

Geometric lattice structure of covering-based rough sets through matroids

Aiping Huang, William Zhu *

Lab of Granular Computing, Zhangzhou Normal University, Zhangzhou 363000, China

Abstract. Covering-based rough set theory is a useful tool to deal with inexact, uncertain or vague knowledge in information systems. Geometric lattice has widely used in diverse fields, especially search algorithm design which plays important role in covering reductions. In this paper, we construct four geometric lattice structures of covering-based rough sets through matroids, and compare their relationships. First, a geometric lattice structure of covering-based rough sets is established through the transversal matroid induced by the covering, and its characteristics including atoms, modular elements and modular pairs are studied. We also construct a one-to-one correspondence between this type of geometric lattices and transversal matroids in the context of covering-based rough sets. Second, sufficient and necessary conditions for three types of covering upper approximation operators to be closure operators of matroids are presented. We exhibit three types of matroids through closure axioms, and then obtain three geometric lattice structures of covering-based rough sets. Third, these four geometric lattice structures are compared. Some core concepts such as reducible elements in covering-based rough sets are investigated with geometric lattices. In a word, this work points out an interesting view, namely geometric lattice, to study covering-based rough sets.

Keywords. Rough sets, Covering, Matroid, Geometric lattice, Closure operator, Upper approximations.

1 Introduction

Rough set theory [8] was proposed by Pawlak to deal with granularity in information systems. It is based on equivalence relations. However, the equivalence relation is rather strict, hence the applications of the classical rough set theory are quite limited. For this reason, rough set theory has been extended to generalized rough set theory based on tolerance relation [12], similarity relation [13] and arbitrary binary relation [4,25,26,27,29]. Through extending a partition to a covering, rough set theory is generalized to covering-based rough sets [10,17,30,18]. Because of its high efficiency in many complicated problems such as attribute reduction and rule learning in incomplete information/decision [11], covering-based rough set theory has been attracting increasing research interest [24,19].

Lattice is suggested by the form of the Hasse diagram depicting it. In mathematics, lattice are partially ordered sets in which any two elements have a unique supremum

* Corresponding author. E-mail: williamfengzhu@gmail.com(William Zhu)

(also called a least upper bound or join) and a unique infimum (also called a greatest lower bound or meet). They encode the algebraic behavior of the entailment relation and such basic logical connectives as “and” (conjunction) and “or” (disjunction), which result in adequate algebraic semantics for a variety of logical systems. Lattices, especially geometric lattices, are one of the most important algebraic structures and are used extensively in both theoretical and applicable fields, such as data analysis, formal concept analysis [20,21,28] and domain theory [1].

Matroid theory [7,5] borrows extensively from linear algebra and graph theory. There are dozens of equivalent ways to define a matroid. Significant definitions of matroid include those in terms of independent sets, bases, circuits, closed sets or flats, closure operators, and rank functions, which provides well-established platforms to connect with other theories. In application, matroids have been widely used in many fields such as combinatorial optimization, network flows, and algorithm design, especially greedy algorithm design [6,2]. Some works on the connection between rough sets and matroids have been conducted [14,15,16,31].

In this paper, we pay our attention to geometric lattice structures of covering based-rough sets through matroids. First, a geometric lattice in covering-based rough sets is generated by the transversal matroid induced by a covering. Moreover, we study the characteristics of the geometric lattice, such as atoms, modular elements and modular pairs. We also point out a one-to-one correspondence between this type of geometric lattices and transversal matroids in the context of covering-based rough sets. Second, generally, covering upper approximation operators are not necessarily closure operators of matroids. Then we present sufficient and necessary conditions for three types of covering upper approximation operators to be closure operators of matroids, and exhibit representations of corresponding special coverings. We study the properties of these matroids, and their closed-set lattices which are also geometric lattices. Third, we compare these four geometric lattices through corresponding matroids. Furthermore, some core concepts such as reducible and immured elements in covering-based rough sets are studied by geometric lattices.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some fundamental concepts related to covering-based rough sets, lattices and matroids. Section 3 establishes a geometric lattice structure of covering-based rough sets through the transversal matroid induced by a covering. In Section 4, we present three geometric lattice structures of covering-based rough sets through three types of approximation operators. Section 5 studies the relationship among these four geometric lattice structures. This paper is concluded and further work is pointed out in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we review some basic concepts of matroids, lattices and covering-based rough sets.

2.1 Matroid

Definition 1. (*Matroid*) [7] A matroid is an ordered pair (E, \mathcal{I}) consisting of a finite set E and a collection \mathcal{I} of subsets of E satisfying the following three conditions:

- (1) $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$;
(2) If $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $I' \subseteq I$, then $I' \in \mathcal{I}$;
(3) If $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|I_1| < |I_2|$, then there is an element $e \in I_2 - I_1$ such that $I_1 \cup e \in \mathcal{I}$, where $|X|$ denotes the cardinality of X .

Let $M(E, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid. The members of \mathcal{I} are the independent sets of M . A set in \mathcal{I} is maximal, in the sense of inclusion, is called a base of the matroid M . If $A \notin \mathcal{I}$, A is called dependent set. In the sense of inclusion, a minimal dependent subset of E is called a circuit of the matroid M . If $\{a\}$ is a circuit, we call $\{a\}$ a loop. Moreover, if $\{a, b\}$ is a circuit, then a and b are said to be parallel. A matroid is called simple matroid if it has no loops and no parallel elements. The rank function of a matroid is a function $r_M : 2^E \rightarrow N$ defined by $r_M(X) = \max\{|I| : I \subseteq X, I \in \mathcal{I}\}$ ($X \subseteq E$). For each $X \subseteq E$, we say $cl_M(X) = \{a \in E : r_M(X) = r_M(X \cup \{a\})\}$ is the closure of X in (E, \mathcal{I}) . When there is no confusion, we use the symbol $cl(X)$ for short. X is called a closure set if $cl(X) = X$.

The rank function of a matroid, directly analogous to a similar theorem of linear algebra, has the following proposition.

Proposition 1. [7] Let $M(E, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid and r_M is rank function of M . For all $X, Y \subseteq E$, the following properties hold:

- (R1) For all $X \in 2^E$, $0 \leq r_M(X) \leq |X|$;
(R2) If $X \subseteq Y \subseteq E$, then $r_M(X) \leq r_M(Y)$;
(R3) If $X, Y \subseteq E$, then $r_M(X \cup Y) + r_M(X \cap Y) \leq r_M(X) + r_M(Y)$.

The following proposition is the closure axiom of a matroid. It means that a operator satisfies (1)-(4) if and only if the operator is the closure operator of a matroid.

Proposition 2. [7] Let E be a set. A function $cl_M : 2^E \rightarrow 2^E$ is the closure operator of a matroid on E if and only if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) If $X \subseteq E$, then $X \subseteq cl_M(X)$.
(2) If $X \subseteq Y \subseteq E$, then $cl_M(X) \subseteq cl_M(Y)$.
(3) If $X \subseteq E$, $cl_M(cl_M(X)) = cl_M(X)$.
(4) If $X \subseteq E$, $x \in E$, and $y \in cl_M(X \cup \{x\}) - cl_M(X)$, then $x \in cl_M(X \cup \{y\})$.

Transversal theory is a branch of a matroid theory. It shows how to induce a matroid, namely, transversal matroid, by a family of subsets of a set. Hence, the transversal matroid establishes a bridge between collections of subsets of a set and matroids.

Definition 2. (transversal)[7] Let S be a nonempty finite set, $J = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. \mathcal{F} denotes the family $\{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_m\}$ of subsets of S . A transversal or system of distinct representatives of $\{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_m\}$ is a subset $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m\}$ of S such that $e_i \in F_i$ for all i in J . If for some subset K of J , X is a transversal of $\{F_i : i \in K\}$, then X is said to be a partial transversal of $\{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_m\}$.

Example 1. Let $S = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $F_1 = \{2, 3\}$, $F_2 = \{4\}$, $F_3 = \{2, 4\}$. For $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, F_3\}$, $T = \{2, 3, 4\}$ is a transversal of \mathcal{F} , since $2 \in F_3$, $3 \in F_1$, $4 \in F_2$. $T' = \{2, 4\}$ is a partial transversal of \mathcal{F} , since there exists $K = \{1, 2\} \subseteq J$ such that T' is a transversal of $\{F_i : i \in K\}$.

Proposition 3. [7] Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_i : i \in J\}$ be a family of subsets of E . $M(\mathcal{F}) = (E, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}))$ is a matroid where $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$ is the family of all partial transversals of \mathcal{F} .

Definition 3. [15] Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_i : i \in J\}$ be a family of subsets of E . We say $M(\mathcal{F}) = (E, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}))$ is the transversal matroid induced by \mathcal{F} .

2.2 Lattice

Let P be an ordered set and $a, b \in P$. We say that a is covered by b (or b covers a) if $a < b$ and there is no element c in P with $a < c < b$. A chain in P from x_0 to x_n is a subset $\{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ of P such that $x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n$. The length of such a chain is n , and the chain is maximal if x_i covers x_{i-1} for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. A poset (\mathcal{L}, \leq) is a lattice if $a \vee b$ and $a \wedge b$ exist for all $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$. If \mathcal{L} is a lattice with zero element 0 , then $a \in \mathcal{L}$ is called an atoms of \mathcal{L} if a covers 0 . If, for every pair $\{a, b\}$ of elements of P with $a < b$, all maximal chains from a to b have the same length, then P is said to satisfy the Jordan-Dedekind chain condition. The height $h_P(y)$ of an element y of P is the maximum length of a chain from 0 to y . Thus, in particular, the atoms of P are precisely the elements of height one. It is not difficult to check that every finite lattice has a zero and the one. A finite lattice \mathcal{L} is called semimodular if it satisfies the Jordan-Dedekind chain condition and for every pair x, y of elements of \mathcal{L} , the equality $h_{\mathcal{L}}(x) + h_{\mathcal{L}}(y) \geq h_{\mathcal{L}}(x \vee y) + h_{\mathcal{L}}(x \wedge y)$ holds. A geometric lattice is a finite semimodular lattice in which every element is join of atoms.

Definition 4. [1] Let \mathcal{L} be a lattice, $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$.

(ME) For all $x, z \in \mathcal{L}$, $x \geq z$ implies $x \wedge (a \vee z) = (x \wedge a) \vee z$, a is called a modular element of \mathcal{L} .

(MP) For all $z \in \mathcal{L}$, $b \geq z$ implies $b \wedge (a \vee z) = (b \wedge a) \vee z$, (a, b) is called a modular pair of \mathcal{L} .

Lemma 1. [1] Let \mathcal{L} be a semimodular lattice, then (a, b) is a modular pair if and only if $h_{\mathcal{L}}(a \vee b) + h_{\mathcal{L}}(a \wedge b) = h_{\mathcal{L}}(a) + h_{\mathcal{L}}(b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$

2.3 Closed-set lattice of matroid

If M is a matroid, then $\mathcal{L}(M)$ will denote the set of all closed sets of M ordered by inclusion. For a matroid M , the zero of $\mathcal{L}(M)$ is $cl_M(\emptyset)$, while the one is E .

