

# EXTENDED CONTACT ALGEBRAS: ALGEBRAIC ANALYSIS AND DUALITY THEORY

RAFAŁ GRUSZCZYŃSKI, PAULA MENCHÓN, AND WILLIAM ZULUAGA

**ABSTRACT.** The ternary extended contact relation was introduced in (Ivanova, 2020) as a more expressive counterpart of the standard binary contact relation. The class of Boolean algebras expanded with the relation was named Extended Contact Algebras (ECAs). In this work, we take an algebraic perspective on ECAs, interpreting the ternary relation as a form of entailment. We introduce *Pseudo-Inference Algebras*, purely algebraic structures where the ternary relation is replaced by a monotone ternary operator, capturing the logical character of extended contact. We show that the subclass of relational Pseudo-Inference Algebras corresponds precisely to ECAs and generates a subvariety of *strict PSI-Algebras*, which forms a discriminator variety. Furthermore, we extend Stone duality to this ternary context, introducing *descriptive PSI-frames* and establishing three interrelated dualities that differ in their morphisms while sharing the same class of topological objects. The framework developed in the paper provides a unified relational semantics for Boolean algebras equipped with monotone ternary operators, connecting spatial and logical notions within a categorical and topological setting.

**KEYWORDS:** Extended Contact Algebras, extended contact relation, modal algebras, ternary relation, ternary operations, topological duality

**MSC:** Primary 06E25; Secondary 03G05

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The class of Extended Contact Algebras (ECAs, for short) was introduced by Ivanova (2020). The idea was motivated by certain limitations related to the well-known Boolean Contact Algebras (BCAs), i.e., Boolean algebras expanded with a binary relation  $\mathsf{C}$  of contact. BCAs were introduced in the early 2000s by Stell (2000) and Düntsch and Winter (2004) as an algebraic tool for representing and studying the phenomenon of the nearness of regions in space. From a certain point of view, they could be seen as an abstract approach to proximity spaces in the sense of Thron (1973) (see, e.g., Düntsch and Vakarelov, 2007).

The idea of BCAs proved both fruitful and useful, giving insight into the algebraic aspects of Region Connection Calculus and developing the so-called Region-based Theories of Space (also known as mereotopologies) that had been investigated at least since the times of de Laguna (1922) and Whitehead (1920; 1929). Among others, it turned out that BCAs have a considerable expressive power that lets express various topological properties by means of the contact relation. However, unsurprisingly, natural properties were discovered that could not be grasped within the framework of contact relations. One of these was the property of internal connectedness of regular closed subsets of topological spaces. Since the topological property of connectedness of regions—particularly important for mereotopology (Pratt and Schoop, 2000)—can be naturally expressed by means of the contact relation, it could be expected that the similar situation holds for the property of internal connectedness. Contrary to this, Tatyana Ivanova (2020) proved that the property cannot be formulated by means of contact.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, she put forward the idea of a ternary relation of *extended contact*, which strengthens the ordinary contact and allows for a definition of the internal connectedness of regular closed sets.

---

This research was funded by (a) the National Science Center (Poland), grant number 2020/39/B/HS1/00216 and (b) the MOSAIC project (EU H2020-MSCA-RISE-2020 Project 101007627).

<sup>1</sup>See also (Gruszczyński and Menchón, 2025).

Formally, an *extended contact algebra* is a structure of the form

$$(A, \vee, \wedge, \neg, 0, 1, \vdash),$$

where  $(A, \vee, \wedge, \neg, 0, 1)$  is a non-degenerate Boolean algebra and  $\vdash$  is a ternary relation on  $A$  such that, for all  $a, b, d, e, f \in R$ , the following conditions hold:

- (ExtCA0) If  $(a, b) \vdash f$ , then  $(a \vee d, b) \vdash d \vee f$ .
- (ExtCA1) If  $(a, b) \vdash d$ ,  $(a, b) \vdash e$  and  $(d, e) \vdash f$ , then  $(a, b) \vdash f$ .
- (ExtCA2) If  $a \leq f$ , then  $(a, b) \vdash f$ .
- (ExtCA3) If  $(a, b) \vdash f$ , then  $a \wedge b \leq f$ .
- (ExtCA4) If  $(a, b) \vdash f$ , then  $(b, a) \vdash f$ .

It is noteworthy that the relation  $\vdash$  has a *logical character* (in a certain sense), since it behaves analogously to a consequence relation, capturing a form of inference or entailment between regions within the underlying Boolean framework. Moreover, this relational perspective—and its generalization from (Vakarelov, 2017) in the form of *sequent algebras*—offers a new perspective on the region-based approach to theories of space, establishing a conceptual bridge between the spatial notion of *nearness* and the logical notion of *entailment*.

In this paper, we adopt the entailment perspective as dominant and define and investigate a class of Pseudo-Inference Algebras that can be viewed as purely algebraic counterparts of Extended Contact Algebras introduced by Ivanova. Purely algebraic, since we replace the ternary relation by a ternary operator which is (almost) a possibility operator, and we translate the axioms for extended contact into constraints put upon the operator.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 recalls the notion of *Extended Contact Algebra* and presents a simplified, yet equivalent, axiomatization of the system originally introduced in (Ivanova, 2020). This formulation yields a more transparent algebraic characterization of the associated operator while preserving the expressive power of the original relational framework. Section 3 introduces the variety of *Pseudo-Inference Algebras* and establishes a one-to-one correspondence between its subclass of *relational algebras* and the class of ECAs. In Section 4 we investigate the class of *relational PSI-algebras* in detail, showing that it generates the subvariety of *strict PSI-Algebras*, defined by the additional equations (R1)–(R2) and (S), and that this subvariety forms a discriminator variety. Finally, Section 5 develops the topological counterpart of the theory by extending Stone duality to the ternary context. We introduce the class of *descriptive PSI-frames* and establish three interrelated dualities which share the same class of topological objects but differ in their morphisms, thereby providing a unified relational semantics for Boolean algebras endowed with a monotone ternary operator. Throughout the paper, we assume the reader is familiar with standard notions from category theory and universal algebra as presented in (Mac Lane, 1978) and (Burris and Sankappanavar, 2011), respectively.

## 2. EXTENDED CONTACT ALGEBRAS

As we mentioned in the introduction, the first axiomatization of ECAs is due to Ivanova (2020). In our approach, we will use a slightly simplified set of constraints that is equivalent to the original one. Thanks to this, on the side of the operator associated with the relation, we obtain a simpler and easier to handle set of algebraic postulates.

We will prove that an *Extended Contact Algebra* is equivalent to a structure of the form  $(\mathbf{A}, \vdash)$ , where  $\mathbf{A} = (A, \vee, \wedge, \neg, 0, 1)$  is a non-degenerate Boolean algebra (whose elements are called *regions*) and  $\vdash$  is a ternary relation on  $A$  such that, for all  $a, b, c, d, f \in A$  ( $\leq$  is the

standard binary Boolean order relation):

- (EC0) If  $(a, b) \vdash f$ , then  $(a \vee d, b) \vdash f \vee d$ .
- (EC1) If  $(a, b) \vdash d$ ,  $(a, b) \vdash e$  and  $(d, e) \vdash f$ , then  $(a, b) \vdash f$ .
- (EC2)  $(a, b) \vdash a \vee f$ .
- (EC3) If  $(a, a) \vdash f$ , then  $a \leq f$ .
- (EC4) If  $(a, b) \vdash f$ , then  $(b, a) \vdash f$ .

–

The constraints can be interpreted as expressing elementary facts about entailment (in the very special case when we have no more than two premises). To see this, let us interpret the Boolean order  $x \leq y$  as *x carries more information than or the same information as y*. According to (EC0), if  $a$  and  $b$  entail  $f$ , then we can weaken premises and the conclusion simultaneously. (EC1) is an instance of the cut rule: if  $a$  and  $b$  entail both  $d$  and  $e$ , which entail  $f$ , then we can eliminate  $d$  and  $e$ . According to (EC2) we can always weaken the conclusion, and according to (EC3) the conclusion never carries more information than the premise. Finally, (EC4) says that the order of premises is not relevant for the entailment.

**Proposition 2.1.** *If (EC1) and (EC2) hold in a structure  $(\mathbf{A}, \vdash)$ , we have that*

$$(2.1) \quad \text{If } (a, b) \vdash c \text{ and } c \leq f, \text{ then } (a, b) \vdash f.$$

*Proof.* Indeed, suppose that  $(a, b) \vdash c$  and  $c \leq f$ . By (EC2) we have that  $(c, c) \vdash c \vee f$ , so  $(c, c) \vdash f$ . By (EC1) it must be the case that  $(a, b) \vdash f$ .  $\square$

Propositions 2.2 and 2.4 below show that our set of axioms is equivalent to the one originally introduced in (Ivanova, 2020).

**Proposition 2.2.** *The axiom (EC2) is equivalent to (ExtCA2).*

*Proof.* It is clear that (ExtCA2) entails (EC2). For the other direction, if  $a \leq f$ , then we have that  $a \vee f = f$ . But by (EC2) it must be the case that  $(a, b) \vdash a \vee f$ , so  $(a, b) \vdash f$ .  $\square$

Since by (ExtCA2) we have that  $a \leq f$  entails that  $(a, a) \vdash f$ , then we can strengthen (EC3) to full equivalence

$$(2.2) \quad (a, a) \vdash f \quad \text{iff} \quad a \leq f.$$

**Proposition 2.3.** *If (EC1), (EC2) and (EC4) hold in a structure  $(\mathbf{A}, \vdash)$ , it is the case that*

$$(2.3) \quad \text{If } (a, b) \vdash c \text{ and } f \leq a, \text{ then } (f, b) \vdash c.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $(a, b) \vdash c$  and  $f \leq a$ . Thus, by (EC2) we obtain that  $(f, b) \vdash a$  and by (EC2) and (EC4) that  $(f, b) \vdash b$ . From these, by (EC1), it follows that  $(f, b) \vdash c$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.4.** *Modulo remaining axioms, (EC3) is equivalent to (ExtCA3).*

*Proof.* One direction is immediate. For the other, assume that (EC3) obtains and that  $(a, b) \vdash f$ . Using (2.3) and (EC4) we conclude that  $(a \wedge b, a \wedge b) \vdash f$ , and so  $a \wedge b \leq f$ , by the assumption.  $\square$

The extended contact is a more expressive counterpart of the standard binary contact relation  $C$ . The latter can be defined by means of  $\vdash$  as follows

$$a \ C \ b \ :\longleftrightarrow \ (a, b) \not\vdash 0$$

but  $\vdash$  cannot be captured in the standard language of Boolean Contact Algebras (see Ivanova, 2020, Propositions 2.1 and 3.1). Similarly, as in the case of the contact relation, the standard interpretation of extended contact is topological, that is for a topological space  $(X, \tau)$ , any subalgebra  $S$  of the Boolean algebra  $\text{RC}(\tau)$  of regular closed subsets of  $X$  with the ternary relation  $\vdash_\tau$  given by

$$(A, B) \vdash_\tau C \ :\longleftrightarrow \ A \cap B \subseteq C$$

is an extended contact algebra. The operation  $\cap$  on the right side of the equivalence is the usual set-theoretical intersection, that, in general, is different from the meet operation of  $\text{RC}(\tau)$ , which for any  $A, B$  is given by  $A \wedge B := \text{ClInt}(A \cap B)$ , the closure of the interior of the intersection. Ivanova (2020, Theorem 6.4) proves that every extended contact algebra can be embedded into the regular closed algebra of a compact,  $T_0$ , semi-regular space. Different, so-called relational, representations of (finite) ECAs can be found in (Balbiani and Ivanova, 2021).

**Proposition 2.5** (Balbiani and Ivanova, 2021, Proposition 3). *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \vdash)$  be an extended contact algebra. For all  $a, b, d, e \in A$ , the following conditions hold:*

- (2.4)  $(0, 1) \vdash a$ .
- (2.5) If  $(a, b) \vdash c$  and  $(x, b) \vdash c$ , then  $(a \vee x, b) \vdash c$ .
- (2.6) If  $(a, b) \vdash c$  and  $d \leq a$ , then  $(d, b) \vdash c$ .
- (2.7) If  $(a, b) \vdash c$  and  $c \leq d$ , then  $(a, b) \vdash d$ .

We conclude this section by presenting some properties of the characteristic function of  $\vdash$ . In a sense that will be made explicit in the following section, this result reveals the algebraic behavior that underlies ECAs.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \vdash)$  be an extended contact algebra and let us write  $\chi_{\vdash}$  for the characteristic function of  $\vdash$ . Then, for every  $a, b, c, x \in A$  the following hold:*

- (2.8)  $\chi_{\vdash}(0, b, c) = \chi_{\vdash}(a, 0, c) = \chi_{\vdash}(a, b, 1) = 1$ ,
- (2.9)  $\chi_{\vdash}(a \vee x, b, c) = \chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c) \wedge \chi_{\vdash}(x, b, c)$ ,
- (2.10)  $\chi_{\vdash}(a, b \vee x, c) = \chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c) \wedge \chi_{\vdash}(a, x, c)$ ,
- (2.11)  $\chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c \wedge x) \leq \chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c) \wedge \chi_{\vdash}(a, b, x)$ .

