JOURNAL OF FORMALIZED MATHEMATICS
Volume 15, Released 2003, Published 2003
Inst. of Computer Science, Univ. of Bialystok

Basic Properties of Rough Sets and Rough Membership Function[1]

Adam Grabowski
University of Bialystok

Summary. We present basic concepts concerning rough set theory. We define tolerance and approximation spaces and rough membership function. Different rough inclusions as well as the predicate of rough equality of sets are also introduced.

MML Identifier: ROUGHS_1.

WWW: http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol15/roughs_1.html

The articles [20], [8], [25], [21], [1], [13], [22], [11], [19], [26], [28], [5], [2], [10], [9], [27], [7], [3], [14], [15], [6], [4], [16], [24], [23], [17], [18], and [12] provide the notation and terminology for this paper.

1. Preliminaries

Let A be a set. Observe that $\langle A, \mathrm{id}_A \rangle$ is discrete.

We now state the proposition

(1) For every set X such that $\nabla_X \subseteq \mathrm{id}_X$ holds X is trivial.

Let A be a relational structure. We say that A is diagonal if and only if:

(Def. 1) The internal relation of $A \subseteq \mathrm{id}_{\text{the carrier of } A}$.

Let A be a non trivial set. Observe that $\langle A, \nabla_A \rangle$ is non diagonal.

Next we state the proposition

(2) For every reflexive relational structure L holds $\mathrm{id}_{\text{the carrier of } L} \subseteq$ the internal relation of L.

One can check that every reflexive relational structure which is non discrete is also non trivial and every relational structure which is reflexive and trivial is also discrete.

We now state the proposition

(3) For every set X and for every total reflexive binary relation R on X holds $\mathrm{id}_X \subseteq R$.

Let us observe that every relational structure which is discrete is also diagonal and every relational structure which is non diagonal is also non discrete.

Let us note that there exists a relational structure which is non diagonal and non empty.

We now state three propositions:

[1]This work has been partially supported by CALCULEMUS grant HPRN-CT-2000-00102.

(4) Let A be a non diagonal non empty relational structure. Then there exist elements x, y of A such that $x \neq y$ and $\langle x, y\rangle \in$ the internal relation of A.

(5) For every set D and for all finite sequences p, q of elements of D holds $\bigcup(p \frown q) = \bigcup p \cup \bigcup q$.

(6) For all functions p, q such that q is disjoint valued and $p \subseteq q$ holds p is disjoint valued.

Let us note that every function which is empty is also disjoint valued.

Let A be a set. One can verify that there exists a finite sequence of elements of A which is disjoint valued.

Let A be a non empty set. Note that there exists a finite sequence of elements of A which is non empty and disjoint valued.

Let A be a set, let X be a finite sequence of elements of 2^A, and let n be a natural number. Then $X(n)$ is a subset of A.

Let A be a set and let X be a finite sequence of elements of 2^A. Then $\bigcup X$ is a subset of A.

Let A be a finite set and let R be a binary relation on A. Observe that $\langle A, R\rangle$ is finite.

One can prove the following proposition

(7) For all sets X, x, y and for every tolerance T of X such that $x \in [y]_T$ holds $y \in [x]_T$.

2. Tolerance and Approximation Spaces

Let P be a relational structure. We say that P has equivalence relation if and only if:

(Def. 2) The internal relation of P is an equivalence relation of the carrier of P.

We say that P has tolerance relation if and only if:

(Def. 3) The internal relation of P is a tolerance of the carrier of P.

Let us note that every relational structure which has equivalence relation has also tolerance relation.

Let A be a set. Observe that $\langle A, \mathrm{id}_A\rangle$ has equivalence relation.

Let us observe that there exists a relational structure which is discrete, finite, and non empty and has equivalence relation and there exists a relational structure which is non diagonal, finite, and non empty and has equivalence relation.

An approximation space is a non empty relational structure with equivalence relation. A tolerance space is a non empty relational structure with tolerance relation.

Let A be a tolerance space. One can check that the internal relation of A is total, reflexive, and symmetric.

Let A be an approximation space. One can verify that the internal relation of A is transitive.

Let A be a tolerance space and let X be a subset of A. The functor $\mathrm{LAp}(X)$ yields a subset of A and is defined by:

(Def. 4) $\mathrm{LAp}(X) = \{x; x \text{ ranges over elements of } A\text{: } [x]_{\text{the internal relation of } A} \subseteq X\}$.

The functor $\mathrm{UAp}(X)$ yields a subset of A and is defined as follows:

(Def. 5) $\mathrm{UAp}(X) = \{x; x \text{ ranges over elements of } A\text{: } [x]_{\text{the internal relation of } A} \text{ meets } X\}$.