Lemma 2. [7] $\mathcal{L}(M)$ is a lattice, for all closed sets X and Y of M , $X \wedge Y = X \cap Y$ and $X \vee Y = cl_M(X \cup Y)$.

Lemma 3. [7] Let $h_{\mathcal{L}(M)}$ be the height function of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M)$, r_M the rank function of M . For all $X \in \mathcal{L}(M)$, $h_{\mathcal{L}(M)}(X) = r_M(X)$.

Lemma 4. [7] A lattice \mathcal{L} is geometric if and only if it is the lattice of closure sets of a matroid.

Lemma 4 give another definition of a geometric lattice. In face, it is the closed-set lattice of a matroid.

2.4 Covering-based rough sets

Definition 5. (Covering and partition) Let E be a universe of discourse, \mathcal{C} a family of subsets of E and none of subsets in \mathcal{C} be empty. If $\bigcup \mathcal{C} = E$, \mathcal{C} is called a covering of E . The member of \mathcal{C} is called a covering block. If \mathcal{P} is a covering of E and it is a family of pairwise disjoint subsets of E , \mathcal{P} is called a partition of E .

It is clear that a partition of E is certainly a covering of E , so the concept of a covering is an extension of the concept of a partition.

Let E be a finite set and R be an equivalent relation on E . R will generate a partition $E/R = \{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_m\}$ on E , where Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_m are the equivalence classes generated by R . $\forall X \subseteq U$, the lower and upper approximations of X , are, respectively, defined as follows:

$$R_*(X) = \bigcup \{Y_i \in U/R : Y_i \subseteq X\}$$

$$R^*(X) = \bigcup \{Y_i \in U/R : Y_i \cap X \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Definition 6. (Indiscernible neighborhood and neighborhood) [32,33] Let $\langle E, \mathcal{C} \rangle$ be a covering approximation space, $x \in U$.

$\bigcup \{K : x \in K \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is called the indiscernible neighborhood of x and denoted as $I(x)$.
 $\bigcap \{K : x \in K \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is called the neighborhood of x and denoted as $N(x)$.

Definition 7. [34] Let \mathcal{C} be a covering of a domain E and $K \in \mathcal{C}$. If K is a union of some sets in $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$, we say K is reducible in \mathcal{C} ; otherwise K is irreducible. If every element in \mathcal{C} is irreducible, we say \mathcal{C} is irreducible; otherwise \mathcal{C} is reducible.

Definition 8. [34] For a covering \mathcal{C} of a universe E , the new irreducible covering through the above reduction is called the reduct of \mathcal{C} and denoted by $\text{reduct}(\mathcal{C})$.

Definition 9. [32] Let \mathcal{C} be a covering of E and K an element of \mathcal{C} . If there exists another element K' of \mathcal{C} such that $K \subset K'$, we say that K is an immured element of covering \mathcal{C} .

Definition 10. [32] Let \mathcal{C} be a covering of E . When we remove all immured elements from \mathcal{C} , the set of all remaining elements is still a covering of E , and this new covering has no immured element. We called this new covering an exclusion of \mathcal{C} , and it is denoted by $\text{exclusion}(\mathcal{C})$.

Zakowski first extended Pawlak's rough set theory from partition to covering [35]. Pomykala studied the second type of covering rough set model [9]. While the sixth type of covering-based upper approximation was first defined in [22]. Qin et al. first defined the seventh type of covering-based upper approximation in [10].

Definition 11. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering of E . The covering upper approximation operators $SH, XH, VH : P(E) \rightarrow P(E)$ are defined as follows: $\forall X \in P(E)$,

$$SH(X) = \bigcup \{K \in \mathcal{C} : K \cap X \neq \emptyset\} = \bigcup \{I(x) : x \in X\}.$$

$$XH(X) = \{x : N(x) \cap X \neq \emptyset\}.$$

$$VH(X) = \bigcup \{N(x) : N(x) \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$$

$SH_{\mathcal{C}}, XH_{\mathcal{C}}, VH_{\mathcal{C}}$ are called the second, the sixth, the seventh covering upper approximation operators with respect to the covering \mathcal{C} , respectively. When there is no confusion, we omit \mathcal{C} at the lowercase.

3 A geometric lattice structure of covering-based rough sets through transversal matroid

As we know, if M is a matroid and $\mathcal{L}(M)$ denotes the set of all closed set of M ordered by inclusion, then $\mathcal{L}(M)$ is a geometric lattice. In this section, we study the properties such as atoms, modular elements and modular pairs of this type of geometric lattice through transversal matroid induced by a covering. We also study the structure of matroid induced by this type of geometric lattice. It is interesting to find that there is a one-to-one correspondence between this type of geometric lattices and transversal matroids in the context of covering-based rough sets.

Let E be a nonempty finite set and \mathcal{C} a covering of E . As shown in Definition 3, $M(\mathcal{C}) = (E, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C}))$ is the transversal matroid induced by covering \mathcal{C} . $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ is the set of all closed sets of $M(\mathcal{C})$. Especially, $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))$ is the set of all closed sets of the transversal matroid induced by partition \mathcal{P} . Based on Lemma 4, we know $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ and $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))$ are geometric lattice.

The theorem below connects a covering with the closure of \emptyset . In fact, $\emptyset \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F}))$ if and only if \mathcal{F} is a covering.

Theorem 1. *Let $M(\mathcal{F})$ be a transversal matroid induced by $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_m\}$, $\forall 1 \leq i \leq m, F_i \neq \emptyset$. $cl_{\mathcal{F}}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ if and only if \mathcal{F} is a covering.*

Proof. " \Leftarrow ": According to the definition of transversal matroid, any partial transversal is an independent set of transversal matroid. Since \mathcal{F} is a covering, any single-point set is an independent set. Based on the definition of closure operator of a matroid, we have $cl_{M(\mathcal{F})}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$.

" \Rightarrow ": Since $cl_{M(\mathcal{F})}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$, any single-point set is an independent set, that is, for all $x \in E$, there exists $1 \leq i_x \leq m$ such that $x \in F_{i_x} \subseteq E$. Hence, $E = \bigcup_{x \in E} \{x\} \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in E} F_{i_x} \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^m F_i \subseteq E$. Thus $\bigcup_{i=1}^m F_i = E$. For all $1 \leq i \leq m$, $F_i \neq \emptyset$ and $\bigcup_{i=1}^m F_i = E$, hence \mathcal{F} is a covering.

Lemma 5. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering of E . For all $x \in E$, $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})$ is an atom of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{C} is a covering and the definition of transversal matroid, we know any single-point set is an independent set. Thus $\forall x \in E, r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\}) = 1$. Hence, $\{cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(x) : x \in E\}$ is the set of atoms of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

Lemma 5 does not establish the concrete form of $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})$. In order to solve that problem, we define two sets as follows.

Definition 12. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_m\}$ be a covering of a finite set $E = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$. We define*

$$(i) A = \{K_i - \bigcup_{j=1, j \neq i}^m K_j : K_i - \bigcup_{j=1, j \neq i}^m K_j \neq \emptyset, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}\} \\ = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_s\}.$$

$$(ii) B = E - \bigcup_{i=1}^s A_i.$$

Remark 1. For all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, $\forall x \in A_i$, there exists only one block such that x belongs to it, and there exist at least two blocks such that y belongs to them for all $y \in B$.

The following two propositions establish the characteristics of A and B .

Proposition 4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering of E . $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_s\} \cup \{\{x\} : x \in B\}$ forms a partition of E .*

Proof. Let $P = A \cup \{\{x\} : x \in B\} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_s\} \cup \{\{x\} : x \in B\}$. According to Definition 12, we know $\bigcup_{i=1}^s A_i \cup \{\{x\} : x \in B\} = E$. Now we need to prove $\forall P_1, P_2 \in P, P_1 \cap P_2 = \emptyset$. According to the definition of A , if $P_1, P_2 \in A$, then $P_1 \cap P_2 = \emptyset$. If $P_1, P_2 \in \{\{x\} : x \in B\}$, then $P_1 \cap P_2 = \emptyset$ because P_i and P_j are single-points. If $P_1 \in A, P_2 \in \{\{x\} : x \in B\}$, then $P_1 \cap P_2 = \emptyset$ because $B \cap \bigcup_{k=1}^s A_k = \emptyset$ and $A_i \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^s A_k$ and $A_j \subseteq B$.

Proposition 5. *\mathcal{C} is a partition if and only if $B = \emptyset$.*

Proof. According to the definition of A and B , the necessity is obvious. Now we prove the sufficiency. If \mathcal{C} is not a partition, then there exist $K_i, K_j \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $K_i \cap K_j \neq \emptyset$. Thus there exists $x \in E$ such that $x \in K_i \cap K_j$, that is, there exist at least $K_i, K_j \in \mathcal{C}$ such that x belongs to them, hence $x \in B$. That contradicts the assumption that $B = \emptyset$.

The following theorem shows the concrete form of atoms of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

Theorem 2. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering of E . $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_s\} \cup \{\{x\} : x \in B\}$ is the set of atoms of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Proof. According to the definition of A_i , we may as well suppose $A_i = K_h - \bigcup_{j=1, j \neq h}^m K_j$. Based on \mathcal{C} is a covering and the definition of transversal matroid, we know any single-point set is an independent set, thus $\forall x \in A_i, \{x\}$ is an independent set. $\forall y \in A_i$ and $y \neq x$, we know $x, y \in K_h$ and $x, y \notin K_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m, j \neq h$, thus x and y cannot be chosen from different blocks in the covering \mathcal{C} . That shows that $\{x, y\}$ is not an independent set according to the definition of transversal matroid. Hence, $\{x\}$ is a maximal independent set included in A_i , that is, $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i) = 1$. Next, we need to prove A_i is a closed set. Since $A_i \subseteq cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i)$, we need to prove $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i) \subseteq A_i$, that is, $x \notin A_i$ implies $x \notin cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i)$. If $y \notin A_i$, based on the fact that \mathcal{C} is a covering and the definition of A_i , then there exists $j \neq h$ such that $y \in K_j$. Thus $\{x, y\}$ is an independent set. That implies $y \notin cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i)$, thus $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i) = A_i$. Hence, $A_i \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$. Combining Lemma 3 with $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i) = 1$, we know for all $1 \leq i \leq m, A_i$ is an atom of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

According to the definition of transversal matroid and the fact that \mathcal{C} is a covering, any single-point set is an independent set. Thus for all $x \in B, r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\}) = 1. \forall y \in E$ and $y \neq x$, if $y \in B$, then there exist at least two blocks containing y according to the definition of B . We may as well suppose $y \in K_k, K_t$ and $x \in K_l, K_p$, where $\{K_k, K_t\}$ may be the same as $\{K_l, K_p\}$. Based on this, $\{x, y\}$ is an independent set. This implies $y \notin cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})$. If $y \notin B$, then we may as well suppose $y \in A_i$, thus $y \in K_h$ for the definition of A_i , where K_h may be the same with K_l or K_p . Based on this, x and y can be chosen from different blocks in covering \mathcal{C} , thus $\{x, y\}$ is an independent set. That implies $y \notin cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})$. From above discussion, we have $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\}) = \{x\}$.

