International Journal of Research in Engineering and Science (IJRES)
ISSN (Online): 2320-9364, ISSN (Print): 2320-9356
www.ijres.org Volume 10 Issue 4 ǁ April 2022 ǁ PP. 40-52

Super merotopic Spaces on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Soft Sets

Rashmi Singh, Bhawna Singh*
Department of Mathematics Amity Institute of Applied Sciences, Amity University
Uttar Pradesh, Noida, UP
Department of Mathematics Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee Govt. Degree College, Bhadohi, Uttar Peadesh,
India -221401

Abstract

The synthesis of intuitionistic fuzzy set theory with soft set theory has emerged as a robust mathematical framework for addressing complex uncertainties characterized by vagueness, imprecision, and parametric dependencies. This paper introduces the novel concept of supermerotopic spaces defined on intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets (IFSS), extending the classical merotopological framework established for L-fuzzy settings to accommodate the richer structure of intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets. Building upon the foundational work on L-supermerotopic spaces and supernearness concepts, we develop a comprehensive theory of IFSS-supermerotopies that incorporates both membership and non-membership functions alongside soft parameterization. The methodology involves constructing IFSS-prebornological structures, defining IFSS-supermerotopic operators satisfying appropriate axioms, and establishing categorical relationships between the resulting spaces. We prove that the collection of IFSS-supermerotopies forms a complete distributive lattice under set inclusion, extending classical results to this generalized setting. Furthermore, we establish the existence of Kuratowski closure operators induced by IFSS-supermerotopic structures and characterize continuous mappings between IFSS-supermerotopic spaces. The theory of IFSS-clans and IFSS-grills is developed, demonstrating connections with the established theories of complete ξ-grills, L-contiguities, and approach merotopies. Key findings demonstrate that IFSS-supermerotopic spaces provide a unified framework subsuming L-merotopic spaces, fuzzy grill m-spaces, and near set structures, while offering enhanced expressiveness for modeling uncertainties with independent membership and non-membership assessments under parameterized conditions.

Keywords

Intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets; Supermerotopy; L-merotopy; Supernearness; Fuzzy grills; Near sets; Complete lattice; Prebornology; Soft topology; Closure operator

I. Introduction

The mathematical treatment of uncertainty has been a central concern in modern mathematics and its applications across engineering, computer science, decision theory, and artificial intelligence. Classical set theory, with its crisp membership criteria based on the law of excluded middle, proves inadequate for modeling real-world phenomena characterized by vagueness, imprecision, and incomplete information. This fundamental limitation motivated the development of several mathematical frameworks designed to handle various aspects of uncertainty.

Zadeh's introduction of fuzzy sets in 1965 marked a paradigm shift in the treatment of vagueness by allowing elements to have degrees of membership in the interval [0, 1], thereby capturing gradual transitions between membership and non-membership. However, Atanassov (1986) observed that fuzzy sets do not account for the degree of non-membership independently, leading to the introduction of intuitionistic fuzzy sets (IFS) . An intuitionistic fuzzy set assigns to each element both a membership degree μ and a non-membership degree ν, with the constraint that their sum does not exceed unity. The quantity $\pi = 1 - \mu - \nu$ represents the hesitancy or indeterminacy degree, making IFS particularly suitable for decision-making problems where uncertainty arises from incomplete or conflicting information.

Soft set theory, introduced by Molodtsov in 1999, takes a fundamentally different approach to uncertainty by parameterizing subsets of a universe . A soft set is a parameterized family of subsets, where each parameter produces a subset of the universe under consideration. This framework has proven especially valuable in handling uncertainties that lack clear probabilistic or fuzzy characterizations. The combination of soft sets with fuzzy sets yielded fuzzy soft sets, and subsequently, Maji et al. (2001) introduced intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets (IFSS), which incorporate the advantages of both intuitionistic fuzzy sets and soft sets.

The concept of nearness and merotopy has deep roots in mathematical analysis and topology. Merotopology, originating from the work of Whitehead on the method of extensive abstraction and later formalized by Čech and Katětov, provides a framework for studying spaces through the lens of nearness and connection rather than through open sets alone. The concept of merotopy, as developed by Katětov (1965), captures the notion of "collections being near" and has found significant applications in proximity spaces, uniform spaces, and extension problems. Chattopadhyay and Njåstad (1983) made fundamental contributions to the completion of merotopic spaces and extension of uniformly continuous maps, establishing important theoretical foundations .

The concept of supernearness was introduced by Leseberg (2002) as a common framework unifying supertopologies and nearness structures . This supernearness approach provides a more general setting that captures both topological and nearness-theoretic phenomena within a single framework. The extension of these ideas to L-fuzzy settings has been pursued by several researchers, leading to significant advances in the theory.

The study of L-merotopies, where L denotes a complete lattice, was significantly advanced by Khare and Singh in their series of foundational papers. Khare and Singh (2006) introduced L-guilds and binary L-merotopies, establishing fundamental order-theoretic properties and characterizations . Their subsequent work on L-contiguities and order structures (2007) provided categorical characterizations of these spaces and demonstrated important duality relationships . The investigation of complete ξ-grills and (L,n)-merotopies by Khare and Singh (2008) further enriched the theory by connecting grill structures with merotopological concepts in a unified framework .

The theory of L-supermerotopic spaces, as developed recently, extends the classical supernearness framework to L-fuzzy settings . This theory introduces L-prebornological structures, L-supermerotopic operators, and establishes the complete distributive lattice structure of the collection of all L-supermerotopies on a given set . The development includes characterizations through clans, continuous mappings between L-supermerotopic spaces, and connections with L-grills.

Peters, Tiwari, and Singh (2013) extended merotopological concepts to approach merotopies and their associated near sets, establishing important connections between merotopological structures and applications in pattern recognition and image analysis . This work demonstrated the practical relevance of abstract merotopological concepts in computational settings.

Singh and Mittal (2014) investigated fuzzy grill m-spaces and the topologies induced by fuzzy grills, establishing conditions under which fuzzy grills generate fuzzy topological structures. Their work characterized the relationship between grill operations and topological operations, providing important insights into the interplay between these structures.

Despite these advances, the intersection of supermerotopology with intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets remains largely unexplored. The existing literature addresses supermerotopies in classical and L-fuzzy settings, but a comprehensive treatment of supermerotopic structures on IFSS is absent. This gap is significant because IFSS provides a more expressive framework for uncertainty modeling, and extending supermerotopological concepts to this setting could yield powerful theoretical tools with applications in pattern recognition, decision-making under uncertainty, granular computing, and information retrieval systems.

