \rightarrow x \leq z \rightarrow y$  and  $z \rightsquigarrow x \leq z \rightsquigarrow y$ ,
- (b8)  $1 \rightarrow x = 1 \rightsquigarrow x = x$ ,
- (b9)  $((x \rightarrow y) \rightsquigarrow y) \rightarrow y = x \rightarrow y$ ,  $((x \rightsquigarrow y) \rightarrow y) \rightsquigarrow y = x \rightsquigarrow y$ ,
- (b10)  $x \rightarrow y \leq (y \rightarrow x) \rightsquigarrow 1$ ,  $x \rightsquigarrow y \leq (y \rightsquigarrow x) \rightarrow 1$ ,
- (b11)  $(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow 1 = (x \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (y \rightsquigarrow 1)$ ,  $(x \rightsquigarrow y) \rightsquigarrow 1 = (x \rightsquigarrow 1) \rightarrow (y \rightarrow 1)$ ,
- (b12)  $x \rightarrow 1 = x \rightsquigarrow 1$ .

If  $(X; \leq, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$  is a pseudo-BCI-algebra, then, by (a3), (a4), (b3) and (b1),  $(X; \leq)$  is a poset with  $1$  as a maximal element. Note that a pseudo-BCI-algebra has also other maximal elements.

**Proposition 2.1** ([4]). *The structure  $(X; \leq, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$  is a pseudo-BCI-algebra if and only if the algebra  $(X; \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$  of type  $(2, 2, 0)$  satisfies the following identities and quasi-identity:*

- (i)  $(x \rightarrow y) \rightsquigarrow [(y \rightarrow z) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightarrow z)] = 1,$
- (ii)  $(x \rightsquigarrow y) \rightarrow [(y \rightsquigarrow z) \rightarrow (x \rightsquigarrow z)] = 1,$
- (iii)  $1 \rightarrow x = x,$
- (iv)  $1 \rightsquigarrow x = x,$
- (v)  $x \rightarrow y = 1 \ \& \ y \rightarrow x = 1 \Rightarrow x = y.$

**Example 2.2** ([4]). Let  $X = \{a, b, c, d, e, f, 1\}$  and define binary operations  $\rightarrow$  and  $\rightsquigarrow$  on  $X$  by the following tables:

$\rightarrow$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	$f$	$1$	$\rightsquigarrow$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	$f$	$1$
$a$	1	$d$	$e$	$b$	$c$	$a$	$a$	$a$	1	$c$	$b$	$e$	$d$	$a$	$a$
$b$	$c$	1	$a$	$e$	$d$	$b$	$b$	$b$	$d$	1	$e$	$a$	$c$	$b$	$b$
$c$	$e$	$a$	1	$c$	$b$	$d$	$d$	$c$	$b$	$e$	1	$c$	$a$	$d$	$d$
$d$	$b$	$e$	$d$	1	$a$	$c$	$c$	$d$	$e$	$a$	$d$	1	$b$	$c$	$c$
$e$	$d$	$c$	$b$	$a$	1	$e$	$e$	$e$	$c$	$d$	$a$	$b$	1	$e$	$e$
$f$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1	1	$f$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1	1
1	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	$f$	1	1	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	$f$	1

Then  $(X; \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$  is a (proper) pseudo-BCI-algebra. Observe that it is not a pseudo-BCK-algebra because  $a \not\leq 1$ .

**Example 2.3** ([9]). Let  $Y_1 = (-\infty, 0]$  and let  $\leq$  be the usual order on  $Y_1$ . Define binary operations  $\rightarrow$  and  $\rightsquigarrow$  on  $Y_1$  by

$$x \rightarrow y = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq y, \\ \frac{2y}{\pi} \arctan(\ln(\frac{y}{x})) & \text{if } y < x, \end{cases}$$

$$x \rightsquigarrow y = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq y, \\ ye^{-\tan(\frac{\pi x}{2y})} & \text{if } y < x \end{cases}$$

for all  $x, y \in Y_1$ . Then  $(Y_1; \leq, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 0)$  is a pseudo-BCK-algebra, and hence it is a nonproper pseudo-BCI-algebra.

**Example 2.4** ([3]). Let  $Y_2 = \mathbb{R}^2$  and define binary operations  $\rightarrow$  and  $\rightsquigarrow$  and a binary relation  $\leq$  on  $Y_2$  by

$$(x_1, y_1) \rightarrow (x_2, y_2) = (x_2 - x_1, (y_2 - y_1)e^{-x_1}),$$

$$(x_1, y_1) \rightsquigarrow (x_2, y_2) = (x_2 - x_1, y_2 - y_1e^{x_2 - x_1}),$$

$$(x_1, y_1) \leq (x_2, y_2) \Leftrightarrow (x_1, y_1) \rightarrow (x_2, y_2) = (0, 0) = (x_1, y_1) \rightsquigarrow (x_2, y_2)$$

for all  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in Y_2$ . Then  $(Y_2; \leq, \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, (0, 0))$  is a proper pseudo-BCI-algebra. Notice that  $Y_2$  is not a pseudo-BCK-algebra because there exists  $(x, y) = (1, 1) \in Y_2$  such that  $(x, y) \not\leq (0, 0)$ .