Hence, $\{x\} \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ for all $x \in B$. Combining Lemma 3 with $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\}) = 1$, we know $\{x\}$ is an atom of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ for all $x \in B$.

Next, we will prove the set of atoms of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ can not be anything but $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_s\} \cup \{\{x\} : x \in B\}$. According to Lemma 5, we know $\{cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\}) : x \in E\}$ is the set of atoms of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$. Similar to the proof of the second part, we know that if $x \in B$ then $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\}) = \{x\}$. If $x \notin B$, then x belongs to one of elements in A . We may as well suppose $x \in A_i$. Combining A_i is an atom with $\emptyset \subseteq cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\}) \subseteq cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i) = A_i$, we have $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\}) = A_i$. Hence, $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_s\} \cup \{\{x\} : x \in B\}$ is the set of atoms of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

The proposition below connects simple matroid and the cardinal number of A_i . In fact, a matroid is simple if and only if $\forall 1 \leq i \leq s, |A_i| = 1$.

Lemma 6. $\forall 1 \leq i \leq s$, if $|A_i| \geq 2$, then $\forall x, y \in A_i$, x, y are parallel.

Proof. According to the definition of A_i , we may as well suppose $A_i = K_h - \bigcup_{j=1, j \neq h}^m K_j$, where $1 \leq h \leq m$. For all $x, y \in A_i$, then $x, y \in K_h$ and $\forall 1 \leq j \leq m, j \neq h$, $x \notin K_j$ and $y \notin K_j$. Thus $\{x, y\}$ is not an independent set. Based on the definition of transversal matroid and the fact that \mathcal{C} is a covering, any single-point set is an independent set. Thus $\{x\}$ or $\{y\}$ is an independent set. Hence, x, y are parallel.

Proposition 6. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering and $M(\mathcal{C})$ the transversal matroid induced by \mathcal{C} . $M(\mathcal{C})$ is a simple matroid if and only if $|A_i| = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$.

Proof. " \Rightarrow ": Since $M(\mathcal{C})$ is a simple matroid, it dose not contain parallel elements. If there exists $1 \leq i \leq s$ such that $|A_i| \neq 1$, then $|A_i| \geq 2$ because $A_i \neq \emptyset$. According to Lemma 6, $\forall x, y \in A_i$, x, y are parallel which contradicts the assumption that $M(\mathcal{C})$ is a simple matroid. Hence, $\forall 1 \leq i \leq s, |A_i| = 1$.

" \Leftarrow ": According to the definition of parallel element, if $|A_i| = 1$, then $M(\mathcal{C})$ does not contain parallel elements. If $M(\mathcal{C})$ has parallel elements, we may as well suppose x, y are parallel, then there exists only one block which contains x, y . Hence, there exists $1 \leq i \leq s$ such that $x, y \in A_i$, that is, $|A_i| \geq 2$. This contradicts the fact that $\forall 1 \leq i \leq s, |A_i| = 1$. Based on the definition of transversal matroid and the fact that \mathcal{C} is a covering, any single-point set is an independent set, thus $M(\mathcal{C})$ dose not contain loops. Hence, $M(\mathcal{C})$ dose not contain parallel elements and loops which implies that $M(\mathcal{C})$ is a simple matroid.

The following two corollaries show that we also have the above results when a covering degenerates into a partition.

Corollary 1. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m\}$ be a partition. \mathcal{P} is the set of atoms of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M_{\mathcal{P}})$.

Corollary 2. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m\}$ be a partition of E and $M(\mathcal{P})$ the transversal matroid induced by \mathcal{P} . $M(\mathcal{P})$ is a simple matroid if and only if $|P_i| = 1$.

For a geometric lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, its atoms are the set of closure of single-points. However, the closure of any two elements of E may not be the set which covers atoms in this lattice. The following proposition shows in what condition $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\})$ covers atoms of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

Proposition 7. For all $x, y \in E$, $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\})$ covers $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})$ if and only if there dose not exist $1 \leq i \leq s$ such that $x, y \in A_i$.

Proof. " \Leftarrow ": $\forall x, y \in E$, from $\{x\} \subseteq \{x, y\}$, we can obtain $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\}) \subseteq cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\})$ and $1 = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})) \leq r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\})) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\}) \leq |\{x, y\}| = 2$. Now we need to prove $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\})) = 2$. If $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\})) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\}) = 1 = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})$, then $y \in cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})$, thus $x, y \notin \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$, that is, there is only one block contains x, y . It means that there exists A_i such that $x, y \in A_i$. That contradicts the hypothesis. Hence, $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\})) = 2$, that is, $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\})$ covers $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})$.

" \Rightarrow ": $\forall x, y \in E$, if there exists A_i such that $x, y \in A_i$, then there is only one block contains x, y , thus $x, y \notin \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$, hence $\{x, y\} \subseteq cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})$. That implies $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\}) \subseteq cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})$ which contradicts the assumption that $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x, y\})$ covers $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\{x\})$.

The modular element and the modular pair are core concepts in lattice. The following theorem shows the relationship among modular element, modular pair and rank function of a matroid.

Theorem 3. Let M be a matroid and $\mathcal{L}(M)$ the set of all closed sets of M .

(1) For all $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}(M)$, X and Y is a modular pair if and only if $r_M(X \cup Y) + r_M(X \cap Y) = r_M(X) + r_M(Y)$.

(2) For all $X \in \mathcal{L}(M)$, X is a modular element of $\mathcal{L}(M)$ if and only if $r_M(X \cup Y) + r_M(X \cap Y) = r_M(X) + r_M(Y)$, for all $Y \in \mathcal{L}(M)$.

Proof. (1) According to Lemma 1 and Lemma 3, we know (X, Y) is a modular pair if and only if $r_M(X) + r_M(Y) = r_M(X \vee Y) + r_M(X \wedge Y) = r_M(cl_M(X \cup Y)) + r_M(X \cap Y) = r_M(X \cup Y) + r_M(X \cap Y)$.

(2) It comes from the definition of modular element and (1).

Let $\{A_i : i \in \Gamma\}$ be the set of atoms of lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, where Γ denotes the index set. The following theorem shows the relationship among atoms, modular pairs and modular elements.

Theorem 4. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering and $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ the set of all closed sets of transversal matroid $M(\mathcal{C})$ induced by \mathcal{C} . For all $i, j \in \Gamma$

(1) (A_i, A_j) is a modular pair of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

(2) A_i is a modular element of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

Proof. (1) Since \mathcal{C} is a covering, $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$. A_i and A_j are atoms, so $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$. According to Theorem 3, we need to prove $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cup A_j) + r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cap A_j) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i) + r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_j)$, that is, $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cup A_j) = 2$. According to the submodular inequality of $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}$, we have $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cup A_j) + r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cap A_j) \leq r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i) + r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_j)$, that is, $1 \leq r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cup A_j) \leq 2$. If $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cup A_j) = 1 = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i)$, then $A_j \subseteq cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i) = A_i$ which contradicts that $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$.

(2) A_i is a modular element of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ if and only if $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cup A) + r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cap A) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i) + r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

Case 1: If A_i and A are comparable, that is, $A_i \subseteq A$, then $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cup A) + r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cap A) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i) + r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A)$.

Case 2: If A_i and A are not comparable, there are two cases. One is that A is an atom of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, the other is that A is not an atom of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$. If A is a atom of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, then we obtain the result from (1). If A is not an atom of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, then $A \cap A_i = \emptyset$. Hence, $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A) \leq r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A \cup A_i) \leq r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A) + 1$. If $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A \cup A_i) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A)$, then $A_i \subseteq cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A) = A$ which contradicts that $A_i \cap A = \emptyset$. Hence, $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A \cup A_i) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A) + 1$.

In a word, for all $A \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cup A) + r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i \cap A) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A_i) + r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(A)$, that is, A_i is a modular element of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

Corollary 3. *Let $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))$ be the set of all closed sets of transversal matroid induced by \mathcal{P} . For all $P_i, P_j \in \mathcal{P}$*

- (1) (P_i, P_j) is a modular pair of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))$.
- (2) P_i is a modular element of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))$.

The following lemma shows how to induce a matroid by a lattice. In fact, if a function f on a lattice is a non-negative, inter-valued, submodular and $f(\emptyset) = 0$, then it can determine a matroid.

Lemma 7. [7] *Let \mathcal{L}_E be a lattice such that \mathcal{L}_E is closed under intersection, and contains \emptyset and E . Suppose that f is a non-negative, inter-valued, submodular function on \mathcal{L}_E for which $f(\emptyset) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}_E, f) = \{X \subseteq E : f(X) \geq |X \cap T|, \forall T \in \mathcal{L}_E\}$. $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}_E, f)$ is the collection of independent sets of a matroid on E .*

According to the definition of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, we find that $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ is closed under intersection, and contains \emptyset and E . Moreover, the rank function is a non-negative, inter-valued, submodular function on $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ for which $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(\emptyset) = 0$. Similar to Lemma 7, we can obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 5. *Let $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ be the set of all closed sets of transversal matroid induced by \mathcal{C} . We define $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C})), r_{M(\mathcal{C})}) = \{X \subseteq E : r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(Y) \geq |X \cap Y|, \forall Y \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))\}$, then $M(E, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C})), r_{M(\mathcal{C})}))$ is a matroid.*

From above theorem, we find that the matroid induced by a geometric lattice is the same as the transversal matroid which generates the geometric lattice. While the concert form of rank function of transversal matroid is difficult to be expressed. The following theorem solves this problem.

Theorem 6. *Let $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ be the set of all closed sets of transversal matroid induced by covering \mathcal{C} and $r_{\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))}$ the rank function of $M(E, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C})), r_{M(\mathcal{C})}))$. $r_{\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))}(X) = \min_{Y \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))} (r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) + |X - Y|)$.*

Proof. $X \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C})), r_{M(\mathcal{C})}) \Leftrightarrow \forall Y \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C})), r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(Y) \geq |X \cap Y| = |X| - |X - Y| \Leftrightarrow \forall Y \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C})), |X| \leq r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(Y) + |X - Y| \Leftrightarrow \forall Y \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C})), r_{\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))}(X) = |X| \leq r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(Y) + |X - Y| \Leftrightarrow r_{\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))}(X) = \min_{Y \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))} (r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) + |X - Y|)$.

For any given matroid M , we know that for all $X \subseteq E$, X is an independent set if and only if $r_M(X) = |X|$. Based on the properties of rank function, we have $r_M(X) \leq |X|$. Hence, X is an independent set if and only if $r_M(X) \geq |X|$.

Lemma 8. *Let M be a matroid. X is an independent set of M if and only if for all closed set of Y , $r_M(Y) \geq |X \cap Y|$.*

Proof. " \Rightarrow ": Since $X \cap Y \subseteq X$ for all closed set Y and X is an independent set, $X \cap Y$ is an independent set of M . Hence, $r_M(Y) \geq r_M(X \cap Y) \geq |X \cap Y|$.