*Proof.* (2.8) Since  $0 \leq c$ , then, by (EC2),  $(0, b) \vdash c$ , so  $\chi_{\vdash}(0, b, c) = 1$ . Similarly, by (EC2) and (EC4), we obtain that  $\chi_{\vdash}(a, 0, c) = 1$ . Finally, because  $a \leq 1$ , from (EC2) again we obtain  $(a, b) \vdash 1$ , and thus  $\chi_{\vdash}(a, b, 1) = 1$ .

(2.9) For the left-to-right direction, let  $\chi_{\vdash}(a \vee x, b, c) = 1$ . Thus,  $(a \vee x, b) \vdash c$ , and from this by (2.6) applied twice we obtain that  $(a, b) \vdash c$  and  $(x, b) \vdash c$ . In consequence,  $\chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c) = 1$  and  $\chi_{\vdash}(x, b, c) = 1$ . Thus,  $\chi_{\vdash}(a \vee x, b, c) \leq \chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c) \wedge \chi_{\vdash}(x, b, c)$ .

For the right-to-left direction, suppose that  $\chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c) = \chi_{\vdash}(x, b, c) = 1$ . Then  $(a, b) \vdash c$  and  $(x, b) \vdash c$ . (2.5) implies that  $(a \vee x, b) \vdash c$ , so  $\chi_{\vdash}(a \vee x, b, c) = 1$ . Therefore  $\chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c) \wedge \chi_{\vdash}(x, b, c) \leq \chi_{\vdash}(a \vee x, b, c)$ . Joining both directions, we obtain the equality.

(2.10) Observe that (EC4) implies that for every  $a, b, c \in A$ ,  $\chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c) = \chi_{\vdash}(b, a, c)$ . Then, by (2.9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\vdash}(a, b \vee x, c) &= \chi_{\vdash}(b \vee x, a, c) \\ &= \chi_{\vdash}(b, a, c) \wedge \chi_{\vdash}(x, a, c) \\ &= \chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c) \wedge \chi_{\vdash}(a, x, c). \end{aligned}$$

(2.11) Suppose that  $\chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c \wedge x) = 1$ , i.e.,  $(a, b) \vdash c \wedge x$ . By (2.7) we obtain  $(a, b) \vdash c$  and  $(a, b) \vdash x$ . Therefore,  $\chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c) \wedge \chi_{\vdash}(a, b, x) = 1$ . Thus,  $\chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c \wedge x) \leq \chi_{\vdash}(a, b, c) \wedge \chi_{\vdash}(a, b, x)$ .

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

### 3. PSEUDO-INFERENCIAL ALGEBRAS

In this section, we introduce the variety of Pseudo-Inferential Algebras and show that there is a one-to-one correspondence between its subclass, consisting of the so-called *relational algebras*, and the class of ECAs.

**Definition 3.1.** A Boolean algebra with a ternary weakly normal monotonic operator (3BAMO for short), is a pair  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  where  $\mathbf{A} = (A, \vee, \wedge, \neg, 0, 1)$  is a Boolean algebra, and  $\Diamond$  is a ternary operator on  $A$  such that for every  $a, b, c, x \in A$  the following hold:

- (MO1)  $\Diamond(0, b, c) = \Diamond(a, 0, c) = \Diamond(a, b, 0) = 0,$
- (MO2)  $\Diamond(a \vee x, b, c) = \Diamond(a, b, c) \vee \Diamond(x, b, c),$
- (MO3)  $\Diamond(a, b \vee x, c) = \Diamond(a, b, c) \vee \Diamond(a, x, c),$
- (MO4)  $\Diamond(a, b, c) \vee \Diamond(a, b, x) \leq \Diamond(a, b, c \vee x).$

⊢

As we see,  $\Diamond$  behaves like the standard modal possibility operator in the first two coordinates, but is only monotonic in the third coordinate. Any 3BAMO is a special case of a Boolean algebra with  $n$ -ary monotonic operator (a BAMO) introduced in (Celani, 2009, Definition 1).

**Example 3.2.** The following is an example of a 3BAMO defined on the four-element Boolean algebra  $\{0, a, b, 1\}$ , with  $b = \neg a$ . We only exhibit the values of the operation  $\Diamond$  that are different from zero. In all other cases,  $\Diamond(x, y, z) = 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \Diamond(1, 1, 1) &= 1, & \Diamond(1, 1, a) &= a, & \Diamond(1, 1, b) &= 1, \\ \Diamond(1, a, 1) &= 1, & \Diamond(1, a, a) &= a, & \Diamond(1, b, 1) &= 1, \\ \Diamond(1, b, b) &= 1, & \Diamond(a, 1, 1) &= 1, & \Diamond(a, 1, a) &= a, \\ \Diamond(a, a, 1) &= 1, & \Diamond(a, a, a) &= a, & \Diamond(b, 1, 1) &= 1, \\ \Diamond(b, 1, b) &= 1, & \Diamond(b, b, 1) &= 1, & \Diamond(b, b, b) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\Diamond(a, a, a) \vee \Diamond(a, a, b) < \Diamond(a, a, 1)$ .

⊢

To obtain the variety of Pseudo-Inference Algebras we extend the 3BAMO axioms with additional postulates corresponding to axioms (EC0)–(EC4).

**Definition 3.3.** A 3BAMO  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  is called a *Pseudo-Inference Algebra* (PSI-Algebra for short), if for every  $a, b, c, d, f \in B$ , the following conditions hold:

- (PI1)  $\Diamond(a, b, f) \leq \Diamond(a, b, \neg d) \vee \Diamond(a, b, \neg e) \vee \Diamond(d, e, f),$
- (PI2)  $\Diamond(a, b, \neg a) = 0,$
- (PI3)  $a \wedge f \leq \Diamond(a, a, f),$
- (PI4)  $\Diamond(a, b, f) \leq \Diamond(b, a, f).$

⊢

The proof of the following result is a straightforward consequence of (MO3) and (MO4). The details are left to the reader.

**Proposition 3.4.** (PI2) is equivalent to the equation

$$(3.1) \quad \Diamond(a, 1, \neg a) = 0$$

and to each of the two quasi-equations below

$$(3.2) \quad a \wedge f = 0 \Rightarrow \Diamond(a, b, f) = 0,$$

$$(3.3) \quad a \wedge f = 0 \Rightarrow \Diamond(a, 1, f) = 0.$$

**Example 3.5.** Every Boolean algebra can be turned into a PSI-Algebra by defining

$$\Diamond(a, b, c) := a \wedge b \wedge c.$$

Indeed, it is not hard to see that distributivity guarantees that (MO1)–(MO4) hold. To verify (PI1), we need to check that the following inequality

$$(3.4) \quad a \wedge b \wedge f \leq (a \wedge b \wedge \neg d) \vee (a \wedge b \wedge \neg e) \vee (d \wedge e \wedge f)$$

holds for every  $a, b, d, e, f \in B$ . We start by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & a \wedge b \leq (a \wedge b) \vee [d \wedge e \wedge f] =: A, \\ (2) \quad & f \leq f \vee \neg(d \wedge e) =: B. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $B = f \vee \neg(d \wedge e) = (d \wedge e \wedge f) \vee \neg(d \wedge e)$ , it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} A \wedge B &= [(a \wedge b) \vee (d \wedge e \wedge f)] \wedge [f \vee \neg(d \wedge e)] \\ &= (a \wedge b \wedge \neg d) \vee (a \wedge b \wedge \neg e) \vee (d \wedge e \wedge f), \end{aligned}$$

and so (1) and (2) together yield (3.4), as claimed. Moreover, since  $a \wedge f = \Diamond(a, a, f)$ , condition (PI3) holds. It is routine to check that (PI2) and (PI4) obtain, too.  $\dashv$

Furthermore, if we order the ternary operators on a Boolean algebra in the pointwise manner, the operator defined in Example 3.5 is the smallest one that turns a Boolean algebra into a PSI-Algebra. This fact can be made precise with the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be any PSI-Algebra. Then, for all  $a, b, f \in A$ , we have*

$$a \wedge b \wedge f \leq \Diamond(a, b, f).$$

*Proof.* By (PI3), (MO2), and (MO3), we obtain

$$a \wedge b \wedge f \leq \Diamond(a \wedge b, a \wedge b, f) \leq \Diamond(a \wedge b, b, f) \leq \Diamond(a, b, f),$$

as claimed.  $\square$

**Remark 3.7.** Not every 3BAMO is a PSI-Algebra. To see this, consider the 3BAMO introduced in Example 3.2. Observe that

$$\Diamond(1, a, 1) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Diamond(1, a, a) = a \quad \text{and} \quad \Diamond(1, a, \neg a) = 0 = \Diamond(\neg a, a, 1).$$

Hence,

$$\Diamond(1, a, 1) > \Diamond(1, a, a) \vee \Diamond(1, a, \neg a) \vee \Diamond(\neg a, a, 1),$$

which shows that condition (PI1) fails.  $\dashv$

**Definition 3.8.** A PSI-Algebra  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  is said to be *relational*, if for every  $a, b, c \in A$ ,

$$\Diamond(a, b, c) \in \{0, 1\}.$$

$\dashv$

It is clear that both classes of 3BAMOs and Pseudo-Inference Algebras, respectively, form varieties.

Our aim now is to extract the algebraic features of ECAs. As shown in Lemma 2.6, the characteristic function of the extended contact relation  $\vdash$  behaves similarly to the ternary operation  $\Diamond$  of 3BAMOs. Below, we make this connection precise and we show how Pseudo-Inference Algebras can serve as algebraic models for Extended Contact Algebras. The guiding idea is to bring to light, by means of the characteristic function of  $\vdash$ , the behavior of a suitable operator that captures the essential features of the extended contact in purely algebraic terms. We emphasize that this approach extends the ideas developed in (Celani and Jansana, 2022), (Bezhanishvili et al., 2016), and (Bezhanishvili et al., 2019) for subordination algebras.

Given an ECA  $(\mathbf{A}, \vdash)$ , we define the ternary operator  $\Diamond_{\vdash} : A^3 \rightarrow A$  associated with  $\vdash$  by

$$(\text{df } \Diamond_{\vdash}) \quad \Diamond_{\vdash}(a, b, c) := \neg \chi_{\vdash}(a, b, \neg c).$$

Also, for a relational Pseudo-Inference Algebra  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  we define a ternary relation by means of the operator in the following way

$$(\text{df} \vdash_{\Diamond}) \quad (a, b) \vdash_{\Diamond} c \quad :\longleftrightarrow \quad \neg \Diamond(a, b, \neg c) = 1.$$

**Lemma 3.9.** *The following hold:*

- (1) *If  $(\mathbf{A}, \vdash)$  is an extended contact algebra, then  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond_{\vdash})$  is a relational Pseudo-Inference Algebra, and  $\vdash_{\Diamond_{\vdash}} = \vdash$ .*
- (2) *If  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  is a relational Pseudo-Inference Algebra, then  $(\mathbf{A}, \vdash_{\Diamond})$  is an extended contact algebra, and  $\Diamond_{\vdash_{\Diamond}} = \Diamond$ .*

*Proof.* (1) Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \vdash)$  be an extended contact algebra. From  $(\text{df} \Diamond_{\vdash})$  and Lemma 2.6, it is easily seen that  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond_{\vdash})$  is a 3BAMO such that  $\Diamond_{\vdash}[A^3] = \{0, 1\}$ . Now we prove the conditions (PI1)–(PI4).

(PI1) Fix arbitrary  $a, b, f, d$  and  $e$  from  $A$ . If  $\Diamond_{\vdash}(a, b, f) = 1$ , then, by  $(\text{df} \Diamond_{\vdash})$ , we have  $(a, b) \not\vdash \neg f$ . Thus, from (EC1) we obtain that  $(a, b) \not\vdash d$  or  $(a, b) \not\vdash e$  or  $(d, e) \not\vdash \neg f$ . Again by  $(\text{df} \Diamond_{\vdash})$ , it must be the case that either  $\Diamond_{\vdash}(a, b, \neg d) = 1$  or  $\Diamond_{\vdash}(a, b, \neg e) = 1$  or  $\Diamond_{\vdash}(d, e, f) = 1$ . From the latter it is clear that (PI1) holds. Further, it is also true that if  $\Diamond_{\vdash}(a, b, f) = 0$ , then (PI1) also holds.

(PI2) From (EC2) and  $(\text{df} \Diamond_{\vdash})$  it follows that  $\Diamond_{\vdash}(a, b, \neg a) = 0$ , as required.

(PI3) Let  $\Diamond_{\vdash}(a, a, f) = 0$ , that is  $(a, a) \vdash \neg f$ . By (EC3) we obtain that  $a \leq \neg f$ , i.e.,  $a \wedge f = 0$ , as required.