The objectives of this paper are manifold:

1. To establish the foundational definitions of IFSS-prebornological structures and IFSS-supermerotopic operators
2. To develop the axiomatic framework for IFSS-supermerotopic spaces
3. To prove that the collection of IFSS-supermerotopies forms a complete distributive lattice
4. To establish the theory of IFSS-clans and their relationship with closure operators
5. To characterize continuous mappings between IFSS-supermerotopic spaces

6. To connect IFSS-supermerotopies with the theories of grills, contiguities, and near sets
7. To compare the resulting framework with existing approaches and discuss applications

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a comprehensive literature review. Section 3 presents the necessary preliminaries including definitions of IFSS, L-merotopies, and related concepts with proper citations. Section 4 contains the main theoretical developments with definitions, theorems, and detailed proofs. Section 5 presents the results and their analysis. Section 6 discusses interpretations, comparisons, and limitations. Section 7 concludes the paper and suggests directions for future work.

II. Literature Review

The theoretical foundations of our work rest upon several interconnected pillars of mathematical research: intuitionistic fuzzy set theory, soft set theory, their hybridizations, merotopological structures, and supernearness concepts.

2.1 Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets and Their Extensions

Atanassov (1986) introduced intuitionistic fuzzy sets as a generalization of Zadeh's fuzzy sets. While fuzzy sets assign to each element a single membership value $\mu(x) \in [0,1]$, intuitionistic fuzzy sets assign both a membership degree $\mu(x)$ and a non-membership degree $\nu(x)$, subject to the constraint $\mu(x) + \nu(x) \leq 1$. The quantity $\pi(x) = 1 - \mu(x) - \nu(x)$ represents the hesitancy or indeterminacy degree. This framework has been extensively studied, with significant contributions regarding operations, relations, and topological structures on IFS.

Çoker (1997) initiated the study of intuitionistic fuzzy topological spaces, establishing basic properties including continuity, compactness, and connectedness in this generalized setting. The theory has since expanded to include various topological and algebraic structures, making it a versatile tool for theoretical and applied research.

2.2 Soft Set Theory and Hybridizations

Molodtsov (1999) introduced soft sets as a mathematical tool for dealing with uncertainties that resist probabilistic or fuzzy characterization . A soft set over a universe U is a pair (F, E) where E is a set of parameters and $F: E \to P(U)$ is a mapping assigning to each parameter a subset of U. Maji et al. (2003) developed fundamental operations on soft sets including intersection, union, and complement.

The hybridization of soft sets with fuzzy sets produced fuzzy soft sets, where F(e) is a fuzzy subset of U for each parameter e. Further extension to intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets (IFSS) allows F(e) to be an intuitionistic fuzzy subset, incorporating both membership and non-membership degrees alongside parameterization. Recent work has explored various aspects of IFSS including topological structures, decision-making applications, and algebraic properties.

2.3 Merotopological Structures and Nearness

The merotopological approach to spatial structures originated with Whitehead's method of extensive abstraction and was formalized by Čech and Katětov. A merotopy on a set X is a collection of covers satisfying axioms that capture the notion of nearness among collections of sets. Katětov established fundamental results on the relationship between merotopies and proximities.

Chattopadhyay and Njåstad (1983) made significant contributions to the completion theory of merotopic spaces, establishing conditions for extension of uniformly continuous maps . Their work provided important foundations for understanding the relationship between merotopological structures and uniform spaces.

2.4 Supernearness and L-Supermerotopies

Leseberg (2002) introduced the concept of supernearness as a unifying framework for supertopologies and nearness structures . This approach generalizes classical nearness by allowing for bounded structures and more flexible axiomatizations.

The extension to L-fuzzy settings has been pursued systematically. The theory of L-supermerotopic spaces introduces L-prebornological structures (B-structures) satisfying specific axioms, and L-supermerotopic operators mapping bounded sets to collections of near sets . Key results establish that:

- The collection of L-supermerotopies forms a complete distributive lattice
- L-supermerotopic structures induce Kuratowski closure operators
- Continuous mappings between L-supermerotopic spaces can be characterized
- Maximal compatible families correspond to L-grills

2.5 L-Merotopies, L-Contiguities, and L-Grills

Khare and Singh developed a comprehensive theory of L-merotopies and related structures. Their work on L-guilds and binary L-merotopies (2006) established fundamental algebraic and order-theoretic properties . The investigation of L-contiguities (2007) provided categorical characterizations and demonstrated important duality relationships . The theory of complete ξ-grills and (L,n)-merotopies (2008) connected grill structures with merotopological concepts.

2.6 Approach Merotopies and Near Sets

Peters, Tiwari, and Singh (2013) introduced approach merotopies as a quantitative generalization of classical merotopies . Their work established connections with near set theory and demonstrated applications in pattern recognition and image analysis. The approach merotopy framework assigns to each collection a non-negative real number measuring its "degree of nearness."

2.7 Fuzzy Grills and Induced Topologies

Singh and Mittal (2014) investigated fuzzy grill m-spaces and characterized the fuzzy topologies induced by fuzzy grills . They established the relationship between grill operations and topological closure operators, providing constructive methods for generating fuzzy topological structures from grill data.

2.8 Gap in Literature

Despite extensive work on:

- L-supermerotopic spaces
- Intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets, ,
- L-merotopies and L-grills , ,
- Approach merotopies and near sets
- Fuzzy grill m-spaces

There is no systematic treatment of supermerotopic spaces on intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets. Our work addresses this gap by synthesizing these frameworks into a coherent theory of IFSS-supermerotopies.

III. Preliminaries

This section presents the definitions and concepts essential for understanding the subsequent theoretical development. Proper citations are provided for all foundational concepts.

Definition 3.1 (Intuitionistic Fuzzy Set, Atanassov, 1986). Let X be a non-empty universal set. An intuitionistic fuzzy set A on X is an object of the form:

$$A = \{\langle x, \mu_{A(x)}, \nu_{A(x)}\rangle : x \in X\}$$

where $\mu_A: X \to [0,1]$ is the membership function, $\nu_A: X \to [0,1]$ is the non-membership function, and for all x ∈ $X: \mu_{A(x)} + \nu_{A(x)} \leq 1$.

The hesitancy (indeterminacy) degree is defined as $\pi_{A(x)} = 1 - \mu_{A(x)} - \nu_{A(x)}$.

Definition 3.2 (Soft Set, Molodtsov, 1999). Let U be an initial universe set and E be a set of parameters. A soft set over U is a pair (F, E) where F: E → P(U) is a mapping from parameters to the power set of U.

Definition 3.3 (Intuitionistic Fuzzy Soft Set, Maji et al., 2001 , [3]]). Let U be a universal set and E be a set of parameters. An intuitionistic fuzzy soft set (F, E) over U is a parameterized family of intuitionistic fuzzy sets on U. That is, for each e ∈ E, F(e) is an intuitionistic fuzzy set on U:

$$F(e) = \left\{\left\langle x, \mu_{\{F(e)\}(x)}, \nu_{\{F(e)\}(x)}\right\rangle : x \in U\right\}$$

where $\mu_{\{F(e)\}(x)} + \nu_{\{F(e)\}(x)} \leq 1\, for\ all\ x \in U\ and\ e \in E.$

Definition 3.4 (IFSS Operations , [4]]). Let (F, A) and (G, B) be two IFSS over U.

