RATIO MATHEMATICA 26 (2014), 03–20 ISSN:1592-7415

Rough Set Theory Applied To Hyper BCK-Algebra

R. Ameri[a], R. Moradian[b] and R. A. Borzooei[c]

[a]School of Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science, College of Sciences, University of Tehran, P.O. Box 14155-6455, Teheran, Iran

ameri@ut.ac.ir

[b]Department of Mathematics, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran

rmoradian58@yahoo.com

[c]Department of Mathematics, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

borzooei@sbu.ac.ir

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to introduce the notions of lower and upper approximation of a subset of a hyper BCK-algebra with respect to a hyper BCK-ideal. We give the notion of rough hyper subalgebra and rough hyper BCK-ideal, too, and we investigate their properties.

Key words: rough set, rough (weak, strong) hyper BCK-ideal, rough hyper subalgebra, regular congruence relation.

MSC 2010: 20N20, 20N25.

1 Introduction

In 1966, Y. Imai and K. Iseki [2] introduced a new notion, called a BCK-algebra. The hyper structure theory (called also multi algebras) was introduced in 1934 by F. Marty [6] at the 8th Congress of Scandinavian Mathematicians. In [3], Y. B. Jun, M. M. Zahedi, X. L. Xin, R. A. Borzooei applied the hyper structures to BCK-algebras and they introduced the notion of hyper BCK-algebra (resp. hyper K-algebra) which is a generalization of BCK-algebra (resp. hyper BCK-algebra). They also introduced the notion of hyper BCK-ideal, weak hyper BCK-ideal, hyper K-ideal and weak hyper K-ideal and gave relations among them. In 1982, Pawlak introduced the concept of rough set (see [7]). Recently Jun [5] applied rough set theory to BCK-algebras. In this paper, we apply the rough set theory to hyper BCK-algebras.

2 Preliminaries

Let U be a universal set. For an equivalence relation Θ on U, the set of elements of U that are related to $x \in U$, is called the *equivalence class* of x and is denoted by $[x]_\Theta$. Moreover, let U/Θ denote the family of all equivalence classes induced on U by Θ. For any $X \subseteq U$, we write X^c to denote the complement of X in U, that is the set $U \backslash X$. A pair (U, Θ) where $U \neq \phi$ and Θ is an equivalence relation on U is called an *approximation space.*
The interpretation in rough set theory is that our knowledge of the objects in U extends only up to membership in the class of Θ and our knowledge about a subset X of U is limited to the class of Θ and their unions. This leads to the following definition.

Definition 2.1. [7] For an approximation space (U, Θ), by a rough approximation in (U, Θ) we mean a mapping $Apr : P(U) \longrightarrow P(U) \times P(U)$ defined for every $X \in P(U)$ by $Apr(X) = (\underline{Apr}(X), \overline{Apr}(X))$, where

$$\underline{Apr}(X) = \{x \in U | [x]_\Theta \subseteq X\},$$
$$\overline{Apr}(X) = \{x \in U | [x]_\Theta \cap X \neq \phi\}.$$

$\underline{Apr}(X)$ is called a *lower rough approximation* of X in (U, Θ), whereas $\overline{Apr}(X)$ is called an *upper rough approximation* of X in (U, Θ).

Definition 2.2. [7] Given an approximation space (U, Θ), a pair $(A, B) \in P(U) \times P(U)$ is called a *rough set* in (U, Θ) if and only if $(A, B) = Apr(X)$ for some $X \in P(U)$.

Definition 2.3. ([7]) Let (U, Θ) be an approximation space and X be a non-empty subset of U.

(i) If $\underline{Apr}(X) = \overline{Apr}(X)$, then X is called *definable.*

(ii) If $\underline{Apr}(X) = \phi$, then X is called *empty interior.*

(iii) If $\overline{Apr}(X) = U$, then X is called *empty exterior*.

Let H be a non-empty set endowed with a hyper operation "$\circ$", that is $\circ$ is a function from $H \times H$ to $P^*(H) = P(H) - \{\phi\}$. For two subsets A and B of H, denote by $A \circ B$ the set $\bigcup_{a\in A, b\in B} a \circ b$. We shall use $x \circ y$ instead of $x \circ \{y\}$, $\{x\} \circ y$, or $\{x\} \circ \{y\}$.

Definition 2.4. ([3]) By a *hyper BCK-algebra* we mean a non- empty set H endowed with a hyper operation "$\circ$"and a constant 0 satisfying the following axioms:

(HK1) $(x \circ z) \circ (y \circ z) \ll x \circ y$,

(HK2) $(x \circ y) \circ z = (x \circ z) \circ y$,

(HK3) $x \circ H \ll \{x\}$,

(HK4) $x \ll y$ and $y \ll x$ imply $x = y$,

for all $x, y, z \in H$, where $x \ll y$ is defined by $0 \in x \circ y$ and for every $A, B \subseteq H$, $A \ll B$ is defined by $\forall a \in A, \exists b \in B$ such that $a \ll b$. In such case, we call "$\ll$"the *hyper order* in H.

