NIILM University International Journal of Applied and Behavioural Sciences (IJABS)

ISSN:3048-9083 2025, Vol.02, Issue 01

A Study of Mathematical Formulation on Algebras of Partial Functions

Neha[1], and Jakhar, Manjeet Singh[2]

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0775-698X

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Mathematics, NIILM University, Kaithal Haryana

[2]Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, NIILM University Kaithal Haryana

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70388/ijabs250101

Received on Sep 10, 2024

Accepted on Nov 30, 2024

Published on Jan 01, 2025

Abstract

Throughout mathematics, numerical approximation is studied in this topic; functions are far more common than relations, which are more generic. But things have always been backwards when it comes to the mathematics of reasoning about these things. At first, the goal of this effort was rigorous algebraic logic. To rephrase, the relations were supplying the meaning to the logical expressions. Since functions are not well-suited to the duty of analyzing formula semantics, this may explain why the related theory of functions remained underdeveloped until recently. On the other hand, computer science has emerged as a driving force in relational history, with binary relations serving as the semantic foundation for (nondeterministic) computer programs in particular. As this perspective sees it, the relation connects the dots between the machine's possible states before and after program execution.

Keywords: Mathematical formulation, algebras, partial functions, numerical approximation, logical formulas

Introduction

Boris Schein and colleagues were the only ones to consistently work on reasoning with (maybe incomplete) functions in the 1960s, despite functions' pervasiveness in mathematics up to the turn of the century.2, 3 A steady flow of publications has been published in the previous fifteen years, nonetheless, with computer science considerations serving as the primary inspiration. An isomorphism from theoretical polynomial math to significant polynomial math is defined whenever there is a large class of algebras whose operations are set-hypothetically described. Afterwards, the depiction class, which is the class of representable algebras, would become its own academic subject. Numerous signatures have been investigated in this context, and one possible explanation—the focus of this work—is that the concrete algebras are algebras of partial functions. Frequent types or quasivarieties of finitely axiomatized representations have been discovered.

Algebraic expressions of partial functions

Different types of relational algebras When R is a binary relation, it signifies that the algebra of partial functions is an algebra of functional relations.

$$xRy \times xRy' \rightarrow y = y'$$

for all x, y and y'. Given that abstract algebras are representable for any choice of set-theoretic operations, we can study the representation class and related issues like complete or finite representability. Consequently, algebras of partial functions are just more variants of algebras of relations, and our methodology remains the same.

Unary functions

Thinking about functional binary relations on a base set X, or unary partial functions, is the simplest and most typical example.

To start, we provide a non-final inventory of operations that have been used in studies of algebras of unary partial functions. Because many abstract and set-theoretic operations only need a single symbol, we will be using a single set of symbols throughout this section. It is already in the past.

- function composition: (a special case of relation composition),
- intersection: ·
- empty function: 0
- identity function: 1’ (defined on the specified base), and there is also
- **domain**: D a unary operation—"D(*f*)” represents the function of identity that is constrained to domain “*f*”.
- **anti-domain**: As a unary operation, A is defined as "A(f)" for all f that is not defined at any given position in the base.

- **range**: R is a unary operation; the expression "R(f)" denotes the identity function with the range "f" as its constraint.
- **fixset**: F a unary operation—F(*f*) is the identity function restricted to the fixed points of '*f*',
- **preferential union**: H a binary operation—"*f* and *g*" (preferential union) takes the value of *f* where *f* is defined and the value of *g* where definition of *f* is not provided while for g is there.
- **relative complement**: \ the usual binary relative complement operation on sets,
- **maximum iterate**: ↑ a unary operation—$f^{\uparrow}(x)$ is defined if only a finite number of iterations of '*f*'are defined on *x* and takes the value $f^n(x)$ for the maximum value of *n* that this is defined. So

$$f^{\uparrow}(x) = \bigcup_{n \in N} (f^n; A(f))$$

Readers will notice that the list above does not include all operations that are discussed extensively in the section on binary relations. When applied to partial functions, thinking about algebras of partial functions with a signature operation that does not generate a function is typically not particularly helpful. To prove that these algebras are legitimate for some functions, one must show that they can live in an algebra with that signature without generating a non-function. Secondly, these algebras are, in general, too narrow to have any real impact. No point in a collection of partial functions closed under unions can map to more than one location. Even worse are signatures that contain a complement; the base can only contain two points.

