

Paper Type: Original Article

Revisiting the Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set and Plithogenic Forest SuperHypersoft Set: Applications in Sustainable Machine Systems

Takaaki Fujita^{1*}  and Florentin Smarandache² 

¹ Independent Researcher, Shinjuku, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, Japan; t171d603@gunma-u.ac.jp.

² Department of Mathematics & Sciences, University of New Mexico, Gallup, NM 87301, USA; smarand@unm.edu.

Received: 13 Jun 2024

Revised: 10 Dec 2024

Accepted: 10 Jan 2025

Published: 12 Jan 2025

Abstract

The Plithogenic Set is widely recognized for its ability to generalize fundamental concepts such as Fuzzy Sets and Neutrosophic Sets. The Extended Plithogenic Set, as recently defined in [93], represents an advanced extension of the Plithogenic Set, offering a more refined mathematical framework for handling uncertainty and contradiction.

A Hypersoft Set is a mathematical structure that maps distinct attributes, each with non-overlapping values, to subsets of a universal set, thus enabling effective multi-criteria decision analysis. Recent studies have explored the integration of Plithogenic Sets and Hypersoft Sets, leading to the development of the Plithogenic Hypersoft Set, which further enhances the capacity for complex decision-making under uncertainty.

In this paper, we extend these concepts further by introducing and analyzing the Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set and the Extended Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set. This work serves as an extended version of [37], specifically expanding upon it by incorporating a detailed examination of applications in the field of sustainable machines.

Keywords: Superhypersoft set, HyperPlithogenic Set, Plithogenic Set, Hypersoft Set

1 | Short Introduction of this paper

1.1 | Plithogenic Sets

Various frameworks have been developed to address uncertainty, including Fuzzy Sets [100, 101, 104, 102, 103], Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets [11, 10, 9], Vague sets [40, 14], Neutrosophic Sets [77, 76, 88, 31, 32], Soft Sets [61, 56, 49], Hypersoft Sets [21, 82, 72, 78], SuperHypersoft Sets [25, 83, 60], and Rough Sets [64, 67, 66, 65].



Corresponding Author: t171d603@gunma-u.ac.jp



Licensee Sustainable Machine Intelligence Journal. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).

The primary focus of this paper is on Plithogenic Sets, a highly flexible and powerful concept that generalizes various approaches, including Fuzzy Sets and Neutrosophic Sets [81, 80, 34, 90, 26, 24]. Recent research has introduced concepts such as the Plithogenic Hypersoft Set[18], which extends Plithogenic Sets by incorporating elements of Soft Sets and Hypersoft Sets. This development represents a significant advancement in the study of uncertainty and decision-making frameworks.

1.2 | Our Contribution in This Paper

Building upon the above considerations, research on Plithogenic Sets, Hypersoft Sets, and related topics is highly significant. However, there remains considerable potential for further expansion and refinement.

In this paper, we propose and investigate the Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set and the Extended Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set. Additionally, we introduce and explore the concepts of the Plithogenic Forest SuperHypersoft Set and the SuperHyperPlithogenic SuperHypersoft Set. Furthermore, we examine their applications in the domain of sustainable machines.

This paper serves as an extended version of [37]. Specifically, it builds upon [37] by incorporating a detailed examination of applications in the field of sustainable machines.

2 | Preliminaries and Definitions

This section provides an introduction to the foundational concepts and definitions required for the discussions in this paper.

2.1 | Plithogenic Set

A Plithogenic Set is a mathematical framework that incorporates multi-valued degrees of appurtenance and contradictions, making it suitable for complex decision-making processes. Various studies have been conducted on Plithogenic Sets [36, 1, 96, 2, 87, 73, 22, 74]. The definition is presented below.

Definition 1 (Plithogenic Set). [81, 80] Let S be a universal set, and $P \subseteq S$. A *Plithogenic Set* PS is defined as:

$$PS = (P, v, Pv, pdf, pCF)$$

where:

- v is an attribute.
- Pv is the range of possible values for the attribute v .
- $pdf : P \times Pv \rightarrow [0, 1]^s$ is the *Degree of Appurtenance Function (DAF)*¹
- $pCF : Pv \times Pv \rightarrow [0, 1]^t$ is the *Degree of Contradiction Function (DCF)*.

These functions satisfy the following axioms for all $a, b \in Pv$:

(1) *Reflexivity of Contradiction Function:*

$$pCF(a, a) = 0$$

(2) *Symmetry of Contradiction Function:*

$$pCF(a, b) = pCF(b, a)$$

¹It is important to note that the definition of the Degree of Appurtenance Function varies across different papers. Some studies define this concept using the power set, while others simplify it by avoiding the use of the power set [93]. The author has consistently defined the Classical Plithogenic Set without employing the power set.

2.2 | Extended Plithogenic Set

The Extended Plithogenic Set is an extended concept of the Plithogenic Set, which was recently defined[93]. The definition is provided below.

Definition 2 (Extended Plithogenic Set). [93] Let P be a non-empty set, and let a be an attribute with a range of possible values V . An *Extended Plithogenic Set (ExPlS)* is defined as a 7-tuple:

$$\text{ExPlS} = (P, a, V, d_D, c_D, d_R, c_R),$$

where:

- $d_D : P \times V \rightarrow [0, 1]^s$ is the *Degree of Appurtenance Function (DAF)* with respect to *dominant* attribute value(s), where s indicates the dimensionality (e.g., $s = 1$ for fuzzy, $s = 3$ for neutrosophic).²
- $c_D : V \times V \rightarrow [0, 1]^t$ is the *Degree of Contradiction Function (DCF)* associated with dominant attribute value(s), where t is the dimensionality of contradiction. It satisfies:

$$c_D(v, v) = 0, \quad c_D(v_1, v_2) = c_D(v_2, v_1) \quad \forall v, v_1, v_2 \in V.$$

- $d_R : P \times V \rightarrow [0, 1]^s$ is the *DAF* with respect to *recessive* attribute value(s), defined similarly to d_D .
- $c_R : V \times V \rightarrow [0, 1]^t$ is the *DCF* associated with recessive attribute value(s), satisfying:

$$c_R(v, v) = 0, \quad c_R(v_1, v_2) = c_R(v_2, v_1) \quad \forall v, v_1, v_2 \in V.$$

2.3 | Hypersoft Set and SuperHypersoft Set

In this subsection, we provide a brief introduction to the concepts of Soft Set, Hypersoft Set, and SuperHypersoft Set. A Soft Set maps attributes (parameters) to subsets of a universal set, offering a simplified framework for parameterized decision modeling [56, 61, 41]. A Hypersoft Set extends this concept by mapping combinations of multiple attributes to subsets of a universal set, thereby facilitating enhanced multi-attribute decision analysis [78, 5, 47, 63, 6, 70, 33, 21]. A SuperHypersoft Set further generalizes this approach by mapping power set combinations of multiple attribute values to subsets of a universal set, enabling higher-dimensional decision-making frameworks [24, 48, 83, 91, 39, 89, 105, 25]. The definitions of these sets are presented as follows.

Definition 3 (Soft Set). [56, 61] Let U be a universal set and A be a set of attributes. A soft set over U is a pair (\mathcal{F}, S) , where $S \subseteq A$ and $\mathcal{F} : S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(U)$. Here, $\mathcal{P}(U)$ denotes the power set of U . Mathematically, a soft set is represented as:

$$(\mathcal{F}, S) = \{(\alpha, \mathcal{F}(\alpha)) \mid \alpha \in S, \mathcal{F}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{P}(U)\}.$$

Each $\alpha \in S$ is called a parameter, and $\mathcal{F}(\alpha)$ is the set of elements in U associated with α .

Definition 4 (Hypersoft Set). [78] Let U be a universal set, and let $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_m$ be attribute domains. Define $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_m$, the Cartesian product of these domains. A hypersoft set over U is a pair (G, \mathcal{C}) , where $G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(U)$. The hypersoft set is expressed as:

$$(G, \mathcal{C}) = \{(\gamma, G(\gamma)) \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{C}, G(\gamma) \in \mathcal{P}(U)\}.$$

For an m -tuple $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_m) \in \mathcal{C}$, where $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, $G(\gamma)$ represents the subset of U corresponding to the combination of attribute values $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_m$.

Definition 5 (SuperHyperSoft Set). [83] Let U be a universal set, and let $\mathcal{P}(U)$ denote the power set of U . Consider n distinct attributes a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n , where $n \geq 1$. Each attribute a_i is associated with a set of attribute values A_i , satisfying the property $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$.

Define $\mathcal{P}(A_i)$ as the power set of A_i for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then, the Cartesian product of the power sets of attribute values is given by:

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \mathcal{P}(A_2) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(A_n).$$

²It is important to note that the definition of the Degree of Appurtenance Function varies across different papers. Some studies define this concept using the power set, while others simplify it by avoiding the use of the power set [93]. The author has consistently defined the Classical Plithogenic Set without employing the power set.

A SuperHyperSoft Set over U is a pair (F, \mathcal{C}) , where:

$$F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(U),$$

and F maps each element $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathcal{C}$ (with $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{P}(A_i)$) to a subset $F(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n) \subseteq U$. Mathematically, the SuperHyperSoft Set is represented as:

$$(F, \mathcal{C}) = \{(\gamma, F(\gamma)) \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{C}, F(\gamma) \in \mathcal{P}(U)\}.$$

Here, $\gamma = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathcal{C}$, where $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{P}(A_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and $F(\gamma)$ corresponds to the subset of U defined by the combined attribute values $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$.

2.4 | Plithogenic Hypersoft Set

A Plithogenic Hypersoft Set combines attributes, sub-criteria, appurtenance degrees, and contradictions for nuanced multi-criteria decision analysis [57, 58, 16, 79, 4, 3, 18, 94].

Definition 6 (Plithogenic Hypersoft Set). [79] Let U be a universal set, $Y \subseteq U$, and $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_m$ be attribute domains. Define $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_m$. A plithogenic hypersoft set is a tuple $(Y, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, d, c)$, where:

1. The Attribute Value Appurtenance Degree Function d is defined as:

$$d : Y \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}([0, 1]^j), \quad \forall y \in Y,$$

where $j = 1$ represents a fuzzy degree, $j = 2$ represents an intuitionistic fuzzy degree, and $j = 3$ represents a neutrosophic degree of appurtenance.