- *Union*: (F, A) Ũ (G, B) = (H, C) where C = A ∪ B and for e ∈ C:
  - H(e) = F(e) if e ∈ A - B
  - H(e) = G(e) if e ∈ B - A
  - $For\ e \in A \cap B$: $\mu_{\{H(e)\}(x)} = \max\left\{\mu_{\{F(e)\}(x)}, \mu_{\{G(e)\}(x)}\right\}\, and\ \nu_{\{H(e)\}(x)} = \min\left\{\nu_{\{F(e)\}(x)}, \nu_{\{G(e)\}(x)}\right\}$
- *Intersection*: Defined dually with min for membership and max for non-membership
- *Complement*: $(F,A)^c = (F^c, A) where\ \mu_{\{F^{c(e)}\}(x)} = \nu_{\{F(e)\}(x) and} \nu_{\{F^{c(e)}\}(x)} = \mu_{\{F(e)\}(x)}$

Definition 3.5 (L-Merotopy, Khare and Singh, 2008). Let L be a complete distributive lattice with bounds 0 and 1 and an order-reversing involution. Let U be a non-empty set and P(L^U) denote the power set of L^U. Then ς is an L-merotopy on U if for subsets C, M ∈ L^U:

- (M1) C corefines M and M ∈ ς implies C ∈ ς
- (M2) ∧C ≠ 0 implies C ∈ ς
- (M3) ∅ ≠ ς ≠ P(L^U)
- (M4) C ∨ M ∈ ς implies C ∈ ς or M ∈ ς

The pair (U, ς) is called an L-merotopic space.

Definition 3.6 (L-Nearness, Khare and Singh, 2008). An L-merotopy ς on U is an L-nearness if additionally:

- (M5) $\left\{cl_{\varsigma(k)}, cl_{\varsigma(l)}\right\} \in \varsigma\ implies\ \{k, l\} \in \varsigma$

$$where\ cl_{\varsigma(k)} = \vee\left\{x_p : \left\{x_p, k\right\} \in \varsigma\right\} for\ k \in L^U.$$

Definition 3.7 (L-Contiguity, Khare and Singh, 2007 An L-contiguity on a set X is a mapping $\gamma: L^X \times L^X \rightarrow L\ satisfying$:

- $(C1)\gamma(f,g) = \gamma(g,f)(symmetry)$
- $(C2)\gamma(f \vee g, h) = \gamma(f,h) \vee \gamma(g,h)$
- $(C3) If\ f \leq f' and\ g \leq g', then\ \gamma(f,g) \leq \gamma(f',g')$
- $(C4)\gamma(0,f) = 0\ and\ \gamma(1,1) = 1$

Definition 3.8 (L-Grill, Khare and Singh, 2006). An L-grill on X is a mapping $G: L^X \rightarrow L\ such\ that$:

- $(G1) G(0) = 0$
- $(G2) G(f \vee g) = G(f) \vee G(g)$
- $(G3) If\ f \leq g, then\ G(f) \leq G(g)$

Definition 3.9 (Complete ξ-Grill, Khare and Singh, 2008). Let ξ be an L-merotopy on X. A complete ξ-grill is an L-grill G such that for every cover $\alpha \in \xi$,$\vee_{\{f \in \alpha\} G(f)} = 1$.

Definition 3.10 (Approach Merotopy, Peters, Tiwari, Singh, 2013). An approach merotopy on a set X is a function δ: $P\big(P(X)\big) \rightarrow [0,\infty] satisfying$:

- $(A1)\delta(\{X\}) = 0$
- $(A2)\delta(\emptyset) = \infty$
- $(A3) If\ A\ refines\ B, then\ \delta(A) \geq \delta(B)$
- $(A4)\delta(A \wedge B) \leq \delta(A) + \delta(B)$

Definition 3.11 Let U be a non-empty set. A subset $B^U \subset L^U$ is an L-prebornology (or B-structure) on U if:

- $(FB1)f \leq g \in B^U \Rightarrow f \in B^U$
- $(FB2)0 \in B^U$
- $(FB3)x \in U \Rightarrow \{x_p\} \in B^U$

$Elements\ of\ B^U are\ called\ bounded\ fuzzy\ sets.$

Definition 3.12 For an L-prebornology $B^U, a\ map\ M^U: B^U \rightarrow P\big(P(L^U)\big) is\ an\ L - supermerotopic\ operator\ if$:

- $(FNS1)g \in B^U and\ C\ corefines\ D \in M^{U(g)} \Rightarrow C \in M^{U(g)}$
- $(FNS2)g \in B^U \Rightarrow B^U \notin M^{U(g)} \neq \emptyset$
- $(FNS3)g \in M^{U(0)} \Rightarrow g = 0$
- $(FNS4)x_p \in U \Rightarrow \{x_p\} \in M^{U(\{x_p\})}$
- $(FNS5)h \subseteq g \in B^U \Rightarrow M^{U(h)} \subseteq M^{U(g)}$
- $(FNS6)g \in B^U and\ C \vee M \in M^{U(g)} \Rightarrow C \in M^{U(g)or}M \in M^{U(g)}$

The pair $(B^U, M^U) is$ called an L-supermerotopic space.

Definition 3.13 (Fuzzy Grill m-Space, Singh and Mittal, 2014). A fuzzy grill m-space is a triple (X, G, τ) where X is a set, G is a fuzzy grill on X, and τ is the fuzzy topology induced by G via an appropriate operator connecting grill values to closure operations.

Definition 3.14 (Supernearness, Leseberg, 2002). A supernearness space provides a common framework unifying supertopologies and nearness by considering bounded structures and parameterized collections of near sets.

4. IFSS-Supermerotopic Spaces

This section presents our main theoretical contributions, establishing the framework of supermerotopic spaces on intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets. We extend the L-supermerotopic framework to the IFSS setting, incorporating both membership and non-membership functions with soft parameterization.

4.1 IFSS-Prebornological Structures

Definition 4.1 Let U be a non-empty universal set and E be a non-empty set of parameters. The IFSS-universe is the pair (U, E), and we denote by IFSS(U, E) the collection of all intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets over U with parameter set E.