However, this is not the case with anti-domain signatures, as increasing the base corrupts the anti-domain process. However, the single-base-set setup is all that is considered in this thesis. Assume A is a Σ-algebra and Σ is a signature of this kind. An isomorphism from A to a polynomial math with components as partial functions and interpretations as the indicated operations is an A representation by partial derivatives.

Entire Illustration of "Composition, Intersection, and Anti-domain" by Partial Functions

Extra criteria, such as meeting completion or join total, can be applied to a representation. If a representation can transform any existing infima into crossing points, it is complete; if it can transform any existing suprema into associations, it is also complete. That being said, we may establish two categories of representations: meet-complete and join-complete. These two types of situations often mix. One area where they fall flat is in the treatment of constrained distributive cross sections as rings of sets.

Due to Boolean algebras being treated as fields of sets, for instance, Hirsch and Hodkinson demonstrated in that the total representation class may be simple even if the representation class is simple.

In this piece, we go over how to depict every conceivable result by utilizing partial derivatives for the symbols {; ·, A}; crossing point, and spaces. The algebras exhibit numerous behaviours that are reminiscent of Boolean algebras with respect to this particular mark. This analogy to Boolean algebras allows us to demonstrate that a representation by incomplete capacity can only be finished if and only if it is joins finished.

We prove that a representation is complete at the point where it is nuclear. We prove that the subset of algebras that are fully representable is not closed under sub-algebras, coordinated associations, homomorphic pictures and cannot be axiomatized by any existential-widespread existential first-request hypothesis by using the criterion that fully depictable algebraic expressions be nuclear.

We focus on the classes of A-algebras that are representable and those that are very much representable, as well as on the applicability of certain distributive rules for these classes. Therefore, we may provide an example of a variable-based mathematical framework that is nuclear and representable but not perfect.

To demonstrate our primary result, we offer an explicit representation: An inclusive existential-general first-request articulation can axiomatize the class of very much representable algebra, a key basic class.

Partial and complete depictions

For every mark A, we prove that a representation by partial derivative is full only if it is fully joined after defining a few terms. Saying or writing that an is an element of an algebra A denotes that an is an element of that algebra's domain. Saying that S is a subset of A or writing S as A are both correct expressions. The cardinality of a domain is represented by the symbol |A|. We adhere to the rule that algebraic expressions are never empty. Considering subset S for map's domain, then [S] signifies the set (s) | s S. If S1 and S2 are subsets of binary functions, $*$ then S_1*S_2 denotes the set $\{s_1*s_2 \mid s_1\in S_1$ and $s_2\in S_2\}$. In a po-set P (whose identity should be clear) the notation $\downarrow a$ signifies the down-set

$\{b \in \mathrm{P} \mid b \leq a\}$.

Definition 1. Assume σ be an arithmetical mark whose signatures consist of subsets {; ·, 0, 1', D, R, A}.

A polynomial equation with fractional elements of the mark σ is one in which the components are incomplete capacity and the operations on those midway capabilities are given by the set-hypothetical technique, as shown in the following.

Consider X to be a union of all the unfulfilled capabilities' domains and scopes. X is known as the base. In the context of fractional capacity math based on variables

- partial derivative composed of binary operations:

“$f \cdot g = \{(x, z) \in X^2 \mid \exists y \in X: (x, y) \in f$ and $(y, z) \in g\}$”,

  - intersectoral binary operator:

“$f \cdot g = \{(x, y) \in X^2 \mid (x, y) \in f$ and $(x, y) \in g$”},

  - defining function, “constant 0”: $0 = \emptyset$,

- A "constant 1" identity function on X:

“$1' = \{(x, x) \in X^2\}$”,

- D, the "unary operator" that takes the domain diagonal:

“$D(f) = \{(x, x) \in X^2 \mid \exists y \in X: (x, y) \in f\}$”,

- This function's range can be diagonalized using operator R, the so-called "unary operator":

“$R(f) = \{(y, y) \in X^2 \mid \exists x \in X: (x, y) \in f\}$”,

- For functions whose definitions are missing, operator A, a "unary operator" used to extract the anti-domain of a diagonal, considers just a subset of X:

“$A(f) = \{(x, x) \in X^2 \mid \exists/y \in X\colon (x, y) \in f\}$”.