(PI4) is an immediate consequence of (EC4).

The equality  $\vdash_{\Diamond_{\vdash}} = \vdash$  is a straightforward consequence of the definitions  $(\text{df} \Diamond_{\vdash})$  and  $(\text{df} \vdash_{\Diamond})$ .

(2) Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a relational Pseudo-Inference Algebra. We are going to show that the conditions (EC1)–(EC4) hold for  $\vdash_{\Diamond}$ .

(EC0) If  $(a, b) \vdash_{\Diamond} f$ , then  $(\text{df} \vdash_{\Diamond})$  entails that  $\Diamond(a, b, \neg f) = 0$ . Notice that, in order to prove our claim it is enough to show that  $\Diamond(a \vee d, b, \neg(f \vee d)) = 0$ . By (PI2) and Proposition 3.4, it is the case that  $\Diamond(d, b, \neg(f \vee d)) = 0$ . So, since by assumption  $\Diamond$  preserves joins in the first coordinate and it is monotone in the third one, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Diamond(a \vee d, b, \neg(f \vee d)) &= \Diamond(a, b, \neg(f \vee d)) \vee \Diamond(d, b, \neg(f \vee d)) \\ &= \Diamond(a, b, \neg(f \vee d)) \leq \Diamond(a, b, \neg f) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

(EC1) Suppose that  $(a, b) \vdash_{\Diamond} d$ ,  $(a, b) \vdash_{\Diamond} e$  and  $(d, e) \vdash_{\Diamond} f$ . Then, by  $(\text{df} \vdash_{\Diamond})$  we have that

$$\Diamond(a, b, \neg d) = \Diamond(a, b, \neg d) = \Diamond(d, e, \neg f) = 0.$$

Since by (PI1) it is the case that  $\Diamond(a, b, \neg f) \leq \Diamond(a, b, \neg d) \vee \Diamond(a, b, \neg e) \vee \Diamond(d, e, \neg f)$ , we obtain  $\Diamond(a, b, \neg f) = 0$ . Therefore, again by  $(\text{df} \vdash_{\Diamond})$ , we conclude that  $(a, b) \vdash_{\Diamond} f$ , as required.

(EC2) By (PI2) and monotonicity we have that  $\Diamond(a, b, \neg a \wedge \neg f) = 0$ , so  $(a, b) \vdash_{\Diamond} \neg(\neg a \wedge \neg f)$ , and by de Morgan law we obtain  $(a, b) \vdash_{\Diamond} a \vee f$ .

(EC3) Suppose  $(a, a) \vdash_{\Diamond} f$ . Thus  $\Diamond(a, a, \neg f) = 0$ , and by (PI3) we obtain that  $a \wedge \neg f = 0$ . It follows that  $a \leq f$ .

(EC4) follows from (PI4) in a straightforward way.

The equality  $\Diamond_{\vdash_{\Diamond}} = \Diamond$  is a straightforward consequence of the definitions  $(\text{df} \Diamond_{\vdash})$  and  $(\text{df} \vdash_{\Diamond})$ .  $\square$

As an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.9 we obtain the following result.

**Proposition 3.10.** *Relational Pseudo-Inference Algebras and Extended Contact Algebras are in one-to-one correspondence.*

**Corollary 3.11.** *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a Boolean algebra. The posets  $\text{EC}(\mathbf{A})$  of Extended Contact Algebras on  $\mathbf{A}$  ordered by inclusion, and  $\text{RPSI}(\mathbf{A})$  of relational PSI-Algebras on  $\mathbf{A}$  ordered pointwise, are dually isomorphic.*



*Proof.* Straightforward from Proposition 3.10, (df  $\Diamond_{\vdash}$ ) and (df  $\vdash_{\Diamond}$ ).  $\square$

**Remark 3.12.** Every Boolean algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  can be naturally turned into a relational PSI-Algebra. Indeed, if we define

$$(a, b) \vdash c :\Leftrightarrow a \wedge b \wedge \neg c = 0,$$

then it is immediate that  $(\mathbf{A}, \vdash)$  is an ECA. Moreover, by (ExtCA3), the relation  $\vdash$  is the largest extended contact relation on  $\mathbf{A}$ . By Lemma 3.9,  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond_{\vdash})$  is a relational PSI-Algebra, and by Corollary 3.11, it is the smallest relational PSI-Algebra on  $\mathbf{A}$ .

#### 4. RELATIONAL PSI-ALGEBRAS

In this section we show that the class of relational PSI-Algebras generates the subvariety of *strict PSI-Algebras*, namely those PSI-Algebras that satisfy the following additional equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(R1)} \quad & \Diamond(x, y, a) \wedge \neg \Diamond(x, y, b) \leq \Diamond(1, 1, a \wedge \neg b), \\ \text{(R2)} \quad & \Diamond(x, a, y) \wedge \neg \Diamond(x, b, y) \leq \Diamond(1, a \wedge \neg b, 1), \\ \text{(S)} \quad & \Diamond(a, b, c) \leq \mu(\Diamond(a, b, c)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu(z) := \neg \Diamond(1, 1, \neg z) \wedge \neg \Diamond(1, \neg z, 1)$ . Moreover, we show that this subvariety is, in fact, a discriminator variety.

**Lemma 4.1.** *In every relational PSI-Algebra, (R1), (R2) and (S) hold.*

*Proof.* It is immediate that every relational PSI-Algebra satisfies (S).

(R1) Suppose that  $\Diamond(x, y, a) \wedge \neg \Diamond(x, y, b) = 1$ . Then,  $\Diamond(x, y, a) = 1$  and  $\Diamond(x, y, b) = 0$ . It follows that  $a \wedge \neg b > 0$ . Indeed, if  $a \wedge \neg b = 0$ , then  $a \leq b$ , and by (MO4) we obtain  $1 = \Diamond(x, y, a) \leq \Diamond(x, y, b) = 0$ , a contradiction. By (PI3), we have  $0 < a \wedge \neg b \leq \Diamond(1, 1, a \wedge \neg b)$ , which implies that  $\Diamond(1, 1, a \wedge \neg b) = 1$ , as required.

(R2) Suppose that  $\Diamond(x, a, y) \wedge \neg \Diamond(x, b, y) = 1$ . Then,  $\Diamond(x, a, y) = 1$  and  $\Diamond(x, b, y) = 0$ . By the same reasoning as before, it follows that  $a \wedge \neg b > 0$ . By (PI3) and (MO2), we have  $0 < a \wedge \neg b \leq \Diamond(a \wedge \neg b, a \wedge \neg b, 1) \leq \Diamond(1, a \wedge \neg b, 1)$ , which leads to  $\Diamond(1, a \wedge \neg b, 1) = 1$ .

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a PSI-Algebra. A filter  $F$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  is said to be *closed* if

$$\Diamond(x_1, x_2, x_3) \rightarrow \Diamond(y_1, y_2, y_3) \in F$$

whenever  $x_i \rightarrow y_i \in F$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . In (Celani, 2009) it was proved that the congruences of 3BAMOs correspond to the closed filters of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Therefore, the congruences of PSI-Algebras are in one-to-one correspondence with their closed filters.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a PSI-Algebra, and let  $F$  be a filter of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Then,  $F$  is closed if and only if, for every  $x, y \in A$  the following conditions hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(Su)} \quad & \text{If } a \rightarrow b \in F \text{ then } \Diamond(x, y, a) \rightarrow \Diamond(x, y, b) \in F. \\ \text{(Mid)} \quad & \text{If } a \rightarrow b \in F \text{ then } \Diamond(x, a, y) \rightarrow \Diamond(x, b, y) \in F. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let us assume that  $F$  is closed. If  $a \rightarrow b \in F$ , since  $x \rightarrow x = y \rightarrow y = 1 \in F$ , then it is immediate that both (Su) and (Mid) hold. For the converse, let us assume that  $F$  satisfy both (Su) and (Mid) and suppose that for all  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ ,  $a_i \rightarrow b_i \in F$ . By (Mid)  $\Diamond(a_2, a_1, a_3) \rightarrow \Diamond(a_2, b_1, a_3) \in F$  and (a)  $\Diamond(b_1, a_2, a_3) \rightarrow \Diamond(b_1, b_2, a_3) \in F$ . Observe that (PI4) implies that  $\Diamond(a_2, a_1, a_3) = \Diamond(a_1, a_2, a_3)$  and  $\Diamond(a_2, b_1, a_3) = \Diamond(b_1, a_2, a_3)$ , so we get (b)  $\Diamond(a_1, a_2, a_3) \rightarrow \Diamond(b_1, a_2, a_3) \in F$ . Furthermore, by (Su), we obtain (c)  $\Diamond(b_1, b_2, a_3) \rightarrow \Diamond(b_1, b_2, b_3) \in F$ . Thus, from (a) and (b), we get that

$$[\Diamond(a_1, a_2, a_3) \rightarrow \Diamond(b_1, a_2, a_3)] \wedge [\Diamond(b_1, a_2, a_3) \rightarrow \Diamond(b_1, b_2, a_3)] \in F.$$



Since in every Boolean algebra the identity  $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow r) \leq p \rightarrow r$  holds, then it is the case that  $\Diamond(a_1, a_2, a_3) \rightarrow \Diamond(b_1, b_2, a_3) \in F$ . Thus by (c)

$$[\Diamond(a_1, a_2, a_3) \rightarrow \Diamond(b_1, b_2, a_3)] \wedge [\Diamond(b_1, b_2, a_3) \rightarrow \Diamond(b_1, b_2, b_3)] \in F,$$

and consequently  $\Diamond(a_1, a_2, a_3) \rightarrow \Diamond(b_1, b_2, b_3) \in F$ , which proves that  $F$  is closed, as desired.  $\square$

For the following result, we define  $\mu^0(x) := x$  and  $\mu^{l+1}(x) := \mu(\mu^l(x))$ , for every  $l \geq 1$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a PSI-Algebra and let  $S \subseteq A$ . The following hold:*

- (1)  $\mu(0) = 0$ .
- (2)  $\mu(x) \leq x$  for all  $x \in A$ .
- (3)  $\mu(z) = 1$  if and only if  $z = 1$ .
- (4)  $\mu$  is a monotone operator.
- (5)  $\mu^{n+1}(x) \leq \mu^n(x)$ , for every  $n \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* (1) From (PI3),  $1 = \Diamond(1, 1, 1)$ , thus  $\mu(0) = \neg\Diamond(1, 1, 1) = 0$ .

(2) From (PI3),  $\neg x \leq \Diamond(1, 1, \neg x)$ , so  $\mu(x) \leq \neg\Diamond(1, 1, \neg x) \leq x$ .

(3) By definition of  $\mu$ , we obtain  $\mu(1) = \neg\Diamond(1, 1, 0) \wedge \neg\Diamond(1, 0, 1)$ , so from (MO1), it follows that  $\mu(1) = 1$ . On the other hand, suppose that  $\mu(z) = 1$ . Then, by (2),  $1 = \mu(z) \leq z$  and it follows that  $z = 1$ .

(4) If  $x \leq y$ , then  $\neg y \leq \neg x$ . From the monotonicity of  $\Diamond$  on each coordinate, it follows that  $\neg\Diamond(1, \neg x, 1) \leq \neg\Diamond(1, \neg y, 1)$  and  $\neg\Diamond(1, 1, \neg x) \leq \neg\Diamond(1, 1, \neg y)$ . Therefore, we may conclude that  $\mu(x) \leq \mu(y)$ .

(5) We proceed by induction on  $l$ . From (2),  $\mu(x) \leq x = \mu^0(x)$ . Suppose that  $\mu(x)^{k+1} \leq \mu(x)^k$ . Then, from (4),  $\mu^{k+2}(x) = \mu(\mu^{k+1}(x)) \leq \mu(\mu^k(x)) = \mu^{k+1}(x)$ . Hence (5) holds, as claimed.  $\square$

**Definition 4.4.** Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a PSI-Algebra. A filter  $F$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  is said to be *modal* if it is closed under  $\mu$ .  $\dashv$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a PSI-Algebra. Then, every closed filter of  $\mathbf{A}$  is modal.*

*Proof.* Let  $a \in F$ , then  $\neg a \rightarrow 0 \in F$ . By Lemma 4.2,  $F$  satisfy both (Su) and (Mid), so  $\Diamond(1, 1, \neg a) \rightarrow \Diamond(1, 1, 0) \in F$  and  $\Diamond(1, \neg a, 1) \rightarrow \Diamond(1, 0, 1) \in F$  so, by (MO1),  $\neg\Diamond(1, 1, \neg a) \in F$  and  $\neg\Diamond(1, \neg a, 1) \in F$ . Since  $F$  is a filter, the latter yields that  $\mu(a) \in F$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a PSI-Algebra satisfying (R1) and (R2). Then, every modal filter is closed.*

*Proof.* Let  $F$  be a modal filter of  $\mathbf{A}$ . By Lemma 4.2, in order to prove our claim it is enough to show that  $F$  satisfies both (Su) and (Mid). To do so, suppose that  $a \rightarrow b \in F$ . Since  $F$  is modal, we have that  $\mu(a \rightarrow b) \in F$ . From (R1) it follows that

$$\Diamond(x, y, a) \wedge \neg\Diamond(x, y, b) \leq \Diamond(1, 1, a \wedge \neg b)$$

and thus

$$(1) \quad \mu(a \rightarrow b) \leq \neg\Diamond(1, 1, \neg(a \rightarrow b)) = \neg\Diamond(1, 1, a \wedge \neg b) \leq \Diamond(x, y, a) \rightarrow \Diamond(x, y, b).$$

In a similar fashion, from (R2), we obtain

$$(2) \quad \mu(a \rightarrow b) \leq \neg\Diamond(1, \neg(a \rightarrow b), 1) = \neg\Diamond(1, a \wedge \neg b, 1) \leq \Diamond(x, a, y) \rightarrow \Diamond(x, b, y).$$

Therefore, both (Su) and (Mid) hold for  $F$ , as required.  $\square$

If  $\mathbf{A}$  is a Boolean algebra, and  $x \in A$ , then the set

$$[x] := \{a \in A : x \leq a\}$$

is the smallest filter of  $\mathbf{A}$  containing  $x$ .