Theorem 2.5. ([3]) In any hyper BCK-algebra H, the following hold:

(a1) $0 \circ 0 = \{0\}$,

(a2) $0 \ll x$,

(a3) $x \ll x$,

(a4) $A \ll A$,

(a5) $A \ll 0$ implies $A = \{0\}$,

(a6) $A \subseteq B$ implies $A \ll B$,

(a7) $0 \circ x = \{0\}$,

(a8) $x \circ y \ll x$,

(a9) $x \circ 0 = \{x\}$,

(a10) $y \ll z$ implies $x \circ z \ll x \circ y$,

(a11) $x \circ y = \{0\}$ implies $(x \circ z) \circ (y \circ z) = \{0\}$ and $x \circ z \ll y \circ z$,

(a12) $A \circ \{0\} = \{0\}$ implies $A = \{0\}$,

for all $x, y, z \in H$ and for all non-empty subsets A and B of H.

Definition 2.6. ([3]) Let H be a hyper BCK-algebra and let S be a subset of H containing 0. If S be a hyper BCK-algebra with respect to the hyper operation "$\circ$"on H, we say that S is a *hyper subalgebra* of H.

Theorem 2.7. ([3]) Let S be a non-empty subset of hyper BCK-algebra H. Then S is a hyper subalgebra of H if and only if $x \circ y \subseteq S$, for all $x, y \in S$.

Definition 2.8. ([3]) Let I be a non-empty subset of hyper BCK-algebra H and $0 \in I$.

(i) I is said to be a *hyper BCK-ideal* of H if $x \circ y \ll I$ and $y \in I$ imply $x \in I$ for all $x, y \in H$.

(ii) I is said to be a *weak hyper BCK-ideal* of H if $x \circ y \subseteq I$ and $y \in I$ imply $x \in I$ for all $x, y \in H$.

(iii) I is called a *strong hyper BCK-ideal* of H if $(x \circ y) \cap I \neq \phi$ and $y \in I$ imply $x \in I$ for all $x, y \in H$.

Theorem 2.9. ([3]) If H be a hyper BCK-algebra, then

(i) every hyper BCK-ideal of H is a weak hyper BCK-ideal of H.

(ii) every strong hyper BCK-ideal of H is a hyper BCK-ideal of H.

Definition 2.10. ([4]) Let H be a hyper BCK-algebra. A hyper BCK-ideal I of H is called *reflexive* if $x \circ x \subseteq I$ for all $x \in H$.

Definition 2.11. ([1]) Let Θ be an equivalence relation on hyper BCK-algebra H and $A, B \subseteq H$. Then,

(i) $A\Theta B$ means that, there exist $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ such that $a\Theta b$,

(ii) $A\bar{\Theta}B$ means that, for all $a \in A$ there exists $b \in B$ such that $a\Theta b$ and for all $b \in B$ there exists $a \in A$ such that $a\Theta b$,

(iii) Θ is called a *congruence relation* on H, if $x\Theta y$ and $x'\Theta y'$ imply $x \circ x'\bar{\Theta}y \circ y'$ for all $x, y, x', y' \in H$.

(iv) Θ is called a *regular relation* on H, if $x \circ y\Theta\{0\}$ and $y \circ x\Theta\{0\}$ imply $x\Theta y$ for all $x, y \in H$.

Example 2.12. Let $H_1 = \{0, 1, 2\}$, $H_2 = \{0, a, b\}$ and hyper operations "$\circ_1$"and "$\circ_2$"on H_1 and H_2 are defined respectively, as follow:

$\circ_1$	0	1	2
0	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$
1	$\{1\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{1\}$
2	$\{2\}$	$\{2\}$	$\{0, 2\}$

$\circ_2$	0	a	b
0	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$
a	$\{a\}$	$\{0, a\}$	$\{0, a\}$
b	$\{b\}$	$\{a, b\}$	$\{0, b\}$

Then $(H_1, \circ_1)$ and $(H_2, \circ_2)$ are hyper BCK-algebras. Define the equivalence relation Θ_1 and Θ_2 on H_1 and H_2, respectively, as

$$\Theta_1 = \{(0, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2), (0, 2), (2, 0)\},$$

and

$$\Theta_2 = \{(0, 0), (a, a), (b, b), (0, a), (a, 0)\}.$$

It is easily checked that Θ_1 is a congruence relation on H_1. But Θ_2 is not a congruence relation on H_2, since $b\Theta_2 b$ and $0\Theta_2 a$ but $b \circ 0\bar{\Theta}_2 b \circ a$ is not true.

Example 2.13. Let $(H_1, \circ_1)$ be a hyper BCK-algebra as Example 2.12. Let $H_2 = \{0, a, b, c\}$ and define the hyper operation "$\circ_2$"on H_2 as follow:

$\circ_2$	0	a	b	c
0	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$
a	$\{a\}$	$\{0, a\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{a\}$
b	$\{b\}$	$\{b\}$	$\{0, a\}$	$\{b\}$
c	$\{c\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{0, c\}$

Then $(H_2, \circ_2)$ is a hyper BCK-algebra. Define the congruence relation Θ_1 and Θ_2 on H_1 and H_2, respectively, by

$$\Theta_1 = \{(0, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2), (0, 1), (1, 0)\},$$

and

$$\Theta_2 = \{(0, 0), (a, a), (b, b), (c, c), (0, b), (b, 0)\}.$$

It is easily checked that Θ_1 is a regular congruence relation on H_1, but Θ_2 is not a regular relation on H_2, since $a \circ b\Theta_2\{0\}$ and $b \circ a\Theta_2\{0\}$ but $(a, b) \notin \Theta_2$.

Theorem 2.14. ([1]) Let Θ be a regular congruence relation on hyper BCK-algebra H. Then $[0]_\Theta$ is a hyper BCK-ideal of H.

