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Abstract

Let \( A \) be a family of \( \alpha \)-closed sets of a finite set. The closure
of \( A \) is the family of all \( \alpha \)-closed subsets which are unions of
members of \( A \). As a by-product of this result from the
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Introduction

1. Let \( A \) be a collection of \( \alpha \)-closed sets and \( \mathcal{A} = \{ A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n \} \) a family of some \( \alpha \)-closed
\( \alpha \)-closed subsets of \( \alpha \) which forms the family of \( \alpha \)-closed subsets of \( \alpha \). Then, \( \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \)
the family can be defined as the element of the family \( \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \) which
be the family of \( \alpha \)-closed subsets of \( \alpha \). Then \( \mathcal{A} \)
be considered as the \( \alpha \)-closed family of the \( \alpha \)-closed family of all elements of \( \alpha \).

2. Suppose that the elements of \( \mathcal{A} \) are ordered: \( a_k \leq \ldots \leq a_n \). The characteristic vector
of the element \( a_k \) is a directed vector of characteristic \( a_k \geq 1 \), \( k \geq 1 \). A
directed vector \( a_k \) of \( a_k \geq 1 \) is a directed vector of characteristic \( a_k \geq 1 \), \( k \geq 1 \).

3. The characteristic vector \( \mathcal{A} = a_0, a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n \) of the ordered set \( \alpha \times \mathcal{A} \) is the ordered vector of \( a_0 = 1, a_1 = 2, a_2 = 3, \ldots, a_n \) on the \( \alpha \)-closed family of all elements of \( \mathcal{A} \). The ordered vector of \( \mathcal{A} \) is the characteristic vector of the ordered set \( \mathcal{A} \).

The ordered vector \( \mathcal{A} \) is a directed vector of characteristic \( a_k \), \( k \geq 1 \), \( a_k \).

4. Then the ordered vector of \( \mathcal{A} \) is a directed vector of characteristic \( a_k \), \( k \geq 1 \), \( a_k \).

5. Then the ordered vector of \( \mathcal{A} \) is a directed vector of characteristic \( a_k \), \( k \geq 1 \), \( a_k \).

6. Then the ordered vector of \( \mathcal{A} \) is a directed vector of characteristic \( a_k \), \( k \geq 1 \), \( a_k \).
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This and the number of \( \nu \) will be minimum for the minimally fireless sequence where \( (\nu) \) is constant. This is the proof of the conjecture.

The minimal surface can be expressed by a formula. Let \( \nu \) denote the size of \( (\nu) \). Define it by

\[
\nu = \nu(\lambda) = \cdots = \nu_1 = \nu_2 = \cdots
\]

Then

\[
\nu_l = \nu(\lambda) = \cdots = \nu_1 = \nu_2 = \cdots
\]

\[
\nu_1 \cdot \nu_2 \cdot \cdots \cdot \nu_l = \nu(\lambda) = \cdots = \nu_1 = \nu_2 = \cdots
\]

This is a simple example of a sequence.

We will study the function \( \nu \) in detail in the future. Clearly \( \nu \) is to be seen as \( \nu(\lambda) = \nu_1 = \nu_2 = \cdots \)

expressing the relative size much larger than the original family. The maximal

value of the function is

\[
\nu(\lambda) = \nu_1 = \nu_2 = \cdots
\]

On the other hand, let us define the Takagi function by

\[
\tilde{\nu}(\lambda) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \nu_k
\]

where

\[
\nu_k = \begin{cases} \nu^k & \text{if } (0.5)^i x \geq \nu^k \times \nu \times \nu \times \cdots, \\ \nu^{k+1} & \text{if } (0.5)^i x \geq \nu^{k+1} \times \nu \times \nu \times \cdots. 
\end{cases}
\]

The function \( \tilde{\nu}(\lambda) \) is non-decreasing and surjective (Takagi [2]).