**Example 2.5** ([3]). Let  $Y$  be the direct product of pseudo-BCI-algebras  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  from Examples 2.3 and 2.4, respectively. Then  $Y$  is a proper pseudo-BCI-algebra, where  $Y = (-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^2$  and binary operations  $\rightarrow$  and

$\rightsquigarrow$  and binary relation  $\leq$  are defined on  $Y$  by

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1, y_1, z_1) \rightarrow (x_2, y_2, z_2) &= \\ &= \begin{cases} (0, y_2 - y_1, (z_2 - z_1)e^{-y_1}) & \text{if } x_1 \leq x_2, \\ \left(\frac{2x_2}{\pi} \arctan\left(\ln\left(\frac{x_2}{x_1}\right)\right), y_2 - y_1, (z_2 - z_1)e^{-y_1}\right) & \text{if } x_2 < x_1, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1, y_1, z_1) \rightsquigarrow (x_2, y_2, z_2) &= \\ &= \begin{cases} (0, y_2 - y_1, z_2 - z_1 e^{y_2 - y_1}) & \text{if } x_1 \leq x_2, \\ (x_2 e^{-\tan\left(\frac{\pi x_1}{2x_2}\right)}, y_2 - y_1, z_2 - z_1 e^{y_2 - y_1}) & \text{if } x_2 < x_1, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$$(x_1, y_1, z_1) \leq (x_2, y_2, z_2) \Leftrightarrow x_1 \leq x_2 \text{ and } y_1 = y_2 \text{ and } z_1 = z_2.$$

Notice that  $Y$  is not a pseudo-BCK-algebra because there exists  $(x, y, z) = (0, 1, 1) \in Y$  such that  $(x, y, z) \not\leq (0, 0, 0)$ .

For any pseudo-BCI-algebra  $(X; \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$  the set

$$K(X) = \{x \in X : x \leq 1\}$$

is a subalgebra of  $X$  (called pseudo-BCK-part of  $X$ ). Then  $(K(X); \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$  is a pseudo-BCK-algebra. Note that a pseudo-BCI-algebra  $X$  is a pseudo-BCK-algebra if and only if  $X = K(X)$ .

It is easily seen that for the pseudo-BCI-algebras  $X$ ,  $Y_1$ ,  $Y_2$  and  $Y$  from Examples 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5, respectively, we have  $K(X) = \{f, 1\}$ ,  $K(Y_1) = Y_1$ ,  $K(Y_2) = \{(0, 0)\}$  and  $K(Y) = \{(x, 0, 0) : x \leq 0\}$ .

We will denote by  $M(X)$  the set of all maximal elements of  $X$  and call it the p-semisimple part of  $X$ . Obviously,  $1 \in M(X)$ . Notice that  $M(X) \cap K(X) = \{1\}$ . Indeed, if  $a \in M(X) \cap K(X)$ , then  $a \leq 1$  and, by the fact that  $a$  is maximal,  $a = 1$ . Moreover, observe that  $1$  is the only maximal element of a pseudo-BCK-algebra. Therefore, for a pseudo-BCK-algebra  $X$ ,  $M(X) = \{1\}$ . In [2] and [3] there is shown that  $M(X) = \{x \in X : x = (x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1\}$  and it is a subalgebra of  $X$ .

Observe that for the pseudo-BCI-algebras  $X$ ,  $Y_1$ ,  $Y_2$  and  $Y$  from Examples 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5, respectively, we have  $M(X) = \{a, b, c, d, e, 1\}$ ,  $M(Y_1) = \{0\}$ ,  $M(Y_2) = Y_2$  and  $M(Y) = \{(0, y, z) : y, z \in \mathbb{R}\}$ .

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $X$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra. Then*

$$M(X) = \{x \rightarrow 1 : x \in X\}.$$

**Proof.** We know that

$$M(X) = \{x \in X : x = (x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1\}.$$

Since, by (b9) and (b12), for any  $x \in X$ ,

$$x \rightarrow 1 = ((x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1,$$

we get that  $x \rightarrow 1 \in M(X)$  for any  $x \in X$ . Hence,

$$\{x \rightarrow 1 : x \in X\} \subseteq M(X).$$

Now, let  $a \in M(X)$ . Then,  $a = (a \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1$ . Putting  $x = a \rightarrow 1 \in X$  we obtain that  $a = x \rightarrow 1$  for some  $x \in X$  and also

$$M(X) \subseteq \{x \rightarrow 1 : x \in X\}.$$

Therefore,  $M(X) = \{x \rightarrow 1 : x \in X\}$ .  $\square$

Let  $X$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra. For any  $a \in X$  we define a subset  $V(a)$  of  $X$  as follows

$$V(a) = \{x \in X : x \leq a\}.$$

Note that  $V(a)$  is non-empty, because  $a \leq a$  gives  $a \in V(a)$ . Notice also that  $V(a) \subseteq V(b)$  for any  $a, b \in X$  such that  $a \leq b$ .