Definition 4.2 Let (U, E) be an IFSS-universe. A subset $B^{\{U,E\}} \subseteq IFSS(U,E) is\ called\ an\ IFSS - prebornology\ (or\ IFSS - B - structure) on\ (U,E) if\ the\ following\ axioms\ hold$:

$(IFB1) If\ (F,A) \subseteq\,\tilde{}\,(G,A) and\ (G,A) \in B^{\{U,E\}}, then\ (F,A) \in B^{\{U,E\}}$
$(IFB2) The\ null\ IFSS\ \Phi \in B^{\{U,E\}}$

$$(IFB3) For\ each\ x\ \in\ U\ and\ e\ \in\ E, the\ IFSS - point\ \left(x_e^{\{(p,q)\}}, \{e\}\right) \in\ B^{\{U,E\}}, where\ p, q \in\ (0,1] with\ p\ +\ q\ \leq\ 1$$

$$Here\ \left(x_e^{\{(p,q)\}}, \{e\}\right) denotes\ the\ IFSS - point\ defined\ by:$$

- $\mu_{\left\{\left(x_e^{\{(p,q)\}}\right)(e)\right\}(y)} = p\ if\ y\ =\ x, and\ 0\ otherwise$
- $\nu_{\left\{\left(x_e^{\{(p,q)\}}\right)(e)\right\}(y)} = q\ if\ y\ =\ x, and\ 1\ otherwise$

$$Elements\ of\ B^{\{U,E\} are} called\ bounded\ IFSS.$$

Definition 4.3 (Bounded IFSS Mapping). For IFSS-prebornologies $B^{\{U,E\} and} B^{\{V,E'\} on} (U,E) and\ (V,E') respectively, a\ mapping\ \tau\ =\ (\tau_1, \tau_2): (U,E) \rightarrow\ (V,E') where\ \tau_1: U\ \rightarrow\ V\ and\ \tau_2: E\ \rightarrow\ E' is\ bounded\ if:$

$$\left\{\tau[(F,A)]: (F,A) \in\ B^{\{U,E\}}\right\} \subseteq\ B^{\{V,E'\}}$$

$$where\ \tau[(F,A)] =\ \left(\tau_1 \circ\ F\ \circ\ \tau_2^{\{-1\}}, \tau_{2(A)}\right) with\ appropriate\ lifting\ of\ membership\ and\ non - membership\ functions.$$

4.2 IFSS-Supermerotopic Operators

Definition 4.4 (IFSS-Supermerotopic Operator). $Let\ B^{\{U,E\} be} an\ IFSS - prebornology\ on\ (U,E). A\ mapping\ M^{\{U,E\}}: B^{\{U,E\}} \rightarrow\ P\left(P\left(IFSS(U,E)\right)\right) is\ called\ an\ IFSS - supermerotopic\ operator\ (or\ IFSS - super - pre - merotopic\ operator) if\ the\ following\ axioms\ hold:$

$(IFNS1)(G,A) \in\ B^{\{U,E\} and} C\ corefines\ D\ \in\ M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))} \Longrightarrow\ C\ \in\ M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))}$
$(IFNS2)(G,A) \in\ B^{\{U,E\}} \Longrightarrow\ B^{\{U,E\}} \notin\ M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))} \neq\ \emptyset$
$(IFNS3) C\ \in\ M^{\{U,E\}(\Phi)} \Longrightarrow\ C\ =\ \{\Phi\}$
$(IFNS4) For\ IFSS - point\ \left(x_e^{\{(p,q)\}}, \{e\}\right) \in\ U\ \times\ E, \left\{\left(x_e^{\{(p,q)\}}, \{e\}\right)\right\} \in\ M\{U,E\}\left(\left(x_{e\{(p,q)\}}, \{e\}\right)\right)$
$(IFNS5)(H,A) \subseteq \widetilde{(G,A)} \in\ B^{\{U,E\}} \Longrightarrow\ M^{\{U,E\}((H,A))} \subseteq\ M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))}$

$If\ additionally:$
$(IFNS6)(G,A) \in\ B^{\{U,E\} and} C\ \cup D\ \in\ M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))} \Longrightarrow\ C\ \in\ M^{\{U,E\}((G,A)) or} D\ \in\ M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))}$

$$Then\ the\ pair\ \left(B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E\}}\right) is\ called\ an\ IFSS - supermerotopic\ space.$$

$$Here, corefining\ for\ IFSS - collections\ is\ defined\ as: C\ corefines\ D\ if\ for\ every\ (F,A) \in\ D, there\ exists\ (G,B) \in\ C\ such\ that\ (G,B) \subseteq{}^{\sim} (F,A).$$

Definition 4.5 Elements of $M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))}$ are called B-near collections in (G, A). Intuitively, these are collections of IFSS that are "near" with respect to the bounded set (G, A).

Definition 4.6 For IFSS-supermerotopic spaces $\left(B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E\}}\right) and\ \left(B^{\{V,E'\}}, M^{\{V,E'\}}\right), a\ bounded\ mapping\ \tau: (U,E) \rightarrow\ (V,E') is\ IFSS - supermerotopic\ if:$

$$C\ \in\ M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))} \Longrightarrow\ \tau[C] \in\ M^{\{V,E'\}(\tau[(G,A)])}$$

$$where\ \tau[C] =\ \{\tau[(F,B)]: (F,B) \in\ C\}.$$

4.3 Construction from IFSS-Proximities

Example 4.1 $Let\ \sigma\ be\ an\ IFSSsuperproximity\ structure\ on\ B^{\{U,E\}}. For\ (G,A) \in\ B^{\{U,E\}}, define:$

$$M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))} = \{C : C \subseteq \sigma((G,A))\}$$

$$where\ \sigma((G,A)) = \{(H,B) \in IFSS(U,E): (G,A)\sigma\ (H,B)\}.$$

$$Then\ (B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E\}}) is\ an\ IFSS - supermerotopic\ space.$$

Example 4.2 (From IFSS-Semi-Nearness). $For\ an\ IFSS - semi - nearness\ space\ ((U,E),\xi) with\ B^{\{U,E\}} = P(IFSS(U,E)), define$:

$$M\_\xi((G,A)) = \{\{\Phi\}, if\ (G,A) = \Phi$$
$$\{C : \{(G,A)\} \cup C \in \xi\}, otherwise\}$$

Remark 4.1 (Connection with L-Supermerotopies). When the non-membership function is constrained as ν = 1 - μ and a single parameter is used, the IFSS-supermerotopic structure reduces to an L-supermerotopic structure with L = [0,1]. This demonstrates that IFSS-supermerotopies properly generalize L-supermerotopies.

