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Abstract

In this work, new concepts of algebra structures such as hyper $\rho$ –algebra, Hyper $\delta$ –algebra were defined. These concepts are introduced by using a hyper operation $\ast$ on $\mathbb{Y} \neq \emptyset$ is a mapping from $\mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{Y}$ to the non-empty power set $P^*(\mathbb{Y}) = P(\mathbb{Y})/\emptyset$ i.e. $\ast : \mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow P^*(\mathbb{Y}) \cup (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mapsto \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \subseteq \mathbb{Y}$, $\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathbb{Y}$ and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \subseteq \mathbb{Y}$ defined as $\gamma_1 \ast \gamma_2 = \bigcup_{\sigma_1 \in \gamma_1, \sigma_2 \in \gamma_2} \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2$ and $\gamma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = \gamma_1 \ast \{\sigma_2\}$, $\sigma_1 \ast \gamma_2 = \{\sigma_1\} \ast \gamma_2$. Let $(\Omega, \ast)$ be a hyper structure such that $1 \in \Omega$, in hyper structure $(\Omega, \ast)$ a hyper order is a relation was defined by $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in P^*(\mathbb{Y})) \land (\gamma_1 \prec \gamma_2 \iff (\forall a \in \gamma_1 \lor b \in \gamma_2) (1 \in a \ast b))$, with some properties. Also, some examples to illustrate our notions are given. And the relationship between these concepts is also discussed.
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Introduction

Abstract algebra was used in many fields of science, notions of Abstract algebra are discussed by many researchers see$^{1,2}$. Many applications were used as hyper-structures in both pure and applied sciences. In 2014 Redfar A et al. used the hyperstructures to define the concept of hyper $BE$-algebra$^3$. In$^4$ the hyperstructure applied by Jun Y et al. to BCK-algebra and he defined the notion hyper BCK-algebra that generalization of BCK-algebra. In 2018 Surdive A et al. used hyper structures to define the concept of BCK-algebra$^5$. Also, Uzay D and Firat A introduced the notion of the multiplier of a hyper BCI-algebra$^6$.

In 2019 the concept of hyper UP-algebras was discussed by Romano D $^9$. Also, khan M and another researcher introduced the notion of BCH-algebra$^{10}$. In 2020 Tawfeeq A et al. defined the concept of Hyper AT-ideal on AT-algebra$^{11}$.

A hyper operation $\ast$ on $\mathbb{Y} \neq \emptyset$ is a mapping from $\mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{Y}$ to the non-empty power set $P^*(\mathbb{Y}) = P(\mathbb{Y})/\emptyset$ i.e. $\ast : \mathbb{Y} \times \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow P^*(\mathbb{Y}) \cup (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mapsto \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \subseteq \mathbb{Y}$, $\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathbb{Y}$ and for all $\emptyset \neq \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \subseteq \mathbb{Y}$ then $\gamma_1 \ast \gamma_2$ defined as $\gamma_1 \ast \gamma_2 = \bigcup_{\sigma_1 \in \gamma_1, \sigma_2 \in \gamma_2} \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2$ and $\gamma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = \gamma_1 \ast \{\sigma_2\}$, $\sigma_1 \ast \gamma_2 = \{\sigma_1\} \ast \gamma_2$.

Let $(\mathbb{Y}, \ast)$ be a hyper structure such that $1 \in \mathbb{Y}$ in hyper structure $(\mathbb{Y}, \ast)$ a hyper order is a relation was defined by $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in P^*(\mathbb{Y})) \land (\gamma_1 \prec \gamma_2 \iff (\forall a \in \gamma_1 \lor b \in \gamma_2) (1 \in a \ast b))$. This relationship is called hyper-order. Let $\sigma_1 \ll \sigma_2$ be instead of $\{\sigma_1\} \ll \{\sigma_2\}$. Then for every $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathbb{Y}$ $(\sigma_1 \ll \sigma_2 \iff 1 \in \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2)$. 