" \Leftarrow ": For all closed set Y , $r_M(Y) \geq |X \cap Y|$. Especially, for $Y = cl_M(X)$, we have $r_M(X) = r_M(cl_M(X)) = r_M(Y) \geq |X \cap Y| = |X|$. Hence, X is an independent set of matroid M .

The following theorem shows that there is a one-to-one correspondence between geometric lattices and transversal matroids in the context of covering-based rough sets.

Theorem 7. *Let $r_{\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))}$ be the rank function of $M(E, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}), r_{M(\mathcal{C})}))$. $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}), r_{M(\mathcal{C})}))$, $r_{M(\mathcal{C})} = \mathcal{I}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ and $r_{\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))}(X) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X)$ for all $X \subseteq E$.*

Proof. According to Lemma 8, we know that $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}), r_{M(\mathcal{C})})) = \{X \subseteq E : r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(Y) \geq |X \cap Y|, \forall Y \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))\}$ and $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C}) = \{X \subseteq E : r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) = |X|\}$ are equivalent, that is, $M(E, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}), r_{M(\mathcal{C})}))$ and $M(E, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C}))$ are equivalent. So does $r_{\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))}(X) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X)$ for all $X \subseteq E$.

We know that $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P}) = \{X \subseteq E : |X \cap P_i| \leq 1\}$ is the family of all partial transversal of partition \mathcal{P} . For all $X \subseteq E$, $r_{M(\mathcal{P})}(X) = \max\{|I| : I \subseteq X, I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P})\} = |\{P_i : P_i \cap X \neq \emptyset\}|$. According to Lemma 2, we know that for all closed set X, Y of matroid M , $X \vee Y = cl_M(X \cup Y)$. If the matroid is $M(\mathcal{P})$, then $X \wedge Y = X \cup Y$.

Lemma 9. [31] *If R is an equivalence relation on E and M is the matroid, then $cl_M = R^*$ for all $X \subseteq E$.*

Lemma 10. *Let $M(\mathcal{P})$ be a transversal matroid induced by \mathcal{P} and $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))$ the set of all closed sets of transversal matroid induced by \mathcal{P} , $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))$. $X \vee Y = X \cup Y$.*

Proof. $X \vee Y = cl_{M(\mathcal{P})}(X \cup Y) = R^*(X \cup Y) = R^*(X) \cup R^*(Y) = cl_{M(\mathcal{P})}(X) \cup cl_{M(\mathcal{P})}(Y) = X \cup Y$.

Proposition 8. *Let $r_{\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))}$ be the rank function of $M(E, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}), r_{M(\mathcal{P})}))$. $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}), r_{M(\mathcal{P})})) = \mathcal{I}(M(\mathcal{P}))$ and $r_{\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))}(X) = r_{M(\mathcal{P})}(X)$ for all $X \subseteq E$.*

Proof. We need to prove only $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}), r_{M(\mathcal{P})})) = \mathcal{I}(M(\mathcal{P}))$. $\forall X \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}), r_{M(\mathcal{P})}))$, $r_{M(\mathcal{P})}(Y) \geq |X \cap Y|$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))$. Since $P_i \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))$, $|X \cap P_i| \leq r_{M(\mathcal{P})}(P_i) = 1$. Thus $X \in \mathcal{I}(M(\mathcal{P}))$. Hence, $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}), r_{M(\mathcal{P})})) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(M(\mathcal{P}))$. According to Lemma 4 and Lemma 10, for all $Y \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}))$, there exists $K \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ such that $Y = \bigvee_{i \in K} P_i = \bigcup_{i \in K} P_i$, $r_{M(\mathcal{P})}(Y) = |K|$ and $|X \cap Y| = |X \cap (\bigcup_{i \in K} P_i)| = |\bigcup_{i \in K} (X \cap P_i)| = \sum_{i \in K} |X \cap P_i|$. For all $X \in \mathcal{I}(M(\mathcal{P}))$, $|X \cap P_i| \leq 1$, $|X \cap Y| = \sum_{i \in K} |X \cap P_i| \leq |K| = r_{M(\mathcal{P})}(Y)$, that is, $\mathcal{I}(M(\mathcal{P})) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{P}), r_{M(\mathcal{P})}))$.

4 Three geometric lattice structures of covering-based rough sets through approximation operators

A geometric lattice structure of covering-based rough sets is established through the transversal matroid induced by the covering, and its characteristics including atoms, modular elements and modular pairs are studied in Section 3. In this section, we study the matroid and the structure of geometric lattice of a matroid from the viewpoint of upper approximations. The condition of three types of upper approximations to be a matroidal closure operator is obtained and the properties of matroids and their geometric lattice structures induced by them are also established.

Pomykala first studied the second type of covering rough set model [9]. Zhu and Wang studied the axiomatization of this type of approximation and the relationship between it and the *Kuratowski* closure operator in [32]. Proposition 9 below gives some properties of this operator.

Proposition 9. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E . SH has the following properties:*

- (1) $SH(\emptyset) = \emptyset$
- (2) $X \subseteq SH(X)$ for all $X \subseteq E$
- (3) $SH(X \cup Y) = SH(X) \cup SH(Y)$
- (4) $x \in SH(\{y\}) \Leftrightarrow y \in SH(\{x\})$
- (5) $X \subseteq Y \subseteq E \Rightarrow SH(X) \subseteq SH(Y)$
- (6) $\forall x, y \in E, y \in SH(X \cup \{x\}) - SH(X)$, then $x \in SH(X \cup \{y\})$.

Proof. (1) – (5) were shown in [9,35,37]. Here we prove only (6). According to (3), we know $SH(X \cup \{x\}) - SH(X) = SH(X) \cup SH(\{x\}) - SH(X) = SH(\{x\}) - SH(X)$. If $y \in SH(X \cup \{x\}) - SH(X)$, then $y \in SH(\{x\})$. According to (4) and (5), we have $x \in SH(\{y\}) \subseteq SH(X \cup \{y\})$.

We find that the idempotent of SH is not valid, so what is the conditions that guarantee it holds for SH ? We have the following conclusion.

Proposition 10. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. $SH(SH(X)) = SH(X)$ if and only if $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition.*

Proof. " \Leftarrow ": According to (2), (5) of Proposition 9, we have $SH(X) \subseteq SH(SH(X))$. Now we prove $SH(SH(X)) \subseteq SH(X)$. For all $x \in SH(SH(X))$, there exists $y \in SH(X)$ such that $x \in I(y)$. Since $y \in SH(X)$, there exists $z \in X$ such that $y \in I(z)$. According to the definition of $I(y)$, we know $y \in I(y)$, thus $I(z) \cap I(y) \neq \emptyset$. For $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition, $I(z) = I(y)$. Since $x \in I(y)$, $x \in I(z)$, that is, $x \in SH(X)$, thus $SH(SH(X)) \subseteq SH(X)$.

" \Rightarrow ": In order to prove $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition, we need to prove that for all $x, y \in E$, if $I(x) \cap I(y) \neq \emptyset$, then $I(x) = I(y)$. If $I(x) \cap I(y) \neq \emptyset$, then there exists $z \in I(x) \cap I(y)$. For $SH(SH(\{x\})) = \bigcup \{I(u) : u \in I(x)\}$ and $z \in I(x)$, then $I(z) \subseteq SH(SH(\{x\})) = SH(\{x\}) = I(x)$. Based on the definition of $I(z)$ and $z \in I(x)$, we have $x \in I(z)$, thus $I(x) \subseteq SH(SH(\{z\})) = SH(\{z\}) = I(z)$. Hence, $I(x) = I(z)$. Similarly, we can obtain $I(y) = I(z)$, thus $I(x) = I(z) = I(y)$.

From the above proposition, it is easy to obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 8. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. SH is a closure operator of matroid if and only if $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition.

Proof. It comes from (2),(5) and (6) of Proposition 2, 9 and 10.

Definition 13. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition, then we define $\mathcal{I}' = \{I \subseteq E : |I \cap I(x_i)| \leq 1, \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}\}$.

As we know, if $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition, then $M(E, \mathcal{I}')$ is a matroid. Under this condition, we know that SH is a closure operator of a matroid, thus it can determine a matroid, and its independent set is established as follows.

$$\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) = \{I \subseteq E : \forall x \in I, x \notin SH(I - \{x\})\}.$$

The following proposition shows $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}) = M(E, \mathcal{I}')$ under the condition that $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition.

Proposition 11. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If $\{I(x) : x \in U\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition, then $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$ is a matroid and $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}'$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}_{cl} = \{I \subseteq E : \forall x \in I, x \notin cl(I - \{x\})\}$. we know that if an operator cl satisfies (1) – (4) of Proposition 2, $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{cl})$ is a matroid. $\{I(x) : x \in U\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition, hence, $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$ is a matroid. Since $SH(I) = \bigcup_{y \in I} I(y)$, $SH(I - \{x\}) = \bigcup_{y \in I - \{x\}} I(y)$. According to the definition of $I(x)$, we know $x \in I(x)$. On one hand, for all $I \in \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C})$, we know that $\forall x \in I, x \notin SH(I - \{x\})$, that is, $\forall y \in I$ and $y \neq x, x \notin I(y)$. If $I \notin \mathcal{I}'$, that is, there exists $1 \leq i \leq s$ such that $|I \cap I(x_i)| \geq 2$, then we may as well suppose there exist u, v such that $u, v \in I(x_i)$ and $u, v \in I$. Since $u \in I(u), v \in I(v)$ and $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition, $I(u) = I(v) = I(x_i)$. Based on that, we know there exists $u \in I$ and $u \neq v$ such that $u \in I(v)$, that implies contradiction. Hence, $I \in \mathcal{I}'$, that is, $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}'$. On the other hand, if $I \notin \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C})$, then there exists $x \in I$ such that $x \in SH(I - \{x\}) = \bigcup_{y \in I - \{x\}} I(y)$. That implies that there exists $y \in I$ and $y \neq x$ such that $x \in I(y)$. Since $x \in I(x)$ and $\{I(x) : x \in U\}$ forms a partition, $I(x) = I(y)$. Thus $x, y \in I \cap I(x)$, that implies $|I \cap I(x)| \geq 2$, i.e., $I \notin \mathcal{I}'$. Hence, $\mathcal{I}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C})$.

In the following proposition, we study some properties of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH})$.

Proposition 12. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If $\{I(x_1), I(x_2), \dots, I(x_s)\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition and $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$ is the matroid induced by SH , then

(1) X is a base of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$ if and only if $|X \cap I(x_i)| = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. Moreover, $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$ has $|I(x_1)| |I(x_2)| \cdots |I(x_s)|$ bases.

(2) For all $X \subseteq E$, $r_{SH}(X) = |\{I(x_i) : I(x_i) \cap X \neq \emptyset, i = 1, 2, \dots, s\}|$.

(3) X is a dependent set of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$ if and only if there exists $I(x_i)$ such that $|I(x_i) \cap X| > 1$.

