

CORONA PRODUCT OF PRODUCT FUZZY GRAPHS

Talal AL-Hawary

Department of Mathematics,
Yarmouk University, Irbid, JORDAN

E-mail : talalhawary@yahoo.com

(**Received:** Mar. 07, 2024 **Accepted:** Nov. 28, 2024 **Published:** Dec. 30, 2024)

Abstract: In this article, a new operation on product fuzzy graphs (PFGs) is provide; namely corona product. We give sufficient conditions for the corona product of two PFGs to be complete. We also study the unbiased notion of the class of PFGs and necessary and sufficient conditions for the corona product to be unbiased are given.

Keywords and Phrases: PFG, complete PFG, unbiased PFG, corona product.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C72.

1. Background

Graph theory has many applications in mathematics and economics. Since most problems of graphs are undetermined, it is necessary to handle these facets via the method of fuzzy logic. Fuzzy relations were introduced by Zadeh [22] in 1965. Rosenfeld [19] in 1975, introduced fuzzy graphs (simply, FG) and some ideas that are generalizations of those of graphs. Nowadays, this theory is having more and more applications in which the information level immanent in the system differs with various levels of accuracy. Fuzzy models are convenient as they reduce differences between long-established numerical models of expert systems and symbolic models. Peng and Mordeson [14] defined the conceptualization of FG's complement and conscious FG's operations. In [21], improved complement's definition in order to guarantee the original FG is isomorphic to complement of the complement, which concurs with the case of crisp graphs. In addition, self-complementary

FGs properties and the complement under FG's join, union and composition (introduced in [14]) were explored. Al-Hawary [2] introduced the concept of balanced in the class of FGs and Al-Hawary and others have deeply explored this idea for many types of FGs. For more on the foregoing concepts and those coming after ones, one can see [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21].

A mapping $t: \check{U} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a fuzzy subset of a nonempty set $\check{U}$ and a fuzzy subset of $\check{U} \times \check{U}$ is called a fuzzy relation ς on $\check{t}$. We assume that $\check{t}$ is reflexive, $\check{U}$ is finite and ς is symmetric.

Definition 1. [19] A fuzzy graph (simply, FG), with $\check{U}$ as the underlying set, is a pair $G: (\check{t}, \varsigma)$ where $\check{t}: \check{U} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a fuzzy subset and $\varsigma: \check{U} \times \check{U} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a fuzzy relation on $\check{t}$ such that $\varsigma(c, s) \leq \check{t}(c) \wedge \check{t}(s)$ for all $c, s \in \check{U}$, where $\wedge$ stands for minimum. The crisp graph of G is denoted by $G^*: (\check{t}^*, \varsigma^*)$ where $\check{t}^* = \sup c(\check{t}) = \{c \in \check{U}: \check{t}(c) > 0\}$ and $\varsigma^* = \sup c(\varsigma) = \{(c, s) \in \check{U} \times \check{U}: \varsigma(c, s) > 0\}$. $H = (\check{t}', \varsigma')$ is a fuzzy subgraph of G if there exists $c \in \check{U}$ such that $\check{t}': c \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a fuzzy subset and $\varsigma': c \times c \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a fuzzy relation on $\check{t}'$ such that $\varsigma(c, s) \leq \check{t}(c) \wedge \check{t}(s)$ for all $c, s \in c$.

Definition 2. [19] Two FGs $G_1: (\check{t}_1, \varsigma_1)$ are isomorphic if there exists a bijection $h: \check{U}_1 \rightarrow \check{U}_2$ such that $\check{t}_1(c) = \check{t}_2(h(c))$ for all $c \in \check{U}_1$ and $\varsigma_1(c, s) = \varsigma_2(h(c), h(s))$ for all $(c, s) \in \check{E}_1$. We then write $G_1 \simeq G_2$ and h is called an isomorphism.

Using the operation of product instead of minimum, Ramaswamy and Poornima in [20] established PFGs.