The concept of $\rho$-algebra was introduced and discussed by Mahmood S. and Alredha M. The constructions of $\delta$-algebra were proposed by Khalil S and Hassan A.

In this work the concept of hyper $\rho$-algebra and some new concepts like hyper $\rho$-subalgebra, hyper $\rho$-ideal, hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal and hyper $\delta$-algebra, hyper $\delta$-subalgebra, hyper $\delta$-ideal were introduced. And the relationship between them was studied.

**Preliminaries**

**Definition 1**\(^{10}\): A $\rho$-algebra $(\Omega,\ast)$ is a non-empty set $\Omega$ with a constant $1 \in \Omega$ and a binary operation $\ast$ that satisfying the following for every $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Omega$:

1. $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_1 = 1$,
2. $1 \ast \sigma = 1$,
3. $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = 1 = \sigma_2 \ast \sigma_1$ imply that $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$,
4. For $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$, imply $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = \sigma_2 \ast \sigma_1 \neq 1$.

**Definition 2**\(^{10}\): Let $(\Psi,\ast,1)$ be a $\rho$-algebra and $\emptyset \neq \mu \subseteq \Psi$ then $\mu$ is called $\rho$-ideal of $\rho$-algebra if:

1. $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mu$ imply $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \in \mu$,
2. $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \in \mu$ and $\sigma_2 \in \mu$ imply $\sigma_1 \in \mu$ for all $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Psi$.

**Definition 3**\(^{10}\): Let $(\Psi,\ast,1)$ be a $\rho$-algebra and $I$ be a subset of $\Psi$. Then $I$ is called $\overline{\rho}$-ideal of $\rho$-algebra $\Psi$ if:

1. $1 \in I$,
2. $\sigma_1 \in I$ and $\sigma_2 \in \Psi \Rightarrow \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \in I$, for all $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Psi$.

**Definition 4**\(^{10}\): Let $(\Omega,\ast)$ be a $\rho$-algebra and let $\emptyset \neq H \subseteq \Omega$. $H$ is called a $\rho$-subalgebra of $(\Omega,\ast)$ if $x \ast y \in H$ whenever $x \in H$ and $y \in H$.

**Definition 5**\(^{5}\): An algebra $(\Psi,\ast,1)$ of type $(2,0)$ is called a hyper BCK-algebra if it satisfies the following hold:

1. $(\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2) \ast (\sigma_2 \ast \sigma_1) \ll \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2$,
2. $(\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2) \ast \sigma_3 = (\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_3) \ast \sigma_2$,
3. $\sigma_1 \ast \Psi \ll \{\sigma_1\}$,
4. $\sigma_1 \ll \sigma_2$ and $\sigma_2 \ll \sigma_1 \Rightarrow \sigma_1 = \sigma_2$.

**Definition 6**\(^{8}\): Let $\emptyset \neq \Psi$ with a constant $1$ and $\ast$ be a hyper operation defined on $\Psi$. Then $(H,\ast,1)$ is called a hyper BCH-algebra:

1. $\sigma_1 \ll \sigma_2$,
2. $(\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2) \ast \sigma_3 = (\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_3) \ast \sigma_2$,
3. $\sigma_1 \ll \sigma_2$ and $\sigma_2 \ll \sigma_1 \Rightarrow \sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ for all $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3 \in \Psi$.

And $\sigma_1 \ll \sigma_2$ is defined by $1 \in \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \forall \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \subseteq \Psi, \gamma_1 \ll \gamma_2$ is defined by: for all $a \in \gamma_1 \exists b \in \gamma_2$ such that $a \ll b$.