2. The Contradiction Degree Function c is defined as:

$$c : \mathcal{A}_i \times \mathcal{A}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{P}([0, 1]^j), \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

where $c(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ is the contradiction degree between attribute values γ_1 and γ_2 , satisfying:

$$c(\gamma_1, \gamma_1) = 0, \quad c(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = c(\gamma_2, \gamma_1).$$

The plithogenic hypersoft set is represented as:

$$f(\gamma) = \{y \mid d_y(\gamma_1), d_y(\gamma_2), \dots, d_y(\gamma_m)\}, \quad \forall y \in Y,$$

where $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_m) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

2.5 | Forest Hypersoft set and Plithogenic Forest Hypersoft Set

A Forest Hypersoft Set models multi-level attributes as trees, mapping their combinations to subsets of a universal set for decision-making. The Plithogenic Forest Hypersoft Set extends the Forest Hypersoft Set by incorporating the principles of the Plithogenic Set. The formal definition is provided below[72].

Definition 7 (Forest of Attributes). Let U be a universal set, and $H \subseteq U$ be a non-empty subset relevant to our decision or classification context. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$ be a finite set of root attributes ($n \geq 1$). Each attribute A_i can be expanded into a *tree* of sub-attributes (of level 1), sub-sub-attributes (of level 2), and so forth, up to potentially multiple levels. Concretely, each root attribute A_i may generate a hierarchy such as:

$$A_i \rightarrow \begin{cases} A_{i1}, A_{i2}, \dots, & \text{(level 1)} \\ A_{i1j}, A_{i2k}, \dots, & \text{(level 2)} \\ \dots & \end{cases}$$

When we collect all such trees stemming from A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n , we obtain a *forest* of attributes.

Notation 8. We use $\text{Tree}(A_i)$ to denote the entire tree of sub-attributes rooted at A_i . Then the *forest* formed by all root attributes is:

$$\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\text{Tree}(A_1), \text{Tree}(A_2), \dots, \text{Tree}(A_n)\}.$$

Each $\text{Tree}(A_i)$ has nodes that represent sub-attributes or deeper-level sub-sub-attributes, etc.

Definition 9 (Forest Hypersoft Set). Let U be a universal set, and let $H \subseteq U$ be a non-empty subset relevant to the decision or classification context. Suppose we have a finite set of root attributes $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$, with $n \geq 1$. Each attribute A_i can be expanded into a *tree* of sub-attributes:

$$A_i \rightarrow \begin{cases} A_{i1}, A_{i2}, \dots & \text{(level 1)} \\ A_{i1k}, A_{i2\ell}, \dots & \text{(level 2)} \\ \dots & \end{cases}$$

Collecting all such trees for A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n produces a *forest* of attributes, denoted

$$\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\text{Tree}(A_1), \text{Tree}(A_2), \dots, \text{Tree}(A_n)\}.$$

Leaf-Level Sub-Attributes. For each tree $\text{Tree}(A_i)$, let $\Gamma(\text{Tree}(A_i))$ be the set of all possible *leaf-level sub-attributes* stemming from A_i . A single leaf-level sub-attribute might represent a path in the tree from A_i down to one of its final sub-sub-attributes. Then define

$$\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \Gamma(\text{Tree}(A_i)),$$

so that any element $\alpha \in \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$ is a final-level attribute value from one of the trees in the forest.

Forest Combinations. Consider the family of all possible subsets of $\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))).$$

Each $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}}$ is understood as a *forest-based combination* of leaf-level sub-attributes (potentially from different root attributes).

Mapping to the Universe. A *Forest Hypersoft Set* over (U, H) is given by a pair

$$(G, \mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}}),$$

where $G : \mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(H)$ satisfies the condition that for each $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}}$, $G(\gamma) \subseteq H$. Concretely,

$$(G, \mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}}) = \left\{ (\gamma, G(\gamma)) \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}}, G(\gamma) \subseteq H \right\}.$$

In words, $G(\gamma)$ is the subset of H that corresponds to the collective influence or membership of all final-level sub-attributes in γ .

Definition 10 (Plithogenic Forest Hypersoft Set (PFHS)). [72] Let U be a universal set, $H \subseteq U$ a non-empty subset, and $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ be n root attributes. Suppose each A_i expands into a tree of sub-attributes up to various levels, collectively forming a forest $\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})$. We define:

- $\Gamma(\text{Tree}(A_i))$ to be the set of *all possible leaf-level* sub-attribute combinations in the tree of A_i . - For instance, if A_i has a branch A_{i1} leading to further sub-attributes A_{i11}, A_{i12} , etc., each path to a leaf represents one final sub-attribute value.
- Let

$$\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})) = \Gamma(\text{Tree}(A_1)) \cup \Gamma(\text{Tree}(A_2)) \cup \dots \cup \Gamma(\text{Tree}(A_n)).$$

Each element in $\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$ is effectively a *final-level attribute value* from one of the trees.

A Plithogenic Forest Hypersoft Set (PFHS) over (U, H) is specified by a tuple

$$\text{PFHS} = (U, H, \mathcal{A}, d, c, G),$$

where:

- (1) $d : H \times \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow [0, 1]^j$ is the *attribute value appartenance degree function*, possibly multi-dimensional ($j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$). For each $y \in H$ and final sub-attribute $\alpha \in \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$, $d_y(\alpha) \in [0, 1]^j$ indicates the membership degree(s) of y with respect to α . (E.g., fuzzy, intuitionistic, or neutrosophic membership.)

(2) $c : \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})) \times \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow [0, 1]^t$ is the *contradiction degree function*, satisfying

$$c(\alpha, \alpha) = 0, \quad c(\alpha, \beta) = c(\beta, \alpha) \quad \text{for all } \alpha, \beta \in \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})).$$

Here, $t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ denotes the dimensionality of contradiction (e.g., fuzzy or neutrosophic contradiction measures).

(3) G is a mapping that assigns each *forest-based combination* of sub-attributes to a subset of H . In practice, a *forest-based combination* is a selection of $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m\} \subseteq \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$ (one or more leaf-level values possibly from different root attributes). Formally, we can consider

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})))$$

to be the set of all feasible combinations of final-level sub-attributes across the forest. Then,

$$G : \mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(H),$$

and for each $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}}$, $G(\gamma) \subseteq H$. The set $G(\gamma)$ is determined by:

$$G(\gamma) = \{y \in H \mid d_y(\alpha_k) \text{ and } c(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \text{ (for } \alpha_i, \alpha_j \in \gamma) \text{ satisfy the plithogenic composition rules}\}.$$

In essence, a PFHS extends *Hypersoft Set* ideas to a forest of multi-level attributes and further incorporates *plithogenic* elements (contradiction degrees and multi-valued membership).

2.6 | HyperPlithogenic Set and SuperHyperPlithogenic Set

Next, the definitions of the HyperPlithogenic Set and the SuperHyperPlithogenic Set are presented below [36, 28, 27, 20, 30, 35, 24]. The HyperPlithogenic Set is a concept defined using hyperstructures, while the SuperHyperPlithogenic Set is defined using superhyperstructures [29, 26, 19, 85, 85, 86, 86, 84].

Definition 11 (n -th Powerset). (cf.[86, 38, 75])

The n -th powerset of a set H , denoted $P_n(H)$, is defined recursively. Starting with the standard powerset, the construction proceeds as:

$$P_1(H) = P(H), \quad P_{n+1}(H) = P(P_n(H)), \quad \text{for } n \geq 1.$$

The n -th non-empty powerset, denoted $P_n^*(H)$, excludes the empty set:

$$P_1^*(H) = P^*(H), \quad P_{n+1}^*(H) = P^*(P_n^*(H)).$$

Here, $P^*(H)$ is the powerset of H excluding the empty set.

Definition 12 (HyperPlithogenic Set). [36, 20, 24] Let X be a non-empty set, and let A be a set of attributes. For each attribute $v \in A$, let Pv be the set of possible values of v . A *HyperPlithogenic Set HPS* over X is defined as:

$$HPS = (P, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{Pv_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\tilde{p}df_i\}_{i=1}^n, pCF)$$

where:

- $P \subseteq X$ is a subset of the universe.
- For each attribute v_i , Pv_i is the set of possible values.
- For each attribute v_i , $\tilde{p}df_i : P \times Pv_i \rightarrow \tilde{P}([0, 1]^s)$ is the *Hyper Degree of Appurtenance Function (HDAF)*, assigning to each element $x \in P$ and attribute value $a_i \in Pv_i$ a set of membership degrees.
- $pCF : \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n Pv_i\right) \times \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n Pv_i\right) \rightarrow [0, 1]^t$ is the *Degree of Contradiction Function (DCF)*.

Definition 13 (n -SuperHyperPlithogenic Set). [36, 20, 24] Let X be a non-empty set, and let $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ be a set of attributes, each associated with a set of possible values P_{v_i} . An n -SuperHyperPlithogenic Set ($SHPS_n$) is defined recursively as:

$$SHPS_n = (P_n, V, \{P_{v_i}\}_{i=1}^n, \{\tilde{p}df_i^{(n)}\}_{i=1}^n, pCF^{(n)}),$$

where:

- $P_1 \subseteq X$, and for $k \geq 2$,

$$P_k = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(P_{k-1}),$$

represents the k -th nested family of non-empty subsets of P_1 .

- For each attribute $v_i \in V$, P_{v_i} is the set of possible values of the attribute v_i .
- For each k -th level subset P_k , $\tilde{p}df_i^{(n)} : P_n \times P_{v_i} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0, 1]^s)$ is the *Hyper Degree of Appurtenance Function (HDAF)*, assigning to each element $x \in P_n$ and attribute value $a_i \in P_{v_i}$ a subset of $[0, 1]^s$.
- $pCF^{(n)} : \bigcup_{i=1}^n P_{v_i} \times \bigcup_{i=1}^n P_{v_i} \rightarrow [0, 1]^t$ is the *Degree of Contradiction Function (DCF)*, satisfying:
 - (1) Reflexivity: $pCF^{(n)}(a, a) = 0$ for all $a \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n P_{v_i}$,
 - (2) Symmetry: $pCF^{(n)}(a, b) = pCF^{(n)}(b, a)$ for all $a, b \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n P_{v_i}$.
- s and t are positive integers representing the dimensions of the membership degrees and contradiction degrees, respectively.

3 | Results of This Paper (Revisit)

This section presents the results obtained in this paper.

3.1 | Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set

The Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set is a concept that integrates the principles of the Plithogenic Set and the SuperHypersoft Set. Definitions and related details are provided below.