Although the list of operations in "Definition 1" does not include all of those that have been investigated for partial derivatives, it does include the most popular ones.

Definition 2. Using "Definition 1" as a guide, let A be an algebraic variable belonging to a mark.

Isomorphisms between A and the algebraic representation of comparable marks are depicted by partial derivatives. A is considered "representable" in the case that it appears in a film.

Theorem 1 (Jackson and Stokes)**.** *The group of {; ·, A}-algebraic expressions illustrated by partial derivative is a limitedly based assortment.*

Actually, it is true that the portrayal class is axiomatized under specific conditions. This means that such axiomatizations do in fact exist.

A ·-semilattice is formed if the algebraic mark {; ·, A} may be represented by partial derivatives. Treating such an algebraic expression as a "po-set" means making use of the request that this semilattice prompted.

Once the idea of a representation has been defined, the two following explanations will work in every situation. These ideas are valid, in particular, for representations as fields of sets and representations by partial derivatives.

Definition 3. The depictionθ of a po-set “P”for$X$ is **met entirely** in the event, if, for all non-empty sub-set$S\ of\ \beta, if\ \prod S$ exists, then

$$\theta(\prod s) = \bigcap\nolimits_{\theta} [s]$$

Definition 4. The depictionθ of a po-set “P” for X is **joined completely,**if, for all sub-set $S\ of\ \beta, if\ \prod S$ exists, then

$$\theta(\sum s) = \bigcup\nolimits_{\theta} [s]$$

Definition 4 does not need S to be non-empty, although Definition 3 must. For examples of Boolean algebraic expressions in forest field theory, the adjective "complete" is used since the meanings of met and joined totally are same.

The property "least element-0" should be present in an algebraic expression A with a mark {; ·, A} and A shown by partial derivatives. This property is given by A(a); a for every a ∈ A, and every representation of A should show 0 with an empty set.

Likewise, "D= A^2" should serve as an example of how the "Set-theoretic domain" works.

The usefulness for a particular mark {; ·, A} is demonstrated by the "lemma" that follows. The fact that illustrated {; ·, A}-algebraic expressions are close to Boolean algebras allows results from the hypothesis of Boolean algebraic expressions to be introduced into the context of {; ·, A}-algebras.

Lemma 1. Pretend that A is the algebraic expression of the mark {; ·, A}. The set ↓ a, with the smallest component 0, the largest component a, the meet given by ·, and the complementation $\bar{}$ supplied by b= A(b), will be a Boolean variable based on math if An can be represented by its partial derivative.

Proof. If θ is a representation of A by partial derivative, and b ≤ a = ⇒ θ(b) ⊆ θ(a), then θ surely reduces ↓ a to subsets of θ(a). The concept of useful representability often makes it clear that θ (b · c) = θ(b) ∩ θ(c) and that b and c are elements of ℓ a, where ⇒ b · c is an element of ↓. Within the range of b ≒ a

"$\theta(b) = \theta(\mathrm{A}(b) ; a) = \mathrm{A}(\theta(b)) ; \theta(a) = \theta(a) \setminus \theta(b)$",

Therefore, b is a member of the set a and θ(b) is equal to θ(b)c, where the set supplement is considered relative to θ(a). Hence, we can see that (↓ a, 0, a, ·,) is a field of sets over θ(a) when we restrict θ to ↓ a, and that ↓ an is an algebraic Boolean expression.

The Exclusive Definition of Range, Composition, Intersection, and Domain

The isomorphism class of algebraic expressions, with components being partial derivatives and activities being some predefined set of procedures on fractional capacity tasks like creation or crossing point, is considered in the theoretical logarithmic properties of the partial derivative. We make a passing reference to representable polynomial math that is isomorphic to an algebraic statement.

