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#### Abstract

In this note first we define a $B C K$-algebra on the states of a deterministic finite automaton. Then we show that it is a $B C K$-algebra with condition ( S ) and also it is a positive implicative $B C K$-algebra. Then we find some quotient $B C K$-algebras of it. After that we introduce a hyper $B C K$-algebra on the set of all equivalence classes of an equivalence relation on the states of a deterministic finite automaton and we prove that this hyper $B C K$-algebra is simple, strong normal and implicative. Finally we define a semi continuous deterministic finite automaton. Then we introduce a hyper $B C K$-algebra $S$ on the states of this automaton and we show that $S$ is a weak normal hyper $B C K$-algebra.
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## 1. Introduction

The hyper algebraic structure theory was introduced by F. Marty [9] in 1934. Imai and Iseki [6] in 1966 introduced the notion of $B C K$-algebra. Meng and

[^0]Jun [10] defined the quotient hyper $B C K$-algebras in 1994. Torkzadeh, Roodbari and Zahedi [12] introduced the hyper stabilizers and normal hyper $B C K$ algebras. Corsini and Leoreanu [4] found some connections between a deterministic finite automaton and the hyper algebraic structure theory. Now in this note first we introduce a $B C K$-algebra on the states of a deterministic finite automaton and we prove some theorems and obtain some related results. Also we define a hyper $B C K$-algebra on the set of all equivalence classes of an equivalence relation on the states of a deterministic finite automaton. Finally we introduce a hyper $B C K$-algebra on the states of a semi continuous deterministic finite automaton.

## 2. Preliminaries

Definition 2.1. [10] Let $X$ be a set with a binary operation "*" and a constant " 0 ". Then $(X, *, 0)$ is called a $B C K$-algebra if it satisfies the following condition:
(i) $((x * y) *(x * z)) *(z * y)=0$,
(ii) $(x *(x * y)) * y=0$,
(iii) $x * x=0$,
(iv) $0 * x=0$,
(v) $x * y=0$ and $y * x=0$ imply $x=y$.

For all $x, y, z \in X$.
For brevity we also call $X$ a $B C K$-algebra. If in $X$ we define a binary relation" $\leq$
" by $x \leq y$ if and only if $x * y=0$, then $(X, *, 0)$ is a $B C K$-algebra if and only
if it satisfies the following axioms for all $x, y, z \in X$; ;
(I) $(x * y) *(x * z) \leq z * y$,
(II) $x *(x * y) \leq y$,
(III) $x \leq x$,
(IV) $0 \leq x$,
(V) $x \leq y$ and $y \leq x$ imply $x=y$.

Definition 2.2. [10] Given a $B C K$-algebra $(X, *, 0)$ and given elements $a, b$ of $X$, we define

$$
A(a, b)=\{x \in X \mid x * a \leq b\}
$$

If for all $x, y$ in $X, A(x, y)$ has a greatest element then the $B C K$-algebra is called to be with condition $(S)$.
Definition 2.3. [10] Let $(X, *, 0)$ be a $B C K$-algebra and let $I$ be a nonempty subset of $X$. Then $I$ is called to be an ideal of $X$ if, for all $x, y$ in $X$,
(i) $0 \in I$,
(ii) $x * y \in I$ and $y \in I$ imply $x \in I$.

Theorem 2.4. [10] Let $I$ be an ideal of $B C K$-algebra $X$. if we define the relation $\sim_{I}$ on $X$ as follows:

$$
x \sim_{I} y \text { if and only if } x o y \in I \text { and } y \text { o } x \in I
$$

Then $\sim_{I}$ is a congruence relation on $H$.
Definition 2.5. [10] Let $(X, *, 0)$ be a $B C K$-algebra, $I$ be an ideal of $X$ and $\sim_{I}$ be an equivalence relation on $X$. we denote the equivalence class containing $x$ by $C_{x}$ and we denote $X / I$ by $\left\{C_{x}: x \in H\right\}$. Also we define the operation * $: X / I \times X / I \rightarrow X / I$ as follows:

$$
C_{x} * C_{y} \longrightarrow C_{x * y}
$$

Theorem 2.6. [10] Let $I$ be an ideal of $B C K$-algebra $X$. Then $I=C_{0}$.
Theorem 2.7. [10] Let $(X, *, 0)$ be a $B C K$-algebra and $I$ be an ideal of $X$. Then $\left(X / I, *, C_{0}\right)$ is a $B C K$-algebra.
Definition 2.8. [10] A $B C K$-algebra $(X, *, 0)$ is called positive implicative if it satisfies the following axiom:

$$
(x * z) *(y * z)=(x * y) * z
$$

for all $x, y, z \in X$.
Definition 2.9. [10] A nonempty subset $I$ of a $B C K$-algebra $X$ is called a varlet ideal of $X$ if
(VI1) $x \in I$ and $y \leq x$ imply $y \in I$,
(VI2) $x \in I$ and $y \in I$ imply that there exists $z \in I$ such that $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$.
Definition 2.10. [8] Let $H$ be a nonempty set and "o" be a hyper operation on $H$, that is "o" is a function from $H \times H$ to $\mathcal{P}^{*}(H)=\mathcal{P}(H)-\{\emptyset\}$. Then $H$ is called a hyper $B C K$-algebra if it contains a constant " 0 " and satisfies the following axioms:
(HK1) $(x \circ z) \circ(y \circ z) \ll x \circ y$,
(HK2) $(x \circ y) \circ z=(x \circ z)$ ○ $y$,
(HK3) $x$ o $H \ll\{x\}$,
(HK4) $x \ll y, y \ll x \Longrightarrow x=y$.
For all $x, y, z \in H$, where $x \ll y$ is defined by $0 \in x o y$ and for every $A, B \subseteq$ $H, A \ll B$ is defined by $\forall a \in A, \exists b \in B$ Such that $a \ll b$.
Theorem 2.11. [2] In a hyper $B C K$-algebra ( $H, o, 0$ ), the condition (HK3) is equivalent to the condition:
$x$ o $y \ll\{x\}$ for all $x, y \in H$.
Definition 2.12. [7] Let $I$ be a non-empty subset of a hyper $B C K$-algebra $H$ and $0 \in I$. Then,
(1) $I$ is called a weak hyper $B C K$-ideal of $H$ if $x$ o $y \subseteq I$ and $y \in I$ imply that $x \in$ $I$, for all $x, y \in H$.
(2) $I$ is called a hyper $B C K$-ideal of $H$ if $x$ o $y \ll I$ and $y \in I$ imply that $x \in$ $I$, for all $x, y \in H$.
(3) $I$ is called a strong hyper $B C K$-ideal of $H$ if $(x \circ y) \cap I \neq \emptyset$ and $y \in$ $I$ imply that $x \in I$, for all $x, y \in H$.
Theorem 2.13. [7] Any strong hyper $B C K$-ideal of a hyper $B C K$-algebra $H$ is a hyper $B C K$-ideal and a weak hyper $B C K$-ideal. Also any hyper $B C K$-ideal of a hyper $B C K$-algebra $H$ is a weak hyper $B C K$-ideal.
Definition 2.14. [12] Let $H$ be a hyper $B C K$-algebra and $A$ be a nonempty subset of $H$. Then the $\operatorname{sets}_{l} A=\{x \in H \mid a \in a$ o $x \quad \forall a \in A\}$ and $A_{r}=$ $\{x \in H \mid x \in x$ o a $\forall a \in A\}$ are called left hyper $B C K$-stabilizer of $A$ and right hyper $B C K$-stabilizer of $A$, respectively.
Definition 2.15. [12] A hyper $B C K$-algebra $H$ is called:
(i) Weak normal, if $a_{r}$ is a weak hyper $B C K$-ideal of $H$ for any element $a \in H$.
(ii) Normal, if $a_{r}$ is a hyper $B C K$-ideal of $H$ for any element $a \in H$.
(iii) Strong normal, if $a_{r}$ is a strong hyper $B C K$-ideal of $H$ for any element $a \in$ $H$.
Definition 2.16. [11] A hyper $B C K$-algebra ( $H, o, 0$ ) is called simple if for all distinct elements $a, b \in H-\{0\}, \quad a \not \leq b$ and $b \not \leq a$.
Definition 2.17. [2] A hyper $B C K$-algebra ( $H, o, 0$ ) is called:
(i) Weak positive implicative (resp. positive implicative), if it satisfies the axiom