If  $a \in M(X)$ , then the set  $V(a)$  is called a *branch* of  $X$  determined by element  $a$ . The following facts are proved in [3]: (1) branches determined by different elements are disjoint, (2) a pseudo-BCI-algebra is a set-theoretic union of branches, (3) comparable elements are in the same branch.

The pseudo-BCI-algebra  $Y_1$  from Example 2.3 has only one branch (as the pseudo-BCK-algebra) and the pseudo-BCI-algebra  $X$  from Example 2.2 has six branches:  $V(a) = \{a\}$ ,  $V(b) = \{b\}$ ,  $V(c) = \{c\}$ ,  $V(d) = \{d\}$ ,  $V(e) = \{e\}$  and  $V(1) = \{f, 1\}$ . Every  $\{(x, y)\}$  is a branch of the pseudo-BCI-algebra  $Y_2$  from Example 2.4, where  $(x, y) \in Y_2$ . For the pseudo-BCI-algebra  $Y$  from Example 2.5 the sets  $V((0, a_1, a_2)) = \{(x, a_1, a_2) \in Y : x \leq 0\}$ , where  $(0, a_1, a_2) \in M(X)$ , are branches of  $Y$ .

**Proposition 2.7** ([2]). *Let  $X$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra and let  $x \in X$  and  $a, b \in M(X)$ . If  $x \in V(a)$ , then  $x \rightarrow b = a \rightarrow b$  and  $x \rightsquigarrow b = a \rightsquigarrow b$ .*

**Proposition 2.8** ([2]). *Let  $X$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra and let  $x, y \in X$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $x$  and  $y$  belong to the same branch of  $X$ ,
- (ii)  $x \rightarrow y \in K(X)$ ,
- (iii)  $x \rightsquigarrow y \in K(X)$ .

**Proposition 2.9** ([3]). *Let  $X$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra and let  $x, y \in X$ . If  $x$  and  $y$  belong to the same branch of  $X$ , then  $x \rightarrow 1 = x \rightsquigarrow 1 = y \rightarrow 1 = y \rightsquigarrow 1$ .*

We have the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.10.** *Let  $X$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra and let  $x, y \in X$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $x$  and  $y$  belong to the same branch of  $X$ ,
- (ii)  $x \rightarrow y \in K(X)$ ,
- (iii)  $x \rightsquigarrow y \in K(X)$ ,

$$(iv) \ x \rightarrow 1 = x \rightsquigarrow 1 = y \rightarrow 1 = y \rightsquigarrow 1.$$

**Proof.** Let  $x, y \in X$ . By Propositions 2.8 and 2.9 and (b12) it is sufficient to prove that if  $x \rightarrow 1 = y \rightarrow 1$ , then  $x \rightarrow y \in K(X)$ , that is, (iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). Assume that  $x \rightarrow 1 = y \rightarrow 1$ . Then, by (b11) and (b12), we have  $(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow 1 = (x \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (y \rightarrow 1) = 1$ , which means that  $x \rightarrow y \leq 1$ . Hence,  $x \rightarrow y \in K(X)$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

We also have the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.11.** *Let  $X$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra and let  $x, y \in X$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $x$  and  $y$  belong to the same branch of  $X$ ,
- (ii)  $x \rightarrow a = y \rightarrow a$  for all  $a \in M(X)$ ,
- (ii')  $x \rightsquigarrow a = y \rightsquigarrow a$  for all  $a \in M(X)$ ,
- (iii)  $x \rightarrow a \leq y \rightarrow a$  for all  $a \in M(X)$ ,
- (iii')  $x \rightsquigarrow a \leq y \rightsquigarrow a$  for all  $a \in M(X)$ .

**Proof.** (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): Assume that  $x, y \in V(b)$  for some  $b \in M(X)$ . Then for any  $a \in M(X)$ , by Proposition 2.7, we get  $x \rightarrow a = b \rightarrow a = y \rightarrow a$ , that is, (ii) holds.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): If  $x \rightarrow a = y \rightarrow a$  for all  $a \in M(X)$ , then putting  $a = 1$  we get  $x \rightarrow 1 = y \rightarrow 1$ . Now, by Proposition 2.10, we obtain (i).

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii): Obvious.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): Let  $x \rightarrow a \leq y \rightarrow a$  for all  $a \in M(X)$ . Then, since  $x \rightarrow a \in M(X)$  by Proposition 2.7, we have that  $x \rightarrow a = y \rightarrow a$  for all  $a \in M(X)$ .

Similarly, we can prove the equivalences (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (ii')  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii').  $\square$

**Proposition 2.12.** *Let  $X$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra and let  $x \in X$  and  $a \in M(X)$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $x \in V(a)$ ,
- (ii)  $x \rightarrow b = a \rightarrow b$  for all  $b \in M(X)$ ,
- (iii)  $x \rightsquigarrow b = a \rightsquigarrow b$  for all  $b \in M(X)$ .