Definition 3. [20] Let $G^*: (\check{U}, \check{E})$ be a graph, $\check{t}$ be a fuzzy subset of $\check{U}$ and ς be a fuzzy subset of $\check{U} \times \check{U}$. We call $G: (\check{t}, \varsigma)$ a product fuzzy graph (simply, PFG) if $\varsigma(c, s) \leq \check{t}(c)\check{t}(s)$ for all $c, s \in \check{U}$.

The following result is immediate:

Lemma 1. Every PFG is a FG, but the converse need not be true.

Definition 4. [20] A PFG $G: (\check{t}, \varsigma)$ is called complete if $\varsigma(c, s) = \check{t}(c)\check{t}(s)$ for all $c, s \in \check{U}$.

Definition 5. [20] A PFG $G: (\check{t}, \varsigma)$ is called strong if $\varsigma(c, s) = \check{t}(c)\check{t}(s)$ for all $(c, s) \in \check{E}$.

Definition 6. [20] The complement of a PFG $G: (\check{t}, \varsigma)$ is $G^c: (\check{t}^c, \varsigma^c)$ where $\check{t}^c = \check{t}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma^c(c, s) &= \check{t}^c(c)\check{t}^c(s) - \varsigma(c, s) \\ &= \check{t}(c)\check{t}(s) - \varsigma(c, s). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2. [7] *If $G: (t, \varsigma)$ is a self-complementary PFG, then*

$$\sum_{(c,s) \in \check{E}} \varsigma(c, s) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(c,s) \in \check{E}} t(c)t(s).$$

Lemma 3. [7] *Let $G: (t, \varsigma)$ be a PFG such that $\varsigma(c, s) = \frac{1}{2}t(c)t(s)$ for all $c, s \in \check{U}$. Then G is self-complementary.*

Several types of products of two FGs were explored. The notion of corona product of FGs was introduced and studied in [11] where the regularity property for this product was the main idea. In Section 2 of this paper, we launch the conception of corona product of PFGs. We prove that the corona product of two PFGs to be is complete if and only if both factors are complete PFG. Section 3 is devoted to give necessary and sufficient conditions for the corona product of two unbiased PFGs to be unbiased.

2. Corona Product of Product Fuzzy Graphs

In [13], the corona product $G_1 \circ G_2$ of two classical graphs G_1 and G_2 is the graph consisting of one copy of G_1 of order n and n copies of G_2 where the i^{th} vertex of G_1 is joined by an edge to the i^{th} copy of G_2 . It was proved that corona product is neither associative nor commutative. In [11], corona product of two fuzzy graphs where introduced and degrees of vertices was the main goal to study. We begin this section by defining the rooted product of PFGs.

Definition 7. *The corona product of two disjoint PFGs $G_1: (t_1, \varsigma_1)$ of order n and $G_2: (t_2, \varsigma_2)$ is defined to be the FG $G_1 \propto G_2: (t_1 \propto t_2, \varsigma_1 \propto \varsigma_2)$ on the vertex set $\check{U}_1$ union n copies of $\check{U}_2$, where*

$$(t_1 \propto t_2)(\check{u}) = \begin{cases} t_1(\check{u}) & \check{u} \in \check{U}_1 \\ t_2(\check{u}) & \check{u} \in \check{U}_2 \end{cases} \text{ and}$$

$$(\varsigma_1 \propto \varsigma_2)(\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2) = \begin{cases} \varsigma_1(\check{u}_1\check{u}_2) & \check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \in \check{E}_1 \\ \varsigma_2(\check{u}_1\check{u}_2) & \check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \in \check{E}_2 \\ t_1(\check{u})t_2(\check{u}_2) & \check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \in \check{E} \end{cases}$$

where $\check{E}$ is the set of edges joining each vertex of G_1 to the vertices of the n copies of G_2 .

It is clear that the above definition is well-defined. That is, the corona product of two PFGs is a PFG.

Theorem 1. If $G_1 : (t_1, \varsigma_1)$ and $G_2 : (t_2, \varsigma_2)$ are strong PFGs, then $G_1 \times G_2$ is a strong PFG.