$$
(x \circ z) \circ(y \circ z) \ll((x \circ y) \circ z)(\operatorname{resp} . \quad(x \circ z) \circ(y \circ z)=(x \circ y) \circ z)
$$

for all $x, y, z \in H$.
(ii) Implicative. if $x \ll x \circ$ ( $y \circ x$ ), for all $x, y, z \in H$.

Definition 2.18. [5] A deterministic finite automaton consists of:
(i) A finite set of states, often denoted by $S$.
(ii) A finite set of input symbols, often denoted by $M$.
(iii) A transition function that takes as arguments a state and an input symbol and returns a state. The transition function will commonly be denoted by $t$, and in fact $t: S \times M \rightarrow S$ is a function.
(iv) A start state, one of the states in $S$ such as $s_{0}$.
(v) A set of final or accepting states $F$. The set $F$ is a subset of $S$.

For simplicity of notation we write $\left(S, M, s_{0}, F, t\right)$ for a deterministic finite automaton.
Remark 2.19. [5] Let $\left(S, M, s_{0}, F, t\right)$ be a deterministic finite automaton. A word of $M$ is the product of a finite sequence of elements in $M, \lambda$ is empty word and $M^{*}$ is the set of all words on $M$. We define recursively the extended transition function, $t^{*}: S \times M^{*} \longrightarrow S$, as follows:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\forall s \in S, \forall a \in M, t^{*}(s, a)=t(s, a), \\
\forall s \in S, t^{*}(s, \lambda)=s
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\forall s \in S, \forall x \in M^{*}, \forall a \in M, t^{*}(s, a x)=t^{*}(t(s, a), x) .
$$

Note that the length $\ell(x)$ of a word $x \in M^{*}$ is the number of its letters. so $\ell(\lambda)=0$ and $\ell\left(a_{1} a_{2}\right)=2$, where $a_{1}, a_{2} \in M$.
Definition 2.20. [4] The state $s$ of $S-\left\{s_{0}\right\}$ will be called connected to the state $s_{0}$ of $S$ if there exists $x \in M^{*}$, such that $s=t^{*}\left(s_{0}, x\right)$.

## 3. $B C K$-ALGEBRAS INDUCED BY A DETERMINISTIC FINITE AUTOMATON

In this section we present some relationships between $B C K$-algebras and deterministic finite automata.
Definition 3.1. Let $\left(S, M, s_{0}, F, t\right)$ be a deterministic finite automaton. If $s \in S-\left\{s_{0}\right\}$ is connected to $s_{0}$, then the order of a state $s$ is the natural number $l+1$, where $l=\min \left\{\ell(x) \mid t^{*}\left(s_{0}, x\right)=s, \quad x \in M^{*}\right\}$, and if $s \in$ $S-\left\{s_{0}\right\}$ is not connected to $s_{0}$ we suppose that the order of $s$ is 1 . Also we suppose that the order of $s_{0}$ is 0 .
We denote the order of a state $s$ by ord $s$.
Now, we define the relation $\sim$ on the set of states $S$, as follows:

$$
s_{1} \sim s_{2} \Leftrightarrow \text { ord } s_{1}=\text { ord } s_{2}
$$

It is obvious that this relation is an equivalence relation on $S$.
Note that we denote the equivalence class of $s$ by $\bar{s}$. Also we denote the set of all these classes by $\bar{S}$.
Theorem 3.2. Let $\left(S, M, s_{0}, F, t\right)$ be a deterministic finite automaton. We define the following operation on $S$ :
$\forall\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right) \in S^{2}, \quad s_{1}$ os $_{2}= \begin{cases}s_{0}, & \text { if ord } s_{1}<\text { ord } s_{2}, \quad s_{1}, s_{2} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{1} \neq s_{2} \\ s_{1}, & \text { if ord } s_{1} \geq \text { ord } s_{2}, \quad s_{1}, s_{2} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{1} \neq s_{2} \\ s_{0}, & \text { if } s_{1}=s_{2} \\ s_{0}, & \text { if } s_{1}=s_{0}, \quad s_{2} \neq s_{0} \\ s_{1}, & \text { if } s_{2}=s_{0}, \quad s_{1} \neq s_{0}\end{cases}$
Then $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ is a $B C K$-algebra and $s_{0}$ is the zero element of $S$.
Proof. By definition of the operation ' $o$ ', we know that $t o t=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} o t=s_{0}$ for all $t \in S$. So ( $S, o, s_{0}$ ) satisfies (III) and (IV).
Now we consider the following situations to show that ( $S, o, s_{0}$ ) satisfies (I) and (II).
(i) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$ and ord $s_{1}<$ ord $s_{2}<\operatorname{ord} s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{0} \circ s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{3}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.