**Proof.** (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): Follows by Proposition 2.7.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Let  $x \in X$  and  $a \in M(X)$ . Assume that  $x \rightarrow b = a \rightarrow b$  for all  $b \in M(X)$ . Putting  $b = 1$  we get  $x \rightarrow 1 = a \rightarrow 1$ . Hence, by Proposition 2.10,  $x$  and  $a$  are in the same branch of  $X$ , that is,  $x \in V(a)$ .

(i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii): Analogous.  $\square$

Let  $(X; \rightarrow, \rightsquigarrow, 1)$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra. Then  $X$  is *p-semisimple* if it satisfies for all  $x \in X$ ,

$$\text{if } x \leq 1, \text{ then } x = 1.$$

Note that if  $X$  is a p-semisimple pseudo-BCI-algebra, then  $K(X) = \{1\}$ . Hence, if  $X$  is a p-semisimple pseudo-BCK-algebra, then  $X = \{1\}$ . Moreover, as it is proved in [3],  $M(X)$  is a p-semisimple pseudo-BCI-subalgebra of  $X$  and  $X$  is p-semisimple if and only if  $X = M(X)$ .

It is not difficult to see that the pseudo-BCI-algebras  $X$ ,  $Y_1$  and  $Y$  from Examples 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5, respectively, are not p-semisimple, and the pseudo-BCI-algebra  $Y_2$  from Example 2.4 is a p-semisimple algebra.

**Proposition 2.13** ([3]). *Let  $X$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra. Then, for all  $a, b, x, y \in X$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $X$  is p-semisimple,
- (ii)  $(x \rightarrow y) \rightsquigarrow y = x = (x \rightsquigarrow y) \rightarrow y$ ,
- (iii)  $(x \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow 1 = x = (x \rightsquigarrow 1) \rightarrow 1$ ,
- (iv) if  $x \rightarrow a = x \rightarrow b$ , then  $a = b$ ,
- (v) if  $x \rightsquigarrow a = x \rightsquigarrow b$ , then  $a = b$ ,
- (vi) if  $a \rightarrow x = b \rightarrow x$ , then  $a = b$ ,
- (vii) if  $a \rightsquigarrow x = b \rightsquigarrow x$ , then  $a = b$ .

**3. Normal pseudo-BCI-algebras.** A pseudo-BCI-algebra  $X$  is called *normal* if  $X = K(X) \cup M(X)$ . Otherwise, it is called *non-normal*.

**Remark.** Every pseudo-BCK-algebra and every p-semisimple pseudo-BCI-algebra are normal.

A pseudo-BCI-algebra  $X$  is called *strongly normal* if  $X$  is normal and  $K(X) \neq \{1\}$  and  $M(X) \neq \{1\}$ .

**Example 3.1.** It is easy to see that the pseudo-BCI-algebra  $X$  from Example 2.2 is strongly normal, and the pseudo-BCI-algebra  $Y$  from Example 2.5 is non-normal.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $X$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $X$  is normal,
- (ii)  $((x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow x \in \{x, 1\}$  for any  $x \in X$ ,
- (iii)  $((x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow x \in \{x, 1\}$  for any  $x \in X$ .

**Proof.** (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): Let  $X$  be normal. Then  $X = K(X) \cup M(X)$ . Let  $x \in X$ . If  $x \in K(X)$ , then

$$((x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow x = 1 \rightarrow x = x \in \{x, 1\}.$$

If  $x \in M(X)$ , then

$$((x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow x = x \rightarrow x = 1 \in \{x, 1\}.$$

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Let  $((x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow x \in \{x, 1\}$  for any  $x \in X$ . Take  $z \in X$ . If  $((z \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow z = z$ , then, by (b9), b(11) and (b12),

$$\begin{aligned} z \rightarrow 1 &= (((z \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow z) \rightarrow 1 \\ &= (((z \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (z \rightarrow 1) \\ &= (z \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (z \rightarrow 1) \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $z \leq 1$ , that is,  $z \in K(X)$ . If  $((z \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow z = 1$ , then,  $(z \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1 \leq z$ . Hence and by (a2) and (b12),

$$z = (z \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1,$$

which means that  $z \in M(X)$ . Hence,  $X = K(X) \cup M(X)$ , that is, it is normal.

(i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii): Analogously.  $\square$

In next theorem we construct some strongly normal pseudo-BCI-algebra. But first, we prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $X$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra. Then*

(i) *for any  $x \in X$  and  $y \in K(X)$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow 1) &= 1 = ((x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)) \rightarrow 1, \\ (x \rightarrow y) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightarrow 1) &= 1 = ((x \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightarrow y)) \rightarrow 1, \\ (x \rightsquigarrow y) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightsquigarrow 1) &= 1 = ((x \rightsquigarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightsquigarrow y)) \rightarrow 1, \\ (x \rightsquigarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightsquigarrow 1) &= 1 = ((x \rightsquigarrow 1) \rightarrow (x \rightsquigarrow y)) \rightarrow 1, \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *for any  $x \in K(X)$  and  $a \in M(X)$ ,*

$$x \rightarrow a = a = x \rightsquigarrow a = (a \rightarrow x) \rightarrow 1 = (a \rightsquigarrow x) \rightarrow 1,$$