**Proposition 1**\(^{8}\): Any hyper BCK-algebra is a hyper BCH-algebra.

**Definition 7**\(^{7}\): Let $\Psi$ be a non-empty set such that $1 \in \Psi$ and $(\Psi,\ast,\ll,1)$ be a hyper-structure. Then $(\Psi,\ast,\ll,1)$ is called a hyper UP-algebra if:

1. $(\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3 \in \Psi)(\sigma_2 \ast \sigma_3 \ll (\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2) \ast (\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_3))$,
2. $(\forall \sigma_1 \in \Psi)(\sigma_1 \ast 1 = \{1\})$,
3. $(\forall \sigma_1 \in \Psi)(1 \ast \sigma_1 = \{\sigma_1\})$,
4. $(\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Psi)((\sigma_1 \ll \sigma_2 \land \sigma_2 \ll \sigma_1)$

**Definition 8**\(^{11}\): Algebra systems $(\Omega,\ast,\ll,f)$ is a $\delta$-algebra if $f \in \Omega$ and the following hold:

1. $\sigma \ast \sigma = f$,
2. $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = f$,
3. $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = f$ and $\sigma_2 \ast \sigma_1 = f \Rightarrow \sigma_1 = \sigma_2$, for all $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Omega$. 
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For all $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2 \in \Omega - \{f\} \rightarrow \sigma_1 * \sigma_2 = \sigma_2 * \sigma_1 \neq f$.

(5) For all $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2 \in \Omega - \{f\} \rightarrow (\sigma_1 * (\sigma_2 * \sigma_3)) * (\sigma_3 * \sigma_2) = f$.

The Concept of Hyper $\rho$-Algebra:

The concept of hyper $\rho$-algebra, hyper $\rho$-subalgebra, hyper $\rho$-ideal and hyper $\rho$-ideal are discussed.

Definition 9: Let $\Omega$ be a non-empty set such that $1 \in \Omega$ and $(\Omega, \ast, \ll, 1)$ be a hyper structure. Then, $(\Omega, \ast, \ll, 1)$ is called a hyper $\rho$-algebra if the following hold:

(1) $\sigma_1 \ll \sigma_2$,

(2) $1 * \sigma_1 = \{1\}$,

(3) $\sigma_1 * 1 = \{\sigma_1\}$,

(4) $(\forall \sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2 \in \Omega - \{1\} \rightarrow \sigma_1 * \sigma_2 = \sigma_2 * \sigma_1 \neq \{1\}$,

(5) $(\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Omega)(\sigma_1 \ll \sigma_2 \land \sigma_2 \ll \sigma_1) \rightarrow \sigma_1 = \sigma_2$.

Example 1: Let $\Omega = \{1,2,3,4,5\}$ be a set, define a hyper operation ($\ast$) on $\Omega$ as follows in Table 1:

Table 1. $(\Omega, \ast, \ll, 1)$ is a hyper $\rho$-algebra with $\gamma = \{1,2,3,4,5\}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) Suppose that $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = \{1\}$, wanted to prove that $\sigma_1 = 1 = \sigma_2$ or $\sigma_1 = 1$. Now, suppose that $\sigma_1 \neq 1 \neq \sigma_2$ and $\sigma_1 \neq 1$, then if $\sigma_1 \neq 1$ then $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = \{1\}$, and that contradiction with $\sigma_1 * \sigma_2 = 1$, then $\sigma_1 = 1 = \sigma_2$ or $\sigma_1 = 1$. Now, suppose that $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = 1$, then $\sigma_1 = 1 = \sigma_2$ or $\sigma_1 = 1$, we wanted $\sigma_1 * \sigma_2 = 1$, by Definition 3.1 condition 5 deduces that $1 \in 1 * \sigma_1 \land 1 \in \sigma_2 \ast \sigma_1$, and since $\sigma_1 = 1 = \sigma_2$, then $1 \in 1 * \sigma_2 \land 1 \in 1 * \sigma_1$, that mean $\sigma_1 * \sigma_2 = \sigma_2 * \sigma_1 = 1$, when $\sigma_1 = 1 = \sigma_2$, or $\sigma_1 = 1$.

Proof: (1) It is clear (by condition 3 definition 9.).

(2) by Definition 3.1 condition 2 $\{1\} \subseteq 1 * \sigma$, then $1 \in 1 * \sigma$ that means $1 \subseteq \sigma$.