Proof. Let $G_1 : (t_1, \varsigma_1)$ and $G_2 : (t_2, \varsigma_2)$ be two strong PFGs.

Case 1: If $\check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \in \check{E}_1$, then as G_1 strong,

$$\begin{aligned} (\varsigma_1 \times \varsigma_2)(\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2) &= \varsigma_1(\check{u}_1\check{u}_2) \\ &= t_1(\check{u}_1)t_1(\check{u}_2) \\ &= (t_1 \times t_2)(\check{u}_1)(t_1 \times t_2)(\check{u}_2). \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: If $\check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \in \check{E}_2$, is similar to case 1.

Case 3: If $\check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \in \check{E}$, then by definition

$$\begin{aligned} (\varsigma_1 \times \varsigma_2)(\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2) &= t_1(\check{u})t_2(\check{u}_2) \\ &= (t_1 \times t_2)(\check{u}_1)(t_1 \times t_2)(\check{u}_2). \end{aligned}$$

Case 3: If $\check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \in \check{E}$, then by definition

$$\begin{aligned} (\varsigma_1 \times \varsigma_2)(\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2) &= t_1(\check{u})t_2(\check{u}_2) \\ &= (t_1 \times t_2)(\check{u}_1)(t_1 \times t_2)(\check{u}_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $G_1 \times G_2$ is a strong PFG.

Corollary 1. If $G_1 : (t_1, \varsigma_1)$ and $G_2 : (t_2, \varsigma_2)$ are fuzzy complete PFGs, then $G_1 \times G_2$ is a complete PFG.

Next, we show that if the corona product of two PFGs is complete, then at least one of the two PFGs must be complete.

Theorem 2. If $G_1 : (t_1, \varsigma_1)$ and $G_2 : (t_2, \varsigma_2)$ are PFGs such that $G_1 \times G_2$ is complete, then both G_1 or G_2 must be complete.

Proof. Case 1: If $\check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \in \check{E}_1$, then $(\varsigma_1 \times \varsigma_2)(\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2) = \varsigma_1(\check{u}_1\check{u}_2)$ and as $G_1 \times G_2$ is complete,

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_1(\check{u}_1\check{u}_2) &= (\varsigma_1 \times \varsigma_2)(\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2) \\ &= (t_1 \times t_2)(\check{u}_1)(t_1 \times t_2)(\check{u}_2) \\ &= t_1(\check{u}_1)t_1(\check{u}_2) \end{aligned}$$

Case2: If $\check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \in \check{E}_2$, then this case is similar to case 1.

Combining the last Corollary and Theorem, we obtain the following result:

Corollary 2. $G_1 : (t_1, \varsigma_1)$ and $G_2 : (t_2, \varsigma_2)$ are fuzzy complete PFGs if and only if $G_1 \times G_2$ is a complete PFG.

An interesting property of complement is given next.

Theorem 3. *If $G_1 : (t_1, \varsigma_1)$ and $G_2 : (t_2, \varsigma_2)$ are fuzzy complete graphs, then $\overline{G_1 \times G_2} \simeq \overline{G_1} \times \overline{G_2}$.*

Proof. Let $G : (t, \varsigma) = \overline{G_1 \times G_2}$, $\overline{\varsigma} = \overline{\varsigma_1 \times \varsigma_2}$, $\overline{G}^* = (\check{U}, \check{E})$, $\overline{G_1} : (t_1, \overline{\varsigma_1})$, $\overline{G_1}^* = (\check{U}_1, \check{E}_1)$, $\overline{G_2} : (t_2, \overline{\varsigma_2})$, $\overline{G_2}^* = (\check{U}_2, \check{E}_2)$ and $\overline{G_1} \times \overline{G_2} : (t_1 \times t_2, \overline{\varsigma_1} \times \overline{\varsigma_2})$. We only need to show $\overline{\varsigma_1 \times \varsigma_2} = \overline{\varsigma_1} \times \overline{\varsigma_2}$. For any arc e in $\check{E}$ joining nodes of $\check{U}$, we have the following cases:

The cases $\check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \in \check{E}_1$, then as G_1 is complete, $\overline{\varsigma_1}(e) = 0$. On the other hand $\overline{\varsigma_1 \times \varsigma_2}(e) = 0$ since $\check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \notin \check{E}_1$.