(iii) *if  $X = K(X) \cup M(X)$ , then  $a \rightarrow x = a \rightarrow 1 = a \rightsquigarrow x$  for any  $a \in M(X) \setminus \{1\}$  and  $x \in K(X)$ .*

**Proof.** (i) Let  $x \in X$  and  $y \in K(X)$ . By (b1) and (b6),  $(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow 1) = 1$ . Then, by (b10),  $1 = (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow 1) \leq ((x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)) \rightarrow 1$ . Hence, by (b1),

$$(x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow 1) = 1 = ((x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)) \rightarrow 1.$$

Next, by (b4), (b11) and (b12) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (x \rightarrow y) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightarrow 1) &= x \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow y) \rightsquigarrow 1) \\ &= x \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (y \rightarrow 1)) \\ &= x \rightarrow ((x \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow 1) \\ &= (x \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightarrow 1) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Now, it is easy to see that

$$(x \rightarrow y) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightarrow 1) = 1 = ((x \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (x \rightarrow y)) \rightarrow 1.$$

Similarly, we can prove other equations of (i).

(ii) Let  $x \in K(X)$  and  $a \in M(X)$ . From Proposition 2.12 we immediately have that

$$x \rightarrow a = a = x \rightsquigarrow a.$$



Moreover, by (b10) and (b12),  $a = x \rightarrow a \leq ((a \rightarrow x) \rightarrow 1)$  and  $a = x \rightsquigarrow a \leq ((a \rightsquigarrow x) \rightarrow 1)$ . Since  $a \in M(X)$ , we get (ii).

(iii) Let  $X = K(X) \cup M(X)$ ,  $a \in M(X) \setminus \{1\}$  and  $x \in K(X)$ . By (ii),  $(a \rightarrow x) \rightarrow 1 = a \neq 1$ . Hence,  $a \rightarrow x \notin K(X)$ , that is,  $a \rightarrow x \in M(X) \setminus \{1\}$ . Then,  $(a \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow x) \in M(X)$ . But, by (i),  $(a \rightarrow x) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow 1) = 1 = ((a \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow x)) \rightarrow 1$ . Thus,  $a \rightarrow x \leq a \rightarrow 1$  and  $(a \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow x) = 1$ , that is, also  $a \rightarrow 1 \leq a \rightarrow x$ . Therefore,  $a \rightarrow x = a \rightarrow 1$ . Similarly, we prove that  $a \rightsquigarrow x = a \rightarrow 1$ .  $\square$

**Remark.** Note that the assumption  $X = K(X) \cup M(X)$  in Lemma 3.3 (iii) is valid. Indeed, let  $Y$  be the pseudo-BCI-algebra from Example 2.5. We know that  $K(Y) = \{(x, 0, 0) : x \leq 0\}$  and  $M(Y) = \{(0, y, z) : y, z \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . Then for  $x < 0$  and  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} (0, a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (x, 0, 0) &= (0, a_1, a_2) \rightsquigarrow (x, 0, 0) = (x, -a_1, -a_2 e^{-a_1}) \\ &\neq (0, a_1, a_2) \rightarrow (0, 0, 0) \\ &= (0, -a_1, -a_2 e^{-a_1}). \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $Y$  be a pseudo-BCK-algebra,  $Z$  be a (proper)  $p$ -semi-simple pseudo-BCI-algebra and  $Y \cap Z = \{1\}$ . Then there exists a unique pseudo-BCI-algebra  $X$  such that  $X = Y \cup Z$ ,  $K(X) = Y$  and  $M(X) = Z$ .*

**Proof.** First, the operations on  $Y$  and  $Z$  we denote by the same symbols  $\rightarrow$  and  $\rightsquigarrow$ . Define on  $X = Y \cup Z$  binary operations  $\mapsto$  and  $\curvearrowright$  as follows

$$x \mapsto y = \begin{cases} x \rightarrow y & \text{if } x, y \in Y \text{ or } x, y \in Z, \\ y & \text{if } x \in Y \text{ and } y \in Z \setminus \{1\}, \\ x \rightarrow 1 & \text{if } x \in Z \setminus \{1\} \text{ and } y \in Y \end{cases}$$

and

$$x \curvearrowright y = \begin{cases} x \rightsquigarrow y & \text{if } x, y \in Y \text{ or } x, y \in Z, \\ y & \text{if } x \in Y \text{ and } y \in Z \setminus \{1\}, \\ x \rightsquigarrow 1 & \text{if } x \in Z \setminus \{1\} \text{ and } y \in Y. \end{cases}$$