(3) Suppose $\sigma_2 = \sigma_2$ that means $1 \subseteq \sigma_2 \ast \sigma_2$ and $1 \subseteq \sigma_2 \ast \sigma_1$ then $\sigma_2 \ll \sigma_2$.

(4) It is verifier (by condition 4 of Definition 9.).

(5) Suppose that $\sigma_2 \ast \sigma_2 = \{\sigma_2\}$: wanted to prove that $\sigma_2 = 1$, from definition 3.1 condition 3 then $\sigma_2 = 1$.

(6) Suppose that $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = \{1\}$, wanted to prove that $\sigma_1 = 1 = \sigma_2$ or $\sigma_1 = 1$. Now, suppose that $\sigma_1 \neq 1 \neq \sigma_2$ and $\sigma_1 \neq 1$, then if $\sigma_1 \neq 1$ then $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = \{1\}$, and that contradiction with $\sigma_1 * \sigma_2 = 1$, then $\sigma_1 = 1 = \sigma_2$ or $\sigma_1 = 1$. Now, suppose that $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = 1$, then $\sigma_1 = 1 = \sigma_2$ or $\sigma_1 = 1$, we wanted $\sigma_1 * \sigma_2 = 1$, by Definition 3.1 condition 5 deduces that $1 \in 1 * \sigma_1 \land 1 \in \sigma_2 \ast \sigma_1$, and since $\sigma_1 = 1 = \sigma_2$, then $1 \in 1 * \sigma_2 \land 1 \in 1 * \sigma_1$, that mean $\sigma_1 * \sigma_2 = \sigma_2 * \sigma_1 = 1$, when $\sigma_1 = 1 = \sigma_2$, or $\sigma_1 = 1$.

(7) Since $\sigma_1 \neq 1 \neq \gamma_2 \subseteq \Omega$, then $\gamma_2 \ast 1 \neq \gamma_2$. Since $\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = \{1\}$, then $\gamma_2 \ast \gamma_1 = \{1\}$, $\forall \emptyset \neq \gamma_2 \subseteq \Omega$. (9) Since $1 * \sigma_1 = \{1\}$, then $\gamma_2 * 1 = 1$, $\forall \emptyset \neq \gamma_1 \subseteq \Omega$. (10) Suppose that $\sigma_1 * \sigma_1 = \{\sigma_1\}$, wanted $\sigma_1 = 1$. Since $\sigma_1 * \sigma_1 = \{\sigma_1\}$,
that means \( \sigma_2 = 1 \). Now, suppose \( \sigma_1 = 1 \), wanted to prove that \( \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = \{\sigma_1\} \), since \( \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_1 = 1 \ast 1 = \{1\} \), then \( \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = \{\sigma_1\} \).

**Definition 10:** Let \((\Omega,\ast,\ll,1)\) be a hyper \(\rho\)-algebra and let \(\gamma \subseteq \Omega\), be a proper subset of \(\Omega\). Then \((\gamma,\ast,\ll,1)\) is called a hyper \(\rho\)-subalgebra if it satisfies the following:

\[
\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \gamma \rightarrow \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma
\]

**Example 2:** Take a hyper \(\rho\)-algebra \((\Omega,\ast,\ll,1)\) in Example 1 and let \(\gamma \subseteq \Omega\) where \(\gamma = \{1,2,3\}\). Table 2 will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(*)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>{2}</td>
<td>{1,2}</td>
<td>{3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>{3}</td>
<td>{3}</td>
<td>{1,3}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then \((\gamma,\ast,\ll,1)\) is a hyper \(\rho\)-subalgebra since \(\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \gamma\), then \(\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma\).