On the other hand, $s_{1} \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Hence, in this case (II) holds.
(ii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$ and ord $s_{2}<$ ord $s_{1}<\operatorname{ord} s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) \circ\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{1} \circ s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{3}$ o $s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{1} \circ s_{3}=s_{0}$ we get that $s_{1} \leq s_{3}$. Thus in this case (I) holds.
Also $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Therefore in this case (II) holds.
(iii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$ and ord $s_{2}<$ ord $s_{3}<$ ord $s_{1}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{3}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. So in this case (II) holds.
(iv) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$ and ord $s_{1}<$ ord $s_{3}<$ ord $s_{2}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{0} \circ s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we get that in this case (I) holds. Also $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Hence, in this case (II) holds.
(v) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$ and ord $s_{3}<$ ord $s_{1}<$ ord $s_{2}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{0} o s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Thus in this case (II) holds.
(vi) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$ and ord $s_{3}<$ ord $s_{2}<$ ord $s_{1}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we get that in this case (I) holds. Also $s_{1} \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. So in this case (II) holds. (vii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}=$ ord $s_{2}<$ ord $s_{3}$ and $s_{1} \neq s_{2}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{1} o s_{3}=s_{0}$ we get that $s_{1} \leq s_{3}$. So in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} \circ\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Therefore in this case (II) holds.
(viii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}=$ ord $s_{2}>$ ord $s_{3}$ and $s_{1} \neq s_{2}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we get that in this case (I) holds.
Also $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Hence, in this case (II) holds.
(ix) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}=$ ord $s_{3}<$ ord $s_{2}$ and $s_{1} \neq s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{0} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Thus in this case (II) holds.
(x) $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}=$ ord $s_{3}>$ ord $s_{2}$ and $s_{1} \neq s_{3}$.

Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{3}$ we get that in this case (I) holds.

Also $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. So in this case (II) holds. (xi) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{2}=$ ord $s_{3}>$ ord $s_{1}$ and $s_{2} \neq s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{0} o s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{3}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} \circ\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Therefore in this case (II) holds.
(xii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{2}=$ ord $s_{3}<\operatorname{ord} s_{1}$ and $s_{2} \neq s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{3}$ we get that in this case (I) holds.
Also $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Hence, in this case (II) holds.
(xiii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}=$ ord $s_{2}=$ ord $s_{3}$ and $s_{1} \neq s_{2} \neq s_{3} \neq s_{1}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{3}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1}$ o $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Thus in this case (II) holds.
(xiv) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}=$ ord $s_{3}, s_{1} \neq s_{3}$ and $s_{1}=s_{2}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{0} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{3}$ we get that in this case (I) holds.
Also $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. So in this case (II) holds. (xv) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}=$ ord $s_{2}, s_{1} \neq s_{2}$ and $s_{1}=s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{1} \circ s_{3}=s_{0}$ we get that $s_{1} \leq s_{3}$. So in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Therefore in this case (II) holds.
(xvi) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}=$ ord $s_{2}, s_{1} \neq s_{2}$ and $s_{2}=s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we get that in this case (I) holds.
Also $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Hence, in this case (II) holds.
(xvii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}<$ ord $s_{3}$ and $s_{1}=s_{2}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{0} \circ s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{3}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Thus in this case (II) holds.
(xviii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}>$ ord $s_{3}$ and $s_{1}=s_{2}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{0} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we get that in this case (I) holds. Also $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. So in this case (II) holds. (xix) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}<$ ord $s_{2}$ and $s_{1}=s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{0} \circ s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.

On the other hand, $s_{1} \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Therefore in this case (II) holds.
$(\mathrm{xx})$ Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}>$ ord $s_{2}$ and $s_{1}=s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{1} \circ s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{3}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{1} \leq s_{1}$ we get that in this case (I) holds.
Also $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Hence, in this case (II) holds.
(xxi) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}<$ ord $s_{2}$ and $s_{2}=s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{0} \circ s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Thus in this case (II) holds.
(xxii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$, ord $s_{1}>$ ord $s_{2}$ and $s_{2}=s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we get that in this case (I) holds. Also $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. So in this case (II) holds. (xxiii) Let $s_{1}=s_{2}=s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=s_{0} o s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Therefore in this case (II) holds.
(xxiv) Let $s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=s_{0} o s_{0}=s_{0}$. Let $s_{3} o s_{2}=t$ and $t \in S$. Since $s_{0} \leq t$ we get that in this case (I) holds.
Also $s_{1} \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{0} \circ s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Hence, in this case (II) holds.
(xxv) Let $s_{2}=s_{0}, \quad s_{1}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}$. Since $s_{1}$ o $s_{3}=s_{1}$ or $s_{1}$ o $s_{3}=s_{0}$, we have two cases:
(6) $\left(s_{1}\right.$ o $\left.s_{2}\right)$ o $\left(s_{1}\right.$ o $\left.s_{3}\right)=s_{1}$ o $s_{1}=s_{0}$. We know that $s_{3}$ o $s_{2}=s_{3}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{3}$ we conclude that in this case (I) holds.
(7) $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{0}=s_{1}$. We know that $s_{3} o s_{2}=s_{3}$ and in this case $s_{1} \circ s_{3}=s_{0}$. So $s_{1} \leq s_{3}$ and (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{1} o s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Thus in this case (II) holds.
(xxvi) Let $s_{3}=s_{0}$ and $s_{1}, s_{2} \neq s_{0}$. Since $s_{1}$ o $s_{2}=s_{1}$ or $s_{1}$ o $s_{2}=s_{0}$, we obtain that $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=s_{1} o s_{1}=s_{0}$ or $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=s_{0} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$. Also $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we conclude that in this case (I) holds.
The proof of (II) is studied in other cases.
(xxvii) Let $s_{1} \neq s_{0}$ and $s_{2}=s_{3}=s_{0}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=s_{1}$ o $s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Therefore in this case (II) holds.
(xxviii) Let $s_{3} \neq s_{0}$ and $s_{1}=s_{2}=s_{0}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) o\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)=s_{0} o s_{0}=s_{0}$. and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we get that in this case (I) holds.