Theorem 2.15. ([1]) Let Θ be a regular congruence relation on $H, I = [0]_\Theta$ and $\frac{H}{I} = \{I_x : x \in H\}$, where $I_x = [x]_\Theta$ for all $x \in H$. Then $\frac{H}{I}$ with hyper operation "$\circ$"and hyper order "$<$"which is defined as follow, is a hyper BCK-algebra which is called *quotient hyper BCK-algebra*,

$$I_x \circ I_y = \{I_z : z \in x \circ y\},$$

and

$$I_x < I_y \Longleftrightarrow I \in I_x \circ I_y.$$

Theorem 2.16. ([1]) Let I be a reflexive hyper BCK-ideal of H and relation Θ on H be defined as follow:

$$x\Theta y \Longleftrightarrow x \circ y \subseteq I \text{ and } y \circ x \subseteq I$$

for all $x, y \in H$. Then Θ is a regular congruence relation on H and $I = [0]_\Theta$.

3 Rough hyper BCK-ideals

Throughout this section H is a hyper BCK-algebra. In this section first we define lower and upper approximation of the subset A of H with respect to hyper BCK-ideal of H and prove some properties. Then we give the definition of (weak, strong) rough hyper BCK-ideals and investigate the relation between them and (weak, strong) hyper BCK-ideals of H.

Definition 3.1. Let Θ be a regular congruence relation on hyper BCK-algebra H, $I = [0]_\Theta$, $I_x = [x]_\Theta$ and A be a non-empty subset of H. Then the sets

$$\underline{Apr}_I(A) = \{x \in H | I_x \subseteq A\},$$
$$\overline{Apr}_I(A) = \{x \in H | I_x \cap A \neq \phi\}.$$

are called *lower and upper approximation* of the set A with respect to the hyper BCK-ideal I, respectively.

Proposition 3.2. For every approximation space (H, Θ) and every subsets $A, B \subseteq H$, we have:

(1) $\underline{Apr}_I(A) \subseteq A \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(A)$,

(2) $\underline{Apr}_I(\phi) = \phi = \overline{Apr}_I(\phi)$,

(3) $\underline{Apr}_I(H) = H = \overline{Apr}_I(H)$,

(4) if $A \subseteq B$, then $\underline{Apr}_I(A) \subseteq \underline{Apr}_I(B)$ and $\overline{Apr}_I(A) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(B)$,

(5) $\underline{Apr}_I(\underline{Apr}_I(A)) = \underline{Apr}_I(A)$,

(6) $\overline{Apr}_I(\overline{Apr}_I(A)) = \overline{Apr}_I(A)$,

(7) $\overline{Apr}_I(\underline{Apr}_I(A)) = \underline{Apr}_I(A)$,

(8) $\underline{Apr}_I(\overline{Apr}_I(A)) = \overline{Apr}_I(A)$,

(9) $\underline{Apr}_I(A) = (\overline{Apr}_I(A^c))^c$,

(10) $\overline{Apr}_I(A) = (\underline{Apr}_I(A^c))^c$,

(11) $\overline{Apr}_I(A \cap B) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(A) \cap \overline{Apr}_I(B)$,

(12) $\underline{Apr}_I(A \cap B) = \underline{Apr}_I(A) \cap \underline{Apr}_I(B)$,

(13) $\overline{Apr}_I(A \cup B) = \overline{Apr}_I(A) \cup \overline{Apr}_I(B)$,

(14) $\underline{Apr}_I(A \cup B) \supseteq \underline{Apr}_I(A) \cup \underline{Apr}_I(B)$,

(15) $\underline{Apr}_I(I_x) = H = \overline{Apr}_I(I_x)$ for all $x \in H$.

Proof. (1), (2) and (3) are straightforward.

(4) For any $x \in \underline{Apr}_I(A)$ we have $I_x \subseteq A \subseteq B$ and so $x \in \underline{Apr}_I(B)$. Now, suppose that $x \in \overline{Apr}_I(A)$. Then $I_x \cap A \neq \phi$ and so $I_x \cap B \neq \phi$. Hence $x \in \overline{Apr}_I(B)$.

(5) Since $\underline{Apr}_I(A) \subseteq A$, by (4) we have $\underline{Apr}_I(\underline{Apr}_I(A)) \subseteq \underline{Apr}_I(A)$. Now, let $x \in \underline{Apr}_I(A)$. Then $I_x \subseteq A$. Since for any $y \in I_x$, we have $I_x = I_y$, then $I_y \subseteq A$ and so $y \in \underline{Apr}_I(A)$. Therefore, $I_x \subseteq \underline{Apr}_I(A)$ and then we obtain $x \in \underline{Apr}_I(\underline{Apr}_I(A))$.

(6) By (1) and (4), $\overline{Apr}_I(A) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(\overline{Apr}_I(A))$. On the other hand, we assume that $x \in \overline{Apr}_I(\overline{Apr}_I(A))$. Then we have $I_x \cap \overline{Apr}_I(A) \neq \phi$ and so there exist $a \in I_x$ and $a \in \overline{Apr}_I(A)$. Hence $I_a = I_x$ and $I_a \cap A \neq \phi$ which imply $I_x \cap A \neq \phi$. Therefore, $x \in \overline{Apr}_I(A)$.