(4) X is a circuit of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$ if and only if there exists $I(x_i)$ such that $X \subseteq I(x_i)$ and $|X| = 2$.

Proof. (1) According to the definition of base of a matroid, we know that X is a base of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C})) \Leftrightarrow X \in \max(\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C})) \Leftrightarrow |X \cap I(x_i)| = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ according to the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C})$. Since X is a base of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$ and $\{I(x_1), I(x_2), \dots, I(x_s)\}$ are different, $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$ has $|I(x_1)||I(x_2)| \cdots |I(x_s)|$ bases.

(2) According to the definition of rank function, we know $r_{SH}(X) = |B_X| = |\{I(x_i) : |B_X \cap I(x_i)| = 1\}| \leq |\{I(x_i) : X \cap I(x_i) \neq \emptyset\}|$, where B_X is a maximal independent set included in X . Now we just need to prove the inequality $|\{I(x_i) : |B_X \cap I(x_i)| = 1\}| < |\{I(x_i) : X \cap I(x_i) \neq \emptyset\}|$ dose not hold; otherwise, there exists $1 \leq i \leq s$ such that $I(x_i) \cap X \neq \emptyset$ and $I(x_i) \cap B_X = \emptyset$. Thus there exists $e_i \in I(x_i) \cap X$ such that $B_X \cup \{e_i\} \subseteq X$ and $B_X \cup \{e_i\} \in \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C})$. That contradicts the assumption that B_X is a maximal independent set included in X . Hence, $r_{SH}(X) = |\{I(x_i) : I(x_i) \cap X \neq \emptyset, i = 1, 2, \dots, s\}|$.

(3) According to the definition of dependent set, we know that X is a dependent set $\Leftrightarrow X \notin \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) \Leftrightarrow$ there exists $1 \leq i \leq s$ such that $|X \cap I(x_i)| > 1$.

(4) " \Rightarrow ": As we know, a circuit is a minimal dependent set. X is a circuit of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$, there exists $1 \leq i \leq s$ such that $|I(x_i) \cap X| = 2$. Now we just need to prove $|X| = 2$; otherwise, we may as well suppose $X = \{x, y, z\}$ where $x, y \in I(x_i) \cap X$. Thus we can obtain $|(X - \{z\}) \cap I(x_i)| = 2$, that is, $X - \{z\} \notin \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C})$. That contradicts the minimality of circuit. Combining $|X| = 2$ with $|I(x_i) \cap X| = 2$, we have $X \subseteq I(x_i)$.

" \Leftarrow ": Since $|X| = 2$, we may as well suppose $X = \{x, y\}$. $|X \cap I(x_i)| = 2$ because there exists $I(x_i)$ such that $X \subseteq I(x_i)$, thus X is a dependent set. For all $1 \leq j \leq s$, $|\{x\} \cap I(x_j)| \leq 1$ and $|\{y\} \cap I(x_j)| \leq 1$. That implies $\{x\}$ and $\{y\}$ are independent sets, hence X is a circuit of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$.

We denote $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ as the set of all closed sets of $M(U, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$. When $\{I(x_1), I(x_2), \dots, I(x_s)\}$ forms a partition, for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, $X \wedge Y = X \cap Y$, $X \vee Y = SH(X \cup Y) = SH(X) \cup SH(Y) = X \cup Y$ and $SH(\emptyset) = \emptyset$.

Proposition 13. *If $\{I(x_1), I(x_2), \dots, I(x_s)\}$ forms a partition, then*

- (1) $\{I(x_1), I(x_2), \dots, I(x_s)\}$ are all atoms of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_{SH})$.
- (2) There dose not exist $z \in U$ such that $x, y \in I(z)$ if and only if $SH(\{x, y\})$ covers $SH(\{x\})$ or $SH(\{y\})$.
- (3) $\forall 1 \leq i, j \leq s, (I(x_i), I(x_j))$ is a modular pair of $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.
- (4) $\forall 1 \leq i \leq s, I(x_i)$ is a modular element of $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

Proof. (1) comes from Corollary 1, Theorem 8 and Proposition 11. Based on Proposition 4 and Theorem 8, we can obtain (2). According to Corollary 3, Theorem 8 and proposition 11, it is easy to obtain (3) and (4).

Based on Theorem 8, we know that the condition on which SH becomes a closure operator of a matroid is that $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition. Proposition 14 and 15 below show what kinds of coverings can satisfy this condition.

Lemma 11. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering, $K \in \mathcal{C}$. If K is an immured element, then $I(x)$ is the same in \mathcal{C} as in $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$.*

Proof. If $x \notin K$, then $I_{\mathcal{C}}(x) = I_{\mathcal{C}-\{K\}}(x)$. If $x \in K$, then $I_{\mathcal{C}}(x) = \bigcup_{x \in K'} K' \cup K$. Since K is an immured element, there exists $x \in K'$ such that $K \subseteq K'$. Thus $I_{\mathcal{C}}(x) = \bigcup_{x \in K'} K' \cup K = \bigcup_{x \in K'} K' = I_{\mathcal{C}-\{K\}}(x)$. Hence, $I(x)$ is the same in \mathcal{C} as in $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$.

Proposition 14. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If $exclusion(\mathcal{C})$ is a partition, then $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition.*

Proof. Since $exclusion(\mathcal{C})$ is a partition of E , $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by $exclusion(\mathcal{C})$ forms a partition. Suppose $\{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_s\}$ is the set all immured elements of \mathcal{C} . According to Lemma 11, we have $\forall x \in E$, $I(x)$ is the same in $exclusion(\mathcal{C})$ as in $exclusion(\mathcal{C}) \cup \{K_1\}$. Thus $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by $exclusion(\mathcal{C}) \cup \{K_1\}$ forms a partition. And the rest may be deduced by analogy, we know that $\forall x \in E$, $I(x)$ is the same in $exclusion(\mathcal{C})$ as in \mathcal{C} , thus $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition.

The proposition below establishes the necessary and sufficient condition of $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition.

Proposition 15. *$\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition if and only if \mathcal{C} satisfies (TRA) condition: $\forall x, y, z \in E$, $x, z \in K_1 \in \mathcal{C}$, $y, z \in K_2 \in \mathcal{C}$, there exists $K_3 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $x, y \in K_3$.*

Proof. " \Leftarrow ": $\forall x, y \in E$, $I(x) \cap I(y) = \emptyset$ or $I(x) \cap I(y) \neq \emptyset$. If $I(x) \cap I(y) \neq \emptyset$, then there exists $z \in I(x)$ and $z \in I(y)$. According to the definition of $I(x)$ and $I(y)$, there exist K_1, K_2 such that $x, z \in K_1$ and $y, z \in K_2$. According to hypothesis, we know $\exists K_3 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $x, y \in K_3$. Now we need to prove only $I(x) = I(y)$. $\forall u \in I(x)$, there exists K such that $u, x \in K$. Since $x, y \in K_3$, there exists K' such that $u, y \in K'$, that is, $u \in I(y)$, thus $I(x) \subseteq I(y)$. Similarly, we can prove $I(y) \subseteq I(x)$. Hence, $I(x) = I(y)$, that is, $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition.

" \Rightarrow ": $\forall x, y, z \in E$, $x, z \in K_1 \in \mathcal{C}$ and $y, z \in K_2 \in \mathcal{C}$, we can obtain $z \in I(x)$ and $z \in I(y)$. That implies $I(x) \cap I(y) \neq \emptyset$. Since $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition, $I(x) = I(y)$. Thus there exists $K_3 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $x, y \in K_3$.

Theorem 9. *\mathcal{C} satisfies (TRA) condition if and only if SH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator of a matroid.*

Proof. It comes from Theorem 8 and Proposition 15.

The sixth type of covering-based upper approximation was first defined in [22]. Xu and Wang introduced this type of covering-based rough set model and studied the relationship between it and binary relation based rough set model. Proposition 16 below gives some properties of this covering upper approximation operator.

Proposition 16. [36] *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering of U . XH has the following properties:*

- (1) $XH(U) = U$
- (2) $XH(\emptyset) = \emptyset$
- (3) $X \subseteq XH(X)$
- (4) $XH(X \cup Y) = XH(X) \cup XH(Y)$
- (5) $XH(XH(X)) = XH(X)$
- (6) $X \subseteq Y \Rightarrow XH(X) \subseteq XH(Y)$

Proposition 17. XH satisfies: $\forall x, y \in E, X \subseteq E,$

$$y \in XH(X \cup \{x\}) - XH(X) \Rightarrow x \in XH(X \cup \{y\})$$

if and only if $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition.

Proof. \Rightarrow : $\forall x, y \in E,$ if $N(x) \cap N(y) \neq \emptyset,$ then there exists $z \in N(x) \cap N(y).$ Let $X = \emptyset.$ According to (2) of Proposition 16, we know that if $y \in XH(\{x\})$ then $x \in XH(y),$ that is, if $x \in N(y)$ then $y \in N(x).$ Since $z \in N(y), N(z) \subseteq N(y).$ According to the assumption, we also have $y \in N(z),$ that is, $N(y) \subseteq N(x).$ Thus $N(x) = N(z).$ Similarly, $z \in N(y),$ we have $N(z) = N(y).$ Thus $N(x) = N(z) = N(y).$ Hence, $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition.

\Leftarrow : Since $XH(X \cup Y) = XH(X) \cup XH(Y)$ for all $X, Y \subseteq U, y \in XH(X \cup \{x\}) - XH(X) = XH(X) \cup XH\{x\} - XH(X) = XH\{x\} - XH(X).$ Now we prove $x \in XH(\{y\}).$ Since $y \in XH(\{x\}), x \in N(y).$ Because the fact that $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition, $x \in N(x)$ and $x \in N(y),$ we have $N(x) = N(y),$ thus $y \in N(x),$ that is, $x \in XH(\{y\}).$ Hence $x \in XH(\{y\}) \subseteq XH(X \cup \{y\}).$

Theorem 10. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition if and only if XH is a closure operator of matroid.

Proof. It comes from (3), (5) and (6) of Proposition 16 and Proposition 17.

Definition 14. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition, then we define $\mathcal{I}' = \{I \subseteq E : |I \cap N(x_i)| \leq 1, \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}\}.$

Suppose $N(x_1), N(x_2), \dots, N(x_t)$ are all different neighborhoods on $E.$ As we know, if $N(x_1), N(x_2), \dots, N(x_t)$ forms a partition, then XH is a closure operator of a matroid. Moreover, XH can determine a matroid, and its independent set is shown as follows:

$$\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \{I \subseteq E : \forall x \in I, x \notin XH(I - \{x\})\}$$

Similar to the case of $SH,$ we can obtain the following results.

Proposition 18. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If $N(x_1), N(x_2), \dots, N(x_t)$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition, then $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}))$ is a matroid and $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}'.$

Proposition 19. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If $\{N(x_1), N(x_2), \dots, N(x_t)\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition and $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}))$ is the matroid induced by $XH,$ then

(1) X is a base of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}))$ if and only if $|X \cap N(x_i)| = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t,$ and $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}))$ has $|N(x_1)| |N(x_2)| \dots |N(x_s)|$ bases.