Let A be a tolerance space and let X be a subset of A. The functor $\mathrm{BndAp}(X)$ yields a subset of A and is defined by:

(Def. 6) $\mathrm{BndAp}(X) = \mathrm{UAp}(X) \setminus \mathrm{LAp}(X)$.

Let A be a tolerance space and let X be a subset of A. We say that X is rough if and only if:

(Def. 7) $\mathrm{BndAp}(X) \neq \emptyset$.

We introduce X is exact as an antonym of X is rough.

In the sequel A is a tolerance space and X, Y are subsets of A.

Next we state a number of propositions:

(8) For every set x such that $x \in \mathrm{LAp}(X)$ holds $[x]_{\text{the internal relation of } A} \subseteq X$.

(9) For every element x of A such that $[x]_{\text{the internal relation of } A} \subseteq X$ holds $x \in \mathrm{LAp}(X)$.

(10) For every set x such that $x \in \mathrm{UAp}(X)$ holds $[x]_{\text{the internal relation of } A}$ meets X.

(11) For every element x of A such that $[x]_{\text{the internal relation of } A}$ meets X holds $x \in \mathrm{UAp}(X)$.

(12) $\mathrm{LAp}(X) \subseteq X$.

(13) $X \subseteq \mathrm{UAp}(X)$.

(14) $\mathrm{LAp}(X) \subseteq \mathrm{UAp}(X)$.

(15) X is exact iff $\mathrm{LAp}(X) = X$.

(16) X is exact iff $\mathrm{UAp}(X) = X$.

(17) $X = \mathrm{LAp}(X)$ iff $X = \mathrm{UAp}(X)$.

(18) $\mathrm{LAp}(\emptyset_A) = \emptyset$.

(19) $\mathrm{UAp}(\emptyset_A) = \emptyset$.

(20) $\mathrm{LAp}(\Omega_A) = \Omega_A$.

(21) $\mathrm{UAp}(\Omega_A) = \Omega_A$.

(22) $\mathrm{LAp}(X \cap Y) = \mathrm{LAp}(X) \cap \mathrm{LAp}(Y)$.

(23) $\mathrm{UAp}(X \cup Y) = \mathrm{UAp}(X) \cup \mathrm{UAp}(Y)$.

(24) If $X \subseteq Y$, then $\mathrm{LAp}(X) \subseteq \mathrm{LAp}(Y)$.

(25) If $X \subseteq Y$, then $\mathrm{UAp}(X) \subseteq \mathrm{UAp}(Y)$.

(26) $\mathrm{LAp}(X) \cup \mathrm{LAp}(Y) \subseteq \mathrm{LAp}(X \cup Y)$.

(27) $\mathrm{UAp}(X \cap Y) \subseteq \mathrm{UAp}(X) \cap \mathrm{UAp}(Y)$.

(28) $\mathrm{LAp}(X^{\mathrm{c}}) = (\mathrm{UAp}(X))^{\mathrm{c}}$.

(29) $\mathrm{UAp}(X^{\mathrm{c}}) = (\mathrm{LAp}(X))^{\mathrm{c}}$.

(30) $\mathrm{UAp}(\mathrm{LAp}(\mathrm{UAp}(X))) = \mathrm{UAp}(X)$.

(31) $\mathrm{LAp}(\mathrm{UAp}(\mathrm{LAp}(X))) = \mathrm{LAp}(X)$.

(32) $\mathrm{BndAp}(X) = \mathrm{BndAp}(X^{\mathrm{c}})$.

In the sequel A is an approximation space and X is a subset of A.

The following propositions are true:

(33) $\mathrm{LAp}(\mathrm{LAp}(X)) = \mathrm{LAp}(X)$.

(34) $\mathrm{LAp}(\mathrm{LAp}(X)) = \mathrm{UAp}(\mathrm{LAp}(X))$.

(35) $\mathrm{UAp}(\mathrm{UAp}(X)) = \mathrm{UAp}(X)$.

(36) $\mathrm{UAp}(\mathrm{UAp}(X)) = \mathrm{LAp}(\mathrm{UAp}(X))$.

Let A be an approximation space. Observe that there exists a subset of A which is exact.

Let A be an approximation space and let X be a subset of A. Observe that $\mathrm{LAp}(X)$ is exact and $\mathrm{UAp}(X)$ is exact.

The following proposition is true

(37) Let A be an approximation space, X be a subset of A, and x, y be sets. If $x \in \mathrm{UAp}(X)$ and $\langle x, y \rangle \in$ the internal relation of A, then $y \in \mathrm{UAp}(X)$.

Let A be a non diagonal approximation space. Observe that there exists a subset of A which is rough.