Definition 14 (Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set). Let:

- U be a universal set, and $\mathcal{P}(U)$ its power set;
- $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ be n distinct attributes, with $n \geq 1$;
- A_i be the (disjoint) set of possible values for attribute a_i , i.e., $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$;
- $\mathcal{P}(A_i)$ be the power set of A_i , for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$;
- $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \mathcal{P}(A_2) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(A_n)$ be the Cartesian product of these power sets;
- $Y \subseteq U$ be a (potentially proper) subset of U .

We define two primary functions:

1. Attribute Value Appurtenance Degree Function.

$$d : Y \times \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}([0, 1]^j),$$

where $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ typically represents the dimensionality of the membership structure:

- $j = 1$: Fuzzy membership degree;
- $j = 2$: Intuitionistic fuzzy membership (membership and non-membership);
- $j = 3$: Neutrosophic membership (truth, indeterminacy, falsity).

For each $y \in Y$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$, $d_y(\gamma)$ belongs to $[0, 1]^j$, indicating the degree(s) of appurtenance of y with respect to the combination of attribute-values in γ .

2. Contradiction Degree Function. For each attribute a_i , define

$$c : \mathcal{P}(A_i) \times \mathcal{P}(A_i) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}([0, 1]^j),$$

which assigns a contradiction degree $c(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ to any two subsets $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \subseteq A_i$. This function satisfies:

$$c(\alpha, \alpha) = 0, \quad c(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = c(\alpha_2, \alpha_1),$$

for all $\alpha, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \subseteq A_i$.

A **Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set (PSHSS)** over U is then defined as a 7-tuple

$$\text{PSHSS} = (U, Y, \{a_i\}, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}, d, c),$$

together with a mapping

$$F : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(U),$$

where each $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ is of the form $\gamma = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$ with $\alpha_i \subseteq A_i$. The image $F(\gamma) \subseteq U$ is determined by the degrees of appurtenance and contradictions between these subsets, typically expressed as:

$$F(\gamma) = \left\{ y \in Y \mid d_y(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \text{ and } c(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) \text{ or } c(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \text{ (for } i \neq j) \text{ satisfy the plithogenic composition rules} \right\}.$$

Intuitively, the function d encodes how strongly each element $y \in Y$ belongs to the combination of attribute-subsets $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$, while c quantifies contradictions among those subsets within the same attribute. The final set $F(\gamma)$ is thus shaped by both appurtenance and contradiction considerations in a plithogenic manner.

Theorem 15 (PSHSS Generalizes SHS and PHS). *Let*

$$\text{PSHSS} = (U, Y, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}, d, c, F)$$

be a *Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set* as in Definition 14. Then:

- (1) **Reduction to SuperHypersoft Set (SHS):** By setting the contradiction degree $c(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ for all $\alpha, \beta \subseteq A_i$ and by treating the multi-dimensional membership degrees in d as classical (crisp) memberships (i.e., restricting $d_y(\gamma) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$), the PSHSS reduces to the conventional SuperHypersoft Set.
- (2) **Reduction to Plithogenic Hypersoft Set (PHS):** By restricting each $\alpha_i \subseteq A_i$ in the power-set product $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(A_n)$ to only singletons $\{\omega_i\} \subseteq A_i$, the PSHSS becomes a Plithogenic Hypersoft Set over the direct product $A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$. Concretely, if α_i is always a singleton (or empty set), then γ reduces to an m -tuple $\gamma = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m)$, and the plithogenic conditions on d and c precisely match those in a PHS definition.

Proof: We prove each reduction separately.

(1) PSHSS to SuperHypersoft Set. Recall that a SuperHypersoft Set (SHS) is defined by

$$(F, \mathcal{C}) \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(A_n),$$

and

$$F : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(U),$$

without any explicit contradiction or multi-valued membership dimension. In a Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set, we have two additional features:

- The *Contradiction Degree Function* $c(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ for subsets of A_i .
- The *Appurtenance Degree Function* $d_y(\gamma)$ (often multi-dimensional: fuzzy, intuitionistic, neutrosophic, etc.).

To recover an SHS, we simply:

- *Nullify the contradiction:* set $c(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = 0$ for all $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \subseteq A_i$. This means no contradiction penalty applies when combining subsets of an attribute's domain.
- *Restrict to crisp membership:* enforce $d_y(\gamma) \in \{0, 1\} \subseteq [0, 1]^j$ for every $y \in U$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$. In other words, an element either belongs or does not belong, without any fractional membership.

Under these two restrictions, the plithogenic composition reduces to a simple mapping $F(\gamma) \subseteq U$ that depends only on whether $d_y(\gamma) = 1$. Since there is no contradiction penalty, the set membership precisely matches the SuperHypersoft definition. Hence, PSHSS becomes an SHS.

(2) PSHSS to Plithogenic Hypersoft Set. A Plithogenic Hypersoft Set (PHS) typically works on the Cartesian product of base attribute domains $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_n$, rather than the power sets $\mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(A_n)$. In Definition 14, each γ is an n -tuple

$$\gamma = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n), \quad \alpha_i \subseteq A_i.$$

If we *restrict each* α_i to be either a *singleton* or possibly the empty set (though typically the empty set is excluded if one wants a pure domain approach), we effectively revert to a direct product of singletons in each A_i . Concretely:

$$\alpha_i = \{\omega_i\} \quad (\text{or } \emptyset),$$

so $\gamma = (\{\omega_1\}, \dots, \{\omega_n\})$. Identifying each $\{\omega_i\}$ with $\omega_i \in A_i$ yields $\gamma \in A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$, matching the standard domain-based product in PHS.

Meanwhile, the *contradiction* and *appurtenance* structure in PSHSS remains:

- The contradiction function $c(\{\omega_i\}, \{\omega'_i\})$ for each attribute domain A_i collapses to $c(\omega_i, \omega'_i)$ (the same form used in Plithogenic Hypersoft Sets).
- The membership degrees $d_y(\{\omega_1\}, \dots, \{\omega_n\})$ match those in PHS (often fuzzy, intuitionistic, or neutrosophic).

Thus, by restricting the power-set dimension to singletons, the PSHSS precisely mirrors the structure of a Plithogenic Hypersoft Set. This establishes the second claim. \square

Theorem 16. *Let* $\text{PSHSS}_1 = (U, Y_1, \{a_i\}, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}, d^{(1)}, c^{(1)}, F_1)$ *and* $\text{PSHSS}_2 = (U, Y_2, \{a_i\}, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}, d^{(2)}, c^{(2)}, F_2)$ *be two Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Sets over the same universe* U *and same attribute domains* $\{A_i\}$. *Suppose that*

$$d_y^{(1)}(\gamma) \leq d_y^{(2)}(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad c^{(1)}(\alpha, \beta) \leq c^{(2)}(\alpha, \beta)$$

for all $y \in Y_1 \cap Y_2$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$, *and* $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{P}(A_i)$. *If* $Y_1 \subseteq Y_2$, *then*

$$F_1(\gamma) \subseteq F_2(\gamma) \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Proof: Fix any $\gamma = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathcal{C}$. Take an arbitrary $y \in F_1(\gamma)$. By Definition 14, $y \in Y_1 \subseteq Y_2$ and satisfies the appurtenance and contradiction thresholds for F_1 . Concretely,

$$d_y^{(1)}(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad c^{(1)}(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \quad (\text{for } 1 \leq i < j \leq n)$$

yield membership of y in $F_1(\gamma)$.

Since $d_y^{(1)}(\gamma) \leq d_y^{(2)}(\gamma)$ componentwise in $[0, 1]^j$, and $c^{(1)}(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \leq c^{(2)}(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)$, the conditions for y to belong to $F_2(\gamma)$ are at least as permissive as those in $F_1(\gamma)$. Hence $y \in F_2(\gamma)$. Because y was chosen arbitrarily in $F_1(\gamma)$, we conclude

$$F_1(\gamma) \subseteq F_2(\gamma) \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Thus the theorem holds. \square

Theorem 17. (Union of Two PSHSSs) *Let* $\text{PSHSS}_1 = (U, Y, \{a_i\}, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}, d^{(1)}, c^{(1)}, F_1)$ *and* $\text{PSHSS}_2 = (U, Y, \{a_i\}, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}, d^{(2)}, c^{(2)}, F_2)$ *be two Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Sets defined over the same* U, Y, \mathcal{C} . *Define a new mapping*

$$F_{\cup}(\gamma) = F_1(\gamma) \cup F_2(\gamma), \quad \gamma \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Then

$$\text{PSHSS}_{\cup} = (U, Y, \{a_i\}, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}, d^{(\cup)}, c^{(\cup)}, F_{\cup})$$

is also a Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set, where

$$d_y^{(\cup)}(\gamma) = \max\{d_y^{(1)}(\gamma), d_y^{(2)}(\gamma)\}, \quad c^{(\cup)}(\alpha, \beta) = \max\{c^{(1)}(\alpha, \beta), c^{(2)}(\alpha, \beta)\}.$$

Proof: We need to verify that $d^{(\cup)}$ and $c^{(\cup)}$ satisfy the plithogenic properties (non-negativity, reflexivity, symmetry, etc.) and that F_{\cup} indeed follows from these definitions.

Step 1: Properties of $d^{(\cup)}$. For each $y \in Y$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$d_y^{(\cup)}(\gamma) = \max\{d_y^{(1)}(\gamma), d_y^{(2)}(\gamma)\}.$$

Since $d_y^{(1)}(\gamma)$ and $d_y^{(2)}(\gamma)$ both lie in $[0, 1]^j$, their componentwise maximum also lies in $[0, 1]^j$. Thus $d_y^{(\cup)}(\gamma)$ is a valid appurtenance degree.

Step 2: Properties of $c^{(\cup)}$. For each attribute a_i , let $\alpha, \beta \subseteq A_i$. Then

$$c^{(\cup)}(\alpha, \beta) = \max\{c^{(1)}(\alpha, \beta), c^{(2)}(\alpha, \beta)\}.$$

Because both $c^{(1)}$ and $c^{(2)}$ are non-negative and symmetric, their maximum is also non-negative and symmetric. Reflexivity follows from

$$c^{(\cup)}(\alpha, \alpha) = \max\{c^{(1)}(\alpha, \alpha), c^{(2)}(\alpha, \alpha)\} = \max\{0, 0\} = 0.$$

Step 3: Construction of F_{\cup} . By definition,

$$F_{\cup}(\gamma) = F_1(\gamma) \cup F_2(\gamma),$$

where $F_i(\gamma)$ are determined by $d^{(i)}$ and $c^{(i)}$, respectively. The effect of taking the maximum of d -values and c -values in each coordinate naturally relaxes the membership conditions, thus covering the union of the original plithogenic superhypersoft membership sets. Consequently,

$$F_{\cup}(\gamma) = \{y \in Y \mid d_y^{(\cup)}(\gamma) \text{ and } c^{(\cup)}(\alpha, \beta) \text{ satisfy the plithogenic conditions}\},$$

which aligns with the standard definition of membership in a PSHSS using $d^{(\cup)}$ and $c^{(\cup)}$. Therefore, PSHSS_{\cup} is indeed a Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set. \square

3.2 | Extended Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set

As previously mentioned, the *Extended Plithogenic Set* framework introduces dominant and recessive viewpoints for attributes, each with its own degree of appurtenance and contradiction functions. Here, we extend these ideas to the SuperHypersoft environment.