Also $s_{1} \circ\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right)=s_{0} \circ s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Hence, in this case (II) holds.
(xxix) Let $s_{2} \neq s_{0}$ and $s_{1}=s_{3}=s_{0}$. Then $\left(\begin{array}{lll}s_{1} & o & s_{2}\end{array}\right) o\left(\begin{array}{lll}s_{1} & o & s_{3}\end{array}\right)=s_{0} o s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{3} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \leq s_{0}$ we obtain that in this case (I) holds.
On the other hand, $s_{1} o\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)=s_{0} o s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Thus in this case (II) holds.
So we conclude that ( $S, o, s_{0}$ ) satisfies (I) and (II).
To prove (V), Let $s_{1} \leq s_{2}$ and $s_{2} \leq s_{1}$. If $s_{1}=s_{2}$, then we are done. Otherwise, since $s_{1} \leq s_{2}$, there exist two cases:
(i) ord $s_{1}<$ ord $s_{2}, \quad s_{1}, s_{2} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{1} \neq s_{2}$. Then $s_{2} o s_{1}=s_{2}$. Therefore $s_{2} \not \leq s_{1}$, which is a contradiction.
(ii) $s_{1}=s_{0}, s_{2} \neq s_{0}$. Then $s_{2} o s_{1}=s_{2} o s_{0}=s_{2}$. Thus $s_{2} \not \leq s_{1}$, which is a contradiction.
So we show that $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ is a $B C K$-algebra.
Example 3.3. Let $A=\left(S, M, s_{0}, F, t\right)$ be a deterministic finite automaton such that $S=\left\{q_{0}, q_{1}, q_{2}, q_{3}\right\}, M=\{a, b\}, s_{0}=q_{0}, F=\left\{q_{1}, q_{3}\right\}$ and $t$ is defiend by


Figure 1

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t\left(q_{0}, a\right)=q_{1}, t\left(q_{0}, b\right)=q_{2}, t\left(q_{1}, a\right)=q_{2}, t\left(q_{1}, b\right)=q_{3} \\
& t\left(q_{2}, a\right)=q_{3}, t\left(q_{2}, b\right)=q_{3}, t\left(q_{3}, a\right)=q_{3}, t\left(q_{3}, b\right)=q_{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

It is easy to see that ord $q_{1}=$ ord $q_{2}=2$, ord $q_{3}=3$ and ord $q_{0}=0$. According to the definition of operation "o" which is defined in Theorem 3.2, we have the following table:

Table 1.

| O | $q_{0}$ | $q_{1}$ | $q_{2}$ | $q_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $q_{0}$ | $q_{0}$ | $q_{0}$ | $q_{0}$ | $q_{0}$ |
| $q_{1}$ | $q_{1}$ | $q_{0}$ | $q_{1}$ | $q_{0}$ |
| $q_{2}$ | $q_{2}$ | $q_{2}$ | $q_{0}$ | $q_{0}$ |
| $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{0}$ |

In this section we suppose that $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ is the $B C K$-algebra, which is defined in Theorem 3.2.
Notation. We denote the class of all states which their order is n by $\overline{s_{n}}$.
Theorem 3.4. ( $S, o, s_{0}$ ) is a $B C K$-algebra with condition (S).
Proof: Let $s_{1}, s_{2} \in S$, ord $s_{1}=n$ and ord $s_{2}=m$. Then we should consider following situations:
(1) Let ord $s_{1}<$ ord $s_{2}, \quad s_{1}, s_{2} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{1} \neq s_{2}$. Then $A\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)=$ $\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} \overline{s_{i}} \cup\left\{s_{2}\right\}$ and the greatest element of $A\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$ is $s_{2}$.
(2) Let ord $s_{1} \geq$ ord $s_{2}, \quad s_{1}, s_{2} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{1} \neq s_{2}$. Then $A\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)=$ $\bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \overline{s_{i}} \cup\left\{s_{1}\right\}$ and the greatest element of $A\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$ is $s_{1}$.
(3) $s_{1}=s_{2}$. Then $A\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)=\bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \overline{s_{i}} \cup\left\{s_{1}\right\}$ and the greatest element of $A\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$ is $s_{1}$.
(4) Let $s_{1}=s_{0}, \quad s_{2} \neq s_{0}$. Then $A\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)=\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} \overline{s_{i}} \cup\left\{s_{2}\right\}$ and the greatest element of $A\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$ is $s_{2}$.
(5) Let $s_{1} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{2}=s_{0}$. Then $A\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)=\bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \overline{s_{i}} \cup\left\{s_{1}\right\}$ and the greatest element of $A\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$ is $s_{1}$.
Theorem 3.5. Let $I_{n}=\left\{s \in S \mid s \in \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} \overline{s_{i}}\right\}$ for any $n \in N$. Then $I_{n}$ is an ideal of $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$.
Proof. Suppose that $s_{1} o s_{2} \in I_{n}$ and $s_{2} \in I_{n}$, then we have the following situations:

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{1} \neq s_{2}, s_{2} \neq s_{0} \text { and } \text { ords } s_{2}<o r d s_{1} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

By definition of the operation " 0 ", we know that $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{1}$. So $s_{1} \in I_{n}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{1} \neq s_{2}, s_{2} \neq s_{0} \text { and } \text { ords } s_{2}=\text { ords } s_{1} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $s_{2} \in I_{n}$ and $\overline{s_{2}} \subseteq I_{n}$, we obtain that $s_{1} \in I_{n}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{1} \neq s_{2}, s_{1} \neq s_{0} \text { and } \operatorname{ord} s_{1}<\operatorname{ords}_{2} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

By definition of $I_{n}$, it is easy to see that $s_{1} \in I_{n}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{1}=s_{2} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is clear that $s_{1} \in I_{n}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{2}=s_{0} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

By definition of the operation " o ", we know that $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{1}$. So $s_{1} \in I_{n}$.
(6) $\mathrm{s}_{1}=s_{0}$.

Since $\mathrm{s}_{0} \in I_{n}$, we get that $s_{1} \in I_{n}$.
Also by definition of $I_{n}$, we know that $s_{0} \in I_{n}$. So $I_{n}$ is an ideal of $S$.
Theorem 3.6. Let $I_{n}$ be a set, which is defined in Theorem 3.5. Then $C_{x}=\{x\}$ for all $x \notin I_{n}$.
Proof. Let $x \notin I_{n}$. By Theorem 2.6, we know that $I_{n}=C_{s_{0}}$. So $s_{0} \notin C_{x}$. Now we suppose that $y \in C_{x}$ and $y \neq x$. By definition of the equivalence relation $\sim_{I_{n}}$, we know that $x$ o $y \in I_{n}$ and $y$ o $x \in I_{n}$. Since $x \notin I_{n}$ and $x$ o $y \in I_{n}$, we obtain that ord $x \nsupseteq$ ord $y$. So ord $y>$ ord $x$ and $y$ o $x=y \in I_{n}=C_{s_{0}}$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $y=x$.
Theorem 3.7. Let $I_{n}$ be the ideal of $S$ which is defined in Theorem 3.5. Then $\left(S / I_{n}, *, C_{S_{0}}\right)$ is a $B C K$-algebra.
Proof. By Theorem 2.7, it is obvious that $\left(S / I_{n}, *, C_{s_{0}}\right)$ is a $B C K$-algebra.
Theorem 3.8. $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ is a positive implicative $B C K$-algebra.
Proof. By considering 29 situations which have been stated in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we get that in all cases $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} o s_{3}\right)=\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) o s_{3}$, for all $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \in S$. So $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ is a positive implicative $B C K$-algebra.
Theorem 3.9. Let $n=\max \{$ ord $s \mid s \in S\}$. Then $I=\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} \overline{s_{i}} \cup\{z\}$ for $1 \leq m \leq n$ and $z \in s_{m}$, is a varlet ideal of $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$.
Proof. To prove (VI1), we suppose that $x \in I$ and $y \leq x$. Then $s_{0}=y$ o $x$ and we have three cases:
(6) Let ord $y<$ ord $x, \quad x, y \neq s_{0}$ and $x \neq y$. Then by definition of $I$, it is obvious that $y \in I$.
(7) Let $x=y$. Then it is clear that $y \in I$.
(3) Let $y=s_{0}, x \neq s_{0}$. Then by definition of $I$, it is easy to see that $s_{0}=y \in I$. Therefore (VI1) holds.
Now we show that $I$ satisfies (VI2). let $x \in I, y \in I$ and $x, y \neq z$. Since ord $x<$ ord $z$ and ord $y<$ ord $z$, we get that $x o z=s_{0}$ and $y$ o $z=s_{0}$. So $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$. Also if $x \in I, y \in I, x=z$ and $y \neq z$, then $x o z=z o z=s_{0}$ and $y o z=s_{0}$. Thus $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$. Similarly we can prove that $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$ for the following cases:

$$
\begin{align*}
& x \in I, y \in I, x \neq z \text { and } y=z  \tag{6}\\
& x \in I, y \in I, x=z \text { and } y=z \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

So (VI2) holds.

## 4. Hyper $B C K$-algebras induced by a deterministic finite <br> AUTOMATON

Theorem 4.1. Let $\left(S, M, s_{0}, F, t\right)$ be a deterministic finite automata. We define the following hyper operation on $\bar{S}$ :
$\forall\left(\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{2}}\right) \in \bar{S}^{2}, \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}\overline{s_{1}}, & \text { if } \overline{s_{1}} \neq \overline{s_{2}}, \overline{s_{2}} \neq \overline{s_{0}} \neq \overline{s_{1}} \\ \left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}, & \text { if } \overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{2}} \\ \overline{s_{0}}, & \text { if } \overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{2}} \neq \overline{s_{0}} \\ \overline{s_{1}}, & \text { if } \overline{s_{1}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}} .\end{array}\right.$
Then $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ is a hyper $B C K$-algebra and $\overline{s_{0}}$ is the zero element of $\bar{S}$.
Proof. First we have to consider the following situations to show that ( $\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}$ ) satisfies (HK1) and (HK2).
(i) Let $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{2}}, \overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{2}} \neq \overline{s_{1}} \neq \overline{s_{3}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=$ $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$. Since $\bar{s} o \bar{s}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \bar{s}\right\}$ we obtain that $\bar{s} \ll \bar{s}$ for any $\bar{s} \in \bar{S}$. So $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $\left.\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{1}}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}}$. Thus in this case (HK2) holds.
(ii) Let $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{2}}, \overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{2}} \neq \overline{s_{3}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$. So $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\} o \overline{s_{3}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=$ $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$. Therefore in this case (HK2) holds.
(iii) Let $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{2}}, \overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{2}}$.

Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\} o \overline{s_{2}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}}$. Since $\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ we obtain that $\overline{s_{0}} \ll \overline{s_{1}}$ and also we know that $\overline{s_{1}} \ll \overline{s_{1}}$. Hence, $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ ) $o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\} o \overline{s_{2}}=$ $\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$. So in this case (HK2) holds.
(iv) Let $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{2}}, \overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{1}}$.
$\operatorname{Then}\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=\overline{s_{1}} o\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{2}}\right\}=\overline{s_{1}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}}$. Thus $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case (HK1) holds.

On the other hand, $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{1}}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=$ $\overline{s_{1}}$. Therefore in this case (HK2) holds.
(v) Let $\overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{3}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\} o\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}=$ $\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$. So $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK1).
Also $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{1}}\right) o \overline{s_{1}}=\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}$. Hence, in this case $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK2).
(vi) Let $\overline{s_{2}}, \overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}, \quad \overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{2}} \neq \overline{s_{3}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \circ\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=$ $\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}}$. Thus $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{2}}=$ $\overline{s_{0}}$. So in this case (HK2) holds.
(vii) Let $\overline{s_{2}}, \overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}, \quad \overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{3}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=$ $\overline{s_{0}} o\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{2}}\right\}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}}$. Therefore $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll$ $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK1).
$\operatorname{Also}\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}}$. So in this case $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK2).
(viii) Let $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}, \quad \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} \neq \overline{s_{3}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=$ $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{0}}=\overline{s_{1}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{0}}=\overline{s_{1}}$. Hence, $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{1}}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{0}}=$ $\overline{s_{1}}$. Thus in this case (HK2) holds.
(ix) Let $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}, \quad \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{3}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=$ $\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\} o \overline{s_{0}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{0}}=\overline{s_{1}}$. Since $\overline{s_{0}} \ll \overline{s_{1}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} \ll \overline{s_{1}}$ we obtain that $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK1).
Also $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\} o \overline{s_{0}}=$ $\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$. Hence, in this case $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK2).
(x) Let $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{2}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} \neq \overline{s_{2}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=$ $\overline{s_{1}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}}$. Therefore $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{0}}=\overline{s_{1}}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=$ $\overline{s_{1}}$. So in this case (HK2) holds.
(xi) Let $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{2}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}, \quad \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{2}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=$ $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$. Since $\overline{s_{0}} \ll \overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} \ll \overline{s_{1}}$ we get that $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK1).
Also $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$ o $\overline{s_{0}}=\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=$ $\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$. Thus in this case $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK2).
(xii) Let $\overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{3}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{0}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}}$. Therefore $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case (HK1) holds.

On the other hand, $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{0}}=$ $\overline{s_{0}}$. Hence, in this case (HK2) holds.
(xiii) Let $\overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{2}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}}$. So $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK1).
On the other hand, $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{0}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{0}} o \overline{s_{2}}=$ $\overline{s_{0}}$. Thus this case $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK2).
(xiv) Let $\overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{0}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}$. Then $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right)=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{0}}=\overline{s_{1}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}}$. Therefore $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) \ll \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}\right) o \overline{s_{3}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{0}}=\overline{s_{1}}$ and $\left(\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{3}}\right) o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{0}}=$ $\overline{s_{1}}$. Hence, in this case (HK2) holds.
So we show that $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK1) and (HK2).
Now we should prove that $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK3). By Theorem 2.11, it is enough to show that $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}} \ll \overline{s_{1}}$ for all $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{2}} \in \bar{S}$. By definition of the hyper operation "o" we know that $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ is equal to $\overline{s_{1}}$ or $\left\{\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{1}}\right\}$ or $\overline{s_{0}}$ for any $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{2}} \in \bar{S}$. Also we know that $\overline{s_{1}} \ll \overline{s_{1}}$ and $\overline{s_{0}} \ll \overline{s_{1}}$.
Hence $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ satisfies (HK3).
To prove (HK4), Let $\overline{s_{1}} \ll \overline{s_{2}}$ and $\overline{s_{2}} \ll \overline{s_{1}}$. If $\overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{2}}$, then we are done. Otherwise, since $\overline{s_{1}} \ll \overline{s_{2}}$, we obtain that $\overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{0}}, \overline{s_{2}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}$. So $\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{1}}=$ $\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{0}}=\overline{s_{2}}$. Therefore $\overline{s_{2}} \not \leq \overline{s_{1}}$, which is a contradiction.
Example 4.2. Consider the deterministic finite automaton $A=\left(S, M, s_{0}, F, t\right)$ in Example 3.3. Then the structure of the hyper BCK-algebra ( $\left.\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ induced on $\bar{S}$ according to Theorem 4.1 is as follows:

Table 2.

| O | $\overline{q_{0}}$ | $\overline{q_{1}}$ | $\overline{q_{3}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\overline{q_{0}}$ | $\overline{q_{0}}$ | $\overline{q_{0}}$ | $\overline{q_{0}}$ |
| $\overline{q_{1}}$ | $\overline{q_{1}}$ | $\left\{\overline{q_{0}}, \overline{q_{1}}\right\}$ | $\overline{q_{1}}$ |
| $\overline{q_{3}}$ | $\overline{q_{3}}$ | $\overline{q_{3}}$ | $\left\{\overline{q_{0}}, \overline{q_{3}}\right\}$ |

Theorem 4.3. Let $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ be the hyper $B C K$-algebra, which is defined in Theorem 4.1. Then $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ is a strong normal hyper $B C K$-algebra.
Proof. By definition of the hyper operation "o", we obtain that $\bar{a} \in \bar{a} o \bar{t}$, for any $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{t}$ in $\bar{S}$. So we have:

$$
{ }_{l} \bar{a}=\{\bar{t} \in \bar{S} \mid \bar{a} \in \bar{a} o \bar{t}\}=\bar{S}, \quad \bar{a}_{r}=\{\bar{t} \in \bar{S} \mid \bar{t} \in \bar{t} o \bar{a}\}=\bar{S}, \quad \forall \bar{a} \in \bar{S}
$$

It is clear that $\bar{S}$ is a strong hyper $B C K$-ideal. So $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ is a strong normal hyper $B C K$-algebra.

Theorem 4.4. Let $\left(\bar{S}, o, \bar{s}_{0}\right)$ be the hyper $B C K$-algebra, which is defined in Theorem 4.1. Then $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ is a simple hyper $B C K$-algebra.
Proof. Let $\overline{s_{1}} \neq \overline{s_{2}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{2}} \neq \overline{s_{0}}$. Then $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}=\overline{s_{1}}$ and $\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{1}}=\overline{s_{2}}$. Hence, $\overline{s_{1}} \not \leq \overline{s_{2}}$ and $\overline{s_{2}} \not \leq \overline{s_{1}}$. So $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ is a simple hyper $B C K$-algebra.
Theorem 4.5. Let $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ be the hyper $B C K$-algebra, which is defined in Theorem 4.1. Then $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ is an implicative hyper $B C K$-algebra.
Proof. Since $\overline{s_{1}} \in \overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}}$ and $\overline{s_{1}} o \overline{s_{2}} \neq \emptyset$ for all $\overline{s_{1}}, \overline{s_{2}} \in \bar{S}$, we obtain that $\overline{s_{1}} \in \overline{s_{1}} o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{1}}\right)$. So $\overline{s_{1}} \ll \overline{s_{1}} o\left(\overline{s_{2}} o \overline{s_{1}}\right)$ and $\left(\bar{S}, o, \overline{s_{0}}\right)$ is an implicative hyper $B C K$-algebra.
Definition 4.6. A deterministic finite automaton ( $S, M, s_{0}, F, t$ ) is called semi continuous if for all distinct elements $s, s^{\prime} \in S$, the following implication holds: If $\exists x \in M^{*}$, such that $s^{\prime}=t^{*}(s, x) \Rightarrow \nexists x^{\prime} \in M^{*}$, such that $s=t^{*}\left(s^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)$.
Theorem 4.7. Let $\left(S, M, s_{0}, F, t\right)$ be a semi continuous deterministic finite automata. We define the following hyper operation on $S$ :


Then $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ is a hyper $B C K$-algebra and $s_{0}$ is the zero element of $S$. Proof. First we consider the following situations to prove (HK1) and (HK2).
(i) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{3} \neq s_{1} \neq s_{2} \neq s_{3}, \quad s_{2}$ is connected to $s_{1}, s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{1}$ and $s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{2}$.
Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $\left\{s_{2}, s_{0}\right\}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=$ $\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. Since $s_{1} o s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} o s_{1}=s_{0}$, we obtain that $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ and $s_{0} \ll s_{1}$. So in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, ( $s_{1} \circ s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)$ o $s_{2}=$ $\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. Thus in this case (HK2) holds.
(ii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{3} \neq s_{1} \neq s_{2} \neq s_{3}, \quad s_{2}$ is not
connected to $s_{1}, s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{1}$ and $s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{2}$.
Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\} \quad o\left\{s_{2}, s_{0}\right\}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ and $s_{0} \ll s_{1}$, we conclude that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $s_{1} \circ s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}\right\}$ o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)$ o $s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\} \circ s_{2}=$ $\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. Therefore in this case (HK2) holds.
(iii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{3} \neq s_{1} \neq s_{2} \neq s_{3}, \quad s_{2}$ is
connected to $s_{1}, s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{1}$ and $s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{2}$. Since $s_{2}$ is connected to $s_{1}$ and $s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{2}$, we get that $s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{1}$. So this case does not happen.
(iv) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{3} \neq s_{1} \neq s_{2} \neq s_{3}, \quad s_{2}$ is connected to $s_{1}, s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{1}$ and $s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{2}$.
Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} o s_{3}\right)=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\} \quad o s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ and $s_{0} \ll s_{1}$, we obtain that in this case (HK1) holds.