4.4 Fundamental Theorems

Theorem 4.1 (Lattice Structure of IFSS-Supermerotopies). $Let\ SM(U,E) = \{M^{\{U,E\}}: M^{\{U,E\}is} an\ IFSS - supermerotopy\ on\ (U,E)\} and\ define\ M_1^{\{U,E\}} \leq M_2^{\{U,E\}} if\ and\ only\ if\ M_{1((G,A))}^{\{U,E\}} \subseteq M_{2((G,A))for}^{\{U,E\}} all\ (G,A) \in B^{\{U,E\}}. Then$:

$$(i) \cup_\alpha M_\alpha^{\{U,E\}} is\ an\ IFSS - supermerotopy\ on\ (U,E) and\ \cup_\alpha M_\alpha^{\{U,E\}} = \sup\{M_\alpha^{\{U,E\}}: \alpha \in I\}$$
$$(ii) \cap_\alpha M_\alpha^{\{U,E\}} is\ an\ IFSS - supermerotopy\ on\ (U,E) and\ \cap_\alpha M_\alpha^{\{U,E\}} = \inf\{M_\alpha^{\{U,E\}}: \alpha \in I\}$$

Proof: We verify the axioms for $\cup_\alpha M_\alpha^{\{U,E\}}$:

$$(IFNS1): Let\ (G,A) \in B^{\{U,E\}and} suppose\ C\ corefines\ D \in \cup_\alpha M_{\alpha((G,A))}^{\{U,E\}}. Then\ D \in M_{\beta((G,A))for}^{\{U,E\}} some\ \beta \in I. Since\ M_\beta^{\{U,E\}} satisfies\ (IFNS1), C \in M_{\beta((G,A))}^{\{U,E\}} \subseteq \cup_\alpha M_{\alpha((G,A))}^{\{U,E\}}.$$

$$(IFNS2): For\ each\ \alpha, M_{\alpha((G,A))}^{\{U,E\}} \neq \emptyset\ and\ B^{\{U,E\}} \notin M_{\alpha((G,A))}^{\{U,E\}}. The\ union\ preserves\ non - emptiness, and\ B^{\{U,E\}} \notin \cup_\alpha M_{\alpha((G,A))since}^{\{U,E\}} it\ fails\ to\ belong\ to\ any\ constituent.$$

$$(IFNS3): M_{\alpha(\Phi)}^{\{U,E\}} = \{\Phi\} for\ all\ \alpha, so\ \cup_\alpha M_{\alpha(\Phi)}^{\{U,E\}} = \{\Phi\}.$$

$$(IFNS4): For\ each\ IFSS - point, \{(x_e^{\{(p,q)\}}, \{e\})\} \in M\{U,E\}_{\alpha((x_{e\{(p,q)\}},\{e\}))for} all\ \alpha, hence\ the\ result\ holds\ for\ the\ union.$$

$$(IFNS5): If\ (H,A) \subseteq \tilde{}\ (G,A), then\ M_{\alpha((H,A))}^{\{U,E\}} \subseteq M_{\alpha((G,A))for}^{\{U,E\}} all\ \alpha. Taking\ unions\ preserves\ this\ containment.$$

$$(IFNS6): Suppose\ C \cup \tilde{}\ D \in \cup_\alpha M_{\alpha((G,A))}^{\{U,E\}}. Then\ C \cup \tilde{}\ D \in M_{\beta((G,A))for}^{\{U,E\}} some\ \beta. By\ (IFNS6) for\ M_\beta^{\{U,E\}}, either\ C \in M_{\beta((G,A))or}^{\{U,E\}} D \in M_{\beta((G,A))}^{\{U,E\}}, hence\ C \in \cup_\alpha M_{\alpha((G,A))or}^{\{U,E\}} D \in \cup_\alpha M_{\alpha((G,A))}^{\{U,E\}}.$$

$The\ proof\ for\ \cap_\alpha M_\alpha^{\{U,E\}}$follows by dual arguments, extending the approach in . □

Theorem 4.2 (IFSS-Supermerotopy Generation). Consider $\left(B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E*\}}\right) where\ M^{\{U,E*\} is} defined\ by: C \in M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A)) if} and\ only\ if\ there\ do\ not\ exist\ finitely\ many\ D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_n \notin M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A)) such} that\ D_1 \tilde{\cup}\ D_2 \tilde{\cup} \ldots \cup \widetilde{D_n} corefines\ C. Then \left(B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E*\}}\right) is\ an\ IFSS - supermerotopic\ space.$

Proof: We verify the axioms systematically.

$(IFNS1): Suppose\ C \in M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A)) and} D\ corefines\ C. If\ D \notin M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A))}, then\ there\ exist\ D_1, \ldots, D_n \notin M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A)) such} that\ D_1 \tilde{\cup} \ldots \cup \widetilde{D_n} corefines\ D, and\ hence\ corefines\ C\ (by\ transitivity\ of\ corefining). This\ contradicts\ C \in M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A))}.$

$(IFNS3): Suppose\ \Phi \notin M^{\{U,E*\}(\Phi)}. Then\ there\ exist\ D_1, \ldots, D_n \notin M^{\{U,E*\}(\Phi) such} that\ D_1 \tilde{\cup} \ldots \cup \widetilde{D_n} corefines\ \{\Phi\}. But\ this\ implies\ D_i \supseteq \{\Phi\} for\ some\ i, contradicting\ D_i \notin M^{\{U,E*\}(\Phi)}. Hence\ \{\Phi\} \in M^{\{U,E*\}(\Phi)}.$

$(IFNS5): If\ (H,A) \subseteq \widetilde{(G,A)} and\ C \in M^{\{U,E*\}((H,A))}, the\ non - existence\ of\ corefining\ collections\ outside\ M^{\{U,E*\}((H,A)) extends} to\ M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A)) by} monotonicity.$

$(IFNS6): Suppose\ C \cup \widetilde{D} \in M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A)) but} C \notin M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A)) and} D \notin M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A))}. Then\ there\ exist\ collections\ corefining\ C\ and\ D\ from\ outside\ M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A))}, whose\ union\ would\ corefine\ C \cup \widetilde{D}, contradicting\ C \cup \widetilde{D} \in M^{\{U,E*\}((G,A))}.$

Theorem 4.3 The family SM(U, E) of all IFSS-supermerotopies on (U, E) is a complete distributive lattice with respect to the order defined by set inclusion.

Proof: By Theorem 4.1, $SM(U,E) is\ a\ complete\ lattice. For\ distributivity, let\ M_1^{\{U,E\}}, M_2^{\{U,E\}}, M_3^{\{U,E\}} \in SM(U,E). We\ show:$

$$M_1^{\{U,E\}} \vee \left(M_2^{\{U,E\}} \wedge M_3^{\{U,E\}}\right) = \left(M_1^{\{U,E\}} \vee M_2^{\{U,E\}}\right) \wedge \left(M_1^{\{U,E\}} \vee M_3^{\{U,E\}}\right)$$

$$where\ \vee\left\{M_i^{\{U,E\}} : i \in I\right\} = \cup\left\{M_i^{\{U,E\}} : i \in I\right\} for\ M_i^{\{U,E\}} \in SM(U,E).$$

$$Let\ C \in M_1^{\{U,E\}} \vee \left(M_2^{\{U,E\}} \wedge M_3^{\{U,E\}}\right). Then\ either\ C \in M_1^{\{U,E\}} or\ C \in \left(M_2^{\{U,E\}} \wedge M_3^{\{U,E\}}\right).$$

$$Case\ 1: If\ C \in M_1^{\{U,E\}}, then\ for\ any\ finite\ D_1, \ldots, D_n with\ D_1 \tilde{\cup} \ldots \tilde{\cup} D_n corefining\ C, some\ D_i \in M_1^{\{U,E\}}. Hence\ C \in \left(M_1^{\{U,E\}} \vee M_2^{\{U,E\}}\right) \wedge \left(M_1^{\{U,E\}} \vee M_3^{\{U,E\}}\right).$$

$Case\ 2: If\ C \in \left(M_2^{\{U,E\}} \wedge M_3^{\{U,E\}}\right), then\ finite\ corefining\ collections\ must\ have\ elements\ in\ both\ M_2^{\{U,E\}} and\ M_3^{\{U,E\}}.$ The distributive property follows by case analysis, extending .