**Remark 1:** There is no relation between hyper \(\rho\)-algebra and hyper UP/BCK/BCH-algebra.

**Example 3:** Let \(\Omega = \{1,2,3,4,5,6\}\), and \(*\) be a hyper operation defined on \(\Omega\) as in Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(*)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>{2}</td>
<td>{1,2}</td>
<td>{3}</td>
<td>{4}</td>
<td>{5}</td>
<td>{6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>{3}</td>
<td>{1,3}</td>
<td>{4}</td>
<td>{5}</td>
<td>{6}</td>
<td>{6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>{4}</td>
<td>{4}</td>
<td>{1,4}</td>
<td>{5}</td>
<td>{6}</td>
<td>{6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>{5}</td>
<td>{5}</td>
<td>{5}</td>
<td>{1,5}</td>
<td>{6}</td>
<td>{6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>{6}</td>
<td>{6}</td>
<td>{6}</td>
<td>{6}</td>
<td>{1,6}</td>
<td>{1,6}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then \((\Omega,\ast,\ll,1)\) is a hyper \(\rho\)-algebra. But it is not hyper UP-algebra since if take \(\sigma_1 = 2\), and \(\sigma_2 = 1\), then \(2 \ast 1 = \{2\} \neq \{1\}\). Also, the system is not hyper BCK-algebra to verify that if \(\sigma_1 = 2, \sigma_2 = 3, \sigma_3 = 4\), then \((2 \ast 3) \ast (3 \ast 4) \ll 2 \ast 3 \rightarrow \{3\} \ast \{4\} \ll \{3\} \rightarrow \{4\} \ll \{3\}, \) but \(1 \notin \{4\} \ast \{3\}\), and by Proposition 2.7 then the system is not BCH-algebra.

**Definition 11:** Let \((\Omega,*,\ll,1)\) be a hyper \(\rho\)-algebra and let a non-empty set \(\gamma \subseteq \Omega\) then \(\gamma\) is called a hyper \(\rho\)-ideal of a hyper \(\rho\)-algebra if:

1. \(\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \gamma \) imply \(\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma\),
2. if \(\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma\), and \(\sigma_2 \in \Omega\) then \(\sigma_1 \in \Omega\) \(\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Omega\).

**Example 4:** Let \(\Omega = \{1,2,3,4\}\) and \(*\) be a hyper operation defined on \(\Omega\) as in Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(*)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>{2}</td>
<td>{1,2}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>{3}</td>
<td>{1,3}</td>
<td>{1,3}</td>
<td>{3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>{4}</td>
<td>{2}</td>
<td>{3}</td>
<td>{1,4}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and let \(\gamma = \{1,2\}\), then Table 5 will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(*)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>{2}</td>
<td>{1,2}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that, \(\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \gamma\), then \(\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma\) and take any \(\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma\) and \(\sigma_2 \in \Omega\) since \(\sigma_1 \in \gamma\), then \((\gamma,*,\ll,1)\) is a hyper \(\rho\)-ideal of hyper \(\rho\)-algebra.

**Remark 2:** Every hyper \(\rho\)-ideal is a hyper \(\rho\)-subalgebra. But the converse is not true in fact.

**Example 5:** Take \(\gamma = \{1,3,5\}\) in Example 3 Table 6 will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(*)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>{1}</td>
<td>{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>{3}</td>
<td>{1,3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>{5}</td>
<td>{5}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that \(\gamma\) is a hyper \(\rho\)-subalgebra, but it is not hyper \(\rho\)-ideal since if \(\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 = \{5\} \subseteq \gamma\) and \(\sigma_2 = 5\), then \(\sigma_1 = 4 \notin \gamma\).
Proposition 3: The intersection of hyper $\rho$-ideals is a hyper $\rho$-ideal.

Proof: Suppose that $\gamma_i, i \in I$ be a hyper $\rho$-ideal of a hyper $\rho$-algebra $\Omega$ and let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \gamma_i$, then $\sigma_1 \star \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma_i, \forall i \in I$ (since $\gamma_i$ is a hyper $\rho$-ideal), so $\sigma_1 \star \sigma_2 \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in I} \gamma_i$.

Now, let $\sigma_1 \star \sigma_2 \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in I} \gamma_i$. And $\sigma_2 \in \gamma_i$, so, since $\sigma_1 \star \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma_i$ and $\sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma_i, \forall i \in I$ (since $\gamma_i$ is a hyper $\rho$-ideal in $\Omega, \forall i \in I$) then $\sigma_1 \subseteq \gamma_i \forall i \in I$, thus $\sigma_1 \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in I} \gamma_i$.