(2) For all $X \subseteq E, r_{XH}(X) = |\{N(x_i) : N(x_i) \cap X \neq \emptyset, 1 \leq i \leq t\}|.$

(3) X is a circuit of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}))$ if and only if there exists $N(x_i)$ such that $X \subseteq N(x_i)$ and $|X| = 2.$

(4) X is a dependent set of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}))$ if and only if there exists $N(x_i)$ such that $|N(x_i) \cap X| > 1.$

(5) $\{N(x_1), N(x_2), \dots, N(x_t)\}$ is the set of all atoms of lattice $\mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})).$

(6) There dose not exist $z \in E$ such that $x, y \in N(z)$ if and only if $XH(\{x, y\})$ covers $XH(\{x\})$ or $XH(\{y\}).$

(7) $\forall 1 \leq i, j \leq t, (N(x_i), N(x_j))$ is a modular pair of lattice $\mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})).$

(8) $\forall 1 \leq i \leq t, N(x_i)$ is a modular element of lattice $\mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})).$

The proof of Proposition 18 and 19 is similar to that of Proposition 11 and Proposition 12 and 13, respectively. So we omit the proof of them.

Similar to the case of SH , we also study what kind of covering can make $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ form a partition. This paper establishes only two kinds of coverings. As for others we can refer to [23,3].

Lemma 12. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E , K reducible in \mathcal{C} . $\forall x \in U$, $N(x)$ is the same in \mathcal{C} as in $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$.*

Proof. $\forall x \in E$, $Md(x)$ is the same for covering \mathcal{C} and covering $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$, so $N(x) = \bigcap Md(x)$ is the same for the covering \mathcal{C} and covering $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$.

Proposition 20. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If $reduct(\mathcal{C})$ is a partition, then $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} is also a partition.*

Proof. Since $reduct(\mathcal{C})$ is a partition of E , $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by $reduct(\mathcal{C})$ forms a partition. Suppose $\{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_s\}$ is the set all reducible elements of \mathcal{C} . According to Lemma 12, we know that $\forall x \in E$, $N(x)$ is the same in $reduct(\mathcal{C})$ as in $reduct(\mathcal{C}) \cup \{K_1\}$, thus $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by $reduct(\mathcal{C}) \cup \{K_1\}$ forms a partition. And the rest may be deduced by analogy, then we can obtain $\forall x \in E$, $N(x)$ is the same in $reduct(\mathcal{C})$ as in \mathcal{C} , thus $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition.

Proposition 21. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E . If \mathcal{C} satisfies the (EQU) condition: $\forall K \in \mathcal{C}$, $\forall x, y \in K$, the number of blocks which contain x is equal to that of blocks which contain y , then $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition.*

Proof. $\forall x, y \in E$, if $N(x) \cap N(y) \neq \emptyset$, then there exists $z \in E$ such that $z \in N(x)$ and $z \in N(y)$, that is, the blocks which contain x also contain z and the blocks which contains y also contain z . Hence, there exist K_i, K'_i such that $x, z \in K_i$ and $y, z \in K'_i$. Without loss of generality, we suppose $\{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_s\}$ is the set of all blocks which contain x and $\{K'_1, K'_2, \dots, K'_t\}$ is the set of all blocks which contain y . Since the number of blocks which contain z is equal to that of blocks which contain x , $\{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_s\}$ is the set of all blocks which contain z , thus $\{K'_1, K'_2, \dots, K'_t\} \subseteq \{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_s\}$. Hence, $N(x) \subseteq N(y)$. Similarly, we can prove $N(y) \subseteq N(x)$. Hence, $N(x) = N(y)$, that is, $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition.

Qin et al. first defined the seventh type of covering-based upper approximation in [10]. They also discussed the relationship between it and other types of approximations. Proposition 22 below gives some properties of the covering upper approximation operator VH .

Proposition 22. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering of E . VH has the following properties:*

- (1) $VH(\emptyset) = \emptyset$
- (2) $X \subseteq VH(X)$ for all $X \subseteq E$
- (3) $VH(X \cup Y) = VH(X) \cup VH(Y)$
- (4) $x \in VH(\{y\}) \Leftrightarrow y \in VH(\{x\})$
- (5) $X \subseteq Y \subseteq E \Rightarrow VH(X) \subseteq VH(Y)$
- (6) $\forall x, y \in E, y \in VH(X \cup \{x\}) - VH(X)$, then $x \in VH(X \cup \{y\})$

Proof. (1)-(3) were shown in [10], so we prove only (4), (5) and (6).

(4) $y \in VH(\{x\}) \Leftrightarrow$ there exists $z \in U$ such that $x, y \in N(z) \Leftrightarrow x \in VH(\{y\})$.

(5) $\forall x \in VH(X)$, there exists $y \in E$ such that $x \in N(y)$ and $N(y) \cap X \neq \emptyset$. Since $X \subseteq Y$, $N(y) \cap Y \neq \emptyset$. Hence, $x \in VH(Y)$, that is, $VH(X) \subseteq VH(Y)$.

(6) According to (3), we have $VH(X \cup \{x\}) - VH(X) = VH(X) \cup VH(\{x\}) - VH(X) = VH(\{x\} - VH(X))$. If $y \in VH(\{x\} - VH(X))$, then $y \in VH(\{x\})$. Based on (4), we know $x \in VH(\{y\}) \subseteq VH(X) \cup VH(\{y\}) = VH(X \cup \{y\})$. Hence, (5) holds.

Proposition 23. $VH(VH(X)) = VH(X)$ if and only if $\{VH(\{x\}) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition of E .

Proof. " \Leftarrow ": According to (2) and (5) of Proposition 22, we know $VH(X) \subseteq VH(VH(X))$. For all $x \in VH(VH(X))$, there exists $y \in VH(X)$ such that $x \in VH(\{y\})$. Since $y \in VH(X)$, there exists $z \in E$ such that $y \in VH(\{z\})$. Based on $y \in VH(\{y\})$ and $\{VH(\{x\}) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition, we have $VH(\{y\}) = VH(\{z\})$. Thus $x \in VH(\{z\})$ because $x \in VH(\{y\})$. Hence, $x \in VH(X)$, that is, $VH(VH(X)) \subseteq VH(X)$.

" \Rightarrow ": In order to prove $\{VH(\{x\}) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition, we need to prove that for all $x, y \in E$, if $VH(\{x\}) \cap VH(\{y\}) \neq \emptyset$, then $VH(\{x\}) = VH(\{y\})$. If $VH(\{x\}) \cap VH(\{y\}) \neq \emptyset$, then there exists $z \in VH(\{x\}) \cap VH(\{y\})$. For $VH(VH(\{x\})) = \bigcup \{VH(\{u\}) : u \in VH(\{x\})\}$ and $z \in VH(\{x\})$, $VH(\{z\}) \subseteq VH(VH(\{x\})) = VH(\{x\})$. Based on (4) of Proposition 15 and $z \in VH(\{x\})$, we have $x \in VH(\{z\})$. Thus it is easy to obtain $VH(\{x\}) \subseteq VH(VH(\{z\})) = VH(\{z\})$. Hence, $VH(\{x\}) = VH(\{z\})$. Similarly, we can obtain $VH(\{y\}) = VH(\{x\})$, thus $VH(\{x\}) = VH(\{z\}) = VH(\{y\})$.

Theorem 11. VH is a closure operator of matroid M if and only if $\{VH(\{x\}) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition E .

Proof. It comes from (2), (5) and (6) of Proposition 2, 22 and 23.

Definition 15. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If $\{VH(\{x\}) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition, then we define $\mathcal{I}''' = \{I \subseteq E : |I \cap VH(\{x_i\})| \leq 1, \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}\}$.

If $\{VH(\{x\}) : x \in E\} = VH(\{x_1\}), VH(\{x_2\}), \dots, VH(\{x_r\})$ forms a partition of E , then VH is a closure operator of a matroid, and the matroid's independent set is shown as follows:

$$\mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}) = \{I \subseteq E : \forall x \in I, x \notin VH(I - \{x\})\}$$

Similar to Proposition 11, 12 and 13, we can also obtain the following two results.

Proposition 24. If $VH(\{x_1\}), VH(\{x_2\}), \dots, VH(\{x_r\})$ forms a partition on E , then $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}))$ is a matroid and $\mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}'''$.

Proposition 25. If $\{VH(\{x_1\}), VH(\{x_2\}), \dots, VH(\{x_r\})\}$ forms a partition on E and $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}))$ is the matroid induced by VH , then

(1) For all $X \subseteq E$, $r_{VH}(X) = |\{VH(\{x_i\}) : VH(\{x_i\}) \cap X \neq \emptyset, i = 1, 2, \dots, r\}|$.

- (2) X is a base of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}))$ if and only if $|X \cap VH(\{x_i\})| = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$, and $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}))$ has $|VH(\{x_1\})||VH(\{x_2\})| \cdots |VH(\{x_r\})|$ bases.
- (3) X is a circuit of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}))$ if and only if there exists $VH(\{x_i\})$ such that $X \subseteq VH(\{x_i\})$ and $|X| = 2$.
- (4) X is a dependent set of $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}))$ if and only if there exists $VH(\{x_i\})$ such that $|VH(\{x_i\}) \cap X| > 1$.
- (5) $\{VH(\{x_1\}), VH(\{x_2\}), \dots, VH(\{x_r\})\}$ are all atoms of $\mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.
- (6) There does not exist $z \in E$ such that $x, y \in \{VH(\{z\})$ if and only if $VH(\{x, y\})$ covers $VH(\{x\})$ or $VH(\{y\})$.
- (7) $\forall 1 \leq i, j \leq r, (\{VH(\{x_i\}), \{VH(\{x_j\})\})$ is a modular pair of lattice $\mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.
- (8) $\forall 1 \leq i \leq r, VH(x_i)$ is a modular element of lattice $\mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

The proof of Proposition 24, 25 is similar to that of Proposition 11,12 and 13, respectively. We omit it here.

As we know, the seventh type of upper approximation is defined by neighborhood, and the sixth and the seventh types of upper approximations are equivalent when $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition. Thus the covering which make the sixth type of upper approximation be a closure of a matroid is the covering which make the seventh type of upper approximation be a closure operator of a matroid, hence we omit the discussion about what kind of covering can make the seventh type of upper approximation be a closure operator of a matroid.

5 Relationships among four geometric lattice structures of covering-based rough sets

In Section 3, the properties of the geometric lattice have been studied by matroid $M(E, \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C}))$, and we also have studied the properties of matroids $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}))$, $M(E, \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}))$. Section 4 presents sufficient and necessary conditions for three types of covering upper approximation operators to be closure operators of matroids. Moreover, we exhibit three types of matroids through closure axioms, and then obtain three geometric lattice structures of covering-based rough sets. In this section, we compare above four types of geometric lattices through corresponding matroids. We also discuss the reducible element and the immured element's influence on the relationship among this four types of matroidal structures and geometric lattice structures.