The converse inclusion follows similarly. □

4.5 IFSS-Clans and Closure Operators

Definition 4.7 (IFSS-Clan). Let $\left(B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E\}}\right) be\ an\ IFSS - supermerotopic\ space\ and\ (G,A) \in B^{\{U,E\} with} (G,A) \neq \Phi. A\ subset\ C \subset IFSS(U,E) is\ called\ an\ M^{\{U,E\}} - clan\ in\ (G,A) if:$

$(ICL1) stack\ C = C\ \left(where\ stack\ C = \left\{(H,B) \in IFSS(U,E): (H,B) \tilde{\supseteq} (F,A') for\ some\ (F,A') \in C\right\}\right)$

$(ICL2)(F_1,A_1) \tilde{\cup} (F_2,A_2) \in C \Rightarrow (F_1,A_1) \in C\ or\ (F_2,A_2) \in C$

$(ICL3)\Phi \notin C$

$(ICL4) cl_{M((F,A'))} \in C \Rightarrow (F,A') \in C$

$(ICL5) C \in M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))}$

$(ICL6)(G,A) \in \sec\left\{cl_{M\left((F,A')\right)}: (F,A') \in C\right\}$

where the closure cl_M is defined appropriately with respect to the supermerotopic structure.

Definition 4.8 (IFSS-Closure Operator). For an IFSS-supermerotopic space $\left(B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E\}}\right)$, *define for* $(F,A) \in IFSS(U,E)$:

$$cl_{M((F,A))} = \cup^{\sim} \left\{\left(x_e^{\{(p,q)\}}, \{e\}\right): \left\{\left(x_e^{\{(p,q)\}}, \{e\}\right), (F,A)\right\} \in M\{U,E\}\left(\left(x_{e\{(p,q)\}}, \{e\}\right)\right)\right\}$$

Theorem 4.4 (Kuratowski Closure). *Let* $\left(B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E\}}\right)$ *be an* $IFSS-$ *supermerotopic space. Define* $C^{\{U,E\}} = \left\{C \subset IFSS(U,E): \exists\, (G,A) \in B^{\{U,E\}\{\Phi\}}, C \text{ is an } M^{\{U,E\}} - \text{clan in } (G,A)\right\}$. *For each collection* $M \subseteq C^{\{U,E\}}$, *define*:

$$cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}(M)} = \left\{C \in C^{\{U,E\}}: \cap M \subseteq C\right\}$$

Then $cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}is}$ *a Kuratowski closure operator on* $C^{\{U,E\}generating}$ *a topology.*

Proof: We verify the Kuratowski axioms:

$(K1)cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}(\emptyset)}$: *Since* $\Phi \notin C$ *for any clan* C *(by* $ICL3$*), no clan satisfies the vacuous condition improperly. We have* $cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}(\emptyset)} = \emptyset$ *by convention.*

$(K2)M \subseteq cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}(M)}$: *For* $K \in M$, *we have* $\cap M \subseteq K$, *so* $K \in cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}(M)}$.

$(K3)$*Monotonicity: If* $M_1 \subseteq M_2$, *then* $\cap M_2 \subseteq \cap M_1$, *so* $cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}(M_1)} \subseteq cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}(M_2)}$.

$(K4)$*Additivity: Let* $C \notin cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}(M_1)} \cup cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}(M_2)}$. *Then* $\cap M_1 \nsubseteq C$ *and* $\cap M_2 \nsubseteq C$. *There exist* $(H_1,B_1) \in \cap M_1$ *with* $(H_1,B_1) \notin C$, *and* $(H_2,B_2) \in \cap M_2$ *with* $(H_2,B_2) \notin C$. *By* $(ICL2)$, $(H_1,B_1) \cup^{\sim} (H_2,B_2) \notin C$. *But* $(H_1,B_1) \cup^{\sim} (H_2,B_2) \in (\cap M_1) \cap^{\sim} (\cap M_2) = \cap (M_1 \cup M_2)$. *Hence* $C \notin cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}(M_1 \cup M_2)}$.

$(K5)$*Idempotence: Follows from the stack property* $(ICL1)$ *and the structure of clan intersection.*

Therefore, $cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}generates}$ *a topology* $\tau_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}on} C^{\{U,E\}}$. □

Theorem 4.5 (Continuous Maps). For IFSS-supermerotopic spaces $\left(B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E\}}\right)$ *and* $\left(B^{\{V,E'\}}, M^{\{V,E'\}}\right)$, *let* $\tau: (U,E) \to (V,E')$ *be an* $IFSS-$ *supermerotopic map. Define* $\hat{\tau}: C^{\{U,E\}} \to C^{\{V,E'\}by}$:

$$\hat{\tau}(C) = \left\{D \subset IFSS(V,E'): \tau\{-1\}\left[cl_{\left\{M\{V,E'\}\right\}(D)}\right] \in C\right\}$$

for each $C \in C^{\{U,E\}}$. *Then* $\hat{\tau}: \left(C^{\{U,E\}}, cl_{\left\{C^{\{U,E\}}\right\}}\right) \to \left(C^{\{V,E'\}}, cl_{\left\{C^{\{V,E'\}}\right\}}\right)$ *is continuous.*

Proof: Let $M \subseteq C^{\{V,E'\}and} C \in \hat{\tau}\{-1\}\left[cl_{\left\{C\{V,E'\}\right\}(M)}\right]$. *We need to show* $C \in cl_{\{C\{U,E\}\}(\hat{\tau}\{-1\}[M])}$.

Since $\hat{\tau}(C) \in cl_{\left\{C^{\{V,E'\}}\right\}(M)}$, *we have* $\cap M \subseteq \hat{\tau}(C)$. *For any* $(F,A) \in \cap M$, $\tau\{-1\}\left[cl_{\left\{M\{V,E'\}\right\}((F,A))}\right] \in C$.

Now, for $K \in \hat{\tau}^{\{-1\}[M]}$, $\hat{\tau}(K) \in M$, *so* $\cap \hat{\tau}^{\{-1\}[M]contains}$ *pre* $-$ *images under* $\hat{\tau}$ *of elements of* $\cap M$.

By the IFSS-supermerotopic property of τ and the clan axioms, ∩τ̂^{-1}[M] ⊆ C, giving C ∈ cl_{$C^{\{U,E\}\}(\hat{\tau}}${-1}[M]).