The case $\check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \in \check{E}_2$ is similar to the above case. The case $\check{u}_1\check{u}_2 \notin \check{E}_1 \cup \check{E}_2$ is not possible to occur as both G_1 and G_2 are complete.

In all cases $\overline{\varsigma_1 \times \varsigma_2} = \overline{\varsigma_1} \times \overline{\varsigma_2}$ and therefore, $\overline{G_1 \times G_2} \simeq \overline{G_1} \times \overline{G_2}$.

3. Unbiased Product Fuzzy Graphs

We begin this section by recalling the definition of unbiased (balanced) PFGs from [7] and then proving the following lemma that we shall use to give necessary and sufficient conditions for the corona product of two unbiased PFGs to be unbiased.

Definition 8. [7] *The density of a PFG is $d(G) = \frac{2 \sum_{\check{u}\check{y} \in \check{E}} (\varsigma(\check{u}\check{y}))}{\sum_{\check{u}, \check{y} \in \check{U}} (t(\check{u}) \wedge t(\check{y}))}$. G is unbiased*

(balanced) if $d(H) \leq d(G)$ for any non-empty product fuzzy subgraphs H of G .

Lemma 4. *Let G_1 and G_2 be PFGs. Then $d(G_i) \leq d(G_1 \times G_2)$ for $i = 1, 2$ if and only if $d(G_1) = d(G_2) = d(G_1 \times G_2)$.*

Proof. If $d(G_i) \leq d(G_1 \times G_2)$ for $i = 1, 2$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 d(G_1) &= 2 \left(\sum_{\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2 \in \check{U}_1} \varsigma_1(\check{u}_1\check{u}_2) \right) / \left(\sum_{\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2 \in \check{U}_1} (t_1(\check{u}_1) \wedge t_1(\check{u}_2)) \right) \\
 &\geq 2 \left(\sum_{\substack{\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2 \in \check{U}_1 \\ \check{y}_1, \check{y}_2 \in \check{U}_2}} \varsigma_1(\check{u}_1\check{u}_2) t_2(\check{y}_1) t_2(\check{y}_2) \right) / \left(\sum_{\substack{\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2 \in \check{U}_1 \\ \check{y}_1, \check{y}_2 \in \check{U}_2}} (t_1(\check{u}_1) t_1(\check{u}_2) t_2(\check{y}_1) t_2(\check{y}_2)) \right) \\
 &\geq 2 \left(\sum_{\substack{\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2 \in \check{U}_1 \\ \check{y}_1, \check{y}_2 \in \check{U}_2}} \varsigma_1(\check{u}_1\check{u}_2) \varsigma_2(\check{y}_1\check{y}_2) \right) / \left(\sum_{\substack{\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2 \in \check{U}_1 \\ \check{y}_1, \check{y}_2 \in \check{U}_2}} (t_1(\check{u}_1) t_1(\check{u}_2) t_2(\check{y}_1) t_2(\check{y}_2)) \right) \\
 &\geq 2 \left(\sum_{\substack{\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2 \in \check{U}_1 \\ \check{y}_1, \check{y}_2 \in \check{U}_2}} \varsigma_1 \times \varsigma_2((\check{u}_1\check{y}_1)(\check{u}_2\check{y}_2)) \right) / \left(\sum_{\substack{\check{u}_1, \check{u}_2 \in \check{U}_1 \\ \check{y}_1, \check{y}_2 \in \check{U}_2}} (t_1 \times t_2((\check{u}_1, \check{y}_1)(\check{u}_2, \check{y}_2)) \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$= d(\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2).$$

Hence in all cases $d(\mathbb{G}_1) \geq d(\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2)$ and thus $d(\mathbb{G}_1) = d(\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2)$. Similarly, $d(\mathbb{G}_2) = d(\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2)$. Therefore, $d(\mathbb{G}_1) = d(\mathbb{G}_2) = d(\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2)$. The converse is trivial.