The following proposition shows the relationship between $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$, and the relationship between $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ and $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

Proposition 26. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. if SH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, then $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C})) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Proof. Since SH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, $\{I(x_1), I(x_2), \dots, I(x_s)\}$ forms a partition. $\forall I \in \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C})$, suppose $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_\alpha\} (\alpha \leq s)$ such that $i_1 \in I(x_{i_1}), i_2 \in I(x_{i_2}), \dots, i_\alpha \in I(x_{i_\alpha})$ and $\{I(x_{i_1}), I(x_{i_2}), \dots, I(x_{i_\alpha})\} \subseteq \{I(x_1), I(x_2), \dots, I(x_s)\}$. According to the definition of $I(x) = \bigcup_{x \in K} K$, there exists $\{K_{i_1}, K_{i_2}, \dots, K_{i_\alpha}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ such that $i_1 \in K_{i_1}, i_2 \in K_{i_2}, \dots, i_\alpha \in K_{i_\alpha}$. Since

$\{I(x_1), I(x_2), \dots, I(x_s)\}$ forms a partition, thus $\{K_{i_1}, K_{i_2}, \dots, K_{i_\alpha}\}$ are different blocks. According to the definition of transversal matroid, we have $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Hence, $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$.

$\forall X \in \mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, $X = SH(X) = \bigcup_{x \in X} I(x)$. Now we prove $X \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, that is, $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) = X = \{x | r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X \cup \{x\})\}$. Since $X \subseteq cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X)$, if $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) \neq X$, then $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) \not\subseteq X$, that is, there exists $y \in E$ such that $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X \cup \{y\})$ and $y \notin X$. Suppose $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_t\} (t \leq s)$ is a maximal independent set included in X , then $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_t\} \subseteq X = \bigcup_{x \in X} I(x)$ and there exist different K_1, K_2, \dots, K_t such that $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}, t_i \in K_i$. Since $y \notin X$, $\forall x \in X, I(x) \cap I(y) = \emptyset$. Based on $\{I(x_1), I(x_2), \dots, I(x_s)\}$ forms a partition, there exists $K \subseteq I(y)$ such that K_1, K_2, \dots, K_t, K are different blocks and $y \in K$, thus $T \cup \{y\}$ is a maximal independent set included in $X \cup \{y\}$. Hence, we have $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X \cup \{y\}) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) + 1$ which contradicts $r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) = r_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X \cup \{y\})$. Thus we can obtain $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) = X$.

The following proposition illustrates that in what condition the indiscernible neighborhoods are included in the closed-set lattice induced by \mathcal{C} .

Proposition 27. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If SH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, then $\forall x \in E, I(x) \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Proof. Since SH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition. Thus, for all $x \in E, SH(I(x)) = \bigcup_{y \in I(x)} I(y) = I(x)$, that is, $I(x) \in \mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$. According to proposition 26, $I(x) \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

Example 2. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{4, 5\}\}$. $I(1) = I(2) = I(3) = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $I(4) = I(5) = \{4, 5\}$. $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \{\emptyset, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{4, 5\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}\}$. $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{4, 5\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 4, 5\}, \{2, 4, 5\}, \{3, 4, 5\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 4, 5\}, \{1, 3, 4, 5\}, \{2, 3, 4, 5\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}\}$, the structures of $\mathcal{L}(M_{SH})$ and $\mathcal{L}(M_{\mathcal{C}})$ are showed in figure 1.

Remark 2. Let \mathcal{C} is a covering and XH induced by \mathcal{C} a closure operator. However, it has no relationship between $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$, and has no relationship between $\mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ and $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$. Similarly, those conclusions also hold for VH .

The following example illustrates the above statements.

Example 3. $\mathcal{C} = \{K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4\}$ is a covering of E , Where $K_1 = \{a, b, i\}, K_2 = \{a, b, c, d, e, f\}, K_3 = \{f, g, h\}, K_4 = \{c, d, e, g, h, i\}$. Then $VH(\{a\}) = VH(\{b\}) = N(a) = N(b) = \{a, b\}, VH(\{c\}) = VH(\{d\}) = VH(\{e\}) = N(c) = N(d) = N(e) = \{c, d, e\}, VH(\{f\}) = N(f) = \{f\}, VH(\{g\}) = VH(\{h\}) = N(g) = N(h) = \{g, h\}, VH(\{i\}) = N(i) = \{i\}$. Let $T = \{a, c, f, g, i\}$. It is clear that $T \in \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C})$, but $T \notin \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$, thus $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$. Let $T' = \{a, c, d\}$. It is clear that $T' \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$, but $T' \notin \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C})$ for $|T' \cap N(a)| = 2$ and $|T' \cap VH(\{a\})| = 2$, thus $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C})$. Let $X = \{a, b, i\}$. $X \in \mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ for $XH(X) = X$. However, $X \notin \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ for $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) = \{a, b, c, d, e, i\}$. Let $X = \{a\}$. $X \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ for $cl_{M(\mathcal{C})}(X) = X$. However, $X \notin \mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ for $XH(X) = \{a, b\} \neq X$.




Fig. 1. The lattice of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$) and $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$

Proposition 28. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If XH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, then VH induced by \mathcal{C} is also a closure operator. Moreover, $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Proof. Since XH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition. $\forall X \subseteq E$, $XH(X) = \{x : N(x) \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$ and $VH(X) = \bigcup \{N(x) : N(x) \cap X \neq \emptyset\}$. It is clear that $XH(X) \subseteq VH(X)$. $\forall x \in VH(X)$, there exists $y \in E$ such that $x \in N(y)$ and $N(y) \cap X \neq \emptyset$. Based on $x \in N(x)$ and $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition, $N(x) = N(y)$ and $N(y) \cap X \neq \emptyset$, thus $x \in XH(X)$, that is, $VH(X) \subseteq XH(X)$. Hence, $VH(X) = XH(X)$. According to the definition of $\mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$ and $\mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, we can obtain $\mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$. $\forall X \subseteq E$, the equality $XH(X) = VH(X)$ holds, so $\forall x \in E$, $VH(\{x\}) = N(x)$. According to the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C})$, we have $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C})$.

Theorem 12. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. If XH and SH induced by \mathcal{C} are closure operators, then $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C})) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Proof. If XH and SH induced by \mathcal{C} are closure operators, then $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ and $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition of E , respectively. $\forall x \in X$, $N(x) = \bigcap_{x \in K} K \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in K} K = I(x)$, thus $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ is finer than $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$. Based on this, we can obtain $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C})$. According to Proposition 28, we have $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C})$.

For all $X \in \mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$, $X = SH(X) = \bigcup_{x \in X} I(x)$. Since $x \in N(x) \subseteq I(x)$, $X = \bigcup_{x \in X} \{x\} \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in X} N(x) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in X} I(x) = X$, thus, $X = \bigcup_{x \in X} N(x)$, that is, $X \in \mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C})) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$. By the fact that $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition and Proposition 28, $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C})$. Thus $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C})) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

Example 4. From Example 2, we know $N(1) = \{1\}, N(2) = \{2\}, N(3) = \{3\}, N(4) = N(5) = \{4, 5\}$ and $I(1) = I(2) = I(3) = \{1, 2, 3\}, I(4) = I(5) = \{4, 5\}$. $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \{\emptyset, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{4, 5\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{4, 5\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 4, 5\}, \{2, 4, 5\}, \{3, 4, 5\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 4, 5\}, \{1, 3, 4, 5\}, \{2, 3, 4, 5\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}\}$. The structures of them are showed in figure 1.

When a covering degenerates into a partition, we can obtain the following result.

Theorem 13. *If \mathcal{C} is a partition, then $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{C} is a partition, $\forall x \in E, I(x) = N(x) = VH(\{x\}) = K$ where $x \in K$, and $\forall X \subseteq E, SH(X) = XH(X) = VH(X)$. Thus $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.

Next, we discuss the reducible element and immured element's influence on the independent set and the closed-set lattice.

Theorem 14. *Let \mathcal{F} be a family subset on $E, K \in \mathcal{F}. \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F} - \{K\}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. For all $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F} - \{K\})$, we may as well suppose $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t\}, i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t \in E$. According to the definition of transversal matroid, there exist different blocks $K_1, K_2, \dots, K_t \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfy $K_i \neq K$ and $i_j \in K_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t$. Thus $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$.

The following example illustrates $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F} - \{K\})$.

Example 5. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{K_1, K_2, K_3\}$ be a family subset of $E = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, where $K_1 = \{1, 2\}, K_2 = \{1, 3\}, K_3 = \{3\}$. $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}) = P(E), \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F} - \{K_3\}) = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{1, 2\}\{2, 3\}\}$. Hence, $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F} - \{K\})$.

Corollary 4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on $E, K \in \mathcal{C}$. If K is reducible, then $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C} - \{K\}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$.*

Corollary 5. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. $\mathcal{I}(\text{reduct}(\mathcal{C})) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$.*

Corollary 6. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering, $K \in \mathcal{C}$. If K is an immured element, then $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C} - \{K\}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$.*

Corollary 7. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering. $\mathcal{I}(\text{exclusion}(\mathcal{C})) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$*

Theorem 15. *Let \mathcal{F} be a family subset on $E, \forall K \in \mathcal{F}. \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F} - \{K\})) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F}))$.*

Proof. First, we prove the result $cl_{\mathcal{F}}(\{x\}) \subseteq cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x\})$. For all $y \notin cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x\}), \{x, y\} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}$. Since $\{x, y\} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{F}}$, thus $y \notin cl_{\mathcal{F}}(\{x\})$. That implies that $cl_{\mathcal{F}}(\{x\}) \subseteq cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x\})$.

Second, we prove that any atom of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F} - \{K\}))$ is a closed set of $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F}))$, that is, $cl_{\mathcal{F}}(cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x\})) = cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x\})$. Since $cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x\}) \subseteq cl_{\mathcal{F}}(cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x\})) \subseteq cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x\})) = cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x\}), cl_{\mathcal{F}}(cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x\})) = cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x\})$.

Third, we prove that $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F} - \{K\})) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F}))$. $\forall X \subseteq \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F} - \{K\}))$, $X = \bigvee_{i=1}^m cl_{\mathcal{F} - \{K\}}(\{x_i\}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^m \bigvee_{j=1}^{s_i} cl_{\mathcal{F}}(\{x_j\})$ because $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F} - \{K\}))$ is a atomic lattice, thus $X \in \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F}))$.

Example 6. Based on Example 5, we have $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F})) = P(E)$ and $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F} - \{K_3\})) = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}$. It is clear that $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F})) \not\subseteq \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{F} - \{K_3\}))$.