Also ( $s_{1}$ o $s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)$ o $s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{2}=$ $\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. Hence, in this case (HK2) holds.
(v) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{3} \neq s_{1} \neq s_{2} \neq s_{3}, \quad s_{2}$ is not connected to $s_{1}, s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{1}$ and $s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{2}$.
Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} o\left\{s_{2}, s_{0}\right\}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ we conclude that in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) \circ s_{3}=s_{1} o s_{3}=s_{1}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) \circ s_{2}=s_{1} o s_{2}=$ $s_{1}$. Thus in this case (HK2) holds.
(vi) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{3} \neq s_{1} \neq s_{2} \neq s_{3}, \quad s_{2}$ is not connected to $s_{1}, s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{1}$ and $s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{2}$.
Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ and $s_{0} \ll s_{1}$, we get that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $s_{1} \circ s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=s_{1} \circ s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) \circ s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{2}=$ $\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. So in this case (HK2) holds.
(vii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{3} \neq s_{1} \neq s_{2} \neq s_{3}, s_{2}$ is connected to $s_{1}, s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{1}$ and $s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{2}$.
Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) \circ\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1}$ o $s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ and $s_{0} \ll s_{1}$, we obtain that in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, ( $s_{1}$ o $s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)$ o $s_{2}=$ $s_{1} o s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. Therefore in this case (HK2) holds.
(viii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, s_{3} \neq s_{1} \neq s_{2} \neq s_{3}, s_{2}$ is not connected to $s_{1}, s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{1}$ and $s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{2}$.
Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} o s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ we conclude that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $s_{1} o s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=s_{1} o s_{3}=s_{1}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o s_{2}=s_{1} o s_{2}=\mathrm{s}_{1}$. Hence, in this case (HK2) holds.
(ix) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{1}=s_{2} \neq s_{3}$ and $s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{1}$.

Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) \circ\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\} o\left\{s_{2}, s_{0}\right\}$
$=s_{0}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \ll s_{0}$ we get that in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, ( $s_{1} o s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=s_{0} o s_{3}=s_{0}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) \circ s_{2}=$ $\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{1}=s_{0}$. Thus in this case (HK2) holds.
(x) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{1}=s_{2} \neq s_{3}$ and $s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{1}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \ll s_{0}$ we obtain that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $s_{1}$ o $s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=s_{0}$ o $s_{3}=s_{0}$ and ( $s_{1} o s_{3}$ ) o $s_{2}=s_{1} o s_{1}=\mathrm{s}_{0}$. So in this case (HK2) holds.
(xi) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, s_{1}=s_{3} \neq s_{2}$ and $s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{2}$. By definition of semi continuous automaton we know that when $s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{2}$ then $s_{2}$ is not connected to $s_{3}$ or $s_{1}$.
So $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{0} \circ\left\{s_{2}, s_{0}\right\}=s_{0}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{0} \ll s_{1}$ we conclude that in this case (HK1) holds.

On the other hand, $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{2}\right) \circ s_{3}=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) \circ s_{2}=s_{0} \circ s_{2}=$ $s_{0}$. Hence, in this case (HK2) holds.
(xii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{1}=s_{3} \neq s_{2}, s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{2}$ and $s_{2}$ is connected to $s_{3}$. Then we have
$\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{0} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. Since $s_{0} \ll s_{1}$ we get that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) ~ o s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\} \quad o s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) ~ o s_{2}=s_{0} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Therefore in this case (HK2) holds.
(xiii) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{1}=s_{3} \neq s_{2}, \quad s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{2}$ and $s_{2}$ is not connected to $s_{3}$. Then we have ( $\left.s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} o s_{3}\right)=s_{0} o s_{2}=s_{0}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{0} \ll s_{1}$ we obtain that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $s_{1} \circ s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=s_{1} \circ s_{1}=s_{0}$ and $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right)$ o $s_{2}=s_{0} \circ s_{2}=s_{0}$. Thus in this case (HK2) holds.
(xiv) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, s_{1} \neq s_{2}=s_{3}$ and $s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{1}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) \circ\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{0}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ and $s_{0} \ll s_{0}$ we conclude that in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right)$ o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\} \quad o s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)$ o $s_{2}=$ $\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. So in this case (HK2) holds.
(xv) Let $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3} \neq s_{0}, \quad s_{1} \neq s_{2}=s_{3}$ and $s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{1}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) \circ\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \quad o s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ we get that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $s_{1} \circ s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=s_{1} \circ s_{3}=s_{1}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) \circ s_{2}=s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$. Hence, in this case (HK2) holds.
(xvi) Let $s_{1}=s_{2}=s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} o s_{3}\right)=s_{0} \quad o s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \ll s_{0}$ we obtain that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $s_{1} o s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=s_{0} o s_{3}=s_{0}$ and ( $s_{1} o s_{3}$ ) o $s_{2}=s_{0} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Therefore in this case (HK2) holds.
(xvii) Let $s_{1}=s_{0}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} o s_{3}\right)=s_{0} o\left(s_{2} o s_{3}\right)=s_{0}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \ll s_{0}$ we conclude that in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) \circ s_{3}=s_{0} \circ s_{3}=s_{0}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) \circ s_{2}=s_{0} \circ s_{2}=$ $s_{0}$. Thus in this case (HK2) holds.
(xviii) Let $s_{2}=s_{0}, s_{3} \neq s_{1}, s_{1} \neq s_{0} \neq s_{3}$ and $s_{3}$ is connected to $s_{1}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) \circ\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{0}$ $=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ and $s_{0} \ll s_{1}$, we get that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $s_{1}$ o $s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=s_{1}$ o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)$ o $s_{2}=s_{1} \circ s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. So in this case (HK2) holds.
(xix) Let $s_{2}=s_{0}, s_{3} \neq s_{1}, s_{1} \neq s_{0} \neq s_{3}$ and $s_{3}$ is not connected to $s_{1}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ we obtain that in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, $\left(s_{1} o s_{2}\right) \circ s_{3}=s_{1} o s_{3}=s_{1}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) \circ s_{2}=s_{1} \circ s_{2}=$ $s_{1}$. Hence, in this case (HK2) holds.
$(\mathrm{xx})$ Let $s_{2}=s_{0}, s_{3}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} \neq s_{0} \neq s_{3}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{0} \circ s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{0} \ll s_{1}$ we conclude that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $s_{1} o s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=s_{1}$ o $s_{3}=s_{0}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)$ o $s_{2}=s_{0} o s_{0}=s_{0}$. Therefore in this case (HK2) holds.
(xxi) Let $s_{3}=s_{0}, s_{2} \neq s_{1}, s_{1} \neq s_{0} \neq s_{2}$ and $s_{2}$ is connected to $s_{1}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) \circ\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ and $s_{0} \ll s_{0}$, we get that in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, $\left(s_{1}\right.$ o $\left.s_{2}\right)$ o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ o $s_{3}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)$ o $s_{2}=$ $s_{1} o s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$. So in this case (HK2) holds.
(xxii) Let $s_{3}=s_{0}, s_{2} \neq s_{1}, s_{1} \neq s_{0} \neq s_{2}$ and $s_{2}$ is not connected to $s_{1}$. Then $\left(s_{1} \circ s_{3}\right) \circ\left(s_{2} \circ s_{3}\right)=s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ we obtain that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $s_{1} o s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=s_{1} \circ s_{3}=s_{1}$ and $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right)$ o $s_{2}=s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{1}$. Hence, in this case (HK2) holds.
(xxiii) Let $s_{3}=s_{0}, s_{2}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} \neq s_{0} \neq s_{2}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} o s_{3}\right)=$ $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$. Since $s_{0} \ll s_{0}$ we conclude that in this case (HK1) holds.
On the other hand, $\left(s_{1}\right.$ o $\left.s_{2}\right)$ o $s_{3}=s_{0} \circ s_{0}=s_{0}$ and $\left(s_{1}\right.$ o $\left.s_{3}\right)$ o $s_{2}=s_{1} o s_{2}=$ $s_{0}$. Therefore in this case (HK2) holds.
(xxiv) Let $s_{2}=s_{3}=s_{0}$ and $s_{1} \neq s_{0}$. Then $\left(s_{1} o s_{3}\right) o\left(s_{2} o s_{3}\right)=s_{1} o s_{0}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1} o s_{2}=s_{1}$. Since $s_{1} \ll s_{1}$ we get that in this case (HK1) holds.
Also ( $s_{1}$ o $s_{2}$ ) o $s_{3}=s_{1}$ o $s_{0}=s_{1}$ and ( $s_{1}$ o $s_{3}$ ) o $s_{2}=s_{1} o s_{0}=s_{1}$. Thus in this case (HK2) holds.
So we obtain that $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ satisfies (HK1) and (HK2).
Now we should prove that ( $S, o, s_{0}$ ) satisfies (HK3). By Theorem 2.11, it is enough to show that $s_{1} O s_{2} \ll\left\{s_{1}\right\}$ for all $s_{1}, s_{2} \in S$. By definition of the hyper operation "o" we know that $s_{1} o s_{2}$ is equal to $s_{1}$ or $\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ or $s_{0}$ for any $s_{1}, s_{2} \in S$. Also we know that $\mathrm{s}_{1} \ll \mathrm{~s}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{s}_{0} \ll \mathrm{~s}_{1}$.
Hence $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ satisfies (HK3).
To prove (HK4), Let $s_{1} \ll s_{2}$ and $s_{2} \ll s_{1}$. If $s_{1}=s_{2}$, then we are done. Otherwise, since $s_{1} \ll s_{2}$, there exist two cases:
(i) $s_{2}$ is connected to $s_{1}, s_{1}, s_{2} \neq s_{0}$ and $s_{1} \neq s_{2}$. Then by definition of semi continuous automaton we know that $s_{2}$ is not connected to $s_{1}$ and we have $s_{2} O s_{1}=s_{2}$. Therefore $s_{2} \not \leq s_{1}$, which is a contradiction.
(ii) $s_{1}=s_{0}, s_{2} \neq s_{0}$. Then $s_{2} o s_{1}=s_{2} o s_{0}=s_{2}$. Thus $s_{2} \not \leq s_{1}$, which is a contradiction.
So we show that $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ is a hyper $B C K$-algebra.
Theorem 4.8. Let $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ be a hyper $B C K$-algebra which is defined in Theorem 4.7. Then $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ is a weak normal hyper $B C K$-algebra.
Proof. By definition of the hyper operation "o", we know that $a_{r}=\{t \in S \mid t \in$ $t$ o $a\}=S-\{a\}$ for all $a \neq s_{0}$ and $a \in S$. Also $a_{r}=S$ for $a=s_{0}$.