**Theorem 4.7.** *A PSI-Algebra  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  is relational if and only if it is simple and satisfies (R1), (R2), and (S).*

*Proof.* If  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  is relational, then the equations hold by Lemma 4.1. It remains to show that  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  is simple. To do so, we need to prove that the only modal filters of  $\mathbf{A}$  are  $\{1\}$  and  $A$ . Suppose that a modal filter  $F$  is such that  $F \neq \{1\}$ . Then, there exists  $a \in F$  such that  $a \neq 1$ . By the assumption,  $\mu(a) \in \{0, 1\}$  and by Proposition 4.3(3), it follows that  $\mu(a) \neq 1$ . Therefore,  $\mu(a) = 0 \in F$  and we obtain  $F = A$ . Hence,  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  is simple, as claimed.

For the converse implication, let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a simple PSI-Algebra satisfying (R1), (R2), and (S). To show that  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  is relational, pick  $a, b, c \in A$  and consider the element  $\Diamond(a, b, c)$ . By hypothesis and by the simplicity of  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$ , the only modal filters of  $\mathbf{A}$  are  $\{1\}$  and  $A$ . Moreover, from (S) and Lemma 4.3, it follows that  $\Diamond(a, b, c) = \mu(\Diamond(a, b, c))$  and by monotonicity of  $\mu$ , we obtain that  $[\Diamond(a, b, c)]$  is a modal filter. So, it is either  $\{1\}$  or  $A$ . In the first case,  $[\Diamond(a, b, c)] = \{1\}$ , hence  $\Diamond(a, b, c) = 1$ . In the second case,  $[\Diamond(a, b, c)] = A$ , which occurs exactly when  $\Diamond(a, b, c)$  is the least element 0. Therefore, for all  $a, b, c \in A$ , we have  $\Diamond(a, b, c) \in \{0, 1\}$ . In consequence,  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  is relational, as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a PSI-Algebra satisfying (S). Then, for all  $a \in A$*

$$\neg\mu(a) = \mu(\neg\mu(a)).$$

*Moreover,  $\mu^l(\neg\mu(a)) = \neg\mu(a)$  for every  $l \geq 0$ .*

*Proof.* It is immediate from the definition of  $\mu$ , that  $\Diamond(1, \neg a, 1), \Diamond(1, 1, \neg a) \leq \neg\mu(a)$ . So, Proposition 4.3 and (S) yield

$$\neg\mu(a) = \Diamond(1, \neg a, 1) \vee \Diamond(1, 1, \neg a) \leq \mu(\Diamond(1, \neg a, 1)) \vee \mu(\Diamond(1, 1, \neg a)) \leq \mu(\neg\mu(a)) \leq \neg\mu(a)$$

as claimed. For the remaining part, observe that

$$\mu^2(\neg\mu(a)) = \mu(\mu(\neg\mu(a))) = \mu(\neg\mu(a)) = \neg\mu(a).$$

The result follows by a straightforward induction on  $l$ .  $\square$

**Definition 4.9.** We say that a PSI-Algebra is *strict* if (R1), (R2), and (S) hold. We will write  $\mathcal{SPSI}$  to denote the variety of strict PSI-Algebras.  $\dashv$

We recall that in every Boolean algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  there is a one-to-one correspondence between congruences and filters. Explicitly, if  $\theta$  is a congruence of  $\mathbf{A}$ , then

$$F_\theta := \{a \in A : (a, 1) \in \theta\}$$

is a filter of  $\mathbf{A}$ ; conversely, if  $F$  is a filter of  $\mathbf{A}$ , then

$$\theta_F := \{(a, b) \in A^2 : a \wedge f = b \wedge f \text{ for some } f \in F\}$$

is a congruence such that

$$\theta_{F_\theta} = \theta \quad \text{and} \quad F = F_{\theta_F}.$$

**Theorem 4.10.** *The variety  $\mathcal{SPSI}$  is a semisimple variety whose simple members are precisely the relational PSI-Algebras.*

*Proof.* It follows immediately from Theorem 4.7 that the simple members of  $\mathcal{SPSI}$  are precisely the relational PSI-Algebras. Hence, to prove our claim, it suffices to show that the variety generated by  $\mathcal{RPSI}$  is exactly  $\mathcal{SPSI}$ . To this end, it is enough to show that every subdirectly irreducible algebra in the variety is simple.

Suppose that  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  is subdirectly irreducible. Then there exists the smallest non-identity congruence  $\theta$ . Consequently,  $F_\theta$  is a non-trivial (i.e.,  $F_\theta \neq \{1\}$ ) modal filter, which is minimal among the non-trivial modal filters of  $A$ . Thus, there exists  $a \in F_\theta$  such that  $a \neq 1$ . From Proposition 4.3, it follows that  $\mu(a) \neq 1$ , and therefore  $\neg\mu(a) \neq 0$ . By Lemma 4.8 and the monotonicity of  $\mu$ , we have that  $[\neg\mu(a)]$  is a proper modal filter. Hence, either  $F_\theta \subseteq [\neg\mu(a)]$  or  $[\neg\mu(a)] = \{1\}$ .

In the first case, since  $F_\theta$  is modal and  $a \in F_\theta$ , it follows that  $\mu(a) \in F_\theta \subseteq [\neg\mu(a)]$ . Then  $\neg\mu(a) \leq \mu(a)$ , and we obtain  $\mu(a) = 1$ , a contradiction in light of Proposition 4.3(3), since  $a \neq 1$ . Therefore  $[\neg\mu(a)] = \{1\}$ , which implies  $\mu(a) = 0$ . Again, since  $F_\theta$  is modal and  $a \in F_\theta$ , it follows that  $0 \in F_\theta$ , and thus  $F_\theta = A$ . Hence  $(\mathbf{A}, \diamond)$  is simple, and by Theorem 4.7,  $(\mathbf{A}, \diamond)$  is a relational PSI-Algebra. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a class of algebras. A ternary term  $t(x, y, z)$  is called a *discriminator term* for the class  $\mathcal{K}$  if, in every algebra  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ , it satisfies

$$t(a, b, c) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } a \neq b, \\ c, & \text{if } a = b, \end{cases}$$

for all  $a, b, c \in A$ . The variety generated by  $\mathcal{K}$  is then called a *discriminator variety*.

In particular, if every  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{K}$  has a Boolean reduct  $(B, \vee, \wedge, \neg, 0, 1)$ , it is well known that this is equivalent to the existence of a unary term  $d(x)$ —called a *unary discriminator term*—which satisfies, in every member of  $\mathcal{K}$ , the following conditions:

$$d(a) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } a = 0, \\ 1, & \text{if } a \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

It is worth noticing that if we consider the symmetric difference

$$x + y := (x \wedge \neg y) \vee (\neg x \wedge y),$$

then, in such a case, the terms  $d$  and  $t$  are in fact interdefinable

$$d(x) = \neg t(0, x, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad t(x, y, z) = (x \wedge d(x + y)) \vee (z \wedge \neg d(x + y)).$$

**Theorem 4.11.** *The variety  $\mathcal{SPSI}$  is a discriminator variety.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.10, to prove our claim it is enough to show that  $\mathcal{RPSI}$  is a class with a discriminator term. To do so, we consider  $d(x) := \neg\mu(\neg x)$  about which we will show that it is indeed a unary discriminator term. Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \diamond)$  be a relational PSI-Algebra. By Proposition 4.3, it is immediately seen that  $d(0) = 0$ . So let us assume that  $a \neq 0$ . If  $d(a) \neq 1$ , it must be that  $d(a) = 0$ , so  $\diamond(1, a, 1) = \diamond(1, 1, a) = 0$ . By (PI3), we get  $a = a \wedge 1 \leq \diamond(1, 1, a)$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $d(a) = 1$  and consequently  $d$  is a unary discriminator term for  $\mathcal{RPSI}$ , as desired.  $\square$

A variety  $\mathcal{V}$  is said to have the *congruence extension property* (abbreviated as CEP) if, for every subalgebra  $\mathbf{A}$  of an algebra  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{V}$  and for each congruence  $\delta$  on  $\mathbf{A}$ , there exists a congruence  $\theta$  on  $\mathbf{B}$  such that  $\delta = \theta \cap A^2$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{V}$  is said to have *definable principal congruences* (DPC) if there exists a formula  $\zeta(x, y, u, v)$  in the first-order language of  $\mathcal{V}$  such that, for every algebra  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$  and all  $a, b, c, d \in A$ ,

$$(c, d) \in \text{Cg}^{\mathbf{A}}(a, b) \iff \mathbf{A} \models \zeta[a, b, c, d],$$

where  $\text{Cg}^{\mathbf{A}}(a, b)$  denotes the smallest congruence on  $\mathbf{A}$  containing  $(a, b)$ . If the formula  $\zeta(x, y, u, v)$  can be expressed as a finite conjunction of equations, then  $\mathcal{V}$  is said to have *equationally definable principal congruences* (EDPC). Finally, a variety  $\mathcal{V}$  is called *arithmetical* if, for every algebra  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$ , the congruence lattice of  $\mathbf{A}$  is both distributive and permutable; equivalently,  $\mathcal{V}$  is arithmetical if it is both *congruence distributive* and *congruence permutable*.

We conclude this section with some immediate consequences of Theorem 4.11.

**Corollary 4.12.** *The following hold:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{SPSI}$  has CEP.
- (2)  $\mathcal{SPSI}$  has EDPC.
- (3)  $\mathcal{SPSI}$  is arithmetical.

## 5. TOPOLOGICAL DUALITIES

In this section, we establish the topological framework underlying the representation of 3BAMOs. We begin by fixing the notation and basic constructions that will be used throughout the rest of the paper. Our aim is to introduce the class of *descriptive PSI-frames*, which provides the relational counterpart of Boolean algebras endowed with a monotone ternary operator. The general strategy follows the classical Stone duality between Boolean algebras and Boolean spaces, while extending it to accommodate ternary operations by means of relational structures of the form  $(X, \tau, R)$ , where  $R$  connects points of the space with triples of closed subsets. This approach applies and generalizes the ideas developed in (Celani, 2009), adapting the duality techniques presented there to the context of ternary modal operations.

As will be shown below, this framework gives rise to three closely related dualities that share the same class of topological objects but differ in their morphisms. Each duality corresponds to a distinct algebraic level: the first captures the purely descriptive correspondence between 3-BAMOs and PSI-frames, the second refines this connection through morphisms that preserve the modal structure, and the third establishes a categorical equivalence between the algebraic and relational semantics of the associated logical systems.

We begin by fixing the notation that will be used throughout the rest of the paper. Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a Boolean space. We denote by  $\mathcal{C}(X)$  the collection of all closed subsets of  $(X, \tau)$ , and by  $\mathcal{C}_0(X)$  the family  $\mathcal{C}(X) - \{\emptyset\}$ . For  $\vec{Y} = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)$  and  $\vec{Z} = (Z_1, Z_2, Z_3)$  in  $\mathcal{C}(X)^3$ , we write  $\vec{Y} \subseteq \vec{Z}$  to indicate that they are comparable with respect to the product order on  $\mathcal{C}(X)^3$ , that is,  $Y_i \subseteq Z_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . Moreover, we write  $\vec{Y} \cap \vec{Z} \neq \emptyset$  whenever there exists some  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  such that  $Y_i \cap Z_i \neq \emptyset$ . Finally, for  $\vec{Y} = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)$ , we define its complement as  $\vec{Y}^c = (Y_1^c, Y_2^c, Y_3^c)$ . We also denote by  $\mathcal{CO}(X)$  the family of all clopen subsets of  $(X, \tau)$ .