Let A be an approximation space and let X be a subset of A. Rough set of X is defined by:

(Def. 8) It $= \langle \mathrm{LAp}(X), \mathrm{UAp}(X) \rangle$.

3. Membership Function

Let A be a finite tolerance space and let x be an element of A. Note that $\mathrm{card}([x]_{\text{the internal relation of } A})$ is non empty.

Let A be a finite tolerance space and let X be a subset of A. The functor $\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A)$ yielding a function from the carrier of A into $\mathbb{R}$ is defined by:

(Def. 9) For every element x of A holds $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x) = \frac{\mathrm{card}(X \cap [x]_{\text{the internal relation of } A})}{\mathrm{card}([x]_{\text{the internal relation of } A})}$.

In the sequel A denotes a finite tolerance space, X denotes a subset of A, and x denotes an element of A.

We now state two propositions:

(38) $0 \leq (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x)$ and $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x) \leq 1$.

(39) $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x) \in [0,1]$.

In the sequel A denotes a finite approximation space, X, Y denote subsets of A, and x denotes an element of A.

Next we state four propositions:

(40) $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x) = 1$ iff $x \in \mathrm{LAp}(X)$.

(41) $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x) = 0$ iff $x \in (\mathrm{UAp}(X))^{\mathrm{c}}$.

(42) $0 < (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x)$ and $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x) < 1$ iff $x \in \mathrm{BndAp}(X)$.

(43) For every discrete approximation space A holds every subset of A is exact.

Let A be a discrete approximation space. Note that every subset of A is exact.

We now state several propositions:

(44) For every discrete finite approximation space A and for every subset X of A holds $\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A) = \chi_{X,\text{the carrier of } A}$.

(45) Let A be a finite approximation space, X be a subset of A, and x, y be sets. If $\langle x, y \rangle \in$ the internal relation of A, then $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x) = (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(y)$.

(46) $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X^{\mathrm{c}},A))(x) = 1 - (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x)$.

(47) If $X \subseteq Y$, then $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x) \leq (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(Y,A))(x)$.

(48) $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X \cup Y,A))(x) \geq (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x)$.

(49) $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X \cap Y,A))(x) \leq (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x)$.

(50) $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X \cup Y,A))(x) \geq \max((\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X,A))(x), (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(Y,A))(x))$.

(51) If X misses Y, then $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X \cup Y, A))(x) = (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X, A))(x) + (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(Y, A))(x)$.

(52) $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X \cap Y, A))(x) \leq \min((\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X, A))(x), (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(Y, A))(x))$.

Let A be a finite tolerance space, let X be a finite sequence of elements of $2^{\text{the carrier of } A}$, and let x be an element of A. The functor $\mathrm{FinSeqM}(x, X)$ yielding a finite sequence of elements of $\mathbb{R}$ is defined by:

(Def. 10) $\mathrm{dom}\,\mathrm{FinSeqM}(x, X) = \mathrm{dom}\,X$ and for every natural number n such that $n \in \mathrm{dom}\,X$ holds $(\mathrm{FinSeqM}(x, X))(n) = (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X(n), A))(x)$.

The following propositions are true:

(53) Let X be a finite sequence of elements of $2^{\text{the carrier of } A}$, x be an element of A, and y be an element of $2^{\text{the carrier of } A}$. Then $\mathrm{FinSeqM}(x, X \frown \langle y \rangle) = (\mathrm{FinSeqM}(x, X)) \frown \langle (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(y, A))(x) \rangle$.

(54) $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(\emptyset_A, A))(x) = 0$.

(55) For every disjoint valued finite sequence X of elements of $2^{\text{the carrier of } A}$ holds $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(\bigcup X, A))(x) = \sum \mathrm{FinSeqM}(x, X)$.

(56) $\mathrm{LAp}(X) = \{x; x$ ranges over elements of A: $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X, A))(x) = 1\}$.

(57) $\mathrm{UAp}(X) = \{x; x$ ranges over elements of A: $(\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X, A))(x) > 0\}$.

(58) $\mathrm{BndAp}(X) = \{x; x$ ranges over elements of A: $0 < (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X, A))(x) \wedge (\mathrm{MemberFunc}(X, A))(x) < 1\}$.

4. Rough Inclusion

In the sequel A denotes a tolerance space and X, Y, Z denote subsets of A.

Let A be a tolerance space and let X, Y be subsets of A. The predicate $X \subseteq_* Y$ is defined by:

(Def. 11) $\mathrm{LAp}(X) \subseteq \mathrm{LAp}(Y)$.

The predicate $X \subseteq^* Y$ is defined as follows:

(Def. 12) $\mathrm{UAp}(X) \subseteq \mathrm{UAp}(Y)$.