(7) By (1), we have $\underline{Apr}_I(A) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(\underline{Apr}_I(A))$. Now, let $x \in \overline{Apr}_I(\underline{Apr}_I(A))$. Then $I_x \cap \underline{Apr}_I(A) \neq \phi$ and so there exist $a \in I_x$ and $a \in \underline{Apr}_I(A)$. Hence $I_a = I_x$ and $I_a \subseteq A$ which imply $I_x \subseteq A$. Therefore, $x \in \underline{Apr}_I(A)$.

(8) By (1), we have $\underline{Apr}_I(\overline{Apr}_I(A)) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(A)$. Now, we assume that $x \in \overline{Apr}_I(A)$. Then $I_x \cap A \neq \phi$. For every $y \in I_x$, we have $I_y = I_x$ and so $I_y \cap A \neq \phi$. Hence $y \in \overline{Apr}_I(A)$ which implies $I_x \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(A)$. Therefore, $x \in \underline{Apr}_I(\overline{Apr}_I(A))$.

(9) For any subset A of H we have:

$$\begin{aligned}(\overline{Apr}_I(A^c))^c &= \{x \in H : x \notin \overline{Apr}_I(A^c)\}\\ &= \{x \in H : I_x \cap A^c = \phi\}\\ &= \{x \in H : I_x \subseteq A\}\\ &= \{x \in H : x \in \underline{Apr}_I(A)\}\\ &= \underline{Apr}_I(A).\end{aligned}$$

(10) For any subset A of H we have:

$$\begin{aligned}(\underline{Apr}_I(A^c))^c &= \{x \in H : x \notin \underline{Apr}_I(A^c)\}\\ &= \{x \in H : I_x \not\subseteq A^c\}\\ &= \{x \in H : I_x \cap A \neq \phi\}\\ &= \{x \in H : x \in \overline{Apr}_I(A)\}\\ &= \overline{Apr}_I(A).\end{aligned}$$

(11) Since $A \cap B \subseteq A$ and $A \cap B \subseteq B$, then by (4), $\overline{Apr}_I(A \cap B) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(A)$ and $\overline{Apr}_I(A \cap B) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(B)$. Hence $\overline{Apr}_I(A \cap B) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(A) \cap \overline{Apr}_I(B)$.

(12) For any subset A and B of H we have:

$$\begin{aligned} x \in \underline{Apr}_I(A \cap B) &\Longleftrightarrow I_x \subseteq A \cap B \\ &\Longleftrightarrow I_x \subseteq A \text{ and } I_x \subseteq B \\ &\Longleftrightarrow x \in \underline{Apr}_I(A) \text{ and } x \in \underline{Apr}_I(B) \\ &\Longleftrightarrow x \in \underline{Apr}_I(A) \cap \underline{Apr}_I(B). \end{aligned}$$

(13) For any subset A and B of H we have

$$\begin{aligned} x \in \overline{Apr}_I(A \cup B) &\Longleftrightarrow I_x \cap (A \cup B) \neq \phi \\ &\Longleftrightarrow (I_x \cap A) \cup (I_x \cap B) \neq \phi \\ &\Longleftrightarrow I_x \cap A \neq \phi \text{ or } I_x \cap B \neq \phi \\ &\Longleftrightarrow x \in \overline{Apr}_I(A) \text{ or } x \in \overline{Apr}_I(B) \\ &\Longleftrightarrow x \in \overline{Apr}_I(A) \cup \overline{Apr}_I(B). \end{aligned}$$

(14) Since $A \subseteq A \cup B$ and $B \subseteq A \cup B$, then by (4), $\underline{Apr}_I(A) \subseteq \underline{Apr}_I(A \cup B)$ and $\underline{Apr}_I(B) \subseteq \underline{Apr}_I(A \cup B)$, which imply that $\underline{Apr}_I(A) \cup \underline{Apr}_I(B) \subseteq \underline{Apr}_I(A \cup B)$.

(15) The proof is straightforward. □

Corollary 3.3. Let (H, Θ) be an approximation space. Then

(i) for every $A \subseteq H$, $\underline{Apr}_I(A)$ and $\overline{Apr}_I(A)$ are definable sets,

(ii) for every $x \in H, I_x$ is definable set.

Proof. (i) By proposition 3.2 (5) and (7), we have $\underline{Apr}_I(\underline{Apr}_I(A)) = \underline{Apr}_I(A) = \overline{Apr}_I(\underline{Apr}_I(A))$. Hence $\underline{Apr}_I(A)$ is a definable set. On the other hand by proposition 3.2 (6) and (8), we have $\overline{Apr}_I(\overline{Apr}_I(A)) = \overline{Apr}_I(A) = \underline{Apr}_I(\overline{Apr}_I(A))$. Therefore $\overline{Apr}_I(A)$ is a definable set.

(ii) By proposition 3.2 (15) the proof is clear. □

Theorem 3.4. Let Θ be a regular congruence relation on H, $I = [0]_\Theta$ be a hyper BCK-ideal of H and A, B are non-empty subsets of H. Then

(i) $\overline{Apr}_I(A) \circ \overline{Apr}_I(B) = \overline{Apr}_I(A \circ B)$,

(ii) $\underline{Apr}_I(A) \circ \underline{Apr}_I(B) \subseteq \underline{Apr}_I(A \circ B)$.