For  $\vec{U} \in \mathcal{CO}(X)^3$  we define

$$L_{\vec{U}} := \left\{ \vec{Y} \in \mathcal{C}_0(X)^3 \mid \vec{Y} \cap \vec{U} \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

**Remark 5.1.** Let  $\vec{U}, \vec{V} \in \mathcal{CO}(X)^3$ . For

$$\vec{U} \cup \vec{V} := (U_1 \cup V_1, U_2 \cup V_2, U_3 \cup V_3), \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{U} \cap \vec{V} := (U_1 \cap V_1, U_2 \cap V_2, U_3 \cap V_3)$$

the following properties hold:

- (1)  $L_{\vec{\emptyset}} = \emptyset$ ,
- (2)  $L_{\vec{X}} = \mathcal{C}_0(X)^3$ ,
- (3)  $L_{\vec{U} \cup \vec{V}} = L_{\vec{U}} \cup L_{\vec{V}}$ ,
- (4)  $L_{\vec{U} \cap \vec{V}} \subseteq L_{\vec{U}} \cap L_{\vec{V}}$ .

+

For  $R \subseteq X \times \mathcal{C}_0(X)^3$ , by means of  $L_{\vec{U}}$ , we define the following sets:

$$\Diamond_R(\vec{U}) := \{x \in X : R(x) \cap L_{\vec{U}^c} \neq \emptyset\}, \quad \Box_R(\vec{U}) := \{x \in X : R(x) \subseteq L_{\vec{U}}\}.$$

**Definition 5.2.** A *descriptive PSI-frame* (a *PSI-frame*, for short) is a structure  $(X, \tau, R)$  such that  $(X, \tau)$  is a Boolean space and  $R \subseteq X \times \mathcal{C}_0(X)^3$  satisfies the following conditions:

(DF1)

For every  $\vec{U} \in \mathcal{CO}(X)^3$ , we have  $\Diamond_R(\vec{U}) \in \mathcal{CO}(X)$ .

(DF2)

For each  $x \in X$ ,  $R(x) = \bigcap \left\{ L_{\vec{U}} : x \in \Box_R(\vec{U}) \text{ and } \vec{U} \in \mathcal{CO}(X)^3 \right\}$ .

(DF3)

For every  $\vec{Y} \in R(x)$ , there exist  $y_1 \in Y_1$  and  $y_2 \in Y_2$  such that  $(\{y_1\}, \{y_2\}, Y_3) \in R(x)$ .

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $(X, \tau, R)$  be a PSI-frame. Then, for all  $x \in X$ ,  $R(x)$  is monotone with respect to the pointwise order on  $\mathcal{C}_0(X)^3$ . Moreover,*

$$\Diamond_R(\vec{U}) = R^{-1}(\vec{U}),$$

for every  $\vec{U} \in \mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}(X)^3$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\vec{Y} \subseteq \vec{Z}$  in  $\mathcal{C}_0(X)^3$ , and assume that  $\vec{Y} \in R(x)$ . We proceed by contradiction assuming that  $\vec{Z} \notin R(x)$ . Then, by (DF2), there exists  $\vec{V} \in \mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}(X)^3$  such that  $R(x) \subseteq L_{\vec{V}}$  and  $\vec{Z} \notin L_{\vec{V}}$ . By the definition of  $L_{\vec{V}}$ , this implies  $\vec{Z} \cap \vec{V} = \emptyset$ . Since  $\vec{Y} \subseteq \vec{Z}$ , we also have  $\vec{Y} \cap \vec{V} = \emptyset$ , which means  $\vec{Y} \notin L_{\vec{V}}$ . This contradicts the assumption  $R(x) \subseteq L_{\vec{V}}$ , because  $\vec{Y} \in R(x)$ . Therefore,  $\vec{Z} \in R(x)$ , as required.

For the second part, observe that the monotonicity of  $R(x)$  with respect to componentwise inclusion of triples of closed sets implies that

$$\Diamond_R(\vec{U}) = \{x \in X : \text{there exists } \vec{Y} \in R(x) \text{ with } \vec{Y} \subseteq \vec{U}\} = R^{-1}(\vec{U}). \quad \square$$

**Corollary 5.4.** *If  $(X, \tau, R)$  is a PSI-frame, then  $(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}(X), \Diamond_R)$  is a 3BAMO.*

*Proof.* It is readily seen that  $(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{O}(X), \Diamond_R)$  satisfies (MO1). To verify that (MO2) and (MO3) hold, observe that Proposition 5.3 reduces the task to showing that, for all clopen sets  $U_1, U_2, U_3, V$  of  $(X, \tau)$ , the following hold:

- (1)  $R^{-1}(U_1 \cup V, U_2, U_3) \subseteq R^{-1}(U_1, U_2, U_3) \cup R^{-1}(V, U_2, U_3)$ ,
- (2)  $R^{-1}(U_1, U_2 \cup V, U_3) \subseteq R^{-1}(U_1, U_2, U_3) \cup R^{-1}(U_1, V, U_3)$ .

We prove (1); the argument for (2) is analogous. Let  $x \in R^{-1}(U_1 \cup V, U_2, U_3)$ . By (DF3), there exist  $y \in U_1 \cup V$  and  $y_2 \in U_2$  such that  $(\{y\}, \{y_2\}, U_3) \in R(x)$ . Then either:

- (a)  $y \in U_1$ , in which case  $\{y\} \subseteq U_1$  and  $\{y_2\} \subseteq U_2$ . Hence, by Proposition 5.3, we obtain  $(U_1, U_2, U_3) \in R(x)$ , so  $x \in R^{-1}(U_1, U_2, U_3) \subseteq R^{-1}(U_1, U_2, U_3) \cup R^{-1}(V, U_2, U_3)$ ;
- (b)  $y \in V$ , and the same reasoning yields  $x \in R^{-1}(V, U_2, U_3) \subseteq R^{-1}(U_1, U_2, U_3) \cup R^{-1}(V, U_2, U_3)$ .

Thus (1) follows, and the proof is complete.  $\square$

Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a Boolean algebra and let  $\beta: A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{Ul}(\mathbf{A}))$  be the Stone mapping

$$\beta(a) = \{U \in \text{Ul}(\mathbf{A}) : a \in U\}.$$

It is well known that the lattice of filters of  $\mathbf{A}$  and the lattice of closed subsets of its dual Stone space  $\text{Ul}(\mathbf{A})$  are dually isomorphic. Such an isomorphism is established by the following assignments:

$$\text{Fi}(\mathbf{A}) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{C}(\text{Ul}(\mathbf{A})) \quad \mathcal{C}(\text{Ul}(\mathbf{A})) \xrightarrow{\psi} \text{Fi}(\mathbf{A})$$

$$F \longmapsto \{U \in \text{Ul}(\mathbf{A}) : F \subseteq U\} \quad Y \longmapsto \{a \in \mathbf{A} : Y \subseteq \beta(a)\}.$$

In what follows, we write  $Y_F$  and  $F_Y$  to denote  $\varphi(F)$  and  $\psi(Y)$ , respectively.

This dual correspondence allows us to define, for any 3BAMO  $\mathfrak{A} = (\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$ , a ternary relation  $R_\Diamond \subseteq \text{Ul}(\mathbf{A}) \times \mathcal{C}_0(\text{Ul}(\mathbf{A}))^3$  as follows:

$$(\text{df } R_\Diamond) \quad (U, \vec{Y}) \in R_\Diamond \iff F_{Y_1} \times F_{Y_2} \times F_{Y_3} \subseteq \Diamond^{-1}[U].$$

The next result shows that the relation  $R_\Diamond$  defined above faithfully represents the algebraic behavior of the operator  $\Diamond$  in the Stone space of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a 3-BAMO and let  $a, b, c \in A$ . Define  $\Box(x, y, z) := \neg\Diamond(\neg x, \neg y, \neg z)$ . Then, the following hold:*

- (1)  $\Diamond_{R_\Diamond}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(c)) = \beta(\Diamond(a, b, c))$ ;
- (2)  $\Box_{R_\Diamond}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(c)) = \beta(\Box(a, b, c))$ ;
- (3)  $\Box_{R_\Diamond}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(c)) = \Diamond_{R_\Diamond}(\beta(\neg a), \beta(\neg b), \beta(\neg c))^c$ .

*Proof.* (1) This follows directly from (df  $R_\Diamond$ ). The proof is analogous the proof of (Celani, 2009, Theorem 5).

(2) Let  $U \in \Box_{R_\Diamond}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(c))$  and assume that  $U \notin \beta(\Box(a, b, c))$ . Then

$$\Diamond(\neg a, \neg b, \neg c) \in U.$$

Since  $\Diamond$  is increasing in all coordinates, we have

$$[\neg a] \times [\neg b] \times [\neg c] = F_{\beta(\neg a)} \times F_{\beta(\neg b)} \times F_{\beta(\neg c)} \subseteq \Diamond^{-1}[U],$$

so  $(\beta(\neg a), \beta(\neg b), \beta(\neg c)) \in R_\Diamond(U)$ . By assumption, this yields

$$(\beta(\neg a), \beta(\neg b), \beta(\neg c)) \cap (\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(c)) \neq \emptyset,$$

which is absurd. Hence  $\Box_{R_\Diamond}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(c)) \subseteq \beta(\Box(a, b, c))$ .

Conversely, let  $U \in \beta(\Box(a, b, c))$  and suppose that  $\vec{Y} \in R_\Diamond(U)$ . We show that  $\vec{Y} \in L_{(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(c))}$ . Indeed, our assumptions entail: (a)  $\Diamond(\neg a, \neg b, \neg c) \notin U$ , and (b)  $F_{Y_1} \times F_{Y_2} \times F_{Y_3} \subseteq \Diamond^{-1}[U]$ . From (a) and (b) it follows that  $(\neg a, \neg b, \neg c) \notin F_{Y_1} \times F_{Y_2} \times F_{Y_3}$ , and hence  $Y_1 \not\subseteq \beta(a)$ ,  $Y_2 \not\subseteq \beta(b)$  and  $Y_3 \not\subseteq \beta(c)$ . Therefore,  $\vec{Y} \cap (\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(c)) \neq \emptyset$ , so  $\vec{Y} \in L_{(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(c))}$ . We conclude that  $\beta(\Box(a, b, c)) \subseteq \Box_{R_\Diamond}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(c))$ , as required.

(3) The result follows from the following calculations:

$$\begin{aligned} \Box_{R_\Diamond}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(c)) &= \beta(\Box(a, b, c)) && \text{by (2)} \\ &= \beta(\Diamond(\neg a, \neg b, \neg c))^c && \text{by the definition of } \Box \\ &= \Diamond_{R_\Diamond}(\beta(\neg a), \beta(\neg b), \beta(\neg c))^c && \text{by (1).} \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The following result shows that the structure obtained by equipping the Stone space of  $\mathbf{A}$  with the relation  $R_\Diamond$  satisfies the conditions required for a PSI-frame.

**Proposition 5.6.** *Let  $\mathfrak{A} = (\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a 3-BAMO and let  $\tau_{\mathbf{A}}$  be the Stone topology for  $\text{Ul}(\mathbf{A})$ . Then  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A}) = (\text{Ul}(\mathbf{A}), \tau_{\mathbf{A}}, R_\Diamond)$  is a PSI-frame.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 5.5(1),  $\Diamond_{R_\Diamond}$  is closed over clopen subsets of  $\text{Ul}(\mathbf{A})$ . Let  $U \in \text{Ul}(\mathbf{A})$ . In the following, we denote  $(\beta(a_1), \beta(a_2), \beta(a_3))$  by  $\beta(\vec{a})$  and  $(\beta(\neg a_1), \beta(\neg a_2), \beta(\neg a_3))$  by  $\beta(\neg \vec{a})$ . We only need to show that

$$D = \bigcap \{L_{\beta(\vec{a})} : U \in \Box_{R_\Diamond}(\beta(\vec{a})), \vec{a} \in A^3\} \subseteq R_\Diamond(U),$$

since the reverse inclusion always holds.

Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that there exists  $\vec{Y} \in D$  such that  $\vec{Y} \notin R_\Diamond(U)$ . Then there exist elements  $a_i \in F_{Y_i}$ , for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , such that  $\Diamond(\vec{a}) \notin U$ . Consequently,  $\vec{Y} \cap \beta(\neg \vec{a}) = \emptyset$ , and since  $U$  is an ultrafilter, we have  $\Box(\neg \vec{a}) \in U$ . By Proposition 5.5(2), it follows that  $\vec{Y} \notin L_{\beta(\neg \vec{a})}$ , while  $U \in \Box_{R_\Diamond}(\beta(\neg \vec{a}))$ . Therefore  $U \notin D$ , which is a contradiction. Hence  $D \subseteq R_\Diamond(U)$ , as required.

Now, suppose that  $\vec{Y} \in R_\Diamond(U)$ . Then  $F_{Y_1} \times F_{Y_2} \times F_{Y_3} \subseteq \Diamond^{-1}[U]$ . We will prove that there exist  $V \in Y_1$  and  $W \in Y_2$  such that  $(\{V\}, \{W\}, Y_3) \in R_\Diamond(U)$ .