We show that  $(X; \mapsto, \curvearrowright, 1)$  is a pseudo-BCI-algebra. We check the conditions (i)–(v) of Proposition 2.1. Since  $Y$  and  $Z$  are pseudo-BCI-algebras, we only need checking these conditions for the elements which are not all in  $Y$  and not all in  $Z$ . Particularly, (iii) and (iv) are satisfied. Now, we prove (v). Let  $x \in Y$  and  $y \in Z$ . Assume that  $x \mapsto y = 1 = y \mapsto x$ . Then,  $y = x \mapsto y = 1$ . This means that  $x = 1 \mapsto x = 1$ , that is,  $x = y = 1$ . Thus, (v) is satisfied. Next, we show the identity (i). Let  $x, x_1, x_2 \in Y$  and  $y, y_1, y_2 \in Z$ . Then

- (1)  $(x \mapsto y_1) \curvearrowright [(y_1 \mapsto y_2) \curvearrowright (x \mapsto y_2)] = y_1 \rightsquigarrow [(y_1 \rightarrow y_2) \rightsquigarrow y_2] = y_1 \rightsquigarrow y_1 = 1,$
- (2)  $(y_1 \mapsto x) \curvearrowright [(x \mapsto y_2) \curvearrowright (y_1 \mapsto y_2)] = (y_1 \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow [y_2 \rightsquigarrow (y_1 \rightarrow y_2)] = (y_1 \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (y_1 \rightarrow 1) = 1,$

- (3)  $(y_1 \mapsto y_2) \curvearrowright [(y_2 \mapsto x) \curvearrowright (y_1 \mapsto x)] = (y_1 \rightarrow y_2) \rightsquigarrow [(y_2 \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (y_1 \rightarrow 1)] = 1,$   
(4)  $(y \mapsto x_1) \curvearrowright [(x_1 \mapsto x_2) \curvearrowright (y \mapsto x_2)] = (y \rightarrow 1) \curvearrowright [(x_1 \rightarrow x_2) \curvearrowright (y \rightarrow 1)] = (y \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow (y \rightarrow 1) = 1,$   
(5)  $(x_1 \mapsto y) \curvearrowright [(y \mapsto x_2) \curvearrowright (x_1 \mapsto x_2)] = y \curvearrowright [(y \rightarrow 1) \curvearrowright (x_1 \rightarrow x_2)] = y \curvearrowright [(y \rightarrow 1) \rightsquigarrow 1] = y \rightsquigarrow y = 1,$   
(6)  $(x_1 \mapsto x_2) \curvearrowright [(x_2 \mapsto y) \curvearrowright (x_1 \mapsto y)] = (x_1 \rightarrow x_2) \curvearrowright (y \rightsquigarrow y) = y \rightsquigarrow y = 1.$

Thus, (i) is also satisfied. Similarly we can prove (ii). Therefore,  $(X; \mapsto, \curvearrowright, 1)$  is a pseudo-BCI-algebra.

Now, note that  $x \mapsto 1 = x \rightarrow 1$  for every  $x \in X$ . This means that  $x \mapsto 1 = 1$  if and only if  $x \rightarrow 1 = 1$ , and  $(x \mapsto 1) \mapsto 1 = x$  if and only if  $(x \rightarrow 1) \rightarrow 1 = x$ . Hence,  $K(X) = Y$  and  $M(X) = Z$ .

Finally, we show uniqueness of pseudo-BCI-algebra  $(X; \mapsto, \curvearrowright, 1)$ . Let  $(X; \mapsto, \curvearrowright, 1)$  be a pseudo-BCI-algebra such that  $X = Y \cup Z$ ,  $K(X) = Y$  and  $M(X) = Z$ . If  $x, y \in Y$  or  $x, y \in Z$ , then

$$x \mapsto y = x \rightarrow y = x \mapsto y \quad \text{and} \quad x \curvearrowright y = x \rightsquigarrow y = x \curvearrowright y.$$

If  $x \in Y$  and  $y \in Z \setminus \{1\}$ , then, by Lemma 3.3,

$$x \mapsto y = y = x \mapsto y \quad \text{and} \quad x \curvearrowright y = y = x \curvearrowright y.$$

If  $x \in Z \setminus \{1\}$  and  $y \in Y$ , then, again by Lemma 3.3,

$$x \mapsto y = x \mapsto 1 = x \rightarrow 1 = x \mapsto y$$

and

$$x \curvearrowright y = x \curvearrowright 1 = x \rightsquigarrow 1 = x \curvearrowright y.$$

Therefore,  $(X; \mapsto, \curvearrowright, 1) = (X; \mapsto, \curvearrowright, 1)$ . □

**Remark.** Notice that a pseudo-BCI-algebra  $X$  constructed in Theorem 3.4 is strongly normal.

**Example 3.5.** Take the following pseudo-BCK-algebra  $Y = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, 1\}$  equipped with the operations  $\rightarrow$  and  $\rightsquigarrow$  given by the following tables (see [6]):

$\rightarrow$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	$1$	$\rightsquigarrow$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	$1$
$\alpha$	1	1	1	1	$\alpha$	1	1	1	1
$\beta$	$\beta$	1	1	1	$\beta$	$\gamma$	1	1	1
$\gamma$	$\beta$	$\beta$	1	1	$\gamma$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	1	1
$1$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	1	$1$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	1

and the following p-semisimple pseudo-BCI-algebra  $Z = \{a, b, c, d, e, 1\}$  equipped with the operations  $\rightarrow$  and  $\rightsquigarrow$  given by the following tables (see [4]):