Proof. (i) Let $z \in \overline{Apr}_I(A) \circ \overline{Apr}_I(B)$. Then there exist $a \in \overline{Apr}_I(A)$ and $b \in \overline{Apr}_I(B)$ such that $z \in a \circ b$. Hence $I_a \cap A \neq \phi$ and $I_b \cap B \neq \phi$ and so there exist $c \in I_a \cap A$ and $d \in I_b \cap B$ such that $a\Theta c$ and $b\Theta d$. Since Θ is a congruence relation on H, then we have $a \circ b \bar{\Theta} c \circ d$ and because $z \in a \circ b$, then there exist $y \in c \circ d$ such that $z\Theta y$. Hence $y \in I_z$. On the other hand, $y \in c \circ d \subseteq A \circ B$ which implies $I_z \cap (A \circ B) \neq \phi$ and so $z \in \overline{Apr}_I(A \circ B)$. Therefore $\overline{Apr}_I(A) \circ \overline{Apr}_I(B) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(A \circ B)$. Now, suppose that $x \in \overline{Apr}_I(A \circ B)$. Then $I_x \cap (A \circ B) \neq \phi$. Let $z \in I_x \cap (A \circ B)$, then there exist $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ such that $z \in a \circ b$ and $I_x = I_z$. Thus we have $I_z \in I_a \circ I_b$ and so $I_x \in I_a \circ I_b$. Hence $x \in a \circ b \subseteq A \circ B \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(A) \circ \overline{Apr}_I(B)$. Therefore, $\overline{Apr}_I(A \circ B) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(A) \circ \overline{Apr}_I(B)$. □

(ii) Let $z \in \underline{Apr}_I(A) \circ \underline{Apr}_I(B)$. Then there exist $a \in \underline{Apr}_I(A)$ and $b \in \underline{Apr}_I(B)$ such that $z \in a \circ b$, $I_a \subseteq A$ and $I_b \subseteq B$. For every $y \in I_z$, we have $I_z = I_y \in I_a \circ I_b$ and so $y \in a \circ b \subseteq A \circ B$. Then $y \in A \circ B$ and so $I_z \subseteq A \circ B$. Therefore $z \in \underline{Apr}_I(A \circ B)$. □

Example 3.5. Let $H = \{0, 1, 2\}$ and define the hyper operation "$\circ$"on H as follow:

$\circ$	0	1	2
0	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$
1	$\{1\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{1\}$
2	$\{2\}$	$\{2\}$	$\{0, 2\}$

Then $(H, \circ)$ is a hyper BCK-algebra. Define the equivalence relation Θ by

$$\Theta = \{(0, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2), (0, 1), (1, 0)\}.$$

Then Θ is a regular congruence relation on H and so we have:

$$I = [0]_\Theta = \{0, 1\}, I_1 = [1]_\Theta = \{0, 1\}, I_2 = [2]_\Theta = \{2\}.$$

Now, if we let $A = \{1, 2\}$ and $B = \{0, 2\}$, then we have $A \circ B = \{0, 1, 2\}$ and so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underline{Apr}_I(A) = \{x \in H | I_x \subseteq A\} = \{2\},\\
&\overline{Apr}_I(A) = \{x \in H | I_x \cap A \neq \phi\} = \{0, 1, 2\},\\
&\underline{Apr}_I(B) = \{x \in H | I_x \subseteq B\} = \{2\},\\
&\overline{Apr}_I(B) = \{x \in H | I_x \cap B \neq \phi\} = \{0, 1, 2\},\\
&\underline{Apr}_I(A \circ B) = \{x \in H | I_x \subseteq A \circ B\} = \{0, 1, 2\},\\
&\overline{Apr}_I(A \circ B) = \{x \in H | I_x \cap (A \circ B) \neq \phi\} = \{0, 1, 2\},\\
&\overline{Apr}_I(A) \circ \overline{Apr}_I(B) = \{0, 1, 2\},\\
&\underline{Apr}_I(A) \circ \underline{Apr}_I(B) = \{0, 2\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we see that $\underline{Apr}_I(A) \circ \underline{Apr}_I(B) \neq \underline{Apr}_I(A \circ B)$ but $\overline{Apr}_I(A) \circ \overline{Apr}_I(B) = \overline{Apr}_I(A \circ B)$.

Definition 3.6. Let Θ be a regular congruence relation on H, $I = [0]_\Theta$ be a hyper BCK-ideal of H and A be a non-empty subset of H. If $\underline{Apr}_I(A)$ and $\overline{Apr}_I(A)$ are hyper subalgebra of H, then A is called a *rough hyper subalgebra* of H.

Theorem 3.7. If I be a hyper BCK-ideal and J be a hyper subalgebra of H, then

(i) $\overline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a hyper subalgebra of H.

(ii) If $I \subseteq J$, then $\underline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a hyper subalgebra of H.

Proof. (i) Since $0 \in J \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(J)$, then $\overline{Apr}_I(J) \neq \phi$. Now, we assume that $x, y \in \overline{Apr}_I(J)$. We must prove that $x \circ y \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(J)$. Since $I_x \cap J \neq \phi$ and $I_y \cap J \neq \phi$, we can let $t \in I_x \cap J$, $s \in I_y \cap J$ and $z \in x \circ y$. Hence $I_z \in I_x \circ I_y = I_t \circ I_s$ and so $z \in t \circ s \subseteq J$. Thus we have $z \in J$ and $z \in I_z$ and so $I_z \cap J \neq \phi$. Therefore, $z \in \overline{Apr}_I(J)$ and so $x \circ y \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(J)$.