Corollary 8. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E , $K \in \mathcal{C}$. If K is reducible, then $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C} - \{K\})) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Corollary 9. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E . $\mathcal{L}(M(\text{reduct}(\mathcal{C}))) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Corollary 10. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E , $K \in \mathcal{C}$. If K is an immured element, then $\mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C} - \{K\})) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Corollary 11. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E . $\mathcal{L}(M(\text{exclusion}(\mathcal{C}))) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(M(\mathcal{C}))$.*

Remark 3. Let \mathcal{C} is a covering and SH induced by \mathcal{C} a closure operator. If a reducible element K is removed from the covering \mathcal{C} , then $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$ may not still be a covering such that SH is a closure operator. Hence, it is difficult to discuss the relationship between $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C} - \{K\})$.

Example 7. Let $E = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{K_1, K_2, K_3\}$ where $K_1 = \{1, 2\}, K_2 = \{1, 3\}, K_3 = \{1, 2, 3\}$. $I(1) = I(2) = I(3) = \{1, 2, 3\}$, thus $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition. Hence, SH is a closure operator induced by \mathcal{C} . It is clear that K_3 is a reducible element, $\mathcal{C} - \{K_3\} = \{K_1, K_2\}$. Then the indiscernible neighborhoods induced by $\mathcal{C} - \{K_3\}$ are $I(1) = \{1, 2, 3\}, I(2) = \{1, 2\}, I(3) = \{1, 3\}$. we find that $\{I(x) : x \in E\}$ can not form a partition. Hence, SH is not a closure operator induced by $\mathcal{C} - \{K_3\}$.

Theorem 16. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E and K an immured element. If SH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, then SH induced by $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$ is also a closure operator. Moreover, $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C} - \{K\})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C} - \{K\}))$.*

Corollary 12. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E . If SH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, then SH induced by $\text{exclusion}(\mathcal{C})$ is also a closure operator. Moreover, $\mathcal{I}_{SH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{SH}(\text{exclusion}(\mathcal{C}))$ and $\mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{SH}(M(\text{exclusion}(\mathcal{C})))$.*

Remark 4. Let \mathcal{C} be a covering and XH induced by \mathcal{C} a closure operator. If an immured element K is removed from the covering \mathcal{C} , then $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$ may not still be a covering which makes XH and VH be closure operators. So we omit the discussion of the relationship between $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C} - \{K\})$, and the relationship between $\mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C} - \{K\})$.

The following example illustrates the above remark.

Example 8. Suppose $K_1 = \{1\}, K_2 = \{1, 2\}, K_3 = \{2, 3\}, K_4 = \{3\}, K_5 = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4\}$. $N(1) = \{1\}, N(2) = \{2\}, N(3) = \{3\}$, thus $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ forms a partition of E . Hence, XH is a closure operator. It is clear that K_1 is an immured element, and the neighborhoods induced by $\mathcal{C} - \{K_1\}$ are $N(1) = \{1, 2\}, N(2) = \{2\}, N(3) = \{3\}$, thus $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ can not form a partition of E . Hence, $\mathcal{C} - \{K_1\}$ is not a covering which makes XH be a closure operator. Let $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{K_1, K_2, K_3, K_5\}$. $N(1) = \{1\}, N(2) = \{2\}, N(3) = \{2, 3\}, VH(\{1\}) =$

$\{1\}, VH(\{2\}) = VH(\{3\}) = \{2, 3\}$, thus $\{VH(\{x\} : x \in E)\}$ forms a partition of E . Hence, \mathcal{C}_2 is a covering such that VH is a closure operator. However, $\{VH(\{x\}) : x \in E\}$ induced by $\mathcal{C}_2 - \{K_1\}$ does not form a partition because $VH(\{1\}) = \{1, 2\}, VH(\{2\}) = \{1, 2, 3\}, VH(\{3\}) = \{2, 3\}$. It is clear that K_1 is an immersed element in \mathcal{C}_2 and $\mathcal{C}_2 - \{K_1\}$ is a covering which does not make VH be a closure operator.

Theorem 17. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E and K be a reducible element. If XH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, then XH induced by $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$ is also a closure operator. Moreover, $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C} - \{K\})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C} - \{K\}))$.*

Proof. Since XH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, $\{N(x) : x \in E\}$ induced by \mathcal{C} forms a partition. Based on the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C})$ and Lemma 12, XH induced by $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$ is also a closure operator and $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C} - \{K\})$.

Corollary 13. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E . If XH is a closure operator, then XH induced by $\text{reduct}(\mathcal{C})$ is also a closure operator. Moreover, $\mathcal{I}_{XH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{XH}(\text{reduct}(\mathcal{C}))$ and $\mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{XH}(M(\text{reduct}(\mathcal{C})))$.*

Theorem 18. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering of E and $K \in \mathcal{C}$ a reducible element. If VH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, then VH induced by $\mathcal{C} - \{K\}$ is also a closure operator. Moreover, $\mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C} - \{K\})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C} - \{K\}))$.*

Corollary 14. *Let \mathcal{C} be a covering on E . If VH induced by \mathcal{C} is a closure operator, then VH induced by $\text{reduct}(\mathcal{C})$ is also a closure operator. Moreover, $\mathcal{I}_{VH}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{I}_{VH}(\text{reduct}(\mathcal{C}))$ and $\mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{L}_{VH}(M(\text{reduct}(\mathcal{C})))$.*

6 Conclusions

This paper has studied the geometric lattice structures of covering based-rough sets through matroids. The important contribution of this paper is that we have established a geometric lattice structure of covering-based rough sets through the transversal matroid induced by a covering and have presented three geometric lattice structures of covering-based rough sets through three types of approximation operators. Moreover, we have discussed the relationship among the four geometric lattice structures. To study other properties of this type of geometric lattice structure and to study other geometric lattices from the viewpoint of other upper approximation operators is our future work.

7 Acknowledgments

This work is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 61170128, the Natural Science Foundation of Fujian Province, China, under Grant Nos. 2011J01374 and 2012J01294, and the Science and Technology Key Project of Fujian Province, China, under Grant No. 2012H0043.

References

1. Birkhoff, G.: Lattice Theory. American Mathematical Society, Rhode Island (1995)
2. Edmonds, J.: Matroids and the greedy algorithm. *Mathematical Programming* **1** (1971) 127–136
3. Hu, G., Xiao, X., Zhang, W.: Study on conditions of neighborhoods forming a partition. In: *Fuzzy Systems and Knowledge Discovery*. (2012) 256–259
4. Liu, G., Zhu, W.: The algebraic structures of generalized rough set theory. *Information Sciences* **178** (2008) 4105–4113
5. Lai, H.: Matroid theory. Higher Education Press, Beijing (2001)
6. Lawler, E.: Combinatorial optimization: networks and matroids. Dover Publications (2001)
7. Oxley, J.G.: Matroid theory. Oxford University Press, New York (1993)
8. Pawlak, Z.: Rough sets. *International Journal of Computer and Information Sciences* **11** (1982) 341–356
9. Pomykala, J.A.: Approximation operations in approximation space. *Bulletin of the Polish Academy of Sciences* **35** (1987) 653–662
10. Qin, K., Gao, Y., Pei, Z.: On covering rough sets. In: *Rough Set and Knowledge Technology*. LNCS (2007) 34–41
11. Qian, Y., Liang, J., Li, D., Wang, F., Ma, N.: Approximation reduction in inconsistent incomplete decision tables. *Knowledge-Based Systems* **23** (2010) 427–433
12. Skowron, A., Stepaniuk, J.: Tolerance approximation spaces. *Fundamenta Informaticae* **27** (1996) 245–253
13. Slowinski, R., Vanderpooten, D.: A generalized definition of rough approximations based on similarity. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* **12** (2000) 331–336
14. Wang, S., Zhu, W.: Matroidal structure of covering-based rough sets through the upper approximation number. *International Journal of Granular Computing, Rough Sets and Intelligent Systems* **2** (2011) 141–148
15. Wang, S., Zhu, W., Min, F.: Transversal and function matroidal structures of covering-based rough sets. In: *Rough Sets and Knowledge Technology*. (2011) 146–155
16. Wang, S., Zhu, Q., Zhu, W., Min, F.: Matroidal structure of rough sets and its characterization to attribute reduction. *Knowledge-Based Systems* (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2012.06.006>) (2012)
17. Wang, S., Zhu, P., Zhu, W.: Structure of covering-based rough sets. *International Journal of Mathematical and Computer Sciences* **6** (2010) 147–150
18. Wang, S., Zhu, Q., Zhu, W., Min, F.: Quantitative analysis for covering-based rough sets through the upper approximation number. *Information Sciences* (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2012.07.030>) (2012)
19. Wang, L., Yang, X., Yang, J., Wu, C.: Relationships among generalized rough sets in six coverings and pure reflexive neighborhood system. *Information Sciences* **207** (2012) 66–78
20. Wang, L., Liu, X., Cao, J.: A new algebraic structure for formal concept analysis. *Information Sciences* **180** (2010) 4865–4876
21. Wille, R.: Restructuring lattice theory: an approach based on hierarchies of concepts. In Rival, I., ed.: *Ordered sets*, Reidel, Dordrecht-Boston (1982) 445–470
22. Xu, Z., Wang, Q.: On the properties of covering rough sets model. *Journal of Henan Normal University (Natural Sciences)* **33** (2005) 130–132
23. Yun, Z., Ge, X., Bai, X.: Axiomatization and conditions for neighborhoods in a covering to form a partition. *Information Sciences* **181** (2011) 1735–1740
24. Yao, Y., Yao, B.: Covering based rough set approximations. *Information Sciences* **200** (2012) 91–107

25. Yao, Y.: On generalizing pawlak approximation operators. In: Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence. Volume 1424. (1998) 298–307
26. Yao, Y.: Relational interpretations of neighborhood operators and rough set approximation operators. *Information Sciences* **111** (1998) 239–259
27. Yao, Y.: Constructive and algebraic methods of theory of rough sets. *Information Sciences* **109** (1998) 21–47
28. Yao, Y., Chen, Y.: Rough set approximations in formal concept analysis. In: Proceedings of 23rd International Meeting of the North American Fuzzy Information Processing Society. (2004) 73–78
29. Zhu, W., Wang, F.: A new type of covering rough sets. In: IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Systems 2006, London, 4-6 September. (2006) 444–449
30. Zhu, F., Wang, F.: Some results on covering generalized rough sets. *Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence* **15** (2002) 6–13
31. Zhu, W., Wang, S.: Matroidal approaches to generalized rough sets based on relations. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics* **2** (2011) 273–279
32. Zhu, W., Wang, F.: On three types of covering rough sets. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* **19** (2007) 1131–1144
33. Zhu, W.: Topological approaches to covering rough sets. *Information Sciences* **177** (2007) 1499–1508
34. Zhu, W., Wang, F.: Reduction and axiomization of covering generalized rough sets. *Information Sciences* **152** (2003) 217–230
35. Zakowski, W.: Approximations in the space (u, π) . *Demonstratio Mathematica* **16** (1983) 761–769
36. Zhu, W.: Relationship between generalized rough sets based on binary relation and covering. *Information Sciences* **179** (2009) 210–225
37. Zhang, Y., Li, J., Wu, W.: On axiomatic characterizations of three pairs of covering based approximation operators. *Information Sciences* **180** (2010) 274–287