Remark 3: The union of two hyper $\rho$-ideals of hyper $\rho$-algebra is not necessary to be hyper $\rho$-ideal.

Example 6: Let $\Omega$ a hyper $\rho$-algebra where $\Omega = \{1,2,3,4,5\}$ with Table 7:

Table 7. The union of two hyper $\rho$-ideals of hyper $\rho$-algebra is not necessary to be hyper $\rho$-ideal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And let $\gamma_1 = \{1,2\}, \gamma_2 = \{1,3\}$ be a hyper $\rho$-ideal in a hyper $\rho$-algebra $\Omega$, but $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2 = \{1,2,3\}$ is not hyper $\rho$-ideal since $2 \star 3 = \{4\} \not\subseteq \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$.

Definition 12: Let $(\Omega, *, \ll, 1)$ be a hyper $\rho$-algebra and let $\lambda$ be a subset of $\Omega$. Then $\lambda$ called a hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal of a hyper $\rho$-algebra if:

1. $1 \in \lambda$,
2. $\sigma_1 \in \lambda, \sigma_2 \in \Omega \rightarrow \sigma_1 \star \sigma_2 \subseteq \lambda, \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Omega$.

Example 7: Let $\Omega = \{1,2,3,4\}$ be a hyper $\rho$-algebra with $\Omega = \{1,2,3,4\}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then $\gamma_1$ is a hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal with Table 9:

Table 9. $(\gamma_1, *, \ll, 1)$ is a hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But $\gamma_2 = \{1,2\}$ is not hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal of $\Omega$ since $2 \in \gamma_2$ and $3 \in \Omega$, but $2 \star 3 \notin \gamma_2$.

Lemma 1: Every hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal is a hyper $\rho$-subalgebra.

Proof: Suppose that $\gamma$ is hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal of hyper $\rho$-algebra; wanted to show that $\gamma$ is hyper $\rho$-subalgebra. Now, since $\gamma$ is hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal then $\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Omega$, then $\sigma_1 \in \gamma, \sigma_2 \in \gamma$, $\sigma_1 \star \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma$.

Put $\sigma_2 \in \gamma$, then $\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \gamma, \sigma_1 \star \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma$ then $\gamma$ is hyper $\rho$-subalgebra.

Remark 4: The converse of the above lemma is not true in fact.

Example 8: Let $\gamma = \{1,3\}$ in Example 6 then $\gamma$ is hyper $\rho$-subalgebra, but it is not hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal, take $\sigma_1 = 3$, and $\sigma_2 = 4$, show that $\sigma_1 \star \sigma_2 = \{2\} \not\subseteq \gamma$.

Proposition 4: The intersection of hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideals is a hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal.

Proof: Suppose that $\gamma_i, i \in I$ be a hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal of hyper $\rho$-algebra then $1 \in \gamma_i, i \in I$, that mean $1 \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \gamma_i$.

Now, let $\sigma_1 \in \gamma_i, i \in I$, and $\sigma_2 \in \Omega$, and since $\gamma_i, i \in I$ are hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal then $\sigma_1 \star \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma_i, \forall i \in I$ that mean $\sigma_1 \star \sigma_2 \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in I} \gamma_i$, is a hyper $\overline{\rho}$-ideal.

The Concept of Hyper $\delta$-Algebra:

The concept of hyper $\delta$-algebra, hyper $\delta$-subalgebra, hyper $\delta$-ideal and the relation between them with the conceptions hyper
\(\rho\) – algebra, hyper \(\rho\) – subalgebra, hyper \(\rho\) – ideal and hyper \(\bar{\rho}\) – ideal are discussed in this section.