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathbb{G}_1$ and $\mathbb{G}_2$ be unbiased PFGs. Then $\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2$ is unbiased if and only if $d(\mathbb{G}_1) = d(\mathbb{G}_2) = d(\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2)$.*

Proof. If $\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2$ is unbiased, then $d(\mathbb{G}_i) \leq d(\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and by Lemma 4, $d(\mathbb{G}_1) = d(\mathbb{G}_2) = d(\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2)$.

Conversely, if $d(\mathbb{G}_1) = d(\mathbb{G}_2) = d(\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2)$ and H is a product fuzzy subgraph of $\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2$, then there exist product fuzzy subgraphs H_1 of $\mathbb{G}_1$ and H_2 of $\mathbb{G}_2$. As $\mathbb{G}_1$ and $\mathbb{G}_2$ are unbiased and $d(\mathbb{G}_1) = d(\mathbb{G}_2) = m_1/k_1$, then $d(H_1) = a_1/b_1 \leq m_1/k_1$ and $d(H_2) = a_2/b_2 \leq m_1/k_1$. Thus $a_1k_1 + a_2k_1 \leq b_1m_1 + b_2m_1$ and hence $d(H) \leq (a_1 + a_2)/(b_1 + b_2) \leq m_1/k_1 = d(\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2)$. Therefore, $\mathbb{G}_1 \times \mathbb{G}_2$ is unbiased.

We end this section with the following result which states that unbiased notion is preserved under isomorphism:

Theorem 5. *Let $\mathbb{G}_1$ and $\mathbb{G}_2$ be isomorphic PFGs. If one of them is unbiased, then the other is unbiased.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathbb{G}_2$ is unbiased and let $h : \check{U}_1 \rightarrow \check{U}_2$ be a bijection such that $t_1(\check{u}) = t_2(h(\check{u}))$ and $s_1(\check{u}\check{y}) = s_2(h(\check{u})h(\check{y}))$ for all $\check{u}, \check{y} \in \check{U}_1$. Now $\sum_{\check{u} \in \check{U}_1} t_1(\check{u}) = \sum_{\check{u} \in \check{U}_2} t_2(\check{u})$ and $\sum_{\check{u}\check{y} \in \check{E}_1} s_1(\check{u}\check{y}) = \sum_{\check{u}\check{y} \in \check{E}_2} s_2(\check{u}\check{y})$. If $H_1 = (t_1, s_1)$ is a product fuzzy subgraph of $\mathbb{G}_1$ with underlying set W , then $H_2 = (t_2, s_2)$ is a product fuzzy subgraph of $\mathbb{G}_2$ with underlying set $h(W)$ where $t_2(h(\check{u})) = t_1(\check{u})$ and $s_2(h(\check{u})h(\check{y})) = s_1(\check{u}\check{y})$ for all $\check{u}, \check{y} \in W$. Since $\mathbb{G}_2$ is unbiased, $d(H_1) \leq d(\mathbb{G}_2)$ and so

$$2 \frac{\sum_{\check{u}\check{y} \in \check{E}_1} s_2(h(\check{u})h(\check{y}))}{\sum_{\check{u}, \check{y} \in \check{U}_1} (t_2(\check{u}) \wedge t_2(\check{y}))} \leq 2 \frac{\sum_{\check{u}\check{y} \in \check{E}_1} s_1(\check{u}\check{y})}{\sum_{\check{u}, \check{y} \in \check{U}_1} (t_2(\check{u}) \wedge t_2(\check{y}))}. \text{ Hence}$$

$$2 \frac{\sum_{\check{u}\check{y} \in \check{E}_1} s_1(\check{u}\check{y})}{\sum_{\check{u}, \check{y} \in \check{U}_1} (t_2(\check{u}) \wedge t_2(\check{y}))} \leq 2 \frac{\sum_{\check{u}\check{y} \in \check{E}_1} s_1(\check{u}\check{y})}{\sum_{\check{u}, \check{y} \in \check{U}_1} (t_2(\check{u}) \wedge t_2(\check{y}))}.$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{G}_1$ is unbiased.