(ii) Since $I = I_0 \subseteq J$, we have $0 \in \underline{Apr}_I(J) \neq \phi$. Now, suppose that $a, b \in \underline{Apr}_I(J)$. Then $I_a \subseteq J$ and $I_b \subseteq J$. For every $z \in a \circ b$ and every $y \in I_z$, we have $I_z = I_y \in I_a \circ I_b$ and so $y \in a \circ b \subseteq J$. Hence $I_z \subseteq J$, which implies that $z \in \underline{Apr}_I(J)$. Therefore, $a \circ b \subseteq \underline{Apr}_I(J)$. □

Theorem 3.8. Let Θ and Φ be two regular congruence relations on H and $I = [0]_\Theta$, $J = [0]_\Phi$ be two hyper BCK-ideals of H such that $I \subseteq J$. Then for any nonempty subset A of H, we have:

(i) $\underline{Apr}_J(A) \subseteq \underline{Apr}_I(A)$,

(ii) $\overline{Apr}_I(A) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_J(A)$.

Proof. (i) First we show that if $I \subseteq J$, then $I_x \subseteq J_x$. Let $y \in I_x$. Then $x\Theta y$. Since Θ is a congruence relation on H and $x\Theta x$, then $x \circ x \bar{\Theta} x \circ y$. Since $0 \in x \circ x$, then there exist $t \in x \circ y$ such that $0\Theta t$ and so $t \in [0]_\Theta = I \subseteq J = [0]_\Phi$. Thus by hypothesis, $t \in [0]_\Phi$ and so $x \circ y \Phi \{0\}$. By the similar way, we can show that $y \circ x \Phi \{0\}$. Since Φ is a regular congruence relation, we get $x\Phi y$ and so $y \in [x]_\Phi = J_x$. Therefore, $I_x \subseteq J_x$. Now, let $x \in \underline{Apr}_J(A)$. Then $J_x \subseteq A$ and so $I_x \subseteq A$ which implies $x \in \underline{Apr}_I(A)$.

(ii) Assume that $x \in \overline{Apr}_I(A)$. Then $I_x \cap A \neq \phi$. Since $I_x \subseteq J_x$, we have $J_x \cap A \neq \phi$. Therefore, $x \in \overline{Apr}_J(A)$. □

Corollary 3.9. Let Θ and Φ are two regular congruence relations on H, $I = [0]_\Theta$, $J = [0]_\Phi$ be two hyper BCK-ideals of hyper BCK-algebra H and A be a non-empty subset of H. Then

(i) $\underline{Apr}_I(A) \cap \underline{Apr}_J(A) \subseteq \underline{Apr}_{I\cap J}(A)$,

(ii) $\overline{Apr}_{I\cap J}(A) \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(A) \cap \overline{Apr}_J(A)$.

Proof. By theorem 3.8, the proof is clear. □

Definition 3.10. Let Θ be a regular congruence relation on H, $I = [0]_\Theta$ be a hyper BCK-ideal of H, A be a non-empty subset of H and $Apr_I(A) = (\underline{Apr}_I(A), \overline{Apr}_I(A))$ be a rough set in the approximation space (H, Θ). If $\underline{Apr}_I(A)$ and $\overline{Apr}_I(A)$ are hyper BCK-ideals (resp, weak, strong) of H, then A is called a *rough hyper BCK-ideal* (resp, weak, strong) of H.

Example 3.11. Let $H = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and hyper operation "$\circ$"on H is defined as follow:

$\circ$	0	1	2	3
0	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$
1	$\{1\}$	$\{0, 1\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{1\}$
2	$\{2\}$	$\{2\}$	$\{0, 1\}$	$\{2\}$
3	$\{3\}$	$\{3\}$	$\{3\}$	$\{0, 3\}$

Then $(H, \circ, 0)$ is a hyper BCK-algebra. We define the regular congruence relation on H as follow:

$$\Theta = \{(0, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2), (3, 3), (0, 1), (1, 0)\}.$$

So we have:

$$I = I_0 = I_1 = \{0, 1\}, I_2 = \{2\}, I_3 = \{3\}.$$

Now, let $A = \{0, 1, 3\}$ be a subset of H, then

$$\underline{Apr}_I(A) = \{x \in H | I_x \subseteq A\} = \{0, 1, 3\},$$
$$\overline{Apr}_I(A) = \{x \in H | I_x \cap A \neq \phi\} = \{0, 1, 3\}.$$

Easily we give that $\underline{Apr}_I(A)$ and $\overline{Apr}_I(A)$ are hyper BCK-ideals. Therefore, A is a rough hyper BCK-ideal of H.

Example 3.12. Let $H = \{0, a, b, c\}$. By the following table $(H, \circ)$ is a hyper BCK-algebra.