**Definition 13:** Let \((\Omega, \ast, \ll, 1)\) be a hyper \(\rho\) – algebra. Then \((\Omega, \ast, \ll, 1)\) is called a hyper \(\delta\) – algebra if the following hold:

\[
(\sigma_1 \ast (\sigma_2 \ast \sigma_3)) \ast (\sigma_3 \ast \sigma_2) = \{1\}
\]

**Theorem 1:** Every hyper \(\delta\) – algebra is a hyper \(\rho\) – algebra.

**Remark 5:** The converse of the above theorem is not true in general.

**Example 9:** Suppose that \(\Omega = \{1, v, w, \sigma\}\) and the binary operation \(\ast\) is described as in the Table 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\ast)</th>
<th>(F)</th>
<th>(V)</th>
<th>(W)</th>
<th>(\sigma)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>{f}</td>
<td>{f}</td>
<td>{f}</td>
<td>{f}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V)</td>
<td>{v}</td>
<td>{f}</td>
<td>{v}</td>
<td>{w}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>{w}</td>
<td>{v}</td>
<td>{f}</td>
<td>{w}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma)</td>
<td>{\sigma}</td>
<td>{w}</td>
<td>{v}</td>
<td>{f}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence \((\Omega, \ast, \ll, f)\) is a hyper \(\rho\) – algebra. However, it is not hyper \(\delta\) – algebra, since \(v \neq \sigma \in \Omega \setminus \{f\}\) and \((v \ast (v \ast \sigma)) \ast (\sigma \ast v) = (v \ast \{w\}) \ast w = \{v\} \ast w \neq \{f\}\).

**Definition 14:** Assume that \(\emptyset \neq H \subseteq \Omega\), where \((\Omega, \ast, \ll, f)\) is a hyper \(\delta\) – algebra, then \(H\) is a hyper \(\delta\) – subalgebra of \(\Omega\) if:

\(\sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \subseteq H\), whenever \(\sigma_1 \in H\) and \(\sigma_2 \in H\).

**Example 10:** In Example 9 let \(\gamma = \{f, v\}\) then \((\gamma, \ast, \ll, f)\) is a hyper \(\delta\) – subalgebra of \(\Omega\) since \(\forall \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \gamma \rightarrow \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2 \subseteq \gamma\).

**Conclusion**

In this paper new concepts of algebra structures such as hyper \(\rho\) – algebra, Hyper \(\delta\) – algebra were defined. And the concepts of a hyper \(\rho/\delta\) – subalgebra, hyper \(\rho/\delta\) – ideal and hyper \(\bar{\rho}\) – ideal were studied. In this work, we extracted the following:

There is no relationship between hyper \(\rho\) – algebra and hyper \(\text{BCH/UP/BCK}\) – algebra. If \((\Omega, \ast, \ll, 1)\) is a hyper \(\delta\) – algebra then it is hyper \(\rho\) – algebra but the converse is not
true. If \((F_\ast, \ast, \ll, 1)\) is a hyper \(\rho/\delta/\bar{\rho}\) - ideal then it is a hyper \(\rho/\delta - \) subalgebra but the converse is not true. And the relationship between these concepts was discussed and illustrated in diagram 1.
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حوال الجبر-$\delta_p$ المفرط
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وزارة التربية، المديرية العامة للتربية في محافظة البصرة، البصرة، العراق

الخلاصة

في هذا العمل تم تعريف مفاهيم جديدة للبنية الجبرية مثل الجبر-$\delta_p$ المفرط و درست مفاهيم الجبر الجزئي و المثالي مثل الجبر الجزئي-$\delta_p$ المفرط و الجبر المثالي-$\delta_p$ المفرط. وقد تم تقديم هذه المفاهيم باستخدام العملية المفرطة على المجموعة غير الخالية. مع اعطاء بعض المبرهنات و الامثلة لتوضيح هذه المفاهيم بالإضافة إلى مناقشة العلاقة بينها.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الجبر-$\delta_p$ المفرط، الجبر-$\delta_p$ المثالي المفرط، الجبر-$\delta_p$ المثالي المفرط، الجبر-$\delta_p$ المثالي المفرط، الجبر-$\delta_p$ المثالي المفرط.