Let  $\text{Fi}(\mathbf{A})$  be the family of filters of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Consider the family

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \{F \in \text{Fi}(\mathbf{A}) : F_{Y_1} \subseteq F \text{ and } F \times F_{Y_2} \times F_{Y_3} \subseteq \Diamond^{-1}[U]\}.$$

Clearly,  $\mathcal{F}_1 \neq \emptyset$  because  $F_{Y_1} \in \mathcal{F}_1$ . By Zorn's lemma, there exists a maximal element  $V$  in  $\mathcal{F}_1$ . Following Celani (2009), we will prove that  $V \in \text{Ul}(\mathbf{A})$ . Let  $a \in A$  and suppose that  $a \notin V$ . We will show that  $\neg a \in V$ . Since  $V \subsetneq \text{Fg}^{\mathbf{A}}(V \cup \{a\})$ , where  $\text{Fg}^{\mathbf{A}}(V \cup \{a\})$  denotes the filter generated by  $V \cup \{a\}$ , and  $V$  is maximal in  $\mathcal{F}_1$ , it follows that there exist  $b \in \text{Fg}^{\mathbf{A}}(V \cup \{a\})$ ,  $x_1 \in F_{Y_2}$ ,  $y_1 \in F_{Y_3}$  such that  $\Diamond(b, x_1, y_1) \notin U$ . We will show that  $\text{Fg}^{\mathbf{A}}(V \cup \{\neg a\}) \in \mathcal{F}_1$ . Let  $c \in \text{Fg}^{\mathbf{A}}(V \cup \{\neg a\})$ ,  $x_2 \in F_{Y_2}$  and  $y_2 \in F_{Y_3}$ . Then, there exists

$f_1 \in V$  such that  $f_1 \wedge \neg a \leq c$ . From  $b \in \mathbf{Fg}^{\mathbf{A}}(V \cup \{a\})$ , we obtain that there exists  $f_2 \in V$  such that  $f_2 \wedge a \leq b$ . Then,  $\Diamond(f_1 \wedge f_2, x_1 \wedge x_2, y_1 \wedge y_2) \in U$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \Diamond(f_1 \wedge f_2, x_1 \wedge x_2, y_1 \wedge y_2) &= \Diamond(f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge (a \vee \neg a), x_1 \wedge x_2, y_1 \wedge y_2) \\ &= \Diamond((f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge a) \vee (f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge \neg a), x_1 \wedge x_2, y_1 \wedge y_2) \\ &= \Diamond(f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge a, x_1 \wedge x_2, y_1 \wedge y_2) \\ &\quad \vee \Diamond(f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge \neg a, x_1 \wedge x_2, y_1 \wedge y_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, either  $\Diamond(f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge a, x_1 \wedge x_2, y_1 \wedge y_2) \in U$  or  $\Diamond(f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge \neg a, x_1 \wedge x_2, y_1 \wedge y_2) \in U$ . In the first case, by monotonicity, it follows that  $\Diamond(b, x_1, y_1) \in U$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $\Diamond(f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge \neg a, x_1 \wedge x_2, y_1 \wedge y_2) \in U$ , and by monotonicity,  $\Diamond(c, x_2, y_2) \in U$ .

Hence,

$$\mathbf{Fg}^{\mathbf{A}}(V \cup \{\neg a\}) \times F_{Y_2} \times F_{Y_3} \subseteq \Diamond^{-1}[U],$$

and by maximality of  $V$ , we conclude that  $\neg a \in V$ .

Since  $V \in \mathbf{Ul}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $F_{Y_1} \subseteq V$ , we obtain  $V \in Y_1$ , and consequently  $(\{V\}, Y_2, Y_3) \in R_{\Diamond}(U)$ . Analogously, it can be proved that there exists  $W \in Y_2$  such that  $(Y_1, \{W\}, Y_3) \in R_{\Diamond}(U)$ . It is easy to see that  $(\{V\}, \{W\}, Y_3) \in R_{\Diamond}(U)$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Having established the correspondence between 3-BAMOs and PSI-frames, we now introduce a more specialized class of descriptive structures that will serve as the semantic counterpart of PSI-Algebras.

The operators  $\Box_R$  and  $\Diamond_R$  introduced above allow us to connect the relational structure of a PSI-frame with algebraic structures of pseudo-inference type. Intuitively, PSI-spaces are precisely those PSI-frames whose relational structure  $R$  ensures that the associated operators on the clopen algebra  $\mathcal{CC}(X)$  satisfy the axioms of a 3BAMO. This observation motivates the following definition.

**Definition 5.7.** A *pseudo-inference space* (or simply *PSI-space*) is a PSI-frame  $(X, \tau, R)$  that satisfies the following four conditions:

- (PIF1)  $R^{-1}(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) \subseteq R^{-1}(Y_1, Y_2, Z) \cup R^{-1}(Y_1, Y_2, W) \cup R^{-1}(\text{cl}(Z^c), \text{cl}(W^c), Y_3),$
- (PIF2)  $Y_1 \cap Y_3 = \emptyset \Rightarrow R^{-1}(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) = \emptyset,$
- (PIF3)  $Y_1 \cap Y_2 \subseteq R^{-1}(Y_1, Y_1, Y_2),$
- (PIF4)  $R^{-1}(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) \subseteq R^{-1}(Y_2, Y_1, Y_3).$

–

With this definition, and also with Corollary 5.4, we obtain a direct algebraic counterpart of PSI-spaces:

**Proposition 5.8.** Let  $(X, \tau, R)$  be a PSI-space. Then, the pair  $(\mathcal{CC}(X), \Diamond_R)$  forms a PSI-Algebra.

Moreover, this correspondence is tight: any 3BAMO can be represented by a relational structure that satisfies the open conditions of a PSI-space. In what follows, we make this explicit by showing how the relational inverse  $R^{-1}$  captures the axioms of the 3BAMO and, conversely, how a 3BAMO induces a PSI-space structure on its ultrafilter space.

**Lemma 5.9.** If  $\mathfrak{A} := (\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  is a 3BAMO, then  $\mathfrak{A}$  satisfies (PI1)<sup>2</sup> iff  $\mathbf{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$  satisfies (PIF1).

*Proof.* Assume that (PIF1) holds in  $\mathbf{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$ . In particular, this entails that for all  $a, b, d, e, f \in A$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\Diamond}^{-1}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(f)) &\subseteq R_{\Diamond}^{-1}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(d)) \cup \\ &\quad R_{\Diamond}^{-1}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(e)) \cup R_{\Diamond}^{-1}(\beta(\neg d), \beta(\neg e), \beta(f)). \end{aligned}$$

<sup>2</sup>Each condition for pseudo-inference frames is formulated in an open form (without quantifiers). When we write that a frame  $\mathfrak{F}$  satisfies an open condition we mean that  $\mathfrak{F}$  satisfies its universal closure.



Since for every  $x \in A$  we have  $\text{Cl}(\beta(x)^c) = \beta(\neg x)$ , by the properties of  $\beta$  and Proposition 5.5, we may conclude that (PI1) holds.

For the converse, assume that  $\mathfrak{A}$  satisfies (PI1). Fix closed non-empty sets of ultrafilters  $Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Z$ , and  $W$ . Let  $U$  be an ultrafilter of  $\mathbf{A}$  such that (a)  $U \in R_\diamond^{-1}(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)$ , (b)  $U \notin R_\diamond^{-1}(Y_1, Y_2, Z)$ , and (c)  $U \notin R_\diamond^{-1}(Y_1, Y_2, W)$ . We will show that  $U \in R_\diamond(\text{Cl}(Z^c), \text{Cl}(W^c), Y_3)$ .

To this end, let  $p \in F_{\text{Cl}(Z^c)}$ ,  $q \in F_{\text{Cl}(W^c)}$ , and  $r \in F_{Y_3}$ . By (b), there exist  $a \in F_{Y_1}$ ,  $b \in F_{Y_2}$ , and  $c \in F_Z$  such that  $\diamond(a, b, c) \notin U$ . Similarly, by (c), there exist  $x \in F_{Y_1}$ ,  $y \in F_{Y_2}$ , and  $l \in F_W$  such that  $\diamond(x, y, l) \notin U$ . Hence, letting  $s = a \wedge x$  and  $t = b \wedge y$ , by the monotonicity of  $\diamond$  in each coordinate we obtain (d)  $\neg \diamond(s, t, c) \wedge \neg \diamond(s, t, l) \in U$ .

Moreover, since  $\beta(\neg p) \subseteq Z \subseteq \beta(c)$  and  $\beta(\neg q) \subseteq W \subseteq \beta(l)$  by assumption, it follows that  $\neg p \leq c$  and  $\neg q \leq l$ . Applying the monotonicity of  $\diamond$  to (d), we get  $\neg \diamond(s, t, \neg p) \wedge \neg \diamond(s, t, \neg q) \in U$ . Together with (a), this yields  $\diamond(s, t, r) \wedge \neg \diamond(s, t, \neg p) \wedge \neg \diamond(s, t, \neg q) \in U$ . Therefore, by (PI1), we obtain  $\diamond(p, q, r) \in U$ . This proves that  $U \in R_\diamond(\text{Cl}(Z^c), \text{Cl}(W^c), Y_3)$ , which in turn entails that (PIF1) holds, as claimed.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.10.** *If  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a 3BAMO, then  $\mathfrak{A}$  satisfies (PI2) iff  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$  satisfies (PIF2).*

*Proof.* For the right-to-left direction, assume that  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$  satisfies (PIF2). Then since  $\beta(a) \cap \beta(\neg a) = \emptyset$ , by (PIF2) and Proposition 5.5,  $R_\diamond^{-1}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(\neg a)) = \beta(\diamond(a, b, \neg a)) = \beta(0)$ . Thus (PI2) obtains in  $\mathfrak{A}$ .

For the left-to-right direction, suppose that  $\mathfrak{A}$  satisfies (PI2). We proceed by contraposition. Let  $U$  be an ultrafilter in  $R_\diamond^{-1}(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)$ , that is,  $F_{Y_1} \times F_{Y_2} \times F_{Y_3} \subseteq \diamond^{-1}[U]$ . For any triple  $(a, b, f)$  from this product, we have  $\diamond(a, b, f) \neq 0$ . Therefore, by (PI2) and Proposition 3.4, for every pair of elements  $a \in F_{Y_1}$  and  $f \in F_{Y_3}$ , it follows that  $a \wedge f \neq 0$ .

Consequently,

$$F_{Y_1} \vee F_{Y_3} = \text{Fg}^{\mathbf{A}}(F_{Y_1} \cup F_{Y_3}) \neq A = F_\emptyset,$$

where  $\text{Fg}^{\mathbf{A}}(F_{Y_1} \cup F_{Y_3})$  denotes the filter of  $\mathbf{A}$  generated by  $F_{Y_1} \cup F_{Y_3}$ . By the standard duality between closed subsets of the Stone space  $\text{Ul}(\mathbf{A})$  and the filters of  $\mathbf{A}$ , it is well known that  $F_{Y_1} \vee F_{Y_3} = F_{Y_1 \cap Y_3}$ . Hence, we conclude that  $Y_1 \cap Y_3 \neq \emptyset$ , which shows that  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$  satisfies (PIF2), as claimed.  $\square$

**Remark 5.11.** The condition (PIF2) cannot be replaced by the simpler condition

$$(5.1) \quad R^{-1}(Y_1, Y_2, \text{Cl}(Y_1^c)) = \emptyset.$$

Indeed, although (5.1) implies (PI2), since one particular instance of (5.1) is

$$R^{-1}(\beta(a), Y_2, \beta(\neg a)) = \emptyset,$$

(PI2) does not entail (5.1), in general. To see this, consider the PSI-Algebra  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}), \diamond)$  with  $\diamond(A, B, C) := A \cap B \cap C$  (cf. Example 3.5). Recall that  $\text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$  is homeomorphic to the Stone-Ćech compactification  $\sigma\mathbb{N}$  of  $\mathbb{N}$ . Let

$$Y := \sigma\mathbb{N} - \mathbb{N},$$

which is neither empty nor clopen. We may think of  $Y$  as the set of all non-principal ultrafilters of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ . Let us compute the value of  $R_\diamond^{-1}(Y, \text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})), \text{Cl}(Y^c))$ . Note that

$$F_Y = \{A \subseteq \mathbb{N} : A \text{ is cofinite}\} \quad \text{and} \quad F_{\text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))} = F_{\text{Cl}(Y^c)} = \{\mathbb{N}\},$$

as  $\text{Cl}(Y^c) = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$ . So it follows that,

$$U \in R_\diamond^{-1}(Y, \text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})), \text{Cl}(Y^c)) \iff F_Y \subseteq U.$$

Thus  $U$  must contain every cofinite subset of  $\mathbb{N}$ ; equivalently,  $U$  is a non-principal ultrafilter. Hence

$$R_\diamond^{-1}(Y, \text{Ult}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})), \text{Cl}(Y^c)) = Y \neq \emptyset,$$

and therefore (5.1) fails in this case.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 5.12.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a 3BAMO. Then, for all closed sets  $X, Y$  of ultrafilters of  $\mathbf{A}$  and for any ultrafilter  $U$ , we have*

$$F_X \times F_X \times F_Y \subseteq \Diamond^{-1}[U] \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \Diamond(a, a, b) \in U \text{ for all } a \in F_X \text{ and } b \in F_Y.$$

*Proof.* The implication from left to right is obvious. For the reverse one, take  $a, b \in F_X$  and  $c \in F_Y$ . Since  $F_X$  is a filter, we have that  $a \wedge b \in F_X$ , and thus  $\Diamond(a \wedge b, a \wedge b, c) \in U$ . As the diamond is a monotonic operator and  $U$  is upward closed, we obtain that  $\Diamond(a, b, c) \in U$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.13.** *If  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a 3BAMO, then  $\mathfrak{A}$  satisfies (PI3) iff  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$  satisfies (PIF3).*

*Proof.* Firstly, let us assume (PIF3) for  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$ . Then, for every  $a, b, f \in B$ , by properties of  $\beta$  we have

$$\beta(a \wedge f) \subseteq R_{\Diamond}^{-1}(\beta(a), \beta(a), \beta(f)) = \Diamond_{R_{\Diamond}}(\beta(a), \beta(a), \beta(f)) = \beta(\Diamond(a, a, f)).$$

Therefore,  $a \wedge f \leq \Diamond(a, a, f)$ .