Definition 18 (Extended Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set). Using the notation from Definition 14, let:

- V be the overall range of potential attribute values (in the classical sense), where each $A_i \subseteq V$ and $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$;
- $\mathcal{P}(A_i)$ be the power set of A_i , with $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(A_n)$;
- $Y \subseteq U$ be a subset of the universe.

An *Extended Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set (ExPSHSS)* is an 11-tuple

$$\text{ExPSHSS} = (U, Y, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}, d_D, c_D, d_R, c_R, F, j_D, j_R),$$

where:

- (1) $d_D : Y \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}([0, 1]^{j_D})$ is the *dominant* degree of appurtenance function, with dimensionality $j_D \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.
- (2) $c_D : \mathcal{P}(A_i) \times \mathcal{P}(A_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}([0, 1]^{j_D})$ is the *dominant* contradiction degree function, satisfying

$$c_D(\alpha, \alpha) = 0, \quad c_D(\alpha, \beta) = c_D(\beta, \alpha).$$
- (3) $d_R : Y \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}([0, 1]^{j_R})$ is the *recessive* degree of appurtenance function, with dimensionality $j_R \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.
- (4) $c_R : \mathcal{P}(A_i) \times \mathcal{P}(A_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}([0, 1]^{j_R})$ is the *recessive* contradiction degree function, satisfying

$$c_R(\alpha, \alpha) = 0, \quad c_R(\alpha, \beta) = c_R(\beta, \alpha).$$

- (5) $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(U)$ assigns each $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ a subset of U , typically determined by combining d_D, d_R, c_D, c_R under plithogenic aggregation rules. Concretely,

$$F(\gamma) = \{y \in Y \mid \Theta(d_D, y, \gamma) \wedge \Theta(d_R, y, \gamma) \wedge \Omega(c_D, c_R, \gamma)\},$$

for some plithogenic composition operators Θ and Ω .

This extended structure allows each attribute subset $\alpha_i \subseteq A_i$ to be interpreted in two ways: one where it is *dominant*, another where it is *recessive*. The overall membership of $y \in Y$ in $F(\gamma)$ then depends on how these dual perspectives balance or contradict each other.

Theorem 19 (ExPSHSS Generalizes PSHSS). *Let*

$$\text{ExPSHSS} = (U, Y, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}, d_D, c_D, d_R, c_R, F, j_D, j_R)$$

be an Extended Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set (ExPSHSS) as in Definition 18. By enforcing that the recessive viewpoint coincides with the dominant viewpoint—i.e., setting

$$d_R = d_D, \quad c_R = c_D, \quad j_R = j_D,$$

the ExPSHSS reduces exactly to a Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set (PSHSS).

Proof: In the Extended Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set, each attribute domain and subset is evaluated by both a *dominant* and a *recessive* membership/contradiction scheme:

$$d_D, c_D \quad \text{and} \quad d_R, c_R.$$

Additionally, each has its own dimensionality j_D and j_R . To recover a standard PSHSS (cf. Definition 14), we remove the distinction between dominant and recessive by identifying them:

$$d_R(\gamma, y) = d_D(\gamma, y), \quad c_R(\alpha, \beta) = c_D(\alpha, \beta), \quad j_R = j_D.$$

Under these conditions, each attribute-value combination $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ and element $y \in Y$ has a *single* appurtenance function $d(\gamma, y)$ (no separate d_D or d_R), and a *single* contradiction function $c(\alpha, \beta)$. The mapping $F(\gamma) \subseteq U$ then depends on these unified values exactly as in the Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set definition. Hence, the Extended Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set collapses to a Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set when dominant and recessive notions coincide. \square

3.3 | Forest SuperHypersoft Set and Plithogenic Forest SuperHypersoft Set

The Plithogenic Forest SuperHypersoft Set is a concept that combines the principles of the Plithogenic Set and the Plithogenic Forest Hypersoft Set. The definition is presented below.

Definition 20 (Forest SuperHypersoft Set (FSHS)). *Let:*

- U be a universal set, and let $H \subseteq U$ be a non-empty subset.
- $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$ be $n \geq 1$ root attributes, each expanding into a tree of sub-attributes, collectively forming a forest $\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})$.
- $\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$ denote the set of all final-level sub-attributes (the leaves) across all attribute trees.
- Define the *forest super-domain* as the power set of leaf-level sub-attributes:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}} = \mathcal{P}(\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))).$$

An element $\beta \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}}$ is thus a subset of final-level sub-attributes (possibly from different root attributes).

A **Forest SuperHypersoft Set** (FSHS) over (U, H) is a pair

$$(G, \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}}),$$

where

$$G : \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(H)$$

maps each set of leaf-level sub-attributes $\beta \subseteq \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$ to a subset $G(\beta) \subseteq H$. In other words,

$$(G, \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}}) = \left\{ (\beta, G(\beta)) \mid \beta \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}}, G(\beta) \subseteq H \right\}.$$

Remark 21 (Forest Superhypersoft set). *In contrast to a standard Forest Hypersoft Set, which considers single final-level attributes in each combination, a Forest SuperHypersoft Set allows each node in the forest to be selected as a power-set combination of its leaf-level sub-attributes. Thus, the function G assigns to each such collection of leaf-level values (potentially from multiple root attributes) a corresponding subset of H . This framework accommodates higher-dimensional or more flexible attribute modeling than the simpler forest hypersoft paradigm.*

Theorem 22. (*Forest SuperHypersoft Set Generalizes Forest Hypersoft Set*) *Let*

$$\text{FSHS} = (G, \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}})$$

be a Forest SuperHypersoft Set over (U, H) , as in Definition 20. By restricting each subset $\beta \subseteq \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$ to be a singleton, we recover exactly a Forest Hypersoft Set.

Proof: Recall that in a *Forest Hypersoft Set*, we consider only single leaf-level attributes in each combination. Concretely, if we denote

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})))$$

to be those subsets containing exactly one element, then each $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}}$ can be written as $\gamma = \{\alpha\}$ for some $\alpha \in \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}} = \{ \{\alpha\} \mid \alpha \in \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})) \}.$$

If we take the given FSHS mapping

$$G : \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(H),$$

and restrict its domain to singletons $\{\alpha\}$, we obtain

$$G(\{\alpha\}) \subseteq H.$$

Renaming the mapping G to a simpler notation (such as F), we have a pair

$$(F, \mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}}) = \left\{ (\{\alpha\}, F(\{\alpha\})) \mid \{\alpha\} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{forest}} \right\},$$

which is precisely the definition of a *Forest Hypersoft Set* (where one final-level attribute α is chosen per combination). Thus, allowing only singleton subsets in the domain recovers the Forest Hypersoft Set scenario. This completes the proof. \square

Definition 23 (Plithogenic Forest SuperHypersoft Set (PFSHS)). Using the same notation as in Definition 10, let

$$\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \Gamma(\text{Tree}(A_i))$$

be the set of final-level sub-attributes. Instead of taking singletons $\alpha \in \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$, we now consider *power sets* of these final-level values. Define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}} = \mathcal{P}(\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))),$$

the power set of all possible leaf-level attributes in the forest. A **Plithogenic Forest SuperHypersoft Set (PFSHS)** over (U, H) is a tuple

$$\text{PFSHS} = (U, H, \mathcal{A}, d, c, F),$$

where:

- (1) $d : H \times \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}} \longrightarrow [0, 1]^j$ is the multi-valued *appurtenance degree function*, analogous to PFHS but now each argument is a *set of leaf-level sub-attributes* $\beta \subseteq \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$.
- (2) $c : \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}} \longrightarrow [0, 1]^t$ is the *contradiction degree function*, measuring contradiction between any two subsets $\beta_1, \beta_2 \subseteq \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$. It satisfies:

$$c(\beta, \beta) = 0, \quad c(\beta_1, \beta_2) = c(\beta_2, \beta_1).$$

- (3) $F : \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(H)$ assigns each subset $\beta \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}}$ a subset $F(\beta) \subseteq H$, determined by plithogenic aggregation of the multi-valued appurtenances and contradictions among the chosen subsets. Formally, $F(\beta) = \{ y \in H \mid d_y(\beta) \text{ and } c(\beta_1, \beta_2) \subseteq [0, 1]^t \text{ (for } \beta_1, \beta_2 \subseteq \beta) \text{ fulfill plithogenic membership rules} \}$.

Hence, PFSHS allows each node in the forest to be taken as a *power-set combination of final-level sub-attributes*, capturing a higher-dimensional structure than the standard PFHS.

Theorem 24. *Let*

$$\text{PFSHS} = (U, H, \mathcal{A}, d, c, F)$$

be a Plithogenic Forest SuperHypersoft Set as in Definition 23. Then:

- (1) *By restricting each selected subset $\beta \subseteq \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$ to a singleton (or to a single path from the forest), we recover a Plithogenic Forest Hypersoft Set (PFHS).*
- (2) *By restricting the forest to single-level attributes (or a single root attribute per domain) and simultaneously allowing multi-subattribute expansions only in a single dimension, we recover a Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set (PSHSS) (without the multi-level forest).*

Proof: We prove each statement separately.

(1) Reducing PFSHS to PFHS. In PFSHS, each element in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}} = \mathcal{P}(\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A})))$ is a *power set* of leaf-level sub-attributes. To recover PFHS:

- Constrain each subset $\beta \subseteq \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$ to contain *exactly one* leaf-level attribute (i.e., $\beta = \{\alpha\}$).
- Equivalently, for any multi-element subset β , disregard it or treat it as a single path-based combination, so that β is effectively a *singleton* representing a final sub-attribute.
- The contradiction function $c(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ then collapses to $c(\{\alpha_1\}, \{\alpha_2\})$, which is the standard plithogenic contradiction among final-level sub-attributes α_1, α_2 .
- Likewise, $d_y(\beta)$ becomes $d_y(\{\alpha\})$, i.e., a single sub-attribute membership measure exactly matching the PFHS setup.