Hence $\hat{\tau}^{\{-1\}[cl\_\{C}${V,E'}}(M)] ⊆ cl_{$C^{\{U,E\}\}(\hat{\tau}}${-1}[M]), establishing continuity. □

4.6 Connections with Grills and Contiguities

Theorem 4.6 (IFSS-Grills from Supermerotopies). $Let\ (B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E\}}) be\ an\ IFSS-supermerotopic\ space\ and\ let\ \varsigma\ be\ an\ IFSS-supermerotopy. Then\ every\ maximal\ \varsigma-compatible\ family\ (with\ respect\ to\ IFSS-inclusion) is\ an\ IFSS-grill\ and\ therefore\ a\ maximal\ \varsigma-clan.$

$$Proof\text{: } Let\ \varsigma\ be\ an\ IFSS-supermerotopy\ and\ let\ \delta \subseteq IFSS(U,E) be\ a\ maximal\ \varsigma-compatible\ family.$$

$$(G1)\Phi \notin \delta\text{: } By\ compatibility\ with\ \varsigma\ and\ axiom\ (IFNS3).$$

$$(G2) Monotonicity\text{: } Suppose\ (K,B) \supseteq\ \tilde{}\ (L,C) and\ (L,C) \in \delta. Then\ \{(K,B)\} \cup \delta\ corefines\ \delta, so\ \{(K,B)\} \cup \delta\ is\ \varsigma-compatible. By\ maximality\ of\ \delta, (K,B) \in \delta.$$

$$(G3) Binary\ union\ property\text{: } Suppose\ (K_1,B_1) \cup\ \tilde{}\ (K_2,B_2) \in \delta. We\ claim\ that\ either\ \{(K_1,B_1)\} \cup \delta\ or\ \{(K_2,B_2)\} \cup \delta\ is\ \varsigma-compatible.$$

$$Suppose\ not. Then\ there\ exist\ \delta_1, \delta_2 \subseteq \delta\ such\ that\ \{(K_1,B_1)\} \cup \delta_1 \notin \varsigma\ and\ \{(K_2,B_2)\} \cup \delta_2 \notin \varsigma.$$

$$By\ (IFNS6), (\{(K_1,B_1)\} \cup \delta_1) \cup\ \tilde{}\ (\{(K_2,B_2)\} \cup \delta_2) \notin \varsigma\ if\ both\ components\ are\ not\ in\ \varsigma.$$

$$But\ this\ collection\ corefines\ \{(K_1,B_1) \cup\ \tilde{}\ (K_2,B_2)\} \cup (\delta_1 \cup \delta_2) \subseteq \delta, contradicting\ \varsigma-compatibility\ of\ \delta.$$

Hence δ is an IFSS-grill.

The connection with complete ξ-grills follows by observing that for appropriate restrictions, the IFSS-grill satisfies the covering condition defining completeness. □

Theorem 4.7 (Connection with L-Contiguities). $Let\ (B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E\}}) be\ an\ IFSS-supermerotopic\ space. Define\ the\ IFSS-contiguity$:

$$\Gamma((F,A),(G,B)) = \left(\Gamma_{\mu((F,A),(G,B))}, \Gamma_{\nu((F,A),(G,B))}\right)$$

$where$:

$$\Gamma_{\mu((F,A),(G,B))} = \sup\{r : \{(F,A),(G,B)\} \in M^{\{U,E\}((H,C))for} some\ (H,C) with\ membership\ level\ \geq r\}$$

$$\Gamma_{\nu((F,A),(G,B))} = \inf\{s : \{(F,A),(G,B)\} \in M^{\{U,E\}((H,C))for} some\ (H,C) with\ non-membership\ level\ \leq s\}$$

$$Then\ \Gamma\ satisfies\ the\ IFSS-contiguity\ axioms\ extending\ the\ L-contiguity\ structure\ of\ .$$

$Proof$:

$(C1) Symmetry\text{: } \Gamma((F,A),(G,B)) = \Gamma((G,B),(F,A)) follows\ from\ symmetry\ of\ the\ set\ \{(F,A),(G,B)\}.$

$$(C2)\Gamma_{\mu\left((F_1,A_1)\cup\tilde{}(F_2,A_2),(G,B)\right)} = \max\left\{\Gamma_{\mu((F_1,A_1),(G,B))}, \Gamma_{\mu((F_2,A_2),(G,B))}\right\}:$$

$$By\ (IFNS6), if\ \{(F_1,A_1) \cup\ \tilde{}\ (F_2,A_2),(G,B)\} \in M^{\{U,E\}((H,C))}, then\ either\ \{(F_1,A_1),(G,B)\} \in M^{\{U,E\}((H,C))or}\{(F_2,A_2),(G,B)\} \in M^{\{U,E\}((H,C))}. The\ supremum\ over\ such\ (H,C) yields\ the\ maximum.$$

(C3) The non-membership component Γ_ν satisfies the dual property with infimum and minimum.

(C4) Boundary conditions follow from (IFNS3) and (IFNS4). □

Theorem 4.8 (Connection with Approach Merotopies). $Let\ (B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E\}})be\ an\ IFSS - supermerotopic\ space. Define\ \delta: P\left(P\big(IFSS(U,E)\big)\right) \rightarrow [0,\infty] \times [0,\infty] by$:

$$\delta(C) = \left(\delta_{\mu(C)}, \delta_{\nu(C)}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}&where:\\ &\delta_{\mu(C)} = \inf\left\{1 - \sup_{e}\sup_{x} \mu_{\{G(e)\}(x)} : C \in M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))for} some\ (G,A) \in B^{\{U,E\}}\right\}\\ &\delta_{\nu(C)} = \sup\left\{\inf_{e}\inf_{x} \nu_{\{G(e)\}(x)} : C \in M^{\{U,E\}((G,A))for} some\ (G,A) \in B^{\{U,E\}}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

$(with \inf\ \emptyset = \infty\ and \sup\ \emptyset = 0). Then\ \delta_{\mu} satisfies\ properties\ analogous\ to\ approach\ merotopy\ axioms, adapted\ to\ the\ IFSS\ setting.$

$$\begin{aligned}&Proof:\\ &(A1)\delta_{\mu(\{(\tilde{U},E)\})} = 0\ where\ (\tilde{U},E) is\ the\ universal\ IFSS, since\ (\tilde{U},E)\\ &\qquad \in M^{\{U,E\}\left((\tilde{U},E)\right)with} maximal\ membership.\end{aligned}$$

$$(A2)\delta_{\mu(\emptyset)} = \infty\ by\ convention\ (no\ bounded\ set\ generates\ the\ empty\ collection).$$

$$\begin{aligned}&(A3)If\ C\ refines\ D\ (every\ element\ of\ D\ contains\ an\ element\ of\ C), then\ any\ (G,A) with\ D\\ &\qquad \in M^{\{U,E\}\left((G,A)\right)also} has\ C \in M^{\{U,E\}\left((G,A)\right)by} (IFNS1). Hence\ \delta_{\mu(C)} \geq \delta_{\mu(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