$\circ$	0	a	b	c
0	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{0\}$
a	$\{a\}$	$\{0, a\}$	$\{0\}$	$\{a\}$
b	$\{b\}$	$\{b\}$	$\{0, a\}$	$\{b\}$
c	$\{c\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{0, c\}$

Now, let relation Θ on H is defined as follow:

$$\Theta = \{(0, 0), (a, a), (b, b), (c, c), (0, b), (b, 0), (0, a), (a, 0), (a, b), (b, a)\}.$$

Then,

$$I_0 = I_a = I_b = \{0, a, b\}, I_c = \{c\}.$$

Let $J_1 = \{0, c\}$, $J_2 = \{0, b\}$ and $J_3 = \{c\}$. Then,

$$\underline{Apr}_I(J_1) = \{c\}, \overline{Apr}_I(J_1) = \{0, a, b, c\},$$
$$\underline{Apr}_I(J_2) = \{\}, \overline{Apr}_I(J_2) = \{0, a, b\},$$
$$\underline{Apr}_I(J_3) = \{c\}, \overline{Apr}_I(J_3) = \{c\}.$$

Hence we can see that J_1 is a hyper BCK-ideal of H but $\underline{Apr}_I(J_1)$ is not a hyper BCK-ideal. Moreover J_2 is not a hyper BCK-ideal but $\overline{Apr}_I(J_2)$ is a hyper BCK-ideal of H. In follows, J_3 is not a hyper BCK-ideal and neither $\underline{Apr}_I(J_3)$ nor $\overline{Apr}_I(J_3)$ is a hyper BCK-ideal of H.

Theorem 3.13. Let Θ be a regular congruence relation on H and $I = [0]_\Theta$ be a hyper BCK-ideal of H. Then

(i) If J be a weak hyper BCK-ideal of H containing I, then $\underline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a weak hyper BCK-ideal of H,

(ii) If J be a hyper BCK-ideal of H containing I, then $\underline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a hyper BCK-ideal of H,

(iii) If J be a strong hyper BCK-ideal of H containing I, then $\underline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a strong hyper BCK-ideal of H.

Proof. (i) Since $I = I_0 \subseteq J$, then $0 \in \underline{Apr}_I(J)$. Now, Let $x, y \in H$ be such that $x \circ y \subseteq \underline{Apr}_I(J)$ and $y \in \underline{Apr}_I(J)$. We must prove that $I_x \subseteq J$. Let $a \in I_x$ and $b \in I_y$. Then $a\Theta x$ and $b\Theta y$. Since Θ is a congruence relation on H, we have $a \circ b\overline{\Theta}x \circ y$ and so for every $z \in a \circ b$, there exist $t \in x \circ y$ such that $z\Theta t$. Since $x \circ y \subseteq \underline{Apr}_I(J)$, we have $t \in \underline{Apr}_I(J)$ and so $I_t = I_z \subseteq J$ which implies $z \in J$. Thus $a \circ b \subseteq J$. On the other hand, $b \in I_y \subseteq J$. Since J is a weak hyper BCK-ideal, we have $a \in J$ and so $I_x \subseteq J$. Hence $x \in \underline{Apr}_I(J)$. Therefore, $\underline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a weak hyper BCK-ideal of H.

(ii) Let $x, y \in H$ be such that $x \circ y \ll \underline{Apr}_I(J)$ and $y \in \underline{Apr}_I(J)$. We must prove that $I_x \subseteq J$. Let $a \in I_x$ and $b \in I_y$. Then $a\Theta x$ and $b\Theta y$. Since Θ is a congruence relation on H, we have $a \circ b\overline{\Theta}x \circ y$ and so for every $z \in a \circ b$, there exist $z' \in x \circ y$ such that $z\Theta z'$. Since $z' \in x \circ y \ll \underline{Apr}_I(J)$, then there exists $t \in \underline{Apr}_I(J) \subseteq J$ such that $z' \ll t$ and so from $z\Theta z'$, we have $I_0 \in I_{z'} \circ I_t = I_z \circ I_t$. Hence $0 \in z \circ t$ and then $z \ll t$. Thus we have proved that for every $z \in a \circ b$, there exist $t \in J$ such that $z \ll t$ which means that $a \circ b \ll J$. On the other hand we have $b \in I_y \subseteq J$. Since J is a hyper BCK-ideal of H, we have $a \in J$. Thus $I_x \subseteq J$ which implies that $x \in \underline{Apr}_I(J)$. Therefore, $\underline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a hyper BCK-ideal of H.

(iii) Suppose that $x, y \in H$ be such that $(x \circ y) \cap \underline{Apr}_I(J) \neq \phi$ and $y \in \underline{Apr}_I(J)$. Let $a \in I_x$ and $b \in I_y$. Then $a\Theta x$ and $b\Theta y$. Since Θ is a congruence relation on H, we have $a \circ b \overline{\Theta} x \circ y$. Since $(x \circ y) \cap \underline{Apr}_I(J) \neq \phi$, then there exist $t \in H$ such that $t \in x \circ y$ and $t \in \underline{Apr}_I(J)$. Now, $t \in x \circ y \overline{\Theta} a \circ b$ implies that there exist $z \in a \circ b$ such that $z\Theta t$ and so $I_t = I_z \subseteq J$. Hence $z \in J$ and so $(a \circ b) \cap J \neq \phi$. On the other hand, we have $b \in I_y \subseteq J$. Since J is a strong hyper BCK-ideal of H, then we have $a \in J$ which implies $I_x \subseteq J$ that means $x \in \underline{Apr}_I(J)$. Therefore, $\underline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a strong hyper BCK-ideal of H. □

Theorem 3.14. Suppose that I be a hyper BCK-ideal of H and Θ be a regular congruence relation on H which is defined as follow:

$$x\Theta y \Leftrightarrow x \circ y \subseteq I \text{ and } y \circ x \subseteq I.$$

(i) If J be a weak hyper BCK-ideal of H containing I, then $\overline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a weak hyper BCK-ideal of H,

(ii) If J be a hyper BCK-ideal of H containing I, then $\overline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a hyper BCK-ideal of H,

(iii) If J be a strong hyper BCK-ideal of H containing I, then $\overline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a strong hyper BCK-ideal of H.