Determining and locating an axiomatization of the class of representable algebras is a crucial step, as we have demonstrated in earlier sections. Axiomatization by a small number of conditions or semi conditions has become commonplace in the representation classes. this was already defined,

The question of whether the partial derivative on a limited set can address each limited representable algebraic expression remains unanswered. The capacity to aid in proving decidability of representability is the primary motivation for the interest in this so-called limited portrayal attribute.

Hirsch, Jackson, and Mikula recently laid out the limited portrayal property for several sig-qualities, however they don't provide a solution for markings that combine crossing point, area, and reach activities.

We obtain a remarkable bound on the size of the base set expected for a representation, which is double-bound, from our verification. Finally, given such a high score, representability of limited algebras is decidable. Additionally, we provide the impression in the model that there are marks for which the limited portrayal property does not apply to partial derivative portrayal.

The results that are presented here start with McLean. The following creator's promise is to translate the initial validation of the limited portrayal attribute into a semantic context so that space is unnecessary.

Algebras of partial functions

To help readers understand and express the findings from this chapter, we have included the necessary vocabulary in this section.

For an algebra A, we say that an is an element of A's domain when we write a ∈ A, meaning that an is an element of A. Algebras are never empty, and we follow this rule.

Definition 1. A subset of the set {; ·, D, R, 0, 1', A, F, Џ, ↑, −1} contains the algebraic signature σ. The algebraic representation of the partial derivative of the mark σ is the algebraic representation of the mark σ with functions provided by the set-hypothetical technique applied to those partial derivatives, as shown in the following.

Assume X be the association of the spaces and scopes of the multitude of fractional capacities happening in algebraic expression ϗ. We refer to X as the basis of A. What follows are the task translations in σ:

- The partial functions are composed of binary operators: *"f*; $g = \{(x, z) \in X^2 \mid \exists y \in X: (x, y) \in f$ and $(y, z) \in g\}$", that is, $(f; g)(x) = g(f(x))$,
- intersectoral binary operator: *"*$f \cdot g = \{(x, y) \in X^2 \mid (x, y) \in f$ and $(x, y) \in g\}$",
- operator D, the "unary operator" used to take a diagonal of function's domain: "$D(f) = \{(x, x) \in X^2 \mid \exists y \in X: (x, y) \in f\}$",
- This function's range can be diagonalized using operator R, the so-called "unary operator": "$R(f) = \{(y, y) \in X^2 \mid \exists x \in X: (x, y) \in f\}$",
- defining empty function, "constant 0": $0 = \emptyset$,
- identity function, "constant 1" on X": "$1' = \{(x, x) \in X^2\}$",
- When taking a diagonal of a function's anti-domain, operator A (the "unary operator") only considers some locations of X for which the function definition is unavailable: "$A(f) = \{(x, x) \in X^2 \mid \nexists y \in X: (x, y) \in f\}$",
- One way to find the fixed points of a function is to utilize operator F, which is a "unary operator" that is defined as fix-set: "$F(f) = \{(x, x) \in X^2 \mid (x, x) \in f\}$",

- preferential union binary operator ∐:

$$(f \cup g)(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & if\ f(x) defined \\ g(x), & if\ f(x) undefined, but\ g(x) defined \\ undefined & otherwise \end{cases}$$

- maximum iterative function of the unary operator $^{\uparrow}$ is defined as:

$$f^{\uparrow} = \bigcup_{n \in N} (f^n; A(f))$$

Wherein,"$f^0 = 1'$ and $f^{n+1} = f; f^n$",

- opposite of operation is "unary operation $^{-1}$": *"*$f^{-1} = \{(y, x) \in X^2 \mid (x, y) \in f$ and $((x', y) \in f \Longrightarrow x = x')\}$".

While Definition 1 does not exclude any activities that have been considered for partial derivatives, it does include the most often seen chores.

Definition 2 Using "Definition 1" as a guide, let A bean algebraic variable belonging to a mark.

Representing A as a partial derivative isomorphism means that A can be expressed algebraically as a comparable mark. If A is depicted, we say that it is representable.

Jackson and Stokes provide a finite equational axiomatization of the representation class for the signature {;, D, R} and any expansion by operations in {0, 1', F}.