It is clear that $S$ is a weak hyper $B C K$-ideal. So it is enough to show that $S-\{s\}$ for all $s \neq s_{0}$ and $s \in S$, is a weak hyper $B C K$-ideal.
It is easy to see that $s_{0} \in S-\{s\}$. Let $s_{1} o s_{2} \subseteq S-\{s\}$ and $s_{2} \in S-\{s\}$. Then we have to consider the following situations:
(1) $\mathrm{s}_{2}$ is connected to $s_{1}, \quad s_{1}, s_{2} \neq s_{0}$ and $s_{1} \neq s_{2}$.

Sinces ${ }_{1}$ o $s_{2}=\left\{s_{1}, s_{0}\right\}$ and $s_{1}$ o $s_{2} \subseteq S-\{s\}$, we obtain that $s_{1} \in S-\{s\}$.
(2) $\mathrm{s}_{2}$ is not connected to $s_{1}, \quad s_{1}, s_{2} \neq s_{0}$ and $s_{1} \neq s_{2}$.

Sinces ${ }_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1}$ o $s_{2} \subseteq S-\{s\}$, we get that $s_{1} \in S-\{s\}$.
(3) $\mathrm{s}_{1}=s_{2}$.

Since $s_{2} \in S-\{s\}$, it is clear that $s_{1} \in S-\{s\}$.
(4) $\mathrm{s}_{1}=s_{0}, \quad s_{2} \neq s_{0}$.

Sinces ${ }_{1} o s_{2}=s_{0}$ and $s_{0} \in S-\{s\}$, we obtain that $s_{1} \in S-\{s\}$.
(5) $\mathrm{s}_{2}=s_{0}, \quad s_{1} \neq s_{0}$.

Sinces ${ }_{1} \circ s_{2}=s_{1}$ and $s_{1}$ o $s_{2} \subseteq S-\{s\}$, we conclude that $s_{1} \in S-\{s\}$.
So ( $S, o, s_{0}$ ) is a weak normal hyper $B C K$-algebra.
Example 4.9. Consider the deterministic finite automaton $A=\left(S, M, s_{0}, F, t\right)$ in Example 3.3. Then the structure of the hyper $B C K$-algebra ( $S, o, s_{0}$ ) induced on the states of this automaton according to Theorem 4.7 is as follows:

Table 3.

| O | $q_{0}$ | $q_{1}$ | $q_{2}$ | $q_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $q_{0}$ | $q_{0}$ | $q_{0}$ | $q_{0}$ | $q_{0}$ |
| $q_{1}$ | $q_{1}$ | $q_{0}$ | $\left\{q_{0}, q_{1}\right\}$ | $\left\{q_{0}, q_{1}\right\}$ |
| $q_{2}$ | $q_{2}$ | $q_{2}$ | $q_{0}$ | $\left\{q_{0}, q_{2}\right\}$ |
| $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{0}$ |

Thus $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ is a hyper $B C K$-algebra.
Remark 4.10. Let $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ be the hyper $B C K$-algebra which is defined in Theorem 4.7. In example 4.9, we saw that $q_{0} \in q_{1} O q_{3}$ and $q_{0} \notin q_{3} O q_{1}$. So $q_{1} \ll q_{3}$ and $q_{3} \not \leq q_{1}$. Hence, $\left(S, o, s_{0}\right)$ may not be simple.
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