Proof. (i) Since $I \subseteq J \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(J)$, then we have $0 \in \overline{Apr}_I(J)$. Let $x, y \in H$ be such that $x \circ y \subseteq \overline{Apr}_I(J)$ and $y \in \overline{Apr}_I(J)$. Then $I_y \cap J \neq \phi$ and for every $z \in x \circ y$, we have $z \in \overline{Apr}_I(J)$ which means $I_z \cap J \neq \phi$. Thus there exist $a, b \in H$ such that $a \in I_y \cap J$ and $b \in I_z \cap J$ which imply that $a\Theta y$, $b\Theta z$ and $a, b \in J$. Thus $y \circ a \subseteq I \subseteq J$ and $z \circ b \subseteq I \subseteq J$ and so we get $y, z \in J$, since J is a weak hyper BCK-ideal. Thus we have proved that for any $z \in x \circ y$, we have $z \in J$ and so $x \circ y \subseteq J$. Since J is a weak hyper BCK-ideal and $y \in J$, obviously we have $x \in J$. Since $x \in I_x$, then $I_x \cap J \neq \phi$. Therefore $x \in \overline{Apr}_I(J)$ and so $\overline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a weak hyper BCK-ideal of H.

(ii) Let $x, y \in H$ be such that $x \circ y \ll \overline{Apr}_I(J)$ and $y \in \overline{Apr}_I(J)$. Then $I_y \cap J \neq \phi$ and for every $z \in x \circ y$, there exist $t \in \overline{Apr}_I(J)$ such that $z \ll t$ and $I_t \cap J \neq \phi$. Thus, there exist $c, d \in H$ such that $c \in I_t \cap J$ and $d \in I_y \cap J$ and so $c\Theta t$, $d\Theta y$ and $c, d \in J$. Hence $t \circ c \subseteq I \subseteq J$ and $y \circ d \subseteq I \subseteq J$. Since J is a hyper BCK-ideal and $c, d \in J$, we have $y, t \in J$. Thus, we have proved that for every $z \in x \circ y$, there exist $t \in J$ such that $z \ll t$ which means that $x \circ y \ll J$ and so from $y \in J$ we get $x \in J$. Consequently, $I_x \cap J \neq \phi$ and so $x \in \overline{Apr}_I(J)$. Therefore, $\overline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a hyper BCK-ideal.

(iii) Let $x, y \in H$ be such that $(x \circ y) \cap \overline{Apr}_I(J) \neq \phi$ and $y \in \overline{Apr}_I(J)$. Then $I_y \cap J \neq \phi$ and so there exist $z \in H$ such that $z \in x \circ y$ and $z \in \overline{Apr}_I(J)$. Hence $I_z \cap J \neq \phi$ and so there exist $c, d \in H$ such that $c \in I_z \cap J$ and $d \in I_y \cap J$. Hence $c\Theta z$ and $d\Theta y$ where $c, d \in J$. Thus we have $z \circ c \subseteq I \subseteq J$ and $y \circ d \subseteq I \subseteq J$. Since J is a strong hyper BCK-ideal and $c, d \in J$, we have $z \in J$ and $y \in J$. Thus we have proved that $(x \circ y) \cap J \neq \phi$ and $y \in J$. Since J is a strong hyper BCK-ideal, we have $x \in J$ and so $I_x \cap J \neq \phi$ which means that $\overline{Apr}_I(J)$ is a strong hyper BCK-ideal of H. □

4 Conclusion

This paper is intend to built up connection between rough sets and hyper BCK-algebras. We have presented a definition of the lower and upper approximation of a subset of a hyper BCK-algebra with respect to a hyper BCK-ideal. This definition and main results are easily extended to other algebraic structures such as hyper K-algebra, hyper I-algebra, etc.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by "Center of Excellence of Algebraic Hyperstructures and its Applications of Tarbiat Modares University (CEAHA)" and "Research Center in Algebraic Hyperstructures and Fuzzy Mathematics, University of Mazandaran, Babolsar, Iran".

References

[1] R. A. Borzooei and H. Harizavi, Regular congrucence relation on hyper BCK-algebra, Sci. Math. Jpn., 61(1)(2005), 83-98.

[2] Y. Imai, K. Iseki, On axiom system of propositional calculi XIV, Proc. Japan Academy, 42(1966), 19-22.

[3] Y. B. Jun, M. M. Zahedi, X. L. Xin, R. A. Borzooei, On hyper BCK-algebra, Italian Journal of pure and applied Mathematics, No. 10(2000), 127-136.

[4] Y. B. Jun, X. L. Xin, E. H. Roh and M. M. Zahedi, Strong hyper BCK-ideals of hyper BCK-algebra, Mathematicae Japonicae, Vol. 51, No. 3(2000), 493-498.

[5] Y. B. Jun, Roughness of ideals in BCK-algebras, Scientiae Mathematicae Japonicae, 57, No. 1(2003), 165-169.

[6] F. Marty, Surune generalization de La notion de groups, 8th Congress Math. Scandinaves, Stockhholm, (1934). 45-49.

[7] Z. Pawlak, Rough sets, Internet. J. Comput. Inform. Sci., 11(1982) 341-356. Kluwer academic publishing, Dorderecht(1991).