The representation class for the signature; A, R is finitely axiomatized by Hirsch, Jackson, and Mikulas using equations in 0, 1', D, F, and H. The same holds for any enlargement of this signature using operations in the same way.

In describing the concrete action as its "bilateral inverse," Menger defines the "opposite" operation as an abstract operation that is meant to mirror this concrete process. In Schweizer and Sklar's work, the contrasting operation reappears, although it seems to have received little further consideration. Specifically, axiomatizations of the representation classes hold for signatures that include opposites.

Conclusion

Once again, this is in contrast to relationships. We proved that some representation classes are not finitely axiomatable and achieved additional finite axiomatizations; these are all favorable outcomes. It would be fascinating to study the root cause of this discrepancy between our results and previous ones. We prioritized the use of functions to model the dynamic behavior of computer programs as the primary application of reasoning with partial functions. Therefore, it's worthwhile to talk about the possible requirements for useful reasoning and the feasibility of this. Determining the validity of formulas is more important for applications than having axiomatizations or deciding representability. It seems to reason that determining validity will become more complicated as the number of syntactic constraints on the formulas being considered decreases. Simplifying the process to prove an equation reveals that it cannot be entirely automated. This is because the validity of the equation depends on two other, simpler equations, which in turn require manual verification after atomic programming instructions have been instantiated with variables. To reframe it, the automated prover can only carry out the verification task if it is given the correct relationships between atomic claims and is able to deduce a quasi-equational validity.

References:

1. Agirseven, D. (2012). Approximate solutions of delay parabolic equations with the Dirichlet condition. *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, *2012*(1), Abstr. Appl, Article ID 682752. https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/682752

2. Anh, C. T., & Hieu, L. V. (2012). Existence and uniform asymptotic stability for an abstract differential equation with infinite delay. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, *51*, 1–14.

3. Chang, J.-C. (2011). Existence of some neutral partial differential equations with infinite delay. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, *74*(10), 3204–3217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.na.2011.01.035

4. Condon, M., Deaño, A., Iserles, A., & Kropielnicka, K. (2012). Efficient computation of delay differential equations with highly oscillatory terms. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, *46*(6), 1407–1420. https://doi.org/10.1051/m2an/2012004

5. Gokdogan, A., Merdan, M., & Yildirim, A. (2012). 'Differential transformation method for solving a neutral functional-differential equation with proportional delays', Caspian J. Math. *Sci.*, *1*(1), 31–37.

6. Huang, C., & Vandewalle, S. (2012). Unconditionally stable difference methods for delay partial differential equations. *Numerische Mathematik*, *122*(3), 579–601. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-012-0467-7

7. Jian, M., Zheng, B., & Zhang, C. (2012). A matrix method for determining eigen values and stability of singular neutral delay-differential systems. *Journal of Applied Mathematics*, *2012*(1), Article ID., Article 749847. https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/749847

8. Karapetyants, A., & Samko, S. (2021). Variable order fractional integrals in variable generalized Hölder spaces of holomorphic functions. *Analysis and Mathematical Physics*, *11*(4), 156. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13324-021-00587-0

9. Krol, K. (2011). Asymptotic properties of fractional delay differential equations. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, *218*(5), 1515–1532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2011.04.059

10. Liu, X., Zhong, S., & Ding, X. (2012). Robust exponential stability of impulsive switched systems with switching delays: A Razumikhin approach. *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, *17*(4), 1805–1812. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cnsns.2011.09.013

11. Roales, M., Rodrguez, F., & Martin, J. A. (2012). Exact solutions and numerical approximations of mixed problems for the wave equation with delay. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, *219*, 3178–3186.

12. Siddiqu, S. S., Akram, G., & Baig, H. (2012). Solution of delay differential equations using nonic spline collocation methods. *International Mathematical Forum*, *7*(46), 2279–2292.

13. Avurakoghene, O. P., & Oredein, A. O. (2023). Educational leadership and artificial intelligence for sustainable development. *Shodh Sari-An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, *02*(03), 211–223. https://doi.org/10.59231/sari7600

14. M, A. P., & C, K. D. (2024). Applied mathematics in today's education system in India. *Shodh Sari-An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, *3(1)*, 113–122.https://doi.org/10.59231/SARI7656