

Representations of FS-domains and BF-domains via FS-approximation Spaces*

Guojun Wu

School of Mathematics and Statistics

Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology

Nanjing 210044, P. R. China

Luoshan Xu[†]

Department of Mathematics, Yangzhou University, Yangzhou 225002, P.R. China

Abstract

In this paper, concepts of (topological) FS-approximation spaces are introduced. Representations of FS-domains and BF-domains via (topological) FS-approximation spaces are considered. It is proved that the collection of CF-closed sets in an FS-approximation space (resp., a topological FS-approximation space) endowed with the set-inclusion order is an FS-domain (resp., a BF-domain) and that every FS-domain (resp., BF-domain) is order isomorphic to the collection of CF-closed sets of some FS-approximation space (resp., topological FS-approximation space) endowed with the set-inclusion order. The concept of topological BF-approximation spaces is introduced and a skillful method without using CF-approximable relations to represent BF-domains is given. It is also proved that the category of FS-domains (resp., BF-domains) with Scott continuous maps as morphisms is equivalent to that of FS-approximation spaces (resp., topological FS-approximation spaces) with CF-approximable relations as morphisms.

Keywords FS-domain; BF-domain; FS-approximation space; CF-approximable relation; topological BF-approximation space; Categorical equivalence

1 Introduction

Domain Theory, developed from continuous lattices introduced by Scott [19] in the 1970s as a denotational model for functional languages, is one of the important research fields of theoretical computer science [4]. It was. Mutual transformations and infiltration of the mathematical structures of orders, topologies and algebras are the basic features of this theory. In recent years, there is a growing body of scholarly work towards synthesizing Domain Theory with various new mathematical fields such as Formal Concept Analysis [3], Rough Set Theory [18], and Mathematical Logic. Such syntheses are clearly reflected in the research of representations

*Supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (11671008), the Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province (BK20170483)

[†]Corresponding author. E-mail: luoshanxu@hotmail.com

for various domains. By representations of domains, we mean any general way by which one can characterize a domain using a suitable family of some mathematical structures ordered by the set-inclusion order. There are many ways to represent domains via such as abstract bases [25, 30], formal topologies [31], information systems [10, 20, 25, 27, 32], formal contexts [7, 8, 9, 22, 29], closure spaces [6, 16, 23, 28, 33, 34], various kinds of logics [24, 26].

Rough Set Theory, created by Pawlak and developed by many other mathematicians and computer scientists, is fundamentally important in artificial intelligence and information sciences. It has provided a more general framework to express common sense reasoning and uncertainty reasoning, and received wide attention on the research areas in both of real-life applications and the theory itself. Rough Set Theory is closely related to Order Theory and Topology. In [14], Järvinen provided the lattice-theoretical background of rough sets and studied order properties of generalized rough sets. Yang and Xu in [35] investigated algebraic and order structures of various families of subsets of generalized approximation spaces (GA-spaces, for short) with possibly infinite universes and arbitrary binary relations. Inspired by Rough Set Theory, Zou, Li and Ho in [38] characterized continuous posets and Scott closed sets by approximation operators. In [17], Lei and Luo studied representations of complete lattices and algebraic lattices based on Rough Set Theory. All of these reveal that there are deep relationships between Rough Set Theory and Domain Theory.

Representations of domains using abstract bases appear to be the most natural and simple ones, while the study scope of abstract bases is little narrow and easy to miss out on something deeper. Noticing from Rough Set Theory that abstract bases (B, \prec) are special GA-spaces (U, R) [35], Wu and Xu in [21] generalized an abstract basis to a CF-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) , and generalized round ideals of abstract bases to CF-closed sets. Since the lower approximation operator \underline{R} and the upper approximation operator \overline{R} are mutually dual, the upper approximation operator \overline{R} was mainly used to give representations of domains via CF-approximation spaces in [21]. It turns out that this approach of representing domains is more general than that of representing domains by abstract bases. The concept of CF-approximable relations using a categorical approach was introduced and that the category of CF-approximation spaces and CF-approximable relations is equivalent to that of continuous domains and Scott continuous maps was proved. The work in [21] makes more natural and closed links between Domain Theory and Rough Set Theory.

FS-domains were introduced and studied by Jung in [11, 12, 13]. It is proved that the category of FS-domains (resp., BF-domains) is a maximal Cartesian closed full subcategory of the category of continuous (resp., algebraic) domains and Scott continuous maps. It is well known that a Cartesian closed category is of great importance in Domain Theory as it can be employed to model the typed λ -calculus. Based on this fact and the work in [21], this paper further works on representations of FS-domains and BF-domains with special CF-approximation spaces—FS-approximation spaces and topological FS-approximation spaces.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we recall some basic notions in Domain Theory and Rough Set Theory, as well as some results in [21]. In Section 3, we introduce the concept of FS-approximation spaces and discuss properties of FS-approximation spaces. In Section 4, we give representations of FS-domains and BF-domains via (topological) FS-approximation spaces.

In Section 5, we will prove that the category of FS-domains (resp., BF-domains) with Scott continuous maps as morphisms is equivalent to the category of FS-approximation spaces (resp., topological FS-approximation spaces) with CF-approximable relations as morphisms.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we quickly recall some basic notions and results in Domain Theory and Rough Set Theory. For notions not explicitly defined herein, the reader may refer to [2, 4, 5]. For some basic notions and results in category theory, please refer to [1].

For a set U and $X \subseteq U$, we use $\mathcal{P}(U)$ to denote the power set of U , $\mathcal{P}_{fin}(U)$ to denote the family of all nonempty finite subsets of U and X^c to denote the complement of X in U . The symbol $F \subseteq_{fin} X$ means F is a finite subset of X .

Let (L, \leq) be a poset. A *principal ideal* (resp., *principal filter*) of L is a set of the form $\downarrow x = \{y \in L \mid y \leq x\}$ (resp., $\uparrow x = \{y \in L \mid x \leq y\}$). For $A \subseteq L$, we write $\downarrow A = \{y \in L \mid \exists x \in A, y \leq x\}$ and $\uparrow A = \{y \in L \mid \exists x \in A, x \leq y\}$. A subset A is a *lower set* (resp., an *upper set*) if $A = \downarrow A$ (resp., $A = \uparrow A$). We say that z is a *lower bound* (resp., an *upper bound*) of A if $A \subseteq \uparrow z$ (resp., $A \subseteq \downarrow z$). The supremum of A is the least upper bound of A , denoted by $\bigvee A$ or $\sup A$. The infimum of A is the greatest lower bound of A , denoted by $\bigwedge A$ or $\inf A$. A nonempty subset D of L is *directed* if every finite subset of D has an upper bound in D . A subset B of a directed set D is called a *cofinal subset* of D , if for all $d \in D$ there is $a \in B$ such that $d \leq a$. It is well known that a cofinal subset of a directed set itself is a directed set.

A poset L is called a *directed complete partially ordered set* (dcpo, for short) if every directed subset of L has a supremum.

Lemma 2.1. *Let D be a directed subset of a poset P and D has a supremum $\sup D$. If $\cup_{i=1}^n A_i = D$, then there is some A_j ($1 \leq j \leq n$) which is a cofinal subset of D , and $\sup A_j = \sup D$.*

Proof. Assume that for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, A_i is not a cofinal subset of D . Then for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, select $d_i \in D$ such that no element in A_i greater than d_i . Since D is directed and $\{d_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is finite, there is $d \in D = \cup_{i=1}^n A_i$ such that $\{d_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\} \subseteq \downarrow d$. Hence, there is $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $d \in A_j$ and $d_j \leq d$, contradicting to the choice of d_j . Thus, there is some A_j ($1 \leq j \leq n$) which is a cofinal subset of D . Clearly, $\sup A_j = \sup D$. \square

Recall that in a poset P , we say that x *way-below* y , written $x \ll y$, if for any directed set D having a supremum with $\sup D \geq y$, there is some $d \in D$ such that $x \leq d$. If $x \ll x$, then x is called a *compact element* of P . The set $\{x \in P \mid x \ll x\}$ is denoted by $K(P)$. The set $\{y \in P \mid x \ll y\}$ will be denoted $\uparrow x$ and $\{y \in P \mid y \ll x\}$ denoted $\downarrow x$. A poset P is said to be *continuous* (resp., *algebraic*) if for all $x \in P$, $\downarrow x$ is directed (resp., $\downarrow x \cap K(P)$ is directed) and $x = \bigvee \downarrow x$ (resp., $x = \bigvee (\downarrow x \cap K(P))$). If a dcpo P is continuous (resp., algebraic), then P is called a *continuous domain* (resp., *an algebraic domain*). A subset B of a poset P is called a *basis* of P if for all $x \in P$, there is $B_x \subseteq B \cap \downarrow x$ such that B_x is directed and $\sup B_x = x$. It is well known that a poset P is continuous iff it has a basis, and that P is algebraic iff $K(P)$ is a basis.

Lemma 2.2. ([4]) Let P be a poset. Then for all $x, y, u, z \in P$,

- (1) $x \ll y \Rightarrow x \leq y$;
- (2) $u \leq x \ll y \leq z \Rightarrow u \ll z$.

Lemma 2.3. ([4]) If P is a continuous poset, then the way-below relation \ll has the interpolation property:

$$x \ll z \Rightarrow \exists y \in P \text{ such that } x \ll y \ll z.$$

Let L and P be dcpos, and $f : L \rightarrow P$ a map. If for any directed subset $D \subseteq L$, $f(\bigvee D) = \bigvee f(D)$, then f is called a *Scott continuous map*. We denote by $[L \rightarrow P]$ the poset of all the Scott continuous maps from L to P in the pointwise order: $f, g \in [L \rightarrow P], f \leq g \Leftrightarrow f(x) \leq g(x)$ for all $x \in L$.

Definition 2.4. ([4]) Let L be a dcpo.

- (1) An *approximate identity* for L is defined to be a directed set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [L \rightarrow L]$ satisfying $\sup \mathcal{D} = id_L$, where id_L is the identity on L .
- (2) A Scott continuous map $\delta : L \rightarrow L$ is said to be *finitely separating* if there exists a finite set M_δ such that for each $x \in L$, there exists $m \in M_\delta$ satisfying $\delta(x) \leq m \leq x$.
- (3) If there is an approximate identity for L consisting of finitely separating maps, then L is called an *FS-domain*.
- (4) If L is an algebraic FS-domain, then L is called a *BF-domain*.