$(A4)The\ refinement\ property\ for\ combined\ collections\ follows\ from\ (IFNS5) and\ boundedness\ properties.$

4.7 Connection with Fuzzy Grill m-Spaces

Theorem 4.9 (Induced IFSS-Topology from Grills). $Let\ (B^{\{U,E\}}, M^{\{U,E\}})be\ an\ IFSS - supermerotopic\ space\ and\ G\ be\ an\ IFSS - grill\ compatible\ with\ M^{\{U,E\}}. Define\ the\ operator\ \Phi_G: IFSS(U,E) \rightarrow IFSS(U,E) by$:

$$\begin{aligned}&For\ (F,A) \in IFSS(U,E), x \in U, e \in E:\\ &\mu_{\{\Phi_{G(F)(e)}\}(x)} = \sup\left\{\mu_{\{F(e)\}(x)} \wedge G_{\mu\left((N_x^e,\{e\})\cap^{\sim}(F,A)\right)}\right\}\\ &\nu_{\{\Phi_{G(F)(e)}\}(x)} = \inf\left\{\nu_{\{F(e)\}(x)} \vee G_{\nu\left((N_x^e,\{e\})\cap^{\sim}(F,A)\right)}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

$$where\ the \frac{supremum}{infimum} is\ taken\ over\ IFSS - neighborhoods\ (N_x^e,\{e\}) of\ the\ point\ x\ with\ parameter\ e.$$

$$\begin{aligned}&Then\ \Phi_G generates\ an\ IFSS - topology\ \tau_{\{M,G\}on}(U,E) via:\\ &\tau_{\{M,G\}} = \left\{(F,A) \in IFSS(U,E): \Phi_{G((F,A)^c)} = (F,A)^c\right\}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&Proof: This\ extends\ the\ fuzzy\ grill\ m - space\ construction\ of\ Singh\ and\ Mittal\ to\ the\ IFSS\\ &\qquad - supermerotopic\ setting. The\ key\ steps\ are:\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&(T1)\Phi_{G(\Phi)} = \Phi: By\ (G1), G(\Phi)\\ &\qquad = (0,1), so\ the\ supremum\ over\ grill\ values\ vanishes\ and\ infimum\ maximizes.\end{aligned}$$

$$(T2)(F,A) \subseteq^{\sim} \Phi_{G((F,A))}: The\ self - containment\ follows\ from\ the\ lattice\ property\ of\ grill\ values.$$

$$(T3)Idempotence\ \Phi_{G\left(\Phi_{G((F,A))}\right)} = \Phi_{G((F,A))}: Follows\ from\ (G2), (G3) and\ stack\ properties.$$

$$(T4) Additivity\ \Phi_{G\left((F,A)\cup^{\sim}(G,B)\right)} = \Phi_{G((F,A))} \cup^{\sim} \Phi_{G((G,B))}: Follows\ from\ (G2) applied\ to\ membership\ and\ (G3) applied\ to\ non - membership\ components.$$

$$Hence\ \Phi_G is\ a\ closure\ operator\ inducing\ the\ topology\ \tau_{\{M,G\}}.$$

IV. Conclusion and Future Work

This paper introduces the theory of supermerotopic spaces on intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets, extending the L-supermerotopic framework to the richer IFSS setting by establishing IFSS-prebornological structures, IFSS-supermerotopic operators, and proving that the collection of IFSS-supermerotopies forms a complete distributive lattice. The framework generates Kuratowski closure operators via IFSS-clans, characterizes continuous mappings, and establishes deep connections with L-grills [3], [5], L-contiguities [4], approach merotopies [2], fuzzy grill m-spaces, supernearness [7], and merotopic completion theory [6]. These results demonstrate that IFSS-supermerotopic theory provides a unified generalization subsuming existing frameworks while offering enhanced expressiveness for modeling uncertainties with independent membership/non-membership assessments under parameterized conditions. Future work includes computational implementation, alternative axiomatizations, applications in decision-making and pattern recognition, and categorical investigations of IFSS-supermerotopic structures.

References

[1] R. Singh and S. Mittal, "Fuzzy Grill m-space and Induced fuzzy Topology," *International Journal of Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication (IJRIT)*, vol. 2, no. 6, pp. 7-14, 2014. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.10441382.

[2] J. F. Peters, S. Tiwari, and R. Singh, "Approach Merotopies and Associated Near Sets," *Theory and Applications of Mathematics & Computer Science*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1-12, 2013. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.10437801.

[3] M. Khare and R. Singh, "Complete ξ-Grills and (L,n)-Merotopies," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 159, no. 5, pp. 620-628, 2008. doi: 10.1016/j.fss.2007.10.007.

[4] M. Khare and R. Singh, "L-Contiguities and their order structure," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 158, no. 4, pp. 399-408, 2007. doi: 10.1016/j.fss.2006.09.005.

[5] M. Khare and R. Singh, "L-Guilds and Binary L-Merotopies," *Novi Sad Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 57-64, 2006. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.10435690.

[6] K. C. Chattopadhyay and O. Njåstad, "Completion of merotopic spaces and extension of uniformly continuous maps," *Topology and its Applications*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 29-44, 1983.

[7] D. Leseberg, "Supernearness, a common concept of supertopologies and nearness," *Topology and its Applications*, vol. 123, no. 1, pp. 145-156, 2002.

[8] K. T. Atanassov, "Intuitionistic fuzzy sets," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 87-96, 1986.

[9] D. Molodtsov, "Soft set theory—First results," *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 37, no. 4-5, pp. 19-31, 1999.

[10] P. K. Maji, R. Biswas, and A. R. Roy, "Intuitionistic fuzzy soft sets," *Journal of Fuzzy Mathematics*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 677-692, 2001.

[11] P. K. Maji, R. Biswas, and A. R. Roy, "Soft set theory," *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 45, no. 4-5, pp. 555-562, 2003.

[12] D. Çoker, "An introduction to intuitionistic fuzzy topological spaces," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 88, no. 1, pp. 81-89, 1997.

[13] L. A. Zadeh, "Fuzzy sets," *Information and Control*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 338-353, 1965.

[14] Z. Pawlak, "Rough sets," *International Journal of Computer & Information Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 341-356, 1982.

[15] M. Katětov, "On continuity structures and spaces of mappings," *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, vol. 6, pp. 257-278, 1965.

[16] J. F. Peters, "Near sets: General theory about nearness of objects," *Applied Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 53, pp. 2609-2629, 2007.

[17] H. Herrlich, "A concept of nearness," *General Topology and its Applications*, vol. 5, pp. 191-212, 1974.

[18] A. K. Katsaras, "Fuzzy proximity spaces," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 100-110, 1979.

[19] T. K. Mondal and S. K. Samanta, "Intuitionistic fuzzy soft topological spaces," *Journal of Fuzzy Mathematics*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 821-832, 2002.

[20] R. Singh, "L-Supermerotopic Spaces," *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 1514-1518, 2021.