Secondly, suppose that (PI3) obtains in  $\mathfrak{A}$ . To derive (PIF3) for  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$ , pick an arbitrary  $U \in Y_1 \cap Y_2$  with the intention to show that  $R_{\Diamond}(U, Y_1, Y_1, Y_2)$ . To this end, let  $a \in F_{Y_1}$  and  $f \in F_{Y_2}$ . By the choice of  $U$ ,  $a \wedge f$  is in  $U$ , so by (PI3) we have that  $\Diamond(a, a, f) \in U$ . It follows from Lemma 5.12 that  $F_{Y_1} \times F_{Y_1} \times F_{Y_2} \subseteq \Diamond^{-1}[U]$ , that is  $U \in R_{\Diamond}^{-1}(Y_1, Y_1, Y_2)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.14.** *If  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a 3BAMO, then  $\mathfrak{A}$  satisfies (PI4) iff  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$  satisfies (PIF4).*

*Proof.* Firstly, assume (PI4) for  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Let  $(\dagger) R_{\Diamond}(U, Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)$  and take  $(b, a, f) \in F_{Y_2} \times F_{Y_1} \times F_{Y_3}$ . Thus  $(a, b, f) \in F_{Y_1} \times F_{Y_2} \times F_{Y_3}$ , and by  $(\dagger)$  we have that  $\Diamond(a, b, f) \in U$ . Thus, since  $U$  is upward closed, by (PI4) we obtain that  $\Diamond(b, a, f) \in U$ . It follows that  $R_{\Diamond}(U, Y_2, Y_1, Y_3)$  and in consequence  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$  satisfies (PIF4).

If (PIF4) holds for  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$ , then for any  $a, b, f \in \mathbf{B}$  we have that

$$R_{\Diamond}^{-1}(\beta(a), \beta(b), \beta(f)) \subseteq R_{\Diamond}^{-1}(\beta(b), \beta(a), \beta(f)),$$

since each  $\beta(x)$  is clopen. Thus any ultrafilter that contains  $\Diamond(a, b, f)$  must also contain  $\Diamond(b, a, f)$ , which is enough to conclude that (PI4) holds for  $\mathfrak{A}$ .  $\square$

Below we combine lemmas 5.9, 5.10, 5.13 and 5.14, in order to provide a characterization of PSI-Algebras by means of PSI-frames.

**Theorem 5.15.** *Let  $\mathfrak{A} = (\mathbf{A}, \Diamond)$  be a 3BAMO, let  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A}) = (\text{Ul}(\mathbf{A}), \tau_{\mathbf{A}}, R_{\Diamond})$  be its associated PSI-frame. Then, for every  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$*

$$\mathfrak{A} \text{ satisfies (PI}i\text{)} \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A}) \text{ satisfies (PIF}i\text{)}.$$

*In consequence,  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a Pseudo-Inference Algebra iff  $\text{Uf}(\mathfrak{A})$  is a PSI-space.*

Up to this point, we have established the dual equivalence between PSI-Algebras and PSI-spaces at the level of objects, showing how a 3BAMO can be represented as a relational PSI-space and vice versa. What remains in this section is to extend this correspondence to morphisms: that is, to describe how homomorphisms between PSI-Algebras correspond to certain maps between PSI-spaces. This analysis will enable us to define categories of PSI-Algebras and PSI-spaces, whose objects and morphisms are aligned via duality, ultimately leading to the equivalence of these categories.

Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \Diamond_{\mathbf{A}})$  and  $(\mathbf{B}, \Diamond_{\mathbf{B}})$  be PSI-algebras. A Boolean homomorphism  $h: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$  is called a *Pseudo-Inference semi-homomorphism* (PSI semi-homomorphism) if, for all  $a, b, c \in A$ ,

$$h(\Diamond_{\mathbf{A}}(a, b, c)) \leq \Diamond_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a), h(b), h(c)).$$

Dually,  $h$  is a *Pseudo-Inference hemi-homomorphism* (PSI hemi-homomorphism) if

$$\Diamond_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a), h(b), h(c)) \leq h(\Diamond_{\mathbf{A}}(a, b, c)),$$

for all  $a, b, c \in A$ . When equality holds,

$$h(\Diamond_{\mathbf{A}}(a, b, c)) = \Diamond_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a), h(b), h(c)),$$

we say that  $h$  is a *Pseudo-Inference homomorphism* (PSI homomorphism).

For a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  and subsets  $Z \subseteq X$ ,  $W \subseteq Y$ , we write  $f[Z]$  for the image of  $Z$  and  $f^{-1}[W]$  for the preimage of  $W$ .

**Lemma 5.16.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \diamond_{\mathbf{A}})$  and  $(\mathbf{B}, \diamond_{\mathbf{B}})$  be two PSI-Algebras and let  $h: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$  be a homomorphism of Boolean algebras. If we set  $f$  to denote the map  $h^{-1}: \text{Ul}(\mathbf{B}) \rightarrow \text{Ul}(\mathbf{A})$ , then the following hold:*

(1) *The following are equivalent:*

- (a)  *$h$  is a PSI semi-homomorphism.*
- (b) *For every  $a, b, c \in A$ ,*

$$f^{-1}[R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}}^{-1}(\beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a), \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(b), \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(c))] \subseteq R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}^{-1}(\beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(b)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(c))).$$

- (c) *For every  $U \in \text{Ul}(\mathbf{B})$  and  $\vec{Z} \in \mathcal{C}_0(\text{Ul}(\mathbf{A}))^3$*

$$(f(U), \vec{Z}) \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}} \Rightarrow \exists \vec{Y} \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}(U), f[\vec{Y}] \subseteq \vec{Z},$$

$$\text{where } f[\vec{Y}] := (f[Y_1], f[Y_2], f[Y_3]).$$

(2) *The following are equivalent:*

- (a)  *$h$  is a PSI hemi-homomorphism.*
- (b) *For every  $a, b, c \in A$ ,*

$$R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}^{-1}(\beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(b)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(c))) \subseteq f^{-1}[R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}}^{-1}(\beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a), \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(b), \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(c))].$$

- (c) *For every  $U \in \text{Ul}(\mathbf{B})$  and  $\vec{Y} \in \mathcal{C}_0(\text{Ul}(\mathbf{B}))^3$*

$$(U, \vec{Y}) \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}} \Rightarrow (f(U), f[\vec{Y}]) \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}}.$$

*Proof.* We start by recalling that, by the Stone duality, it is the case that

$$(5.2) \quad f^{-1}[\beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a)] = \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a)),$$

for every  $a \in A$ . Now we proceed with the proof.

(1): (a)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (b) This is immediate from (5.2), Proposition 5.5 and properties of  $\beta_{\mathbf{B}}$ .

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) If  $U \in f^{-1}[R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}}^{-1}(\beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a), \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(b), \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(c))]$ , then  $(f(U), (\beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a), \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(b), \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(c))) \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}}$ . By (c), there exists  $\vec{Y} \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}(U)$  such that  $f[\vec{Y}] \subseteq \vec{Z}$ . Therefore,

$$(5.3) \quad F_{Y_1} \times F_{Y_2} \times F_{Y_3} \subseteq \diamond_{\mathbf{B}}^{-1}[U]$$

and  $f[Y_i] \subseteq \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a_i)$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . In order to prove our claim, we need to show that

$$F_{f^{-1}[\beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a_1)]} \times F_{f^{-1}[\beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a_2)]} \times F_{f^{-1}[\beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a_3)]} \subseteq \diamond_{\mathbf{B}}^{-1}[U].$$

To this end, let  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in B$  be such that  $f^{-1}[\beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a_i)] \subseteq \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(x_i)$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . Then, it follows that  $Y_i \subseteq f^{-1}[\beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a_i)] \subseteq \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(x_i)$ . Thus from (5.3), we can conclude that  $\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}(x, y, z) \in U$ . Hence, because of the latter and (5.2), we can say that  $U \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}^{-1}(\beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(b)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(c)))$ , as claimed.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c). Let us assume that  $(f(U), \vec{Z}) \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}}$ . Observe that by (a) and the monotonicity of  $R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}}^{-1}$ , we have that

$$f^{-1}[R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}}^{-1}(\vec{Z})] \subseteq R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}^{-1}(\beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a_1)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a_2)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a_3))),$$

for every  $a_i \in F_{Z_i}$ . Thus, since  $U \in f^{-1}[R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}}^{-1}(\vec{Z})]$  by assumption, from the latter we obtain

$$(5.4) \quad \diamond_{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a_1)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a_2)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a_3))) \in U.$$

Let  $T_i$  be the filter generated by  $h[F_{Z_i}]$ . It is immediate from (5.4) and the monotonicity of  $\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}$  that

$$T_1 \times T_2 \times T_3 \subseteq \diamond_{\mathbf{B}}^{-1}[U].$$

Consequently, if we take  $Y_i := Y_{T_i}$ , it is readily seen that  $\vec{Y} \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}(U)$  and  $f[\vec{Y}] \subseteq \vec{Z}$ . This concludes the proof.

(2): (a)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (b). This is straightforward from (5.2), Proposition 5.5 and properties of  $\beta_{\mathbf{B}}$ .

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (b). Let us assume that  $U \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}^{-1}(\beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(b)), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(c)))$ . By (c) we have that  $f(U) \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}^{-1}(f[\beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a))], f[\beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(b))], f[\beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(c))])$ . Finally, from (5.2) and the monotonicity of  $R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}^{-1}$ , we can conclude that  $f(U) \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}}^{-1}(\beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a), \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(b), \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(c))$ . Hence, (b) holds.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c). Suppose that  $(U, \vec{Y}) \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}$ . Then, by the monotonicity of  $R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}^{-1}$ , it is the case that (k)  $U \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{B}}}^{-1}(\beta_{\mathbf{B}}(b_1), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(b_2), \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(b_3))$ , for every  $b_1, b_2, b_3 \in B$ , such that  $Y_i \subseteq \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(b_i)$ . In order to prove our claim, let  $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in A$  such that  $F[Y_i] \subseteq \beta_{\mathbf{A}}(a_i)$ . Then, by (5.2), it follows that  $Y_i \subseteq \beta_{\mathbf{B}}(h(a_i))$ . So, from (b) and (k) we can conclude that  $(f(U), f[\vec{Y}]) \in R_{\diamond_{\mathbf{A}}}$ , as required.  $\square$

Let  $(X_1, \tau_1, R_1)$  and  $(X_2, \tau_2, R_2)$  be two PSI-spaces, and let  $f: X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  be a function. Consider the following conditions:

(Sp1) For any  $U \in \mathcal{CO}(X_2)$ , we have  $f^{-1}[U] \in \mathcal{CO}(X_1)$ .

(Sp2) If  $(x, \vec{Y}) \in R_1$ , then  $(f(x), f[\vec{Y}]) \in R_2$ , where

$$f[Z] = \{f(z) : z \in Z\} \quad \text{and} \quad f[\vec{Y}] = (f[Y_1], f[Y_2], f[Y_3]).$$

(Sp3) If  $(f(x), \vec{Z}) \in R_2$ , then there exists  $\vec{Y} \in \mathcal{CO}_0(X_1)^3$  such that  $Y \in R_1(x)$  and  $f[\vec{Y}] \subseteq \vec{Z}$ .