Under these restrictions, the tuple $(U, H, \mathcal{A}, d, c, G)$ (where G is the restricted mapping) is precisely a Plithogenic Forest Hypersoft Set (Definition 10), because each argument in the mapping is now $\alpha \in \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$, not a *power set* of them. Hence, PFSHS generalizes PFHS.

(2) Reducing PFSHS to Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set (PSHSS). Recall a Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set PSHSS typically has the structure:

$$\text{PSHSS} = (U, Y, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}, d, c, F),$$

where $\{A_i\}$ are distinct attributes, \mathcal{C} might be $\mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(A_n)$, and there is no notion of multiple hierarchical levels (no forest). To embed a PSHSS in PFSHS, we:

- Restrict each $\text{Tree}(A_i)$ to a single level (no deeper branches). Thus $\Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$ is effectively $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ (or the relevant expansions if each A_i itself is a set).
- Let each $\beta \subseteq \Gamma(\text{Forest}(\mathcal{A}))$ correspond to subsets from $\mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(A_n)$ in the classical sense.
- The contradiction function c and the membership function d now replicate exactly the plithogenic superhypersoft definitions. The hierarchical structure collapses, so the “forest” is a trivial forest with each root having no deeper sub-attributes.

Hence, the PFSHS framework (with additional multi-level capabilities) indeed specializes to the existing Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set under these limitations. This completes the proof that PFSHS generalizes both PFHS and PSHSS. \square

3.4 | *m-SuperHyperPlithogenic n-SuperHypersoft Set*

The *m-SuperHyperPlithogenic n-SuperHypersoft Set* is defined as follows. It is a concept that combines the principles of the SuperHypersoft Set and the SuperHyperPlithogenic Set.

Definition 25 (*m-SuperHyperPlithogenic n-SuperHypersoft Set*). Let:

- (1) U be a universal set, and let $Y \subseteq U$ be a (possibly proper) subset of U .

- (2) $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ be n distinct attributes ($n \geq 1$).
- (3) For each attribute a_i , let A_i be a non-empty set of possible values, satisfying $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Let $\mathcal{P}(A_i)$ denote its power set.

- (4) Define

$$\mathcal{C}_n = \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \mathcal{P}(A_2) \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}(A_n),$$

called the n -SuperHypersoft domain. An element $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_n$ is an n -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ with each $\alpha_i \subseteq A_i$.

- (5) Let X be a (potentially larger) universal space containing U . We construct a sequence P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m with $m \geq 1$ as follows:

$$P_1 \subseteq X, \quad P_{k+1} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(P_k), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m-1.$$

Here, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\cdot)$ denotes a suitable family of non-empty subsets or hyper-subsets of P_k , so that P_m is an m -level nested family derived from P_1 .

- (6) A *Hyper Degree of Appurtenance Function (HDAF)*:

$$\tilde{d} : P_m \times \mathcal{C}_n \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0, 1]^s),$$

where $s \geq 1$ is the dimension of the membership degrees. For each $x \in P_m$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_n$, $\tilde{d}_x(\gamma) \subseteq [0, 1]^s$ encodes a *hyper* (possibly set-valued or multi-level) membership degree regarding how x appends to or belongs with the attribute combination γ .

- (7) A *Degree of Contradiction Function (DCF)*:

$$pCF^{(m,n)} : \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \right) \times \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \right) \longrightarrow [0, 1]^t,$$

where $t \geq 1$ is the dimension of contradiction. It satisfies:

$$pCF^{(m,n)}(a, a) = 0, \quad pCF^{(m,n)}(a, b) = pCF^{(m,n)}(b, a),$$

for all $a, b \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i$.

- (8) A mapping

$$F : \mathcal{C}_n \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(U),$$

where each $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_n$ is mapped to a subset $F(\gamma) \subseteq U$. Concretely, $F(\gamma)$ is determined by plithogenic rules that combine:

- The hyper degree(s) $\tilde{d}_x(\gamma)$ for $x \in P_m$,
- The contradiction degrees $pCF^{(m,n)}(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)$ within each attribute domain (for $\alpha_i, \alpha_j \subseteq A_i$ when $i = j$, or extended forms for cross-attribute contradictions, if applicable),
- The chosen dimension(s) of membership s and contradiction t .

A structure

$$m\text{-SHPS } n\text{-SHS} = \left(U, Y, \{a_i\}, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}_n, P_m, \tilde{d}, pCF^{(m,n)}, F \right)$$

satisfying the above properties is called an m -SuperHyperPlithogenic n -SuperHypersoft Set.

Theorem 26. (*m -SuperHyperPlithogenic n -SuperHypersoft Set Generalizes PSHSS and SHPS_n*)

Let

$$m\text{-SHPS } n\text{-SHS} = \left(U, Y, \{a_i\}, \{A_i\}, \mathcal{C}_n, P_m, \tilde{d}, pCF^{(m,n)}, F \right)$$

be an m -SuperHyperPlithogenic n -SuperHypersoft Set as per Definition 25. Then:

- (1) **Reduction to Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set (PSHSS).**

If we fix $m = 1$ (so that $P_m = P_1 \subseteq X$ has no higher-level nesting) and let $\tilde{d}_x(\gamma)$ be singleton (or crisp) membership degrees in $[0, 1]^s$ rather than a hyper-set for each $x \in P_1$, the resulting structure precisely coincides with the standard Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set.

(2) **Reduction to SuperHyperPlithogenic Set (SHPS_n).**

If we fix $n = 1$ (i.e., we have only one attribute domain A_1 , so $\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{P}(A_1)$) and keep the hyper-level recursion for $m \geq 1$, the construction reverts to an m -level SuperHyperPlithogenic Set in the sense of [36, 20, 24], where the single attribute domain A_1 (and its possible values) combine with hyper membership degrees \tilde{d} and the contradiction function $pCF^{(m,n)}$ (now simplified to $pCF^{(m,1)}$).

Proof: We prove each statement separately.

(1) From m -SHPS n -SHS to Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set. By setting $m = 1$, we have no nested expansions: $P_1 \subseteq X$, and

$$P_2, P_3, \dots, P_m \quad \text{are not defined.}$$

Hence $\tilde{d}: P_1 \times \mathcal{C}_n \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0, 1]^s)$ becomes a simple membership degree function from P_1 to $[0, 1]^s$. If we further assume it takes on *single* values (e.g., $\tilde{d}_x(\gamma) \in [0, 1]^s$ in a pointwise manner, rather than subsets of $[0, 1]^s$), then \tilde{d} effectively matches the attribute value appurtenance function d in the Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set definition [23, 80]. Likewise, the contradiction function $pCF^{(1,n)}$ merges seamlessly with the standard contradiction function c . Finally, the mapping

$$F(\gamma) \subseteq U$$

is determined by these membership degrees and contradiction values just as in Definition of PSHSS. Thus, under these restrictions, we recover the conventional PSHSS.

(2) From m -SHPS n -SHS to SuperHyperPlithogenic Set. If $n = 1$, then the domain

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{P}(A_1),$$

so each γ is effectively a subset of A_1 . This coincides with the single-attribute scenario in the *SuperHyperPlithogenic Set* [36, 20, 24], which considers a (possibly nested) HDAF over a single family of attribute values. The recursion on m remains valid for building P_m from P_1 via $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. The contradiction function $pCF^{(m,1)}$ becomes the usual contradiction measure on $\bigcup_{i=1}^1 A_i = A_1$. The mapping

$$F: \mathcal{P}(A_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(U)$$

then behaves as in the hyperplithogenic approach. Therefore, under $n = 1$, we retrieve exactly an m -level SuperHyperPlithogenic Set structure.

In conclusion, each specialized case ($m = 1$ or $n = 1$) yields one of the known structures, proving that an m -SuperHyperPlithogenic n -SuperHypersoft Set generalizes both the Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set and the SuperHyperPlithogenic Set. \square

4 | Some Applications of the Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set for Sustainable Machines

In this section, we examine some applications of the Plithogenic SuperHypersoft Set for sustainable machines.

Example 27 (AI-Driven Optimization for Energy-Efficient Computing Systems). AI-Driven Optimization is the process of using artificial intelligence algorithms to enhance efficiency, decision-making, and performance across various domains by learning and adapting dynamically (cf.[62, 7, 50]). Let U be the set of all possible system configurations and let $Y \subset U$ be a set of candidate configurations. Consider two attributes:

- a_1 : *Energy Consumption*, with $A_1 = \{\text{Low, Medium, High}\}$.
- a_2 : *Processing Speed*, with $A_2 = \{\text{Fast, Moderate, Slow}\}$.

Define the attribute combination space as

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \mathcal{P}(A_2),$$

where $\mathcal{P}(A_i)$ denotes the power set of A_i . For a specific combination, say

$$\gamma = (\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Fast}\}),$$

we assign each candidate $y \in Y$ a fuzzy membership degree

$$d_y(\gamma) \in [0, 1],$$

and a contradiction degree

$$c(\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Fast}\}) \in [0, 1].$$

For instance, if for a candidate configuration y_0 we have

$$d_{y_0}(\gamma) = 0.85 \quad \text{and} \quad c(\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Fast}\}) = 0.10,$$

then using a plithogenic rule—requiring that

$$d_{y_0}(\gamma) - c(\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Fast}\}) \geq 0.70,$$

we find that

$$0.85 - 0.10 = 0.75 \geq 0.70.$$

Thus, y_0 is included in the selected set $F(\gamma)$; that is, $y_0 \in F(\gamma)$.

Example 28 (Sustainable Machine Learning Models for Climate Forecasting and Environmental Monitoring). Sustainable Machine Learning Models are AI models designed to minimize environmental impact by optimizing energy efficiency, resource utilization, and long-term scalability while maintaining high performance [52, 53, 13, 8]. Let U be the set of climate forecasting models developed from various sensor data, and let $Y \subset U$ be the subset of models with high reliability. Consider two attributes:

- a_1 : *Sensor Data Quality*, with $A_1 = \{\text{High}, \text{Medium}, \text{Low}\}$.
- a_2 : *Climatic Variability*, with $A_2 = \{\text{Stable}, \text{Variable}\}$.