Lemma 2.5. ([4, Lemma II-2.14]) Let L be a dcpo.

- (1) If $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [L \rightarrow L]$ is an approximate identity for L , then $\mathcal{D}' = \{\delta^2 = \delta \circ \delta \mid \delta \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is also an approximate identity.
- (2) If $\delta \in [L \rightarrow L]$ is finitely separating, then $\delta(x) \ll x$ for all $x \in L$. Thus an FS-domain is a continuous domain.

The following definitions and lemmas are basic concepts and results in Rough Set Theory.

Definition 2.6. ([15, 35]) A *generalized approximation space* (GA-space, for short) is a pair (U, R) consisting of a non-empty set U and a non-empty binary relation R on U . For a GA-space (U, R) , define $R_s, R_p : U \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(U)$ such that for all $x \in U$,

$$R_s(x) = \{y \in U \mid xRy\}, \quad R_p(x) = \{y \in U \mid yRx\}.$$

Definition 2.7. ([15, 35]) Let (U, R) be a GA-space. Define $\underline{R}, \overline{R} : \mathcal{P}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(U)$ such that for $A \subseteq U$,

$$\underline{R}(A) = \{x \in U \mid R_s(x) \subseteq A\}, \quad \overline{R}(A) = \{x \in U \mid R_s(x) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Operators \underline{R} and \overline{R} are called *the lower approximation operator* and *the upper approximation operator* in (U, R) , respectively.

Lemma 2.8. ([15, 35]) Let (U, R) be a GA-space.

- (1) $\underline{R}(A^c) = (\overline{R}(A))^c$, $\overline{R}(A^c) = (\underline{R}(A))^c$, where A^c is the complement of $A \subseteq U$.
- (2) $\underline{R}(U) = U$, $\overline{R}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$.
- (3) Let $\{A_i \mid i \in I\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(U)$. Then $\underline{R}(\bigcap_{i \in I} A_i) = \bigcap_{i \in I} \underline{R}(A_i)$, $\overline{R}(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} \overline{R}(A_i)$.
- (4) If $A \subseteq B \subseteq U$, then $\underline{R}(A) \subseteq \underline{R}(B)$, $\overline{R}(A) \subseteq \overline{R}(B)$.
- (5) For all $x \in U$, $\overline{R}(\{x\}) = R_p(x)$.

A binary relation $R \subseteq U \times U$ on a set U is said *reflexive* if for all $x \in U$, one has xRx ; and is said *transitive* if xRy and yRz implies xRz for all $x, y, z \in U$. A binary relation R is called a *preorder* if it is reflexive and transitive.

Lemma 2.9. ([21, 37]) *Let (U, R) be a GA-space.*

- (1) *R is reflexive iff for all $X \subseteq U$, $X \subseteq \overline{R}(X)$.*
- (2) *R is transitive iff for all $X \subseteq U$, $\overline{R}(\overline{R}(X)) \subseteq \overline{R}(X)$.*
- (3) *If R is transitive and $A, B \subseteq U$, then $\overline{R}(B) \subseteq \overline{R}(A)$ whenever $B \subseteq \overline{R}(A)$.*
- (4) *If R is a preorder, then the operator \underline{R} is an interior operator of a topology on U .*

In [21], Wu and Xu introduced CF-approximation spaces and gave representations of continuous domains by them. We here recall some key notions and results in [21].

Definition 2.10. ([21]) Let (U, R) be a GA-space, R a transitive relation and $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{fin}(U) \cup \{\emptyset\}$. If for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$, whenever $K \subseteq_{fin} \overline{R}(F)$, there always exists $G \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $K \subseteq \overline{R}(G)$ and $G \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$, then (U, R, \mathcal{F}) is called a *generalized approximation space with consistent family of finite subsets*, or a *CF-approximation space*, for short.

Definition 2.11. ([21]) Let (U, R, \mathcal{F}) be a CF-approximation space, $E \subseteq U$. If for all $K \subseteq_{fin} E$, there always exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $K \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \subseteq E$ and $F \subseteq E$, then E is called a *CF-closed set* of (U, R, \mathcal{F}) . The collection of all CF-closed sets of (U, R, \mathcal{F}) is denoted by $\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$.

Lemma 2.12. ([21]) *For a CF-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) , the following statements hold:*

- (1) *For any $F \in \mathcal{F}$, $\overline{R}(F) \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$;*
- (2) *If $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, $A \subseteq E$, then $\overline{R}(A) \subseteq E$;*
- (3) *If $\{E_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$ is a directed family, then $\bigcup_{i \in I} E_i \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. (1) Let $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Then For all $K \subseteq_{fin} \overline{R}(F)$, by Definition 2.10, there is $G \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $K \subseteq \overline{R}(G)$ and $G \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$. By Lemma 2.9(3), $\overline{R}(G) \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$. By Definition 2.11, we see that $\overline{R}(F) \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$.

(2) and (3) follow directly from Lemma 2.8(4), 2.9(3) and Definition 2.11. \square

Lemma 2.13. ([21]) *For a CF-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) and $E \subseteq U$, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *$E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$;*
- (2) *The family $\mathcal{A} = \{\overline{R}(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E\}$ is directed and $E = \bigcup \mathcal{A}$;*
- (3) *There exists a family $\{F_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $\{\overline{R}(F_i)\}_{i \in I}$ is directed, and $E = \bigcup_{i \in I} \overline{R}(F_i)$;*
- (4) *There always exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $K \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \subseteq E$ whenever $K \subseteq_{fin} E$.*

Proof. If $E = \emptyset \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, then by Definition 2.11, $\emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$ and the lemma holds. If $\emptyset \neq E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, then we have

(1) \Rightarrow (2) By Definition 2.11, we know that $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$. Let $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, then there exist $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ and $F_1, F_2 \subseteq E$, such that $X_1 = \overline{R}(F_1)$, $X_2 = \overline{R}(F_2)$. By $F_1 \cup F_2 \subseteq_{fin} E$ and Definition 2.11 we know that there exists $F_3 \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $F_1 \cup F_2 \subseteq \overline{R}(F_3)$ and $F_3 \subseteq E$. By Lemma 2.9(3), we know that $\overline{R}(F_1) \subseteq \overline{R}(F_3)$ and $\overline{R}(F_2) \subseteq \overline{R}(F_3)$. This shows that \mathcal{A} is directed. Next we prove $E = \bigcup \mathcal{A}$. By Lemma 2.12(2) we know that $\bigcup \mathcal{A} \subseteq E$ holds. Conversely, if $x \in E$,

then by Definition 2.11, there is $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $x \in \overline{R}(F) \subseteq E$ and $F \subseteq E$. So $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{A}$. By the arbitrariness of $x \in E$ we know that $E \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{A}$. Thus $E = \bigcup \mathcal{A}$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Trivial.

(3) \Rightarrow (4) It follows directly from the finiteness of K and the directedness of $\{\overline{R}(F_i)\}_{i \in I}$.

(4) \Rightarrow (1) If $K \subseteq_{fin} E$, then there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $K \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \subseteq E$. By Definition 2.10, there exists $G \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $K \subseteq \overline{R}(G)$ and $G \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$. By Lemma 2.9(3), we know that $\overline{R}(G) \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \subseteq E$. Thus $K \subseteq \overline{R}(G) \subseteq E$. Noticing that $G \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \subseteq E$, by Definition 2.11, we have that $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$. \square

Example 2.14. Let (L, \leq) be a continuous domain, R_L the way-below relation “ \ll ” of (L, \leq) ; $\mathcal{F}_L = \{F \subseteq_{fin} L \mid F \text{ has a top element } c_F\}$.

(1) (L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L) is a CF-approximation space.

(2) $\mathfrak{C}(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L) = \{\downarrow x \mid x \in L\}$.

Proof. (1) By Lemma 2.2, we know that $R_L = \ll$ is transitive. For any $F \in \mathcal{F}_L$, let c_F be the top element in F . By Lemma 2.8(5), we have that $\overline{R}_L(F) = \downarrow c_F$. For $K \subseteq_{fin} \overline{R}_L(F) = \downarrow c_F$, by that L is a continuous domain, we know that $\downarrow c_F$ is directed. Then there exists $x \in \downarrow c_F$ such that $K \subseteq \downarrow x$. It follows from $x \ll c_F$ and Lemma 2.3 that there is $y \in L$ such that $x \ll y \ll c_F$. Thus $K \subseteq \downarrow y$. Set $G = \{y\} \in \mathcal{F}_L$. By that $K \subseteq \overline{R}_L(G) = \downarrow y$ and $G \subseteq \overline{R}_L(F) = \downarrow c_F$, we have that (L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L) is a CF-approximation space.

(2) By the proof of (1) and Lemma 2.12(1), we know that $\{\downarrow x \mid x \in L\} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L)$. Conversely, let $E \in \mathfrak{C}(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L)$. Then by Lemma 2.13 and the continuity of L , there is a directed set $D \subseteq L$ such that $E = \bigcup \{\downarrow d \mid d \in D\}$. Next we prove $E = \downarrow \bigvee D$. Obviously, $E \subseteq \downarrow \bigvee D$. Conversely, if $x \in \downarrow \bigvee D$, then by Lemma 2.3, there is $y \in L$ such that $x \ll y \ll \bigvee D$. So there is $d \in D$ such that $x \ll y \leq d$. Thus $x \in \downarrow d \subseteq E$, and $E = \downarrow \bigvee D$. This shows that $\mathfrak{C}(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L) \subseteq \{\downarrow x \mid x \in L\}$ and $\mathfrak{C}(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L) = \{\downarrow x \mid x \in L\}$. \square

We call (L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L) the induced CF-approximation space by continuous domain (L, \leq) .