**Definition 5.17.** Let  $f: X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  be a function between the PSI-spaces  $(X_1, \tau_1, R_1)$  and  $(X_2, \tau_2, R_2)$ . Then, we say that  $f$  is a *semi-PSI map* if (Sp1) and (Sp2) hold. Further,  $f$  is a *hemi-PSI map* if (Sp1) and (Sp3) hold. Finally, we say that  $f$  is a *PSI map* if it is both a semi-PSI map and a hemi-PSI map.  $\dashv$

The identity function on a PSI-space acts as a semi-PSI (hemi-PSI or PSI) map, and when two semi-PSI (hemi-PSI or PSI) maps are composed functionally, the result is also a semi-PSI (hemi-PSI or PSI) map. This structure gives rise to three categories: the category  $\mathbf{PSIsp}_0$ , which consists of PSI-spaces and semi-PSI maps, the category  $\mathbf{PSIsp}_1$ , which consists of PSI-spaces and hemi-PSI maps, and  $\mathbf{PSIsp}_2$  which consists of PSI-spaces and PSI maps. Similarly, the standard composition of two semi-homomorphisms (hemi-homomorphisms or homomorphisms) results in another semi-homomorphism (hemi-homomorphism or homomorphism), the identity function on a PSI-Algebra is itself a semi-homomorphism (hemi-homomorphism or homomorphism). Consequently, PSI-Algebras and their semi-homomorphisms form a concrete category, denoted as  $\mathbf{PSI}_0$ . Likewise, the category with PSI-Algebras as objects and hemi-homomorphisms as arrows is denoted by  $\mathbf{PSI}_1$ , and the category with PSI-Algebras as objects and homomorphisms as arrows is denoted by  $\mathbf{PSI}_2$ .

The following result is immediate, so we omit its proof.

**Proposition 5.18.** *Isomorphisms on the category  $\mathbf{PSI}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{PSI}_1$  and  $\mathbf{PSI}_2$  corresponds precisely with bijective semi-homomorphisms, bijective hemi-homomorphisms and bijective homomorphisms, respectively.*

In light of Definition 5.17, the following result is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.16.

**Lemma 5.19.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \diamond_{\mathbf{A}})$  and  $(\mathbf{B}, \diamond_{\mathbf{B}})$  be two PSI-Algebras and let  $h: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$  be a homomorphism of Boolean algebras. Let us consider the map  $h^{-1}: \mathbf{Ul}(\mathbf{B}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ul}(\mathbf{A})$ . Then, the following holds:*

- (1)  $h$  is a PSI semi-homomorphism if and only if  $h^{-1}$  is a semi-PSI map.
- (2)  $h$  is a PSI hemi-homomorphism if and only if  $h^{-1}$  is a hemi-PSI map.
- (3)  $h$  is a PSI homomorphism if and only if  $h^{-1}$  is a PSI map.

An adaptation of (Celani, 2009, Theorem 18) produces the following

**Lemma 5.20.** *Let  $f: X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  be a mapping between the ps-spaces  $(X_1, \tau_1, R_1)$  and  $(X_2, \tau_2, R_2)$ . Consider the function  $f^*: \mathcal{CO}(X_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{CO}(X_1)$  defined by  $f^*(U) := f^{-1}[U]$ . Then, the following hold:*

- (1)  $f$  is a semi-PSI map if and only if  $f^*$  is a PSI semi-homomorphism.

- (2)  $f$  is a hemi-PSI map if and only if  $f^*$  is a PSI hemi-homomorphism.
- (3)  $f$  is a PSI map if and only if  $f^*$  is a PSI homomorphism.

Let  $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ . By Theorem 5.15 and Lemma 5.19, we are able to define functors

$$G_j: \text{PSI}_j^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{PSISp}_j$$

as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{B}, \Diamond) &\mapsto (\text{Ul}(\mathbf{B}), \tau_{\mathbf{B}}, R_{\Diamond}), \\ h &\mapsto h^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, by Proposition 5.8 and Lemma 5.20 the assignments

$$\begin{aligned} (X, \tau, R) &\mapsto (\mathcal{CO}(X), \Diamond_R), \\ f &\mapsto f^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

also define functors

$$H_j: \text{PSISp}_j \rightarrow \text{PSI}_j^{\text{op}}.$$

Therefore, by standard results of Stone duality, together with Lemmas 5.19 and 5.20, it follows that the functors  $G_j$  and  $H_j$  with  $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  yield an equivalence of categories.

**Theorem 5.21.** *The categories  $\text{PSI}_0$ ,  $\text{PSI}_1$  and  $\text{PSI}_2$  are dually equivalent to  $\text{PSISp}_0$ ,  $\text{PSISp}_1$  and  $\text{PSISp}_2$ , respectively.*

Theorem 5.21 establishes the dual equivalences between the algebraic and the topological sides of the theory of PSI-Algebras. In view of this correspondence, we can now focus on the case of Extended Contact Algebras. The next remark shows how these algebras naturally fit into the general framework of PSI-Algebras and PSI-spaces, thus allowing us to interpret the extended contact relation as a particular instance of the relational operator  $\Diamond$ . This observation motivates the introduction of a special class of PSI-spaces, namely those for which the relational component exhibits a form of totality, as defined below.

**Remark 5.22.** Let  $(\mathbf{B}, \vdash)$  be an ECA and let  $(\mathbf{B}, \Diamond_{\vdash})$  be its associated relational PSI-Algebra. if  $\vec{Y} \in \mathcal{CO}(\text{Ul}(\mathbf{B}))$ , it is clear that  $R^{-1}(\vec{Y}) \in \{\text{Ul}(\mathbf{B}), \emptyset\}$ . Moreover, by Theorem 5.21 it is also the case that  $(\mathbf{B}, \Diamond_{\vdash})$  is isomorphic to  $(\mathcal{CO}(\text{Ul}(\mathbf{B})), \Diamond_{R_{\Diamond_{\vdash}}})$ .  $\dashv$

**Definition 5.23.** We say that a PSI-space  $(X, R)$  is *total* if for every  $\vec{Y} \in \mathcal{CO}(X)^3$ , the following condition holds

(T) If there exists  $x \in X$  such that  $(x, \vec{Z}) \in R$ , then,  $(y, \vec{Z}) \in R$  for every  $y \in X$ .

Equivalently, (T) says that  $R^{-1}(\vec{Z}) = \{X, \emptyset\}$ , for every  $\vec{Z} \in \mathcal{CO}(X)^3$ .  $\dashv$

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 5.15, 5.8, Proposition 5.5 and Definition 5.23 we get:

**Proposition 5.24.** *The following hold:*

- (1)  $(\mathbf{B}, \vdash)$  is an ECA iff  $(\text{Ul}(\mathbf{B}), R_{\Diamond_{\vdash}})$  is a total PSI-space.
- (2)  $(X, \tau, R)$  is a total PSI-space if and only if  $(\mathcal{CO}(X), \Diamond_R)$  is a relational PSI-Algebra.

Let  $(\mathbf{A}, \vdash_{\mathbf{A}})$  and  $(\mathbf{B}, \vdash_{\mathbf{B}})$  be two ECAs. We say that a homomorphism of Boolean algebras  $h: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$  is a *reflecting ECA-morphism* if for every  $a, b, c \in \mathbf{A}$ :

$$(h(a), h(b)) \vdash_{\mathbf{B}} h(c) \Rightarrow (a, b) \vdash_{\mathbf{A}} c.$$

On the other hand, if

$$(a, b) \vdash_{\mathbf{A}} c \Rightarrow (h(a), h(b)) \vdash_{\mathbf{B}} h(c)$$

holds, then we say that  $h$  is a *preserving ECA-morphism*. Furthermore, if  $h$  is both reflecting and preserving ECA-morphism, then we say that  $h$  is a *similarity ECA-morphism*.

**Proposition 5.25.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}_1, \vdash_1)$  and  $(\mathbf{A}_2, \vdash_2)$  be two ECAs and let  $(\mathbf{A}_i, \Diamond_{\vdash_i})$  be its associated relational PSI-Algebras, with  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . If  $h : A_1 \rightarrow A_2$  is a Boolean homomorphism, then the following hold:*

- (1)  *$h$  is a reflecting ECA-morphism iff  $h$  is a PSI semi-homomorphism.*
- (2)  *$h$  is a preserving ECA-morphism iff  $h$  is a PSI hemi-homomorphism.*
- (3)  *$h$  is a similarity ECA-morphism iff  $h$  is a PSI homomorphism.*

We write  $\text{EC}_0$ ,  $\text{EC}_1$  and  $\text{EC}_2$  for the categories whose objects are ECAs and whose morphisms are respectively, reflecting ECA-morphism, preserving ECA-morphism and similarity ECA-morphism. In addition, we denote by  $\text{tPSISp}_0$ ,  $\text{tPSISp}_1$  and  $\text{tPSISp}_2$  the full subcategories of  $\text{PSISp}_0$ ,  $\text{PSISp}_1$  and  $\text{PSISp}_2$  whose objects are total PSI-spaces.

We are now in a position to formulate one of the main results of this paper.

**Theorem 5.26.** *The categories  $\text{EC}_0$ ,  $\text{EC}_1$  and  $\text{EC}_2$  are dually equivalent to  $\text{tPSISp}_0$ ,  $\text{tPSISp}_1$  and  $\text{tPSISp}_2$ , respectively.*

*Proof.* Let  $j \in \{0, 1\}$  and consider the assignments

$$L_j : \text{EC}_j^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{tPSISp}_j$$

defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{B}, \vdash) &\mapsto (\text{Ul}(\mathbf{B}), \tau_{\mathbf{B}}, R_{\Diamond_{\vdash}}), \\ h &\mapsto h^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

And also consider the assignments

$$M_j : \text{tPSISp}_j \rightarrow \text{EC}_j^{\text{op}}.$$

defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (X, \tau, R) &\mapsto (\mathcal{CO}(X), \vdash_{\Diamond_R}), \\ f &\mapsto f^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that from Proposition 3.9 and Theorem 5.21 it follows immediately that every pair  $L_j$  and  $M_j$  forms a pair of functors that result in the desired equivalence.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- Balbani, P. and Ivanova, T. (2021). Relational Representation Theorems for Extended Contact Algebras. *Studia Logica*, 109:701–723.
- Bezhanishvili, G., Bezhanishvili, N., Santoli, T., and Venema, Y. (2019). A strict implication calculus for compact hausdorff spaces. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 170(11):102714.
- Bezhanishvili, G., Bezhanishvili, N., Sourabh, S., and Venema, Y. (2016). Irreducible Equivalence Relations, Gleason Spaces, and de Vries Duality. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 25(3):381–401.
- Burris, S. N. and Sankappanavar, H. P. (2011). *A Course in Universal Algebra*. Graduate texts in mathematics. Springer, New York, NY, 1981 edition.
- Celani, S. and Jansana, R. (2022). A variety of algebras closely related to subordination algebras. *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics*, 32(2–3):200–238.
- Celani, S. A. (2009). Topological duality for boolean algebras with a normal n-ary monotonic operator. *Order*, 26(1):49–67.
- de Laguna, T. (1922). Point, line, and surface, as sets of solids. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 19(17):449–461.
- Dütsch, I. and Vakarelov, D. (2007). Region-based theory of discrete spaces: a proximity approach. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 49:5–14.
- Dütsch, I. and Winter, M. (2004). Construction of Boolean contact algebras. *AI Communications*, 13:246.
- Gruszczyński, R. and Menchón, P. (2025). On non-definability of internal connectedness via contact relation. arXiv:2503.08691 [math.GN]
- Ivanova, T. (2020). Extended contact algebras and internal connectedness. *Studia Logica*, 108(2):239–254.

- Mac Lane, S. (1978). *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. Springer New York.
- Pratt, I. and Schoop, D. (2000). Expressivity in polygonal, plane mereotopology. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 65(2):822–838.
- Stell, J. G. (2000). Boolean Connection Algebras: A New Approach to the Region-Connection Calculus. *Artificial Intelligence*, 122(1–2):111–136.
- Thron, W. J. (1973). Proximity structures and grills. *Mathematische Annalen*, 206:35–62.
- Vakarelov, D. (2017). A mereotopology based on sequent algebras. *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics*, 27(3–4):342–364.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1920). *The Concept of Nature*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *Process and Reality*. MacMillan, New York.

RAFAŁ GRUSZCZYŃSKI, ORCID: 0000-0002-3379-0577, DEPARTMENT OF LOGIC, NICOLAUS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY IN TORUŃ, POLAND

Email address: `gruszka@umk.pl`

PAULA MENCHÓN, ORCID: 0000-0002-9395-107X, DEPARTMENT OF LOGIC, NICOLAUS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY IN TORUŃ, POLAND, AND UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DEL CENTRO DE LA PROVINCIA DE BUENOS AIRES, TANDIL, BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

Email address: `mpmenchon@nucompa.exa.unicen.edu.ar`

WILLIAM ZULUAGA, ORCID: 0000-0002-8798-9493, CONICET AND UNIVERSITY OF THE CENTER OF THE BUENOS AIRES PROVINCE, TANDIL, BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

Email address: `wizubo@gmail.com`