Define the combination space $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \mathcal{P}(A_2)$ and consider

$$\gamma = (\{\text{High}\}, \{\text{Stable}\}).$$

For each model $y \in Y$, let the membership degree be expressed as an intuitionistic fuzzy number

$$d_y(\gamma) = (\mu_y, \nu_y) \in [0, 1]^2,$$

where μ_y and ν_y denote the degrees of membership and non-membership, respectively. Assume for a model y_1 that

$$\mu_{y_1} = 0.90, \quad \nu_{y_1} = 0.05,$$

and the contradiction degree is

$$c(\{\text{High}\}, \{\text{Stable}\}) = 0.05.$$

If we set the acceptance criterion as

$$\mu_y - c(\{\text{High}\}, \{\text{Stable}\}) \geq 0.80,$$

then for y_1 we have

$$0.90 - 0.05 = 0.85 \geq 0.80,$$

so $y_1 \in F(\gamma)$.

Example 29 (Smart Resource Allocation in Cloud Computing for CO₂ Emission Reduction). Let U be the set of possible server allocation configurations in a cloud environment, and $Y \subset U$ be the candidate configurations that promote energy efficiency. Consider the attributes:

- a_1 : *Server Load*, with $A_1 = \{\text{Low}, \text{Medium}, \text{High}\}$.
- a_2 : *Cooling Efficiency*, with $A_2 = \{\text{Efficient}, \text{Inefficient}\}$.

Take $\gamma = (\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Efficient}\}) \in \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \mathcal{P}(A_2)$. For a configuration $y \in Y$, suppose

$$d_y(\gamma) = 0.80 \quad \text{and} \quad c(\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Efficient}\}) = 0.15.$$

With the selection rule defined as

$$d_y(\gamma) - c(\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Efficient}\}) \geq 0.65,$$

we obtain $0.80 - 0.15 = 0.65$; hence, the configuration is accepted ($y \in F(\gamma)$), contributing to a reduction in CO₂ emissions.

Example 30 (Green IoT Solutions for Sustainable Urban Development). Sustainable Urban Development is the planning and management of cities to balance economic growth, environmental protection, and social well-being for long-term sustainability and resilience(cf.[54, 99, 12, 43]). Let U be the set of IoT sensor networks deployed in an urban area and let $Y \subset U$ be the set of networks deemed sustainable. Using a forest structure, assume a root attribute:

- a_1 : *Sensor Type*, with $A_1 = \{\text{Temperature, Air Quality, Noise}\}$.

Each sensor type can further be decomposed into sub-attributes (e.g., measurement range, accuracy). Define the forest super-domain as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}} = \mathcal{P}(\Gamma(\text{Forest}(A_1))),$$

where $\Gamma(\text{Forest}(A_1))$ denotes the set of all leaf-level sub-attributes. For instance, let

$$\beta = \{\text{Temperature: High-Precision, Air Quality: Standard}\}.$$

For each sensor network $y \in Y$, assign a membership degree

$$d_y(\beta) \in [0, 1],$$

and for any two sub-attribute subsets $\beta_1, \beta_2 \subset \beta$, define the contradiction function

$$c(\beta_1, \beta_2) \in [0, 1].$$

If for a network y_2 we have

$$d_{y_2}(\beta) = 0.88 \quad \text{and} \quad c(\beta_1, \beta_2) = 0.10,$$

and if the rule

$$d_y(\beta) - c(\beta_1, \beta_2) \geq 0.78$$

is imposed, then y_2 qualifies ($y_2 \in F(\beta)$), supporting sustainable urban monitoring.

Example 31 (Blockchain-Based System for Transparent and Energy-Efficient Supply Chain Management). Supply Chain Management is the coordination and optimization of processes involved in sourcing, production, logistics, and distribution to enhance efficiency, reduce costs, and ensure sustainability[68, 46, 59]. Let U denote the set of all supply chain nodes, and let $Y \subset U$ be the nodes that exhibit high transparency and energy efficiency. Consider the following attributes:

- a_1 : *Transparency Level*, with $A_1 = \{\text{High, Medium, Low}\}$.
- a_2 : *Energy Efficiency*, with $A_2 = \{\text{Efficient, Moderate, Inefficient}\}$.

Select the combination

$$\gamma = (\{\text{High}\}, \{\text{Efficient}\}) \in \mathcal{C}.$$

For a given node $y \in Y$, if

$$d_y(\gamma) = 0.87 \quad \text{and} \quad c(\{\text{High}\}, \{\text{Efficient}\}) = 0.05,$$

and if we require

$$d_y(\gamma) - c(\{\text{High}\}, \{\text{Efficient}\}) \geq 0.80,$$

then since $0.87 - 0.05 = 0.82 \geq 0.80$, the node y is selected (i.e., $y \in F(\gamma)$) for inclusion in the blockchain system.

Example 32 (Edge Computing Framework for Minimizing Energy Consumption in Data Centers). Edge Computing Framework is a decentralized computing architecture that processes data near the source, reducing latency, bandwidth usage, and energy consumption for real-time applications and efficiency[55, 97, 45]. Let U be the set of data center nodes (including edge nodes) and let $Y \subset U$ be those nodes evaluated as highly energy efficient. Assume a forest-type evaluation for a key attribute:

- a_1 : *Energy Consumption*, with $A_1 = \{\text{Low, Medium, High}\}$.

Further decompose A_1 into sub-attributes (e.g., cooling efficiency, ambient operating conditions). Define the forest super-domain

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{forest}} = \mathcal{P}(\Gamma(\text{Forest}(A_1))).$$

For a chosen subset β (e.g., corresponding to “Low energy consumption” along with favorable cooling conditions), suppose for a node y_3 that

$$d_{y_3}(\beta) = 0.92 \quad \text{and} \quad c(\beta_1, \beta_2) = 0.12,$$

where $\beta_1, \beta_2 \subset \beta$. With a selection threshold defined by

$$d_{y_3}(\beta) - c(\beta_1, \beta_2) \geq 0.80,$$

y_3 qualifies as energy efficient and is therefore included in $F(\beta)$.

Example 33 (Reinforcement Learning for Optimizing Renewable Energy Utilization in Data Centers). Renewable Energy is energy derived from natural sources like sunlight, wind, and water, replenished continuously, reducing reliance on fossil fuels and minimizing environmental impact(cf. [92, 42, 17]). Let U be the set of operational strategies for a data center, and $Y \subset U$ be the set of candidate strategies under consideration. We now employ an m -SuperHyperPlithogenic n -SuperHypersoft Set framework to integrate multi-level (e.g., time-sequenced) decisions with multiple attributes. Assume:

- $n = 2$ attributes:
 - a_1 : *Renewable Energy Utilization*, with $A_1 = \{\text{High}, \text{Low}\}$.
 - a_2 : *Operating Cost*, with $A_2 = \{\text{Low}, \text{High}\}$.
- $m \geq 2$ levels of decision-making. Let $P_1 \subset X$ be an initial set of strategies and define recursively

$$P_{k+1} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(P_k), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m-1.$$

For a given combination

$$\gamma = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \mathcal{P}(A_2),$$

assume that for a hyper-level strategy $x \in P_m$ the hyper degree of appurtenance is given by

$$\tilde{d}_x(\gamma) \in [0, 1]^s,$$

and that the degree of contradiction is

$$pCF^{(m,2)}(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \in [0, 1]^t.$$

For example, if for a specific strategy x we have

$$\tilde{d}_x(\gamma) = (0.70, 0.80) \quad (\text{interpreted componentwise}),$$

and

$$pCF^{(m,2)}(\alpha, \beta) = 0.15,$$

then by defining a reward function

$$R(x) = \tilde{d}_x(\gamma) - pCF^{(m,2)}(\alpha, \beta),$$

and requiring that $R(x) \geq 0.65$, the strategy x is accepted into $F(\gamma)$. This approach underpins a reinforcement learning framework optimizing renewable energy usage.

Example 34 (AI-Driven Predictive Maintenance for Reducing Electronic Waste in Hardware Systems). Electronic Waste (E-Waste) refers to discarded electronic devices and components, requiring proper recycling to reduce environmental pollution and promote sustainable resource management [51, 44, 95]. Let U be the set of hardware components and let $Y \subset U$ be the subset of components evaluated as having low failure risk and extended service life. Consider the attributes:

- a_1 : *Failure Risk*, with $A_1 = \{\text{Low}, \text{Medium}, \text{High}\}$.
- a_2 : *Maintenance Cost*, with $A_2 = \{\text{Low}, \text{Medium}, \text{High}\}$.

For the combination

$$\gamma = (\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Low}\}),$$

if for a component $y \in Y$ we have

$$d_y(\gamma) = 0.93 \quad \text{and} \quad c(\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Low}\}) = 0.00,$$

then with a threshold condition

$$0.93 - 0.00 \geq 0.85,$$

the component is selected ($y \in F(\gamma)$), thereby supporting predictive maintenance and reducing electronic waste.

Example 35 (Sustainable Algorithms for Large-Scale Data Processing and Storage). Large-Scale Data Processing is the handling, analysis, and management of vast datasets using distributed computing, cloud infrastructure, and optimized algorithms for efficiency and scalability[71, 69, 15, 98]. Let U be the set of algorithms designed for large-scale data processing, and let $Y \subset U$ be those algorithms that balance processing speed, computational cost, and energy consumption. Consider three attributes:

- a_1 : *Computational Cost*, with $A_1 = \{\text{Low}, \text{High}\}$.
- a_2 : *Energy Consumption*, with $A_2 = \{\text{Low}, \text{High}\}$.
- a_3 : *Processing Speed*, with $A_3 = \{\text{Fast}, \text{Slow}\}$.

Then the combination space is

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{P}(A_1) \times \mathcal{P}(A_2) \times \mathcal{P}(A_3).$$

For the particular combination

$$\gamma = (\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Fast}\}),$$

assume for an algorithm $y \in Y$ that

$$d_y(\gamma) = 0.80,$$

and that the contradiction degrees among the attribute values are given by

$$c(\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Low}\}) = 0.05, \quad c(\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Fast}\}) = 0.10.$$

Then, by defining an aggregate evaluation as

$$\text{Evaluation} = d_y(\gamma) - \left(c(\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Low}\}) + c(\{\text{Low}\}, \{\text{Fast}\}) \right),$$

we obtain

$$0.80 - (0.05 + 0.10) = 0.65.$$

If the acceptance threshold is set at 0.60, then the algorithm qualifies, i.e., $y \in F(\gamma)$, and is deemed sustainable for large-scale data processing.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments

We humbly extend our heartfelt gratitude to everyone who has provided invaluable support, enabling the successful completion of this paper. We also express our sincere appreciation to all readers who have taken the time to engage with this work. Furthermore, we extend our deepest respect and gratitude to the authors of the references cited in this paper. Thank you for your significant contributions.