$\rightarrow$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	$1$		$\rightsquigarrow$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	$1$
$a$	1	$d$	$e$	$b$	$c$	$a$		$a$	1	$c$	$b$	$e$	$d$	$a$
$b$	$c$	1	$a$	$e$	$d$	$b$		$b$	$d$	1	$e$	$a$	$c$	$b$
$c$	$e$	$a$	1	$c$	$b$	$d$		$c$	$b$	$e$	1	$c$	$a$	$d$
$d$	$b$	$e$	$d$	1	$a$	$c$		$d$	$e$	$a$	$d$	1	$b$	$c$
$e$	$d$	$c$	$b$	$a$	1	$e$		$e$	$c$	$d$	$a$	$b$	1	$e$
$1$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1		$1$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1

Then, using Theorem 3.4, we can construct the new pseudo-BCI-algebra  $(X; \mapsto, \curvearrowright, 1)$  such that  $X = Y \cup Z$  and the operations  $\mapsto$  and  $\curvearrowright$  are as follows:

$\mapsto$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	$1$
$\alpha$	1	1	1	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1
$\beta$	$\beta$	1	1	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1
$\gamma$	$\beta$	$\beta$	1	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1
$a$	$a$	$a$	$a$	1	$d$	$e$	$b$	$c$	$a$
$b$	$b$	$b$	$b$	$c$	1	$a$	$e$	$d$	$b$
$c$	$d$	$d$	$d$	$e$	$a$	1	$c$	$b$	$d$
$d$	$c$	$c$	$c$	$b$	$e$	$d$	1	$a$	$c$
$e$	$e$	$e$	$e$	$d$	$c$	$b$	$a$	1	$e$
$1$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1

and

$\curvearrowright$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	$1$
$\alpha$	1	1	1	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1
$\beta$	$\gamma$	1	1	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1
$\gamma$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	1	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1
$a$	$a$	$a$	$a$	1	$c$	$b$	$e$	$d$	$a$
$b$	$b$	$b$	$b$	$d$	1	$e$	$a$	$c$	$b$
$c$	$d$	$d$	$d$	$b$	$e$	1	$c$	$a$	$d$
$d$	$c$	$c$	$c$	$e$	$a$	$d$	1	$b$	$c$
$e$	$e$	$e$	$e$	$c$	$d$	$a$	$b$	1	$e$
$1$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$	$e$	1

Obviously,  $K(X) = Y$  and  $M(X) = Z$ , that is,  $X$  is strongly normal.

**4. Extensions of pseudo-BCI-algebras.** Let  $X$  and  $X^*$  be pseudo-BCI-algebras. If  $X$  is a subalgebra of  $X^*$ , then  $X^*$  is called an *extension* of  $X$ . If  $X^*$  is p-semisimple (respectively, strongly normal, non-normal), then  $X^*$  is called a *p-semisimple* (respectively, *strongly normal*, *non-normal*) *extension* of  $X$ . If  $|X^* \setminus X| = 1$ , then  $X^*$  is called a *simple extension* of  $X$ .

First, we show some simple lemma. Consider the map  $p : X \rightarrow X$  such that

$$p(x) = x \rightarrow 1$$

for all  $x \in X$ . Obviously,  $p(x) = x \rightsquigarrow 1$  for all  $x \in X$ . Note that  $Im(p) = M(X)$ ,  $Ker(p) = K(X)$  and if  $X$  is p-semisimple, then  $p$  is surjective.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $X$  be a p-semisimple pseudo-BCI-algebra. Then, for all  $a \in X$ , maps  $f_a^{\rightarrow}, f_a^{\rightsquigarrow}, g_a^{\rightarrow}, g_a^{\rightsquigarrow} : X \rightarrow X$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} f_a^{\rightarrow}(x) &= x \rightarrow a, \\ f_a^{\rightsquigarrow}(x) &= x \rightsquigarrow a, \\ g_a^{\rightarrow}(x) &= a \rightarrow x, \\ g_a^{\rightsquigarrow}(x) &= a \rightsquigarrow x \end{aligned}$$

for all  $x \in X$ , are injective. Moreover,  $g_a^{\rightarrow}$  and  $g_a^{\rightsquigarrow}$  are also surjective.