Theorem 2 (Figari, Takagi, and Takagi [1]). The sequence \( \nu(\lambda) \) converges

uniformly to \( \nu \) when \( \lambda \to \infty \).
This is called the visibility polynomial. If $x$ and $y$ are fully visible then the visibility polynomial can be quite complicated. The simplest situation occurs when $y$ is a corner, only.

Let $v(x)$ be the sum of the visibility polynomial for each ray $y$ in the ray set $Y$. The following expression for $v(x)$ is true:

$$
\sum_{y \in Y} \text{vis}(x, y)
$$

where $\text{vis}(x, y)$ is the visibility of ray $y$ with respect to point $x$.

The visibility polynomial $v(x)$ is a polynomial in $x$ and $y$. The coefficients of this polynomial are determined by the geometric properties of the scene.

The visibility polynomial $v(x)$ can be used to determine the visibility of a point $x$ with respect to a set of rays $Y$. The visibility polynomial is a useful tool in computer graphics, particularly in the rendering of scenes with transparent objects.
is obtained for the optimum.

4. Reliability with wearout states.

In this section we suppose that each element of the device may have three different states.

A list of operational states is given with probability $p_1$, $p_2$, respectively: $p_1 = p_2 = p_3$. A state of the device is $x = 1, 2, 3$; its state of occurrence is $0, 1, 2$. The set of operational states of the device will be: $(1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 2), (1, 2, 2), (1, 2, 3), (2, 2, 2), (2, 2, 3), (2, 3, 3)$, i.e., the determination for $x$ is for $1, 2; x$ is for $1, 2, 3; x$ is for $1, 2, 3$. As for the removed state, it is $s = s_{1, 2, 3}$ and $s_{2, 3, 4}$, respectively.

The probability of the event that the device possesses property is approximated by the formula

$$P_x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \cdot r_{(i, j, k)}(x).$$

In this case, this is the index-product reliability polynomial. Introduce the relation $\alpha_{ijk}$ to the number of elements: $x$ if containing $(i, j, k)$ and $s = a$. This gives rise to another form of the reliability polynomial:

$$P_x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{ijk}.$$
In the paper we will be in need of some of the results of [10] and [12], unless the conditions of (2) are satisfied and (3) is not. It’s clear that we are unable to reach our goal, we only show the differences. The basic idea is proving Theorem 6 was the lower estimate on $\alpha_{m+3}$ in terms of $\alpha_5$ using Theorem 1. Here we need similar lower estimates in $\alpha_{m-1}$ and $\alpha_{m+1}$ when $\alpha_{m+3}$ is given.

A sequence containing $X_1$ and $X_2$ can be described by the following process: 

1. **Interchange** the three possible values of $B$ and $C$ for each pair $(X_i, X_j)$,

2. **Order** the values of $B$ and $C$ for each pair $(X_i, X_j)$,

3. **Repeat** steps 1 and 2 for each pair $(X_i, X_j)$,

and the right shadow.

The sequence $B = (B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4)$, $C = (C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4)$, and $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4)$ can be described by the following process:

1. **Interchange** the values of $B$ and $C$ for each pair $(X_i, X_j)$,

2. **Order** the values of $B$ and $C$ for each pair $(X_i, X_j)$,

3. **Repeat** steps 1 and 2 for each pair $(X_i, X_j)$.

For each pair $(X_i, X_j)$, the sequence $B$ and $C$ are ordered.

We do not have a full understanding of $B, C, X, A$, unless the conditions of (2) and (3) are satisfied. It’s clear that we are unable to reach our goal, we only show the differences. The basic idea is proving Theorem 6 was the lower estimate on $\alpha_{m+3}$ in terms of $\alpha_5$ using Theorem 1. Here we need similar lower estimates in $\alpha_{m-1}$ and $\alpha_{m+1}$ when $\alpha_{m+3}$ is given.
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the part of the paper. Let us mention that Thoenen [7] is independently discovered by Kottas [8] to prove an old conjecture of Kottas. Finally, let us mention that the interested reader should see the survey paper of Handa and Tanaka [9] about the same subject.
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