Let A be a tolerance space and let X, Y be subsets of A. The predicate $X \subseteq^*_* Y$ is defined by:

(Def. 13) $X \subseteq_* Y$ and $X \subseteq^* Y$.

One can prove the following three propositions:

(59) If $X \subseteq_* Y$ and $Y \subseteq_* Z$, then $X \subseteq_* Z$.

(60) If $X \subseteq^* Y$ and $Y \subseteq^* Z$, then $X \subseteq^* Z$.

(61) If $X \subseteq^*_* Y$ and $Y \subseteq^*_* Z$, then $X \subseteq^*_* Z$.

5. Rough Equality of Sets

Let A be a tolerance space and let X, Y be subsets of A. The predicate $X =_* Y$ is defined as follows:

(Def. 14) $\mathrm{LAp}(X) = \mathrm{LAp}(Y)$.

Let us notice that the predicate $X =_* Y$ is reflexive and symmetric. The predicate $X =^* Y$ is defined as follows:

(Def. 15) $\mathrm{UAp}(X) = \mathrm{UAp}(Y)$.

Let us notice that the predicate $X =^{*} Y$ is reflexive and symmetric. The predicate $X =^{*}_{*} Y$ is defined as follows:

(Def. 16) $\mathrm{LAp}(X) = \mathrm{LAp}(Y)$ and $\mathrm{UAp}(X) = \mathrm{UAp}(Y)$.

Let us notice that the predicate $X =^{*}_{*} Y$ is reflexive and symmetric.

Let A be a tolerance space and let X, Y be subsets of A. Let us observe that $X =_{*} Y$ if and only if:

(Def. 17) $X \subseteq_{*} Y$ and $Y \subseteq_{*} X$.

Let us observe that $X =^{*} Y$ if and only if:

(Def. 18) $X \subseteq^{*} Y$ and $Y \subseteq^{*} X$.

Let us observe that $X =^{*}_{*} Y$ if and only if:

(Def. 19) $X =_{*} Y$ and $X =^{*} Y$.

REFERENCES

[1] Grzegorz Bancerek. Cardinal numbers. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/card_1.html.

[2] Grzegorz Bancerek and Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Segments of natural numbers and finite sequences. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/finseq_1.html.

[3] Józef Białas. Group and field definitions. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/realset1.html.

[4] Czesław Byliński. Basic functions and operations on functions. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funct_3.html.

[5] Czesław Byliński. Functions and their basic properties. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funct_1.html.

[6] Czesław Byliński. Functions from a set to a set. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funct_2.html.

[7] Czesław Byliński. Partial functions. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/partfun1.html.

[8] Czesław Byliński. Some basic properties of sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/zfmisc_1.html.

[9] Czesław Byliński. Finite sequences and tuples of elements of a non-empty sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/finseq_2.html.

[10] Czesław Byliński. The sum and product of finite sequences of real numbers. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/rvsum_1.html.

[11] Agata Darmochwał. Finite sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/finset_1.html.

[12] Adam Grabowski. On the category of posets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/orders_3.html.

[13] Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Basic properties of real numbers. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/real_1.html.

[14] Andrzej Nędzusiak. σ-fields and probability. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/prob_1.html.

[15] Andrzej Nędzusiak. Probability. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/prob_2.html.

[16] Beata Padlewska and Agata Darmochwał. Topological spaces and continuous functions. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/pre_topc.html.

[17] Konrad Raczkowski and Paweł Sadowski. Equivalence relations and classes of abstraction. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/eqrel_1.html.

[18] Konrad Raczkowski and Paweł Sadowski. Topological properties of subsets in real numbers. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/rcomp_1.html.

[19] Andrzej Trybulec. Binary operations applied to functions. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funcop_1.html.

[20] Andrzej Trybulec. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, Axiomatics, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Axiomatics/tarski.html.

[21] Andrzej Trybulec. Subsets of real numbers. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, Addenda, 2003. http://mizar.org/JFM/Addenda/numbers.html.

[22] Andrzej Trybulec and Czesław Byliński. Some properties of real numbers operations: min, max, square, and square root. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/square_1.html.

[23] Wojciech A. Trybulec. Partially ordered sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/orders_1.html.

[24] Wojciech A. Trybulec. Groups. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/group_1.html.

[25] Zinaida Trybulec. Properties of subsets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/subset_1.html.

[26] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations and their basic properties. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/relat_1.html.

[27] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations defined on sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/relset_1.html.

[28] Edmund Woronowicz and Anna Zalewska. Properties of binary relations. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/relat_2.html.

Received November 23, 2003

Published January 2, 2004