Data Availability

This paper does not involve any data analysis.

Ethical Approval

This article does not involve any research with human participants or animals.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Disclaimer

This study primarily focuses on theoretical aspects, and its application to practical scenarios has not yet been validated. Future research may involve empirical testing and refinement of the proposed methods. The authors have made every effort to ensure that all references cited in this paper are accurate and appropriately attributed. However, unintentional errors or omissions may occur. The authors bear no legal responsibility for inaccuracies in external sources, and readers are encouraged to verify the information provided in the references independently. Furthermore, the interpretations and opinions expressed in this paper are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of any affiliated institutions.

References

- [1] Mohamed Abdel-Basset, Mohamed El-Hoseny, Abdullallah Gamal, and Florentin Smarandache. A novel model for evaluation hospital medical care systems based on plithogenic sets. *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, 100:101710, 2019.
- [2] Walid Abdelfattah. Variables selection procedure for the dea overall efficiency assessment based plithogenic sets and mathematical programming. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 2022.
- [3] Muhammad Rayees Ahmad and Usman Afzal. Mathematical modeling and ai based decision making for covid-19 suspects backed by novel distance and similarity measures on plithogenic hypersoft sets. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, 132:102390, 2022.
- [4] Muhammad Rayees Ahmad, Muhammad Saeed, Usman Afzal, and Miin-Shen Yang. A novel mcdm method based on plithogenic hypersoft sets under fuzzy neutrosophic environment. *Symmetry*, 12(11):1855, 2020.
- [5] Nehmat Ahmed and Osama T. Pirbal. Plithogenic crisp hypersoft topology. *European Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 2024.
- [6] Mohammed Abdullah Al-Hagery, Abdalla I Abdalla Musa, et al. Automated credit card risk assessment using fuzzy parameterized neutrosophic hypersoft expert set. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science*, (1):93–3, 2025.
- [7] Eleni Alopogianni, Charalampos Karyotis, Tomasz Maniak, Rahat Iqbal, Nikos Passas, Faiyaz Doctor, and Zoran Vujicic. Ai-driven optimization of small cell deployment for beyond 5g networks. *Procedia Computer Science*, 238:908–913, 2024.
- [8] Hamzeh F Assous, Hazem AL-Najjar, Nadia Al-Rousan, and Dania AL-Najjar. Developing a sustainable machine learning model to predict crop yield in the gulf countries. *Sustainability*, 15(12):9392, 2023.
- [9] Krassimir Atanassov. Intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *International journal bioautomation*, 20:1, 2016.
- [10] Krassimir T Atanassov. *On intuitionistic fuzzy sets theory*, volume 283. Springer, 2012.
- [11] Krassimir T Atanassov and Krassimir T Atanassov. *Intuitionistic fuzzy sets*. Springer, 1999.
- [12] Timothy Beatley and Stephen Maxwell Wheeler. *The sustainable urban development reader*. Routledge London, 2004.
- [13] Yuxing Ben, Weilu Han, Chris James, and Dingzhou Cao. Building a general and sustainable machine learning solution in a real-time drilling system. In *SPE/IADC Drilling Conference and Exhibition*, page D101S014R002. SPE, 2020.
- [14] Humberto Bustince and P Burillo. Vague sets are intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *Fuzzy sets and systems*, 79(3):403–405, 1996.
- [15] Samira Daneshyar and Majid Razmjoo. Large-scale data processing using mapreduce in cloud computing environment. *International Journal on Web Service Computing (IJWSC)*, 3(4), 2012.
- [16] E. Dhivya and A. Arokia Lancy. Near plithogenic hypersoft sets. *2ND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MATHEMATICAL TECHNIQUES AND APPLICATIONS: ICMTA2021*, 2022.
- [17] Ibrahim Dincer. Renewable energy and sustainable development: a crucial review. *Renewable and sustainable energy reviews*, 4(2):157–175, 2000.
- [18] Kayode Fatukasi and Sunday Adebisi. Optimizing cryptocurrency investment decisions using plithogenic hypersoft sets in mcdm. *Plithogenic Logic and Computation*, 2:122–125, 2024.
- [19] Takaaki Fujita. Short survey on the hierarchical uncertainty of fuzzy, neutrosophic, and plithogenic sets. *Advancing Uncertain Combinatorics through Graphization, Hyperization, and Uncertainization: Fuzzy, Neutrosophic, Soft, Rough, and Beyond*, page 285.
- [20] Takaaki Fujita. Exploring concepts of hyperfuzzy, hyperneutrosophic, and hyperplithogenic sets. 2024. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.12216.87045.
- [21] Takaaki Fujita. Note for hypersoft filter and fuzzy hypersoft filter. *Multicriteria Algorithms With Applications*, 5:32–51, 2024.
- [22] Takaaki Fujita. A review of fuzzy and neutrosophic offsets: Connections to some set concepts and normalization function. *Advancing Uncertain Combinatorics through Graphization, Hyperization, and Uncertainization: Fuzzy, Neutrosophic, Soft, Rough, and Beyond*, page 74, 2024.
- [23] Takaaki Fujita. Short note of bunch graph in fuzzy, neutrosophic, and plithogenic graphs. *Advancing Uncertain Combinatorics through Graphization, Hyperization, and Uncertainization: Fuzzy, Neutrosophic, Soft, Rough, and Beyond*, page 294, 2024.
- [24] Takaaki Fujita. *Advancing Uncertain Combinatorics through Graphization, Hyperization, and Uncertainization: Fuzzy, Neutrosophic, Soft, Rough, and Beyond*. Biblio Publishing, 2025.

- [25] Takaaki Fujita. A comprehensive discussion on fuzzy hypersoft expert, superhypersoft, and indetermsoft graphs. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 77:241–263, 2025.
- [26] Takaaki Fujita. Expanding horizons of plithogenic superhyperstructures: Applications in decision-making, control, and neuro systems. *Advancing Uncertain Combinatorics through Graphization, Hyperization, and Uncertainization: Fuzzy, Neutrosophic, Soft, Rough, and Beyond*, page 416, 2025.
- [27] Takaaki Fujita. Forest hyperplithogenic set and forest hyperrough set. *Advancing Uncertain Combinatorics through Graphization, Hyperization, and Uncertainization: Fuzzy, Neutrosophic, Soft, Rough, and Beyond*, 2025.
- [28] Takaaki Fujita. Hyperplithogenic cubic set and superhyperplithogenic cubic set. *Advancing Uncertain Combinatorics through Graphization, Hyperization, and Uncertainization: Fuzzy, Neutrosophic, Soft, Rough, and Beyond*, page 79, 2025.
- [29] Takaaki Fujita. Short note of superhyperstructures of partitions, integrals, and spaces. *Advancing Uncertain Combinatorics through Graphization, Hyperization, and Uncertainization: Fuzzy, Neutrosophic, Soft, Rough, and Beyond*, page 384, 2025.
- [30] Takaaki Fujita. Symbolic hyperplithogenic set. *Advancing Uncertain Combinatorics through Graphization, Hyperization, and Uncertainization: Fuzzy, Neutrosophic, Soft, Rough, and Beyond*, page 130, 2025.
- [31] Takaaki Fujita and Florentin Smarandache. *Advancing Uncertain Combinatorics through Graphization, Hyperization, and Uncertainization: Fuzzy, Neutrosophic, Soft, Rough, and Beyond (Second Volume)*. Biblio Publishing, 2024.
- [32] Takaaki Fujita and Florentin Smarandache. *Advancing Uncertain Combinatorics through Graphization, Hyperization, and Uncertainization: Fuzzy, Neutrosophic, Soft, Rough, and Beyond (Third Volume)*. Biblio Publishing, 2024.
- [33] Takaaki Fujita and Florentin Smarandache. A short note for hypersoft rough graphs. *HyperSoft Set Methods in Engineering*, 3:1–25, 2024.
- [34] Takaaki Fujita and Florentin Smarandache. Study for general plithogenic soft expert graphs. *Plithogenic Logic and Computation*, 2:107–121, 2024.
- [35] Takaaki Fujita and Florentin Smarandache. A concise introduction to hyperfuzzy, hyperneutrosophic, hyperplithogenic, hypersoft, and hyperrough sets with practical examples. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 80:609–631, 2025.
- [36] Takaaki Fujita and Florentin Smarandache. Exploring concepts of hyperfuzzy, hyperneutrosophic, and hyperplithogenic sets (ii). 2025.
- [37] Takaaki Fujita and Florentin Smarandache. *Plithogenic Superhypersoft Set and Plithogenic Forest SuperHypersoft Set*. Infinite Study, 2025.
- [38] Takaaki Fujita and Florentin Smarandache. Superhypergraph neural networks and plithogenic graph neural networks: Theoretical foundations. 2025.
- [39] Oswaldo Edison García Brito, Andrea Sofia Ribadeneira Vacacela, Carmen Hortensia Sánchez Burneo, and Mónica Cecilia Jimbo Galarza. English for specific purposes in the medical sciences to strengthen the professional profile of the higher education medicine student: a knowledge representation using superhypersoft sets. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 74(1):10, 2024.
- [40] W-L Gau and Daniel J Buehrer. Vague sets. *IEEE transactions on systems, man, and cybernetics*, 23(2):610–614, 1993.
- [41] Daniela Gifu. Soft sets extensions: Innovating healthcare claims analysis. *Applied Sciences*, 14(19):8799, 2024.
- [42] Robert Gross, Matthew Leach, and Ausilio Bauen. Progress in renewable energy. *Environment international*, 29(1):105–122, 2003.
- [43] Graham Houghton. Developing sustainable urban development models. *Cities*, 14(4):189–195, 1997.
- [44] Sunil Herat. Sustainable management of electronic waste (e-waste). *Clean–Soil, Air, Water*, 35(4):305–310, 2007.
- [45] SK Alamgir Hossain, Md Anisur Rahman, and M Anwar Hossain. Edge computing framework for enabling situation awareness in iot based smart city. *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, 122:226–237, 2018.
- [46] John B Houlihan. International supply chain management. *International journal of physical distribution & materials management*, 15(1):22–38, 1985.
- [47] Muhammad Ihsan, Atiqe Ur Rahman, and Muhammad Haris Saeed. Hypersoft expert set with application in decision making for recruitment process. 2021.
- [48] Pablo Andrés Jaramillo Arias, Carlos Javier Torres Miño, Jorge Israel Rivadeneira Cepeda, and Hugo Xavier Cuesta Subia. Analysis of genetic components of late blight resistance (*phytophthora infestans*) in potatoes (*solanum phureja*) from cutuglahua, pichincha, using neutrosophic superhypersoft sets. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 74(1):30, 2024.
- [49] Jinta Jose, Bobin George, and Rajesh K Thumbakara. Soft graphs: A comprehensive survey. *New Mathematics and Natural Computation*, pages 1–52, 2024.
- [50] Muhammad Ahmad Khan, Muhammad Zain Yousaf, Min Luo, Wu Wenhuan, Sohrab Mirsaedi, and Kashem M Muttaqi. Ai-driven optimization approach for enhanced performance of power converters through efficient controller tuning. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Energy Technologies for Future Grids (ETFG)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [51] Peeranart Kiddee, Ravi Naidu, and Ming H Wong. Electronic waste management approaches: An overview. *Waste management*, 33(5):1237–1250, 2013.
- [52] Naveen Kodakandla. Scaling ai responsibly: Leveraging mlops for sustainable machine learning deployments. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, 13(1):3447–3455, 2024.
- [53] Daniel Leuthe, Tim Meyer-Hollatz, Tobias Plank, and Anja Senkmüller. Towards sustainability of ai-identifying design patterns for sustainable machine learning development. *Information systems frontiers*, pages 1–43, 2024.
- [54] Hongling Liu, Guanghong Zhou, Ronald Wennersten, and Björn Frostell. Analysis of sustainable urban development approaches in china. *Habitat international*, 41:24–32, 2014.
- [55] Changchun Long, Yang Cao, Tao Jiang, and Qian Zhang. Edge computing framework for cooperative video processing in multimedia iot systems. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 20(5):1126–1139, 2017.
- [56] Pradip Kumar Maji, Ranjit Biswas, and A Ranjan Roy. Soft set theory. *Computers & mathematics with applications*, 45(4-5):555–562, 2003.