**Proof.** Since  $X$  is p-semisimple, immediately by Proposition 2.13,  $f_a^{\rightarrow}, f_a^{\rightsquigarrow}, g_a^{\rightarrow}, g_a^{\rightsquigarrow}$  are injective. Moreover, for all  $x \in X$ , by (b4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (g_a^{\rightarrow} \circ f_a^{\rightsquigarrow})(x) &= g_a^{\rightarrow}(x \rightsquigarrow a) = a \rightarrow (x \rightsquigarrow a) \\ &= x \rightsquigarrow (a \rightarrow a) = x \rightsquigarrow 1 \\ &= p(x) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (g_a^{\rightsquigarrow} \circ f_a^{\rightarrow})(x) &= g_a^{\rightsquigarrow}(x \rightarrow a) = a \rightsquigarrow (x \rightarrow a) \\ &= x \rightarrow (a \rightsquigarrow a) = x \rightarrow 1 \\ &= p(x) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since  $p$  is surjective, maps  $g_a^{\rightarrow}$  and  $g_a^{\rightsquigarrow}$  are surjective.  $\square$

**Remark.** Note that  $g_a^{\rightarrow} \circ f_a^{\rightsquigarrow} = g_a^{\rightsquigarrow} \circ f_a^{\rightarrow}$  and the map  $p$  can be decomposed into an injection and a bijection.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $X$  be a p-semisimple pseudo-BCI-algebra. Then*

- (i) *there is no p-semisimple simple extension of  $X$  if  $|X| \geq 2$ ,*
- (ii) *there is a unique strongly normal simple extension of  $X$ ,*
- (iii) *there is no non-normal simple extension of  $X$ .*

**Proof.** (i) Let  $X$  be a p-semisimple pseudo-BCI-algebra and  $|X| \geq 2$ . Assume that  $X^* = X \cup \{x_0\}$  is a p-semisimple extension of  $X$ . Since  $|X| \geq 2$ , we can take  $x \in X \setminus \{1\}$ . Now, take the map  $g_x^{\rightarrow} : X^* \rightarrow X^*$ . By Lemma 4.1 we have  $g_x^{\rightarrow}(X^*) = X^*$  and  $g_x^{\rightarrow}(X) = X$ . Note that  $g_x^{\rightarrow}(x_0) \in X$ . Indeed, if  $g_x^{\rightarrow}(x_0) \in X^* \setminus X = \{x_0\}$ , then  $x \rightarrow x_0 = x_0 = 1 \rightarrow x_0$  and by Proposition 2.13,  $x = 1$ , which is impossible. Hence,  $g_x^{\rightarrow}(x_0) \in X$ . Thus,  $g_x^{\rightarrow}(X^*) = g_x^{\rightarrow}(X) \cup \{g_x^{\rightarrow}(x_0)\} = X$  and we have a contradiction.

(ii) First, there is a unique (pseudo-)BCK-algebra  $B_0 = \{0, 1\}$  in which the operation  $\rightarrow$  is as follows

$$\begin{array}{c|cc} \rightarrow & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{array}$$

Now, it is sufficient to take a pseudo-BCI-algebra  $X^* = B_0 \cup X$  as in Theorem 3.4. Obviously,  $X^*$  is the unique strongly normal simple extension of  $X$ .

(iii) It follows from (i) and the fact that for any pseudo-BCI-algebra  $Y$  we have  $K(Y) = \{1\}$  if and only if  $M(Y) = Y$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.3.** *If  $X$  is a  $p$ -semisimple pseudo-BCI-algebra such that  $|X| \geq 3$ , then  $X$  is not a simple extension of any pseudo-BCI-algebra.*

For arbitrary pseudo-BCI-algebras we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.4** ([4]). *Any pseudo-BCI-algebra has a simple extension.*

*Remark.* Note that for a pseudo-BCI-algebra  $X$  a new element of its simple extension  $X^*$  constructed in [4] belongs to  $K(X)$ . This means that if  $X$  is strongly normal (respectively, non-normal), then also  $X^*$  is strongly normal (respectively, non-normal).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Dudek, W. A., Jun, Y. B., *Pseudo-BCI algebras*, East Asian Math. J. **24** (2008), 187–190.
- [2] Dymek, G., *Atoms and ideals of pseudo-BCI-algebras*, Comment. Math. **52** (2012), 73–90.
- [3] Dymek, G.,  *$p$ -semisimple pseudo-BCI-algebras*, J. Mult.-Valued Logic Soft Comput. **19** (2012), 461–474.
- [4] Dymek, G., *On compatible deductive systems of pseudo-BCI-algebras*, J. Mult.-Valued Logic Soft Comput. **22** (2014), 167–187.
- [5] Dymek, G., Kozanecka-Dymek, A., *Pseudo-BCI-logic*, Bull. Sect. Logic Univ. Łódź **42** (2013), 33–42.
- [6] Halaš, R., Kühr, J., *Deductive systems and annihilators of pseudo-BCK-algebras*, Ital. J. Pure Appl. Math. **25** (2009).
- [7] Iorgulescu, A., *Algebras of Logic as BCK Algebras*, Editura ASE, Bucharest, 2008.
- [8] Iséki, K., *An algebra related with a propositional calculus*, Proc. Japan Acad. **42** (1966), 26–29.
- [9] Jun, Y. B., Kim, H. S., Neggers, J., *On pseudo-BCI ideals of pseudo BCI-algebras*, Mat. Vesnik **58** (2006), 39–46.

Grzegorz Dymek  
 Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science  
 The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin  
 Konstantynów 1H  
 20-708 Lublin  
 Poland  
 e-mail: gdymek@o2.pl

Received September 9, 2014