Lemma 2.15. ([21]) *Let (U, R, \mathcal{F}) be a CF-approximation space.*

(1) *If $E_1, E_2 \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, then $E_1 \ll E_2$ if and only if there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $E_1 \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$ and $F \subseteq E_2$;*

(2) *If $F \subseteq E$, then $\overline{R}(F) \ll E$;*

(3) *$\overline{R}(F) \ll \overline{R}(F)$ if and only if there exists $G \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $G \subseteq \overline{R}(G) = \overline{R}(F)$.*

Proof. (1) Let $E_1, E_2 \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$. If $E_1 \ll E_2$, then it follows from $E_2 \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$ and Lemma 2.13(2) that $E_2 = \bigcup \{\overline{R}(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E_2\}$ and that $\{\overline{R}(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E_2\}$ is directed. By that $E_1 \ll E_2$, there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F \subseteq E_2$ and $E_1 \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$. Conversely, if there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $E_1 \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$ and $F \subseteq E_2$, then for any directed family $\{C_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$ with $E_2 \subseteq \bigvee_{i \in I} C_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i$, then by $F \subseteq E_2$ and the finiteness of F , we know that there exists $i_0 \in I$ such that $F \subseteq C_{i_0}$. By Lemma 2.12(2) and $E_1 \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$, we know that $E_1 \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \subseteq C_{i_0}$, showing that $E_1 \ll E_2$.

(2) and (3) follow directly from (1). \square

3 FS-approximation spaces

In this section, we introduce FS-approximation spaces and topological FS-approximation spaces. They are special types of CF-approximation spaces. And then discuss their properties. We first recall the concept of CF-approximable relations in [21].

Definition 3.1. ([21]) Let $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$, $(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ be CF-approximation spaces, and $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$ a binary relation. If

- (1) for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_1$, there is $G \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $F \Theta G$;
- (2) for all $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}_1$, $G \in \mathcal{F}_2$, if $F \subseteq \overline{R_1}(F')$, $F \Theta G$, then $F' \Theta G$;
- (3) for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_1$, $G, G' \in \mathcal{F}_2$, if $F \Theta G$, $G' \subseteq \overline{R_2}(G)$, then $F \Theta G'$;
- (4) for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_1$, $G \in \mathcal{F}_2$, if $F \Theta G$, then there are $F' \in \mathcal{F}_1$, $G' \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $F' \subseteq \overline{R_1}(F)$, $G \subseteq \overline{R_2}(G')$ and $F' \Theta G'$; and
- (5) for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_1$, $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$, if $F \Theta G_1$ and $F \Theta G_2$, then there is $G_3 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $G_1 \cup G_2 \subseteq \overline{R_2}(G_3)$ and $F \Theta G_3$,

then Θ is called a *CF-approximable relation* from $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ to $(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$.

Definition 3.2. Let (U, R, \mathcal{F}) be a CF-approximation space and

$$\text{Id}_{(U,R,\mathcal{F})} = \{(F, G) \mid F, G \in \mathcal{F}, G \subseteq \overline{R}(F)\} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}.$$

Then it is easy to check that $\text{Id}_{(U,R,\mathcal{F})}$ is a CF-approximable relation from (U, R, \mathcal{F}) to itself. $\text{Id}_{(U,R,\mathcal{F})}$ is called the *identity CF-approximable relation* on (U, R, \mathcal{F}) .

Proposition 3.3. Let Θ be a CF-approximable relation from $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ to $(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$. Then for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_1, G \in \mathcal{F}_2$, the following statements are equivalent:

- (1) $F \Theta G$;
- (2) There exists $F' \in \mathcal{F}_1$ such that $F' \subseteq \overline{R_1}(F)$ and $F' \Theta G$;
- (3) There exists $G' \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $F \Theta G'$ and $G \subseteq \overline{R_2}(G')$;
- (4) There exist $F' \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $G' \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $F' \subseteq \overline{R_1}(F)$, $G \subseteq \overline{R_2}(G')$ and $F' \Theta G'$.

Proof. Follows directly from (2)-(4) in Definition 3.1. □

Proposition 3.4. Let Θ be a CF-approximable relation from $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ to $(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ and $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$. Then the family $\mathcal{D} = \{\overline{R}(G) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}_1, F \subseteq E, G \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ and } F \Theta G\}$ is directed.

Proof. It is easy to see by Definition 2.11 and the condition (1) in Definition 3.1 that $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$. Let $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{D}$. Then there are $F_i \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $G_i \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $F_i \subseteq E$, $F_i \Theta G_i$ and $X_i = \overline{R}(G_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$). It follows from Definition 2.11 that there exists $F_3 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ such that $F_1 \cup F_2 \subseteq \overline{R}(F_3)$ and $F_3 \subseteq E$. It follows from Definition 3.1(2) that $F_3 \Theta G_1$ and $F_3 \Theta G_2$. By Definition 3.1(5), there exists $G_3 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $G_1 \cup G_2 \subseteq \overline{R_2}(G_3)$ and $F_3 \Theta G_3$. By Lemma 2.9 (3), we have that $X_1 \cup X_2 \subseteq \overline{R}(G_3)$ and the family $\mathcal{D} = \{\overline{R}(G) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}_1, F \subseteq E, G \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ and } F \Theta G\}$ is directed. □

Lemma 3.5. ([21]) Let Θ be a CF-approximable relation from $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ to $(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$. Define a map $f_\Theta : \mathfrak{C}(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ such that for all $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$,

$$f_\Theta(E) = \bigcup \{\overline{R}(G) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}_1, F \subseteq E, G \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ and } F \Theta G\}.$$

Then f_Θ is a Scott continuous map.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 2.12, Proposition 3.4 and the definition of f_Θ that f_Θ is well-defined and order preserving. It is direct to show that for any directed family $\{E_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, we have $f_\Theta(\bigcup_{i \in I} E_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} f_\Theta(E_i)$. By Lemma 2.12(3), f_Θ is a Scott continuous map. \square

Now we can give one of the main concepts in this paper.

Definition 3.6. A CF-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) is called an *FS-approximation space* if there exists a directed family $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ of CF-approximable relations on (U, R, \mathcal{F}) satisfying the following conditions:

$$(FS\ 1) \bigcup_{i \in I} \Theta_i = \text{Id}_{(U, R, \mathcal{F})};$$

(FS 2) For all Θ_i ($i \in I$), there is $\mathcal{M}_i \subseteq_{fin} \mathcal{F}$ such that for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$, exists $M \in \mathcal{M}_i$ satisfying

$$\forall G \in \mathcal{F}, F \Theta_i G \Rightarrow G \subseteq \overline{R}(M) \subseteq \overline{R}(F).$$

Theorem 3.7. For an FS-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) , $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ is an FS-domain.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 2.13(2) and 2.15(2) that the family $\{\overline{R}(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is a basis of $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ and that $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ is a continuous domain. Next we prove that there is an approximate identity for $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ consisting of finitely separating maps. Let $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a directed family of CF-approximable relations on (U, R, \mathcal{F}) satisfying the condition (FS 1) and (FS 2) in Definition 3.6. For all $i \in I$, the map f_{Θ_i} is a Scott continuous maps on $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ by Lemma 3.5. Let $\Theta_j, \Theta_k \in \{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\Theta_j \subseteq \Theta_k$. Notice that $f_{\Theta_i}(E) = \bigcup\{\overline{R}(G) \mid F, G \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E \text{ and } F \Theta_i G\}$ ($i \in I$) for all $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$. Then we have $f_{\Theta_j}(E) \subseteq f_{\Theta_k}(E)$ for all $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, showing that the family $\{f_{\Theta_i}\}_{i \in I}$ is directed by the directedness of $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$. For all $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\bigvee_{i \in I} f_{\Theta_i})(E) &= \bigvee_{i \in I} (f_{\Theta_i}(E)) \text{ (by Lemma II-2.5 in [4])} \\ &= \bigcup_{i \in I} (f_{\Theta_i}(E)) \text{ (by Lemma 2.12(3))} \\ &= \bigcup_{i \in I} (\bigcup\{\overline{R}(G) \mid F, G \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E \text{ and } F \Theta_i G\}) \\ &= \bigcup\{\overline{R}(G) \mid F, G \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E \text{ and } (F, G) \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \Theta_i\} \\ &= \bigcup\{\overline{R}(G) \mid F, G \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E \text{ and } (F, G) \in \text{Id}_{(U, R, \mathcal{F})}\} \text{ (by (FS 1))} \\ &= \bigcup\{\overline{R}(G) \mid F, G \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E \text{ and } G \subseteq \overline{R}(F)\} \\ &= \bigcup\{\overline{R}(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } F \subseteq E\} \text{ (by Lemma 2.12(1) and 2.13(2))} \\ &= E \text{ (by Lemma 2.13(2)).} \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\bigvee_{i \in I} f_{\Theta_i} = id_{\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})}$.

Next we verify that for all $i \in I$, f_{Θ_i} is finitely separating. By the condition (FS 2) in Definition 3.6, we have a finite subfamily \mathcal{M}_i of \mathcal{F} such that for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $N \in \mathcal{M}_i$ satisfying

$$\forall G \in \mathcal{F}, F \Theta_i G \Rightarrow G \subseteq \overline{R}(N) \subseteq \overline{R}(F).$$

For $M \in \mathcal{M}_i$ and $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, set

$$\mathcal{D}_M = \{\overline{R}(F) \mid (F \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E) \text{ and } (\forall G \in \mathcal{F}, F \Theta_i G \Rightarrow G \subseteq \overline{R}(M) \subseteq \overline{R}(F))\}.$$

Then we have $\bigcup_{M \in \mathcal{M}_i} \mathcal{D}_M = \{\overline{R}(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } F \subseteq E\}$. By Lemma 2.13(2), family $\{\overline{R}(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } F \subseteq E\}$ is directed. Since \mathcal{M}_i is finite, by Lemma 2.1, there exists $M_0 \in \mathcal{M}_i$ such that \mathcal{D}_{M_0} is a cofinal subfamily of $\{\overline{R}(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } F \subseteq E\}$ and $\bigcup \mathcal{D}_{M_0} = \bigcup \{\overline{R}(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } F \subseteq E\}$. It follows from Lemma 2.13(2) that $\bigcup \mathcal{D}_{M_0} = E$. Set $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_i = \{\overline{R}(M) \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_i\}$. For $F, G \in \mathcal{F}$ with $F \subseteq E$ and $F \Theta_i G$, by finiteness of F , directedness of \mathcal{D}_{M_0} and that $\bigcup \mathcal{D}_{M_0} = E$, we can find some $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $F_0 \subseteq E$ and,

$$\forall G \in \mathcal{F}, F_0 \Theta_i G \Rightarrow G \subseteq \overline{R}(M_0) \subseteq \overline{R}(F_0).$$

(hence $\overline{R}(F_0) \in \mathcal{D}_{M_0}$) such that $F \subseteq \overline{R}(F_0)$. It follows from $F \subseteq \overline{R}(F_0)$ and $F \Theta_i G$ that $F_0 \Theta_i G$ by Definition 3.1(2). Thus $G \subseteq \overline{R}(M_0) \subseteq \overline{R}(F_0)$. It follows from $G \subseteq \overline{R}(M_0)$ that $\overline{R}(G) \subseteq \overline{R}(M_0)$ by Lemma 2.9(3). Since

$$f_{\Theta_i}(E) = \bigcup \{\overline{R}(G) \mid F, G \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E \text{ and } F \Theta_i G\},$$

we have $f_{\Theta_i}(E) \subseteq \overline{R}(M_0) \subseteq E$ and $\overline{R}(M_0) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_i$. By finiteness of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_i$, we see that f_{Θ_i} is finitely separating.