- [57] Nivetha Martin and Florentin Smarandache. *Concentric plithogenic hypergraph based on plithogenic hypersoft sets—A novel outlook*. Infinite Study, 2020.
- [58] Nivetha Martin and Florentin Smarandache. Introduction to combined plithogenic hypersoft sets. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 35:503–510, 2020.
- [59] John T Mentzer, William DeWitt, James S Keebler, Soonhong Min, Nancy W Nix, Carlo D Smith, and Zach G Zacharia. Defining supply chain management. *Journal of Business logistics*, 22(2):1–25, 2001.
- [60] Mona Mohamed, Alaa Elmor, Florentin Smarandache, and Ahmed A Metwaly. An efficient superhypersoft framework for evaluating llms-based secure blockchain platforms. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 72:1–21, 2024.
- [61] Dmitriy Molodtsov. Soft set theory-first results. *Computers & mathematics with applications*, 37(4-5):19–31, 1999.
- [62] Vamshi Bharath Munagandla, Sai Surya Varshika Dandyala, Bharath Chandra Vadde, and DevOps Engineer. Ai-driven optimization of research proposal systems in higher education. *Revista de Inteligencia Artificial en Medicina*, 15(1):650–672, 2024.
- [63] Sagvan Y Musa and Baravan A Asaad. Topological structures via bipolar hypersoft sets. *Journal of Mathematics*, 2022(1):2896053, 2022.
- [64] Zdzislaw Pawlak. Rough sets. *International journal of computer & information sciences*, 11:341–356, 1982.
- [65] Zdzislaw Pawlak. Rough set theory and its applications to data analysis. *Cybernetics & Systems*, 29(7):661–688, 1998.
- [66] Zdzislaw Pawlak, Jerzy Grzymala-Busse, Roman Slowinski, and Wojciech Ziarko. Rough sets. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(11):88–95, 1995.
- [67] Zdzislaw Pawlak, S. K. Michael Wong, Wojciech Ziarko, et al. Rough sets: probabilistic versus deterministic approach. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 29(1):81–95, 1988.
- [68] Damien Power. Supply chain management integration and implementation: a literature review. *Supply chain management: an International journal*, 10(4):252–263, 2005.
- [69] Erik Riedel, Christos Faloutsos, Garth A Gibson, and David Nagle. Active disks for large-scale data processing. *Computer*, 34(6):68–74, 2002.
- [70] Muhammad Saeed, Muhammad Khubab Siddique, Muhammad Ahsan, Muhammad Rayees Ahmad, and Atiqe Ur Rahman. A novel approach to the rudiments of hypersoft graphs. *Theory and Application of Hypersoft Set*, Pons Publication House, Brussel, pages 203–214, 2021.
- [71] Sherif Sakr, Anna Liu, and Ayman G Fayoumi. The family of mapreduce and large-scale data processing systems. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 46(1):1–44, 2013.
- [72] P Sathya, Nivetha Martin, and Florentine Smarandache. Plithogenic forest hypersoft sets in plithogenic contradiction based multi-criteria decision making. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 73:668–693, 2024.
- [73] Prem Kumar Singh. Plithogenic set for multi-variable data analysis. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science*, 2020.
- [74] Prem Kumar Singh. Complex plithogenic set. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science*, 2022.
- [75] F. Smarandache. Introduction to superhyperalgebra and neutrosophic superhyperalgebra. *Journal of Algebraic Hyperstructures and Logical Algebras*, 2022.
- [76] Florentin Smarandache. Neutrosophy: neutrosophic probability, set, and logic: analytic synthesis & synthetic analysis. 1998.
- [77] Florentin Smarandache. A unifying field in logics: Neutrosophic logic. In *Philosophy*, pages 1–141. American Research Press, 1999.
- [78] Florentin Smarandache. Extension of soft set to hypersoft set, and then to plithogenic hypersoft set. *Neutrosophic sets and systems*, 22(1):168–170, 2018.
- [79] Florentin Smarandache. Extension of soft set to hypersoft set, and then to plithogenic hypersoft set. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 22:168–170, 2018.
- [80] Florentin Smarandache. *Plithogenic set, an extension of crisp, fuzzy, intuitionistic fuzzy, and neutrosophic sets-revisited*. Infinite study, 2018.
- [81] Florentin Smarandache. Plithogeny, plithogenic set, logic, probability, and statistics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.03948*, 2018.
- [82] Florentin Smarandache. *Practical applications of IndetermSoft Set and IndetermHyperSoft Set and introduction to TreeSoft Set as an extension of the MultiSoft Set*. Infinite Study, 2022.
- [83] Florentin Smarandache. Foundation of the superhypersoft set and the fuzzy extension superhypersoft set: A new vision. *Neutrosophic Systems with Applications*, 11:48–51, 2023.
- [84] Florentin Smarandache. *SuperHyperFunction, SuperHyperStructure, Neutrosophic SuperHyperFunction and Neutrosophic SuperHyperStructure: Current understanding and future directions*. Infinite Study, 2023.
- [85] Florentin Smarandache. The cardinal of the m-powerset of a set of n elements used in the superhyperstructures and neutrosophic superhyperstructures. *Systems Assessment and Engineering Management*, 2:19–22, 2024.
- [86] Florentin Smarandache. Foundation of superhyperstructure & neutrosophic superhyperstructure. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 63(1):21, 2024.
- [87] Florentin Smarandache and Said Broumi. *Neutrosophic graph theory and algorithms*. IGI Global, 2019.
- [88] Florentin Smarandache and NM Gallup. Generalization of the intuitionistic fuzzy set to the neutrosophic set. In *International Conference on Granular Computing*, pages 8–42. Citeseer, 2006.
- [89] Florentin Smarandache and Daniela Gifu. The power of soft set extensions with healthcare claims data.
- [90] Florentin Smarandache and Nivetha Martin. Plithogenic n-super hypergraph in novel multi-attribute decision making. *International Journal of Neutrosophic Science*, 2020.
- [91] Florentin Smarandache, A. Saranya, A. Kalavathi, and S. Krishnaprakash. Neutrosophic superhypersoft sets. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 77:41–53, 2024.
- [92] Bent Sorensen. *Renewable energy*. Elsevier, 2004.

- [93] S Sudha, Nivetha Martin, and Florentin Smarandache. *Applications of Extended Plithogenic Sets in Plithogenic Sociogram*. Infinite Study, 2023.
- [94] S Sudha, Nivetha Martin, and Florentin Smarandache. State of art of plithogeny multi criteria decision making methods. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 56(1):27, 2023.
- [95] Pia Tanskanen. Management and recycling of electronic waste. *Acta materialia*, 61(3):1001–1011, 2013.
- [96] Devendra Kumar Tayal, Sumit Kumar Yadav, and Divya Arora. Personalized ranking of products using aspect-based sentiment analysis and plithogenic sets. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 82:1261–1287, 2022.
- [97] Xiaokang Wang, Laurence T Yang, Xia Xie, Jirong Jin, and M Jamal Deen. A cloud-edge computing framework for cyber-physical-social services. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 55(11):80–85, 2017.
- [98] Xinzheng Xu, Tianming Liang, Jiong Zhu, Dong Zheng, and Tongfeng Sun. Review of classical dimensionality reduction and sample selection methods for large-scale data processing. *Neurocomputing*, 328:5–15, 2019.
- [99] Tan Yigitcanlar and Suharto Teriman. Rethinking sustainable urban development: towards an integrated planning and development process. *International journal of environmental science and technology*, 12:341–352, 2015.
- [100] Lotfi A Zadeh. Fuzzy sets. *Information and control*, 8(3):338–353, 1965.
- [101] Lotfi A Zadeh. Fuzzy sets and their application to pattern classification and clustering analysis. In *Classification and clustering*, pages 251–299. Elsevier, 1977.
- [102] Lotfi A Zadeh. Fuzzy sets versus probability. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 68(3):421–421, 1980.
- [103] Lotfi A Zadeh. Fuzzy logic, neural networks, and soft computing. In *Fuzzy sets, fuzzy logic, and fuzzy systems: selected papers by Lotfi A Zadeh*, pages 775–782. World Scientific, 1996.
- [104] Lotfi Asker Zadeh. Fuzzy sets as a basis for a theory of possibility. *Fuzzy sets and systems*, 1(1):3–28, 1978.
- [105] Yue Zhao. Enhanced exprom methodology using superhypersoft sets for evaluating the quality of cultural industry development in the digital economy with single-valued neutrosophic sets. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 79:342–354, 2025.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The perspectives, opinions, and data shared in all publications are the sole responsibility of the individual authors and contributors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of Sciences Force or the editorial team. Sciences Force and the editorial team disclaim any liability for potential harm to individuals or property resulting from the ideas, methods, instructions, or products referenced in the content.