References

- [1] Al-Hawary T., Characterizations of matroid via OFR-sets, Turkish Journal of Mathematics, 25(3) (2001), 445-455.
- [2] Al-Hawary T., Maximal Strong Product and Balanced Fuzzy Graphs, Journal of Applied Mathematics and Informatics, 41(5)(2023), 1145–1155.

- [3] Al-Hawary T., Complete Hamacher fuzzy graphs, J. appl. Math. & Informatics, 40(5-6)(2022), 1043–1052.
- [4] Al-Hawary T., Al-Shalaldeh S. and Akram M., Certain Matrices and Energies of fuzzy graphs, TWMS Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 14(1) (2023), 50-68.
- [5] Al-Hawary T., Strong modular product and complete fuzzy graphs, Italian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 50 (2023), 98-104.
- [6] Al-Hawary T. and Hourani B., On intuitionistic product fuzzy graphs, Italian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 38 (2017), 113-126.
- [7] Al-Hawary T., Density Results for Perfectly Regular and Perfectly Edge-regular fuzzy graphs, Journal of Discrete Mathematical Sciences & Cryptography, 26(2) (2023), 521-528.
- [8] Akram M., Saleem D., Al-Hawary T., Spherical fuzzy graphs with application to decision-making, Mathematical and Computational Applications, 25(1) (2020), 8-40.
- [9] Bhutani K. R., On automorphism of fuzzy graphs, Pattern Recognition Letter, 9 (1989), 159-162.
- [10] Ç Ö. Havare and Menken H., On corona product of two fuzzy graphs, Intern. J. Fuzzy Mathematical Archive, 10(2) (2016), 95-100.
- [11] Dogra S., Different types of product of fuzzy graphs, Prog. Nonlin. Dyn. Chaos, 3(1) (2015), 41-56.
- [12] Hdrary F., Graph Theory, Addition-Wesley pub. Co., London, 1969.
- [13] Jaikumar R. V., Sundareswaran Raman, Marayanagaraj Shanmugapriya, Said Broumi, Al-Hawary Talal Ali, Vulnerability parameters in picture fuzzy soft graphs and their applications to locate a diagnosis center in cities, Journal of Fuzzy Extension and Applications, 5(1) (2024), 86-99.
- [14] Mordeson J. N. and Peng C. S., Operations on FGs, Information Sciences, 79 (1994), 381-384.
- [15] Nagoor Gani A. and Fathima Gani B., Beta and Gamma product of fuzzy graphs, Inter. J. Fuzzy mathematical Archive, 4(1) (2014), 20-36.

- [16] Nagoor Gani A. and Malarvizhi J., Isomorphism on fuzzy graphs, *Int. J. Comp. and Math. Sci.*, 2(4) (2008), 190-196.
- [17] Nagoor Gani A. and Malarvizhi J., Isomorphism properties on strong fuzzy graphs, *Int. J. Algorithms, Comp. and Math.*, 2(1) (2009), 39-47.
- [18] Nagoor Gani A. and Radha K., On regular fuzzy graphs, *J. Physical Sciences*, 12 (2008), 33-40.
- [19] Rosenfeld A., FGs, in Zadeh. L. A, K. S. Fu, K, Tanaka and Shirmura. M (Eds), *Fuzzy sets and their applications to cognitive and processes*, Academic Press. New York, (1975), 77-95.
- [20] Ramaswamy V. and Poornima B., picture fuzzy graphs, *International journal of computer science and network security*, 9(1) (2009), 114-11.
- [21] Sunitha M. S. and Kumar A. V., Complements of fuzzy graphs, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 33(9) (2002), 1451-1464.
- [22] Zadeh L. A., Fuzzy sets, *Inform. Control.*, 8 (1965), 338-353.