To sum up, it is proved that $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ is an FS-domain. \square

Definition 3.8. A CF-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) is called a *strong FS-approximation space* if there exists a directed family $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ of CF-approximable relations from (U, R, \mathcal{F}) to itself satisfying the following conditions:

$$(FS 1) \bigcup_{i \in I} \Theta_i = \text{Id}_{(U, R, \mathcal{F})};$$

(FS 2') For all Θ_i ($i \in I$), there is $\mathcal{M}_i \subseteq_{fin} \mathcal{F}$ such that for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $M \in \mathcal{M}_i$ satisfying

$$\forall G \in \mathcal{F}, F \Theta_i G \Rightarrow G \subseteq \overline{R}(M) \text{ and } M \subseteq \overline{R}(F).$$

Remark 3.9. By Lemma 2.9(3), we have that (FS 2') \Rightarrow (FS 2). Thus a strong FS-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) must be an FS-approximation space, and $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ is an FS-domain. If R is a preorder, then (FS 2') \Leftrightarrow (FS 2).

Since for a preorder R on a set U , the lower approximation operator \underline{R} is really an interior operator for a topology on U , we have naturally the following definitions.

Definition 3.10. Let (U, R) be a GA-space, $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{fin}(U) \cup \{\emptyset\}$. If R is a preorder, then a CF-approximation space (resp., FS-approximation space) (U, R, \mathcal{F}) is called a *topological CF-approximation space* (resp., *topological FS-approximation space*).

Remark 3.11. It follows from Lemma 2.9 that for a GA-space (U, R) with R being a preorder and $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{fin}(U) \cup \{\emptyset\}$, then (U, R, \mathcal{F}) is a CF-approximation space, hence a topological CF-approximation space.

Example 3.12. Let (L, \leq) be an algebraic domain, $R_{K(L)} = \leq_{K(L)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{K(L)} = \{F \subseteq_{fin} K(L) \mid F \text{ has a top element } c_F\}$, where $\leq_{K(L)}$ is the restriction of \leq to $K(L)$. Then

- (1) $(K(L), R_{K(L)}, \mathcal{F}_{K(L)})$ is a topological CF-approximation space;
- (2) $\mathfrak{C}(K(L), R_{K(L)}, \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}) = \{\downarrow x \cap K(L) \mid x \in L\}$.

Proof. (1) Trivial. (2) Similar to the proof of Example 2.14(2). \square

In this paper, we call $(K(L), R_{K(L)}, \mathcal{F}_{K(L)})$ the induced topological CF-approximation space by the algebraic domain L .

The following proposition gives a characterization of CF-approximable relation between topological CF-approximation spaces.

Proposition 3.13. *Let $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1), (U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ be topological CF-approximation spaces. Then a binary relation $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$ is a CF-approximable relation iff it satisfies*

- (1) for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_1$, there is $G \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $F \Theta G$;
 - (2) for all $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}_1$, $G, G' \in \mathcal{F}_2$, if $F \subseteq \overline{R_1}(F')$, $G' \subseteq \overline{R_2}(G)$, and $F \Theta G$, then $F' \Theta G'$;
- and
- (3) for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_1$, $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$, if $F \Theta G_1$ and $F \Theta G_2$, then there is $G_3 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $G_1 \cup G_2 \subseteq \overline{R_2}(G_3)$ and $F \Theta G_3$.

Proof. Follows directly from Lemma 2.9 and that R is a preorder. \square

Theorem 3.14. *If (U, R, \mathcal{F}) is a topological FS-approximation space, then $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ is a BF-domain.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 2.9(1), 2.13(2) and 2.15(1) that the family $\{\overline{R}(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is a basis of $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ consisting of compact elements. Thus $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ is an algebraic domain. By Theorem 3.7, we know that $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ is an FS-domain, hence a BF-domain. \square

4 Representations of FS-domains and BF-domains

In this section, we first consider representations of FS-domains via FS-approximation spaces. Then we introduce topological BF-approximation spaces and consider representations of BF-domains via topological BF-approximation spaces.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $(L_1, R_{L_1}, \mathcal{F}_{L_1})$ and $(L_2, R_{L_2}, \mathcal{F}_{L_2})$ be the induced CF-approximation spaces by continuous domains L_1 and L_2 , respectively. For a Scott continuous map $g : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$, define $\Omega_g \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{L_1} \times \mathcal{F}_{L_2}$ such that*

$$\forall F \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}, \forall G \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}, (F, G) \in \Omega_g \Leftrightarrow c_G \ll_{L_2} g(c_F),$$

where c_F is the top element of F . Then we have

- (1) Ω_g is a CF-approximable relation from $(L_1, R_{L_1}, \mathcal{F}_{L_1})$ to $(L_2, R_{L_2}, \mathcal{F}_{L_2})$; and
- (2) if $h \in [L_1 \rightarrow L_2]$ and $g \leq h$, then $\Omega_g \subseteq \Omega_h$, that is if $(F, G) \in \Omega_g$, then $(F, G) \in \Omega_h$.

Proof. (1) We need to prove that Ω_g satisfies the conditions (1)-(5) in Definition 3.1.

Let $F \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}$. Since L_2 is a continuous domain, we know that $\downarrow g(c_F) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore there exists $x \in L_2$ such that $x \ll g(c_F)$. Thus $\{x\} \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}$ and $(F, \{x\}) \in \Omega_g$. This shows that Ω_g satisfies the condition (1) in Definition 3.1.

To check that Ω_g satisfies the condition (2) in Definition 3.1, let $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}$ and $G \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F &\subseteq \overline{R_{L_1}}(F') = \downarrow c_{F'}, (F, G) \in \Omega_g \\ \Rightarrow c_F &\ll c_{F'}, c_G \ll g(c_F) \\ \Rightarrow c_G &\ll g(c_F) \leq g(c_{F'}) \\ \Rightarrow (F', G) &\in \Omega_g. \end{aligned}$$

To check that Ω_g satisfies the condition (3) in Definition 3.1, let $F \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}$ and $G, G' \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (F, G) \in \Omega_g, G' &\subseteq \overline{R_{L_2}}(G) = \downarrow c_G \\ \Rightarrow c_{G'} &\ll c_G, c_G \ll g(c_F) \\ \Rightarrow c_{G'} &\ll g(c_F) \\ \Rightarrow (F, G') &\in \Omega_g. \end{aligned}$$

To check that Ω_g satisfies the condition (4) in Definition 3.1, let $F \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}$, $G \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}$ and $(F, G) \in \Omega_g$. Then $c_G \ll g(c_F)$. By Lemma 2.3, there exist $a_1, a_2 \in L_2$ such that $c_G \ll a_1 \ll a_2 \ll g(c_F)$. Since L_1 is a continuous domain and g is Scott continuous, we have that $g(c_F) = \bigvee \{g(x) \mid x \ll c_F\}$ and $\{g(x) \mid x \ll c_F\}$ is directed. It follows from $a_2 \ll g(c_F) = \bigvee \{g(x) \mid x \ll c_F\}$ that there exists $v \ll c_F$ such that $a_2 \leq g(v)$. Thus $c_G \ll a_1 \ll g(v)$. Set $F' = \{v\} \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}$ and $G' = \{a_1\} \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}$. Then $G \subseteq \downarrow a_1 = \overline{R_{L_2}}(G')$, $F' = \{v\} \subseteq \downarrow c_F = \overline{R_{L_1}}(F)$ and $(F', G') \in \Omega_g$, showing that Ω_g satisfies the condition (4).

To check that Ω_g satisfies the condition (5) in Definition 3.1, let $F \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}$ and $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}$ satisfying $(F, G_1) \in \Omega_g$ and $(F, G_2) \in \Omega_g$. Then $\{c_{G_1}, c_{G_2}\} \subseteq \downarrow g(c_F)$. Since L is a continuous domain, we have $d \in L_2$ such that $\{c_{G_1}, c_{G_2}\} \subseteq \downarrow d$ and $d \ll g(c_F)$. Therefore $G_1 \cup G_2 \subseteq \overline{R_{L_2}}(\{d\})$ and $(F, \{d\}) \in \Omega_g$, showing that Ω_g satisfies the condition (5).

(2) Straightforward. □

Theorem 4.2. *Let (L, \leq) be an FS-domain. Then the induced CF-approximation space (L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L) is an FS-approximation space.*

Proof. Let $\{\delta_i\}_{i \in I}$ be an approximate identity for L consisting of finitely separating maps. For all $i \in I$, construct a binary relation $\Theta_i = \Omega_{\delta_i}$ such that

$$\forall F, G \in \mathcal{F}_L, (F, G) \in \Theta_i \Leftrightarrow c_G \ll \delta_i(c_F).$$

It follows from Proposition 4.1 that $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a directed family of CF-approximable relations from (L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L) to itself. Next, we check that $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies (FS 1) and (FS 2) in Definition 3.6.

To check that $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies (FS 1) in Definition 3.6, let $F, G \in \mathcal{F}_L$ and $(F, G) \in \text{Id}_{(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L)}$. Then $G \subseteq \overline{R_L}(F) = \downarrow c_F$ and $c_G \ll c_F$. Since $\{\delta_i\}_{i \in I}$ is an approximate identity for L , we have that $\bigvee_{i \in I} (\delta_i(c_F)) = c_F$. Since L is continuous and $c_G \ll c_F = \bigvee_{i \in I} (\delta_i(c_F))$,

by interpolation property, there exists $i \in I$ such that $c_G \ll \delta_i(c_F)$ and $(F, G) \in \Theta_i = \Omega_{\delta_i}$, showing that $\text{Id}_{(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L)} \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} \Theta_i$.

Conversely, let $(F, G) \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \Theta_i$. Then there exists $j \in I$ such that $(F, G) \in \Theta_j = \Omega_{\delta_j}$. Therefore $c_G \ll \delta_j(c_F) \leq c_F$. Thus $G \subseteq \downarrow c_F = \overline{R_L}(F)$. It follows from the definition of $\text{Id}_{(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L)}$ that $(F, G) \in \text{Id}_{(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L)}$, showing that $\bigcup_{i \in I} \Theta_i \subseteq \text{Id}_{(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L)}$. Thus $\bigcup_{i \in I} \Theta_i = \text{Id}_{(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L)}$. Thus (FS 1) is checked.

Next we check that $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies (FS 2) in Definition 3.6. By Definition 2.4, for every $i \in I$, we can get a finite set M_i such that for each $x \in L$, there exists $m \in M_i$ such that $\delta(x) \leq m \leq x$. Construct a finite family $\mathcal{M}_i = \{\{m\} \mid m \in M_i\}$ for all $i \in I$. Since δ_i is finitely separating with M_i , we know that for every $F \in \mathcal{F}_L$, there exists $m \in M_i$ such that $\delta_i(c_F) \leq m \leq c_F$. Now, set $M = \{m\} \in \mathcal{M}_i$. If $G \in \mathcal{F}_L$ and $F \Theta_i G$, then $c_G \ll \delta_i(c_F)$. Therefore $c_G \ll m \leq c_F$ and $G \subseteq \overline{R_L}(M) \subseteq \overline{R_L}(F)$, showing that Θ_i satisfies (FS 2) in Definition 3.6 for every $i \in I$. \square

Theorem 4.3. (Representation Theorem I: for FS-domain) *A poset (L, \leq) is an FS-domain iff there is an FS-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) such that $(L, \leq) \cong (\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$.*

Proof. \Leftarrow : Follows directly from Theorem 3.7.

\Rightarrow : If L is an FS-domain, then by Theorem 4.2, the induced CF-approximation space (L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L) is an FS-approximation space. Define $f : L \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L)$ such that for all $x \in L$, $f(x) = \downarrow x$. Then it follows from Example 2.14(2) and the continuity of L that f is an order isomorphism. \square

Theorem 4.4. (Representation Theorem II: for FS-domain) *A poset (L, \leq) is an FS-domain iff there is a strong FS-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) such that $(L, \leq) \cong (\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$.*

Proof. \Leftarrow : Follows directly from Theorem 4.3 and Remark 3.9.

\Rightarrow : By the proof of Theorem 4.3 we need only to prove that (L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L) defined in Example 2.14 is a strong FS-approximation space. Let $\{\delta_i\}_{i \in I}$ be an approximate identity for L consisting of finitely separating maps. For all $i \in I$, construct a binary relation $\Theta_i = \Omega_{\delta_i^2}$ such that

$$\forall F, G \in \mathcal{F}_L, (F, G) \in \Theta_i \Leftrightarrow c_G \ll \delta_i^2(c_F).$$

By Proposition 4.1, $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a directed family of CF-approximable relations on (L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L) .

Similar to the proof of Theorem 4.2, it is easy to check that $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies (FS 1) in Definition 3.8 by Lemma 2.5(1). Next we check that $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies (FS 2') in Definition 3.8. By Definition 2.4, for every $i \in I$, we can get a finite set M_i such that for each $x \in L$, there exists $m \in M_i$ such that $\delta(x) \leq m \leq x$. Construct a finite family $\mathcal{M}_i = \{\{\delta_i(m)\} \mid m \in M_i\}$ for every $i \in I$. Since δ_i is finitely separating with M_i , we know that for every $F \in \mathcal{F}_L$, there exists $m \in M_i$ such that $\delta_i(c_F) \leq m \leq c_F$. Now, set $M = \{\delta_i(m)\} \in \mathcal{M}_i$. If $G \in \mathcal{F}_L$ and $F \Theta_i G$, then $c_G \ll \delta_i^2(c_F)$. Noticing that $\delta_i(c_F) \leq m \leq c_F$ and δ_i is order preserving, we have that $\delta_i^2(c_F) \leq \delta_i(m) \leq \delta_i(c_F) \ll c_F$ by Lemma 2.5. Thus $c_G \ll \delta_i(m) \ll c_F$, $G \subseteq \overline{R_L}(M)$ and $M \subseteq \overline{R_L}(F)$, showing that Θ_i satisfies (FS 2') in Definition 3.8 for every $i \in I$. \square

Definition 4.5. ([4]) Let P be a poset, $k : P \rightarrow P$ a monotone map. If k satisfies

- (1) $k(x) \leq x$ for all $x \in P$; and
- (2) $k(k(x)) = k(x)$ for all $x \in P$,

then k is called a *kernel operator*.

Lemma 4.6. ([4, Proposition II-2.20]) *For a dcpo L , the following properties are equivalent:*

- (1) L is a BF-domain;
- (2) L is an algebraic domain and has an approximate identity consisting of maps with finite range;
- (3) L has an approximate identity consisting of kernel operators with finite range.

Now we arrive at representations of BF-domain with topological FS-approximation spaces.

Theorem 4.7. (Representation Theorem III: for BF-domains) *A poset (L, \leq) is a BF-domain iff there is a topological FS-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) such that $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq) \cong (L, \leq)$.*

Proof. \Leftarrow : Follows from Theorem 3.14.

\Rightarrow : Let (L, \leq) a BF-domain, $\mathcal{F}_{K(L)} = \{F \subseteq_{fin} K(L) \mid F \text{ has a top element}\}$ and $R_{K(L)} = \leq_{K(L)}$. By Remark 3.11, $(K(L), R_{K(L)}, \mathcal{F}_{K(L)})$ is a topological CF-approximation space. Moreover, for any $F \in \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}$, let c_F be the top element of F . To show that $(K(L), R_{K(L)}, \mathcal{F}_{K(L)})$ is a topological FS-approximation space, we need only to prove $(K(L), R_{K(L)}, \mathcal{F}_{K(L)})$ satisfies (FS 1) and (FS 2). By Lemma 4.6, we have an approximate identity $\{\delta_i\}_{i \in I}$ for L consisting of kernel operators with finite range. For all $i \in I$, define $\Theta_i \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{K(L)} \times \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}$ such that

$$\forall F, G \in \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}, (F, G) \in \Theta_i \iff c_G \leq \delta_i(c_F).$$

It is routine to check that $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a directed family of CF-approximable relations.

To check that $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies (FS 1), let $F, G \in \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (F, G) \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \Theta_i &\iff \exists j \in I \text{ such that } (F, G) \in \Theta_j \\ &\iff \exists j \in I \text{ such that } c_G \leq \delta_j(c_F) \\ &\iff c_G \leq c_F \text{ ("} \Leftarrow \text{" follows by } \bigvee_{i \in I} \delta_i(c_F) = c_F \text{ and } c_G \in K(L)) \\ &\iff G \subseteq \overline{R_{K(L)}(F)} = \downarrow_{c_F} \cap K(L) \\ &\iff (F, G) \in \text{Id}_{(K(L), R_{K(L)}, \mathcal{F}_{K(L)})}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we check that $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies (FS 2). For all Θ_i , let M_i be the range of δ_i . For any $m \in M_i$, by Lemma 2.5(2) and the condition (2) in Definition 4.5, we have that $m = \delta_i(m) \ll m$ and m is compact. Set $\mathcal{M}_i = \{\{m\} \mid m \in M_i\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}$. For all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}$, select $\{\delta_i(c_F)\} \in \mathcal{M}_i$. If $G \in \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}$ and $F \Theta_i G$, then $c_G \leq \delta_i(c_F) \leq c_F$, showing that $G \subseteq \overline{R_{K(L)}(\{\delta_i(c_F)\})} \subseteq \overline{R_{K(L)}(F)}$. Thus $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies (FS 2).

By Example 3.12(2), we see that $(\mathfrak{C}(K(L), R_{K(L)}, \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}), \subseteq) \cong (L, \leq)$. \square

Representations of FS-domains and BF-domains above are all given by using CF-approximable relations. In the following, we will give direct representations of BF-domains without using CF-approximable relations. To this end, we give another one of main concepts in this paper as follows.

Definition 4.8. A topological BF-approximation space is a topological CF-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) satisfying that for all $K \subseteq_{fin} U$, there is a finite family $\mathcal{M}_K \subseteq_{fin} \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$(TB\ 1) \ \mathcal{P}(K) \cap \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_K;$$

$$(TB\ 2) \ (\forall F \in \mathcal{F})(\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_K, \bigcup \mathcal{G} \subseteq \overline{R}(F)) \implies (\exists M \in \mathcal{M}_K)(\bigcup \mathcal{G} \subseteq \overline{R}(M) \subseteq \overline{R}(F)).$$

Remark 4.9. For a topological BF-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) , we have

(1) the binary relation R is a preorder;

(2) for the same $K \subseteq_{fin} U$, we have may more than one finite families of \mathcal{F} satisfying conditions (TB 1) and (TB 2), however, we can use Axiom of Choice for all $K \subseteq_{fin} U$ to select a fixed one $\mathcal{M}_K \subseteq_{fin} \mathcal{F}$ satisfying conditions (TB 1) and (TB 2).

(3) for all $K \subseteq_{fin} U$, set $\mathcal{G} = \emptyset$, then by (TB 2) in Definition 4.8, we have that $\mathcal{M}_K \neq \emptyset$.

Theorem 4.10. If (U, R, \mathcal{F}) is a topological BF-approximation space, then $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ is a BF-domain.

Proof. Clearly, $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ is an algebraic domain. To show that $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ is a BF-domain, we divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1. Set $\mathcal{D} = \{K \subseteq_{fin} U \mid \exists F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ s.t. } F \subseteq K\}$. Then in set-inclusion order, \mathcal{D} is clearly a directed family. For all $K \in \mathcal{D}$, define $\delta_K : \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$ such that for all $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, $\delta_K(E) = \bigcup \{\overline{R}(M) \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq E\}$, where \mathcal{M}_K is stated in Remark 4.9(2).

Step 2. Assert that for all $K \in \mathcal{D}$, δ_K is well defined and has finite range.

Let $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$. By the finiteness of \mathcal{M}_K and $\mathcal{M}_K \subseteq_{fin} \mathcal{F}$, we have $\bigcup \{M \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq E\} \subseteq_{fin} E$. It follows from $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$ that there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\bigcup \{M \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq E\} \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \subseteq E$. It follows from $\{M \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq E\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_K$ and (TB 2) that there is $M^* \in \mathcal{M}_K$ such that $\bigcup \{M \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq E\} \subseteq \overline{R}(M^*) \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \subseteq E$. By Lemma 2.9 (1) and (3), we see that $M^* \subseteq E$ and $\overline{R}(M^*)$ is the greatest element in $\{\overline{R}(M) \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq E\}$ equipped with set-inclusion order. Hence $\delta_K(E) = \overline{R}(M^*) \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, showing that δ_K is well defined. It follows from the finiteness of \mathcal{M}_K and $M^* \in \mathcal{M}_K$ that δ_K has finite range.

Step 3. Assert that for all $K \in \mathcal{D}$, δ_K is Scott continuous.

Obviously, δ_K is order preserving. Let $\{E_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq (\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ be a directed family and $E = \bigvee_{i \in I} E_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} E_i \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$. By the proof of Step 2, there is $M_E^* \in \mathcal{M}_K$ and $M_E^* \subseteq E$ such that $\delta_K(E) = \overline{R}(M_E^*)$. Since $M_E^* \subseteq_{fin} \bigcup_{i \in I} E_i = E$, there exists $j \in I$ such that $M_E^* \subseteq E_j$. So, $\delta_K(E_j) = \bigcup \{\overline{R}(M) \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq E_j\} \supseteq \overline{R}(M_E^*) = \delta_K(E)$. Therefore $\delta_K(E) \subseteq \delta_K(E_j) \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} \delta_K(E_i) \subseteq \delta_K(E)$. Thus $\delta_K(\bigcup_{i \in I} E_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} \delta_K(E_i)$, showing that δ_K is Scott continuous.

Step 4. Assert that $\{\delta_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{D}}$ is an approximate identity on $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$.

To show $\{\delta_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{D}}$ is directed, let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $K = K_1 \cup K_2 \cup \bigcup (\mathcal{M}_{K_1} \cup \mathcal{M}_{K_2})$. Then $K \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{K_1} \cup \mathcal{M}_{K_2} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(K) \cap \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_K$. For all $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, $i = 1, 2$, we have that

$$\delta_{K_i}(E) = \bigcup \{\overline{R}(M) \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_{K_i} \text{ and } M \subseteq E\} \subseteq \bigcup \{\overline{R}(M) \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq E\} = \delta_K(E),$$

showing that $\{\delta_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{D}}$ is directed.

Let $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $F \subseteq E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$. Then by (TB 1), there exists $\mathcal{M}_F \subseteq_{fin} \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\mathcal{P}(F) \cap \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_F$. It follows from $F \in \mathcal{P}(F) \cap \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_F$ that $\overline{R}(F) \subseteq \bigcup \{\overline{R}(M) \mid M \in$

\mathcal{M}_F and $M \subseteq E\} = \delta_F(E)$. Noticing that $F \in \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, we have $\overline{R}(F) \subseteq \bigvee_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \delta_K(E)$. By Lemma 2.13 and the arbitrariness F , we have $E = \{\overline{R}(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E\} \subseteq \bigvee_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \delta_K(E)$. Obviously, $\bigvee_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \delta_K(E) \subseteq E$ and $\bigvee_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \delta_K(E) = E$. This shows that $\bigvee_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \delta_K = id_{\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})}$.

To sum up Step 1–Step 4, by Lemma 4.6, we have that $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$ is a BF-domain. \square

Since a BF-domain is an FS-domain, it is natural to ask that whether a topological BF-approxiamtion space is a topological FS-approxiamtion space or not? The following proposition gives an affirmative answer.

Proposition 4.11. *A topological BF-approxiamtion space is a topological FS-approxiamtion space.*

Proof. Let (U, R, \mathcal{F}) be a topological BF-approxiamtion space. Then $\mathcal{D} = \{K \subseteq_{fin} U \mid \exists F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ such that } F \subseteq K\}$ defined in the proof of Theorem 4.10 is a directed family. For all $K \in \mathcal{D}$, define a binary relation Θ_K on \mathcal{F} such that

$$\forall F, G \in \mathcal{F}, (F, G) \in \Theta_K \iff \exists M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ such that } G \subseteq \overline{R}(M) \subseteq \overline{R}(F),$$

where \mathcal{M}_K is stated in Remark 4.9(2).

To show the proposition, it suffices by Definition 3.6 to show that the family $\{\Theta_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{D}}$ is a directed family of CF-approximable relations on (U, R, \mathcal{F}) satisfying (FS 1) and (FS 2) in Definition 3.6. To this end, we divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1. Show that for all $K \in \mathcal{D}$, Θ_K is a CF-approximable relation.

To check Θ_K satisfies the condition (1) in Proposition 3.13, let $F \in \mathcal{F}$. By the proof of Theorem 4.10, there is an $M^* \in \mathcal{M}_K$ such that $\overline{R}(M^*)$ is the greatest element in $\{\overline{R}(M) \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq \overline{R}(F)\}$. Thus $M^* \subseteq \overline{R}(M^*) \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$ and $(F, M^*) \in \Theta_K$, showing Θ_K satisfies the condition (1).

To check Θ_K satisfies the condition (2) in Proposition 3.13, let $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}_1, G, G' \in \mathcal{F}_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & F \subseteq \overline{R}(F'), G' \subseteq \overline{R}(G) \text{ and } F \Theta_K G \\ \implies & \exists M \in \mathcal{M}_K, F \subseteq \overline{R}(F'), G' \subseteq \overline{R}(G) \text{ and } G \subseteq \overline{R}(M) \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \\ \implies & \exists M \in \mathcal{M}_K, G' \subseteq \overline{R}(M) \subseteq \overline{R}(F') \\ \implies & F' \Theta_K G'. \end{aligned}$$

So, Θ_K satisfies the condition (2).

To check Θ_K satisfies the condition (3) in Proposition 3.13, let $F \in \mathcal{F}_1, G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$. If $(F, G_1) \in \Theta_K$ and $(F, G_2) \in \Theta_K$, then there exists $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{M}_K$ such that $G_i \subseteq \overline{R}(M_i) \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$ ($i = 1, 2$). By the maximality of $\overline{R}(M^*)$, we have that $G_1 \cup G_2 \subseteq \overline{R}(M_1) \cup \overline{R}(M_2) \subseteq \overline{R}(M^*) \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$ and $(F, M^*) \in \Theta_K$, showing that Θ_K satisfies the condition (3).

Thus, Θ_K is a CF-approximable relation on (U, R, \mathcal{F}) .

Step 2. It follows from Step 4 in the proof of Theorem 4.10 that $(\{\mathcal{M}_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{D}}, \subseteq)$ is directed. Thus $\{\Theta_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{D}}$ is directed.

Step 3. Check the condition (FS 1) in Definition 3.6 for $\{\Theta_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{D}}$.

Clearly, for all $K \in \mathcal{D}$, $\Theta_K \subseteq Id_{(U, R, \mathcal{F})}$. Conversely, let $F, G \in \mathcal{F}$. If $(F, G) \in Id_{(U, R, \mathcal{F})}$, then $G \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$. By the proof of Theorem 4.10, we have an approximate identity $\{\delta_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{D}}$ on

$\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, where for all $E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, $\delta_K(E) = \bigcup \{\overline{R}(M) \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq E\}$. Thus $\bigvee_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \delta_K(\overline{R}(F)) = \overline{R}(F)$. It follows from Lemma 2.15(1) and R being a preorder that $\overline{R}(F)$ is a compact element of $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$. So there exists $J \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\delta_J(\overline{R}(F)) = \overline{R}(F)$. Thus $G \subseteq \delta_J(\overline{R}(F))$. By Step 2 of Theorem 4.10, there exists $M_F^* \in \mathcal{M}_J$ such that $\delta_J(\overline{R}(F)) = \overline{R}(M_F^*) \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$. Hence, $G \subseteq \overline{R}(M_F^*) \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$, showing that $(F, G) \in \Theta_J \subseteq \bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \Theta_K$ and $\bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \Theta_K = \text{Id}_{(U, R, \mathcal{F})}$, showing that $\{\Theta_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{D}}$ satisfies the condition (FS 1).

Step 4. Check that $\{\Theta_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{D}}$ satisfies the condition (FS 2) in Definition 3.6.

For all $K \in \mathcal{D}$, let $\mathcal{M}_K \subseteq_{fin} \mathcal{F}$ be the one stated in Remark 4.9(2). Let $F \in \mathcal{F}$. By the proof of Theorem 4.10, there is an $M^* \in \mathcal{M}_K$ such that $\overline{R}(M^*)$ is the greatest element in $\{\overline{R}(M) \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq \overline{R}(F)\}$. If $G \in \mathcal{F}$ and $(F, G) \in \Theta_K$, then there is $M \in \mathcal{M}_K$ such that $G \subseteq \overline{R}(M) \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$. Noticing that $\overline{R}(M^*)$ is the greatest element in $\{\overline{R}(M) \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_K \text{ and } M \subseteq \overline{R}(F)\}$, we have $G \subseteq \overline{R}(M^*) \subseteq \overline{R}(F)$, showing that $\{\Theta_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{D}}$ satisfies the condition (FS 2).

To sum up, (U, R, \mathcal{F}) is a topological FS-approximation space. \square

Theorem 4.12. *Let L be a BF-domain, $(K(L), R_{K(L)}, \mathcal{F}_{K(L)})$ the induced CF-approximation space by L . Then $(K(L), R_{K(L)}, \mathcal{F}_{K(L)})$ is a topological BF-approximation space.*

Proof. By Remark 3.11, $(K(L), R_{K(L)}, \mathcal{F}_{K(L)})$ is a topological CF-approximation space. By Lemma 4.6, there is an approximate identity $\{\delta_i\}_{i \in I}$ for L consisting of kernel operators with finite range. For all $i \in I$, we use $\text{Im}(\delta_i)$ to denote the range of δ_i . For any $m \in \text{Im}(\delta_i)$, by Lemma 2.5 (2), we have that $m = \delta_i(m) \ll m$ and m is compact, showing that $\text{Im}(\delta_i) \subseteq K(L)$.

For $H \subseteq_{fin} K(L)$ and $H \neq \emptyset$, it follows from $\bigvee_{i \in I} \delta_i(a) = a$ that there is $i_a \in I$ such that $a \leq \delta_{i_a}(a)$ for all $a \in H \subseteq K(L)$. Clearly, $\delta_{i_a}(a) \leq a$ and $\delta_{i_a}(a) = a$. For $\{\delta_{i_a} \mid a \in H\} \subseteq_{fin} \{\delta_i\}_{i \in I}$, it follows from the directedness of $\{\delta_i\}_{i \in I}$ that there exists $j \in I$ such that $\delta_{i_a} \leq \delta_j$ for all $a \in H$. Thus for all $a \in H$, we have that $a \geq \delta_j(a) \geq \delta_{i_a}(a) = a$, and $a = \delta_j(a)$, showing that $H \subseteq \text{Im}(\delta_j)$. Set $\mathcal{M}_H = \mathcal{P}(\text{Im}(\delta_j)) \cap \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}$. It follows from $H \subseteq \text{Im}(\delta_j)$ that $\mathcal{P}(H) \cap \mathcal{F}_{K(L)} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_H$, showing that \mathcal{M}_H satisfies (TB 1). To show \mathcal{M}_H satisfies (TB 2), let $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_H$ satisfying $\bigcup \mathcal{G} \subseteq \overline{R}_{K(L)}(F) = \downarrow_{c_F} \cap K(L)$. Take $M = \{\delta_j(c_F)\} \subseteq \text{Im}(\delta_j)$. Clearly, $M \in \mathcal{M}_H$. It follows from $\delta_j(c_F) \leq c_F$ that $\overline{R}_{K(L)}(M) = \downarrow_{\delta_j(c_F)} \cap K(L) \subseteq \downarrow_{c_F} \cap K(L) = \overline{R}_{K(L)}(F)$. For all $g \in \bigcup \mathcal{G}$, notice that $\bigcup \mathcal{G} \subseteq \text{Im}(\delta_j)$, we have $\delta_j(g) = g$. It follows from $\bigcup \mathcal{G} \subseteq \overline{R}_{K(L)}(F) = \downarrow_{c_F} \cap K(L)$ that $g \leq c_F$. Thus $g = \delta_j(g) \leq \delta_j(c_F)$, showing that $\bigcup \mathcal{G} \subseteq \downarrow_{\delta_j(c_F)} \cap K(L) = \overline{R}_{K(L)}(M)$. Thus, we obtain that $\bigcup \mathcal{G} \subseteq \overline{R}_{K(L)}(M) \subseteq \overline{R}_{K(L)}(F)$, showing that \mathcal{M}_H satisfies (TB 2).

For $H \subseteq_{fin} K(L)$ and $H = \emptyset$, we have $\mathcal{P}(H) \cap \mathcal{F}_{K(L)} = \emptyset$. Let $\mathcal{M}_\emptyset = \mathcal{P}(\text{Im}(\delta_i)) \cap \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}$, for any $i \in I$. Obviously, $\mathcal{M}_\emptyset \subseteq_{fin} \mathcal{F}_{K(L)}$ and \mathcal{M}_\emptyset satisfies (TB 1). The check of (TB 2) is similar to the case of $H \neq \emptyset$. \square

Theorem 4.13. (Representation Theorem IV: for BF-domains) *A poset (L, \leq) is a BF-domain iff there exists a topological BF-approximation space (U, R, \mathcal{F}) such that $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq) \cong (L, \leq)$.*

Proof. Follows directly from Proposition 4.11, Theorem 4.7, 4.10 and 4.12. \square

5 Categorical equivalence between related categories

In this section, we first define compositions of suitable CF-approximable relations, and then prove categorical equivalence of related categories.

Definition 5.1. Let $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$, $(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ and $(U_3, R_3, \mathcal{F}_3)$ be CF-approximation spaces, $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$ and $\Upsilon \subseteq \mathcal{F}_2 \times \mathcal{F}_3$ be CF-approximable relations. Then the composition $\Upsilon \circ \Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_3$ of Υ and Θ is defined by that for any $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, F_3 \in \mathcal{F}_3$, $(F_1, F_3) \in \Upsilon \circ \Theta$ iff there exists $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ satisfying $(F_1, F_2) \in \Theta$ and $(F_2, F_3) \in \Upsilon$.

Proposition 5.2. Let $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$, $(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ and $(U_3, R_3, \mathcal{F}_3)$ be CF-approximation spaces, $\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$ and $\Upsilon \subseteq \mathcal{F}_2 \times \mathcal{F}_3$ be CF-approximable relations. Then the composition $\Upsilon \circ \Theta$ is a CF-approximable relation from CF-approximation space $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ to $(U_3, R_3, \mathcal{F}_3)$.

Proof. Since the composition of CF-approximable relation “ \circ ” is precisely the composition of binary relation, we have that $\Upsilon \circ \Theta$ satisfies the condition (1) in Definition 3.1.

To check that $\Upsilon \circ \Theta$ satisfies the condition (2) in Definition 3.1, let $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}_1, H \in \mathcal{F}_3$.

$$\begin{aligned} & F \subseteq \overline{R_1}(F'), (F, H) \in \Upsilon \circ \Theta \\ \Rightarrow & \exists G \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ such that } F \subseteq \overline{R_1}(F'), F \Theta G \text{ and } G \Upsilon H \\ \Rightarrow & \exists G \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ such that } F' \Theta G \text{ and } G \Upsilon H \text{ (by } \Theta \text{ satisfying (2) in Definition 3.1)} \\ \Leftrightarrow & (F', H) \in \Upsilon \circ \Theta. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\Upsilon \circ \Theta$ satisfies the condition (2) in Definition 3.1. Similarly, by Υ satisfying the condition (3) in Definition 3.1, we have that $\Upsilon \circ \Theta$ satisfies the condition (3) in Definition 3.1.

To check that $\Upsilon \circ \Theta$ satisfies the condition (4) in Definition 3.1, let $F \in \mathcal{F}_1, H \in \mathcal{F}_3$.

$$\begin{aligned} & (F, H) \in \Upsilon \circ \Theta \\ \Rightarrow & \exists G \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ such that } F \Theta G, G \Upsilon H \\ \Rightarrow & \exists F' \in \mathcal{F}_1, G \in \mathcal{F}_2, H' \in \mathcal{F}_3 \text{ such that } F' \subseteq \overline{R_1}(F), F' \Theta G; G \Upsilon H', H \subseteq \overline{R_3}(H') \\ & \text{(by Proposition 3.3)} \\ \Rightarrow & \exists F' \in \mathcal{F}_1, H' \in \mathcal{F}_3 \text{ such that } F' \subseteq \overline{R_1}(F), H \subseteq \overline{R_3}(H') \text{ and } (F', H') \in \Upsilon \circ \Theta. \end{aligned}$$

To check that $\Upsilon \circ \Theta$ satisfies the condition (5) in Definition 3.1, let $F \in \mathcal{F}_1, H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{F}_3$.

$$\begin{aligned} & (F, H_1) \in \Upsilon \circ \Theta \text{ and } (F, H_2) \in \Upsilon \circ \Theta \\ \Rightarrow & \exists G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ such that } F \Theta G_1, F \Theta G_2; G_1 \Upsilon H_1, G_2 \Upsilon H_2 \\ \Rightarrow & \exists G_3 \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ such that } G_1 \cup G_2 \subseteq \overline{R_2}(G_3), F \Theta G_3; G_1 \Upsilon H_1, G_2 \Upsilon H_2 \\ & \text{(by } \Theta \text{ satisfying (5) in Definition 3.1)} \\ \Rightarrow & G_3 \Upsilon H_1, G_3 \Upsilon H_2 \text{ and } F \Theta G_3 \text{ (by } \Upsilon \text{ satisfying (2) in Definition 3.1)} \\ \Rightarrow & \exists H_3 \in \mathcal{F}_3 \text{ such that } H_1 \cup H_2 \subseteq \overline{R_3}(H_3), G_3 \Upsilon H_3 \text{ and } F \Theta G_3 \\ & \text{(by } \Upsilon \text{ satisfying (5) in Definition 3.1)} \\ \Rightarrow & \exists H_3 \in \mathcal{F}_3 \text{ such that } H_1 \cup H_2 \subseteq \overline{R_3}(H_3) \text{ and } (F, H_3) \in \Upsilon \circ \Theta. \end{aligned}$$

To sum up, $\Upsilon \circ \Theta$ is a CF-approximable relation from $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ to $(U_3, R_3, \mathcal{F}_3)$. \square

Proposition 5.3. *Let Θ be a CF-approximable relation from CF-approximation space $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ to $(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$. Then $\Theta \circ \text{Id}_{(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)} = \text{Id}_{(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)} \circ \Theta = \Theta$, where the identity CF-approximable relation $\text{Id}_{(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)}$ is defined in Definition 3.2.*

Proof. For all $F \in \mathcal{F}_1, G \in \mathcal{F}_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (F, G) \in \Theta &\Leftrightarrow \exists G' \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ s.t. } F \Theta G', G \subseteq \overline{R_2}(G') \text{ (by Proposition 3.3)} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists G' \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ s.t. } F \Theta G', (G', G) \in \text{Id}_{(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (F, G) \in \text{Id}_{(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)} \circ \Theta. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\text{Id}_{(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)} \circ \Theta = \Theta$. Similarly, by Proposition 3.3, we have $\Theta \circ \text{Id}_{(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)} = \Theta$.

□

By Proposition 5.2 and 5.3, FS-approximation spaces (resp., strong FS-approximation spaces, topological FS-approximation spaces, topological BF-approximation spaces) as objects and CF-approximable relations as morphisms form a category, denoted by **FS-APPS** (resp., **StFS-APPS**, **TopFS-APPS**, **TopBF-APPS**).

In this paper, we use **FS-DOM** (resp., **BF-DOM**) to denote the category of FS-domains (resp., BF-domains) and Scott continuous maps.

Next, we investigate more relationships between CF-approximable relations and Scott continuous maps, and establish categorical equivalence between category **FS-APPS** (resp., **TopFS-APPS**) and category **FS-DOM** (resp., **BF-DOM**).

Lemma 5.4. ([21]) *Let Θ be a CF-approximable relation from $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ to $(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$.*

(1) *Let $f : \mathfrak{C}(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ be a Scott continuous map. Define $\Theta_f \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$ such that*

$$\forall F \in \mathcal{F}_1, G \in \mathcal{F}_2, F \Theta_f G \Leftrightarrow G \subseteq f(\overline{R_1}(F)).$$

Then Θ_f is a CF-approximable relation from $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ to $(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$.

(2) *Let Θ be a CF-approximable relation from CF-approximation spaces $(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ to $(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$, $f : \mathfrak{C}(U_1, R_1, \mathcal{F}_1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(U_2, R_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ a Scott continuous map. Then $\Theta_{f \circ \Theta} = \Theta$ and $f \circ \Theta_f = f$, where $f \circ \Theta_f$ is the one defined in Lemma 3.5.*

Proof. It is a routine work to check relevant items by Definition 3.1, Lemma 2.12 and 2.13. □

Proposition 5.5. *Let L_1 and L_2 be continuous domains, $(L_1, R_{L_1}, \mathcal{F}_{L_1})$ and $(L_2, R_{L_2}, \mathcal{F}_{L_2})$ the relative induced CF-approximation spaces.*

(1) *For any CF-approximable relation Ω from $(L_1, R_{L_1}, \mathcal{F}_{L_1})$ to $(L_2, R_{L_2}, \mathcal{F}_{L_2})$, define $g_\Omega : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ such that for any $x \in L_1$,*

$$g_\Omega(x) = \sup_{L_2} (\bigcup \{ \overline{R_{L_2}}(G) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}, G \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}, F \subseteq \downarrow x \text{ and } (F, G) \in \Omega \}).$$

Then g_Ω is Scott continuous.

(2) *Let $g : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ be a Scott continuous map, Ω a CF-approximable relation from $(L_1, R_{L_1}, \mathcal{F}_{L_1})$ to $(L_2, R_{L_2}, \mathcal{F}_{L_2})$. Then $g_{\Omega_g} = g$ and $\Omega_{g_\Omega} = \Omega$, where Ω_g is defined in Proposition 4.1.*

Proof. (1) It follows from Lemma 3.5 and Example 2.14(2) that $g_\Omega(x) = \sup_{L_2} f_\Omega(\downarrow x)$ and $f_\Omega(\downarrow x) \in \mathfrak{C}(L_2, R_{L_2}, \mathcal{F}_{L_2}) = \{\downarrow y \mid y \in L_2\}$, where f_Ω is defined in Lemma 3.5. By continuity of L_2 , we have $f_\Omega(\downarrow x) = \downarrow y$ for some $y \in L_2$ and g_Ω is well defined. For any directed set $D \subseteq L_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_\Omega(\sup_{L_1} D) &= \sup_{L_2} f_\Omega(\downarrow \sup_{L_1} D) \\ &= \sup_{L_2} f_\Omega(\bigcup_{d \in D} \downarrow d) \text{ (by the continuity of } L_1) \\ &= \sup_{L_2} (\bigcup_{d \in D} f_\Omega(\downarrow d)) \text{ (by Lemma 2.12(3), 3.5 and Example 2.14(2))} \\ &= \sup_{L_2} \{\sup_{L_2} f_\Omega(\downarrow d) \mid d \in D\} \\ &= \sup_{L_2} \{g_\Omega(d) \mid d \in D\}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that g_Ω is Scott continuous.

(2) For every $x \in L_1$ and Ω_g defined in Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\Omega_g}(x) &= \sup_{L_2} f_{\Omega_g}(\downarrow x) \\ &= \sup_{L_2} (\bigcup \{\overline{R_{L_2}}(G) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}, G \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}, F \subseteq \downarrow x \text{ and } (F, G) \in \Omega_g\}) \\ &= \sup_{L_2} (\bigcup \{\downarrow t \mid s \in L_1, t \in L_2, s \ll x \text{ and } t \ll g(s)\}) \\ &= \sup_{L_2} \{t \mid s \in L_1, t \in L_2, s \ll x \text{ and } t \ll g(s)\} \\ &= \sup_{L_2} \{g(s) \mid s \in L_1 \text{ and } s \ll x\} \text{ (by the continuity of } L_2) \\ &= g(x). \text{ (by the Scott continuity of } g) \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $g_{\Omega_g} = g$.

For any $F \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}$ and $G \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (F, G) \in \Omega_{g_\Omega} &\iff c_G \ll g_\Omega(c_F) = \sup_{L_2} f_\Omega(\downarrow c_F) \\ &\iff G \subseteq f_\Omega(\downarrow c_F) \text{ (by } f_\Omega(\downarrow x) \in \mathfrak{C}(L_2, R_{L_2}, \mathcal{F}_{L_2}) = \{\downarrow y \mid y \in L_2\}) \\ &\iff G \subseteq \bigcup \{\overline{R_{L_2}}(K) \mid H \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}, K \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}, H \subseteq \downarrow c_F \text{ and } (H, K) \in \Omega\} \\ &\iff (\exists H \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}, K \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2})(H \subseteq \downarrow c_F = \overline{R_{L_1}}(F), G \subseteq \overline{R_{L_2}}(K) \text{ and } (H, K) \in \Omega) \\ &\quad \text{(by Proposition 3.4)} \\ &\iff (F, G) \in \Omega. \text{ (by Proposition 3.3)} \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\Omega_{g_\Omega} = \Omega$. □

Theorem 5.6. *Let (U, R, \mathcal{F}) be an FS-approximation space, (V, Q, \mathcal{G}) the FS-approximation space induced by the FS-domain $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$. Then $(U, R, \mathcal{F}) \cong (V, Q, \mathcal{G})$ in **FS-APPS**.*

Proof. By Example 2.14, we have that $V = \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F})$, $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}) \mid \mathcal{C} \text{ has a top element}\}$, and Q is the way-below relation \ll in FS-domain $(\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq)$. Define $\Upsilon \subseteq \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{G}$ and $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\forall F \in \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{G}, (F, \mathcal{C}) \in \Upsilon \iff E_{\mathcal{C}} \ll \overline{R}(F), \quad (\mathcal{C}, F) \in \Omega \iff F \subseteq E_{\mathcal{C}},$$

where $E_{\mathcal{C}}$ denote the top element in \mathcal{C} .

We prove firstly that Υ is a CF-approximable relation from (U, R, \mathcal{F}) to (V, Q, \mathcal{G}) . It is a routine work to check that Υ satisfies the conditions (1), (2), (3) and (5) in Definition 3.1. To check that Υ satisfies (4) in Definition 3.1, let $F \in \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{G}$. Then we have

$$(F, \mathcal{C}) \in \Upsilon \iff E_{\mathcal{C}} \ll \overline{R}(F)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\iff \exists E_1, E_2 \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}) \text{ such that } E_C \ll E_1 \ll E_2 \ll \overline{R}(F) \text{ (by Lemma 2.3)} \\
&\iff \exists E_1, E_2 \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), F' \in \mathcal{F} \text{ such that } E_C \ll E_1 \ll E_2 \subseteq \overline{R}(F'), F' \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \\
&\quad \text{(by Lemma 2.15)} \\
&\implies \exists E_1 \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), F' \in \mathcal{F} \text{ such that } E_C \ll E_1, E_1 \ll \overline{R}(F'), F' \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \\
&\implies \exists F' \in \mathcal{F}, \{E_1\} \in \mathcal{G} \text{ such that } F' \subseteq \overline{R}(F), (F', \{E_1\}) \in \Upsilon, \mathcal{C} \subseteq \overline{Q}(\{E_1\}) = \downarrow\{E_1\}.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that that Υ satisfies (4) in Definition 3.1.

We then prove that Ω is a CF-approximable relation from (V, Q, \mathcal{G}) to (U, R, \mathcal{F}) . It is a routine work to check that Ω satisfies the conditions (1), (2), (3) and (5) in Definition 3.1. To check that Ω satisfies (4) in Definition 3.1, let $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{G}, F \in \mathcal{F}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{C}, F) \in \Omega &\iff F \subseteq E_C \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}) \\
&\implies \exists F_1 \in \mathcal{F} \text{ such that } F \subseteq \overline{R}(F_1), F_1 \subseteq E_C \text{ (by Definition 2.11)} \\
&\implies \exists F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F} \text{ such that } F \subseteq \overline{R}(F_1), F_1 \subseteq \overline{R}(F_2) \text{ and } F_2 \subseteq E_C \text{ (by Definition 2.11)} \\
&\implies \exists F_1 \in \mathcal{F}, \{\overline{R}(F_2)\} \in \mathcal{G} \text{ such that } F \subseteq \overline{R}(F_1), (\{\overline{R}(F_2)\}, F_1) \in \Omega \text{ and } \overline{R}(F_2) \ll E_C \\
&\quad \text{(by Lemma 2.15(2))} \\
&\implies \exists \{\overline{R}(F_2)\} \in \mathcal{G}, F_1 \in \mathcal{F} \text{ such that } \{\overline{R}(F_2)\} \subseteq \overline{Q}(\mathcal{C}), (\{\overline{R}(F_2)\}, F_1) \in \Omega, F \subseteq \overline{R}(F_1).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that Ω satisfies (4) in Definition 3.1.

Next we prove $\Omega \circ \Upsilon = \text{Id}_{(U, R, \mathcal{F})}$ and $\Upsilon \circ \Omega = \text{Id}_{(V, Q, \mathcal{G})}$. Let $F, G \in \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \in \mathcal{G}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(F, G) \in \text{Id}_{(U, R, \mathcal{F})} &\iff G \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \\
&\iff \exists F_1 \in \mathcal{F}, G \subseteq \overline{R}(F_1), F_1 \subseteq \overline{R}(F) \text{ (by Definition 2.10)} \\
&\iff \exists \mathcal{C} = \{\overline{R}(F_1)\} \in \mathcal{G}, G \subseteq E_C, E_C \ll \overline{R}(F) \text{ (by Lemma 2.15(2))} \\
&\iff \exists \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{G}, (F, \mathcal{C}) \in \Upsilon, (\mathcal{C}, G) \in \Omega \text{ (by definitions of } \Omega \text{ and } \Upsilon) \\
&\iff (F, G) \in \Omega \circ \Upsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) \in \text{Id}_{(V, Q, \mathcal{G})} &\iff \mathcal{C}_2 \subseteq \overline{Q}(\mathcal{C}_1) \\
&\iff E_{\mathcal{C}_2} \ll E_{\mathcal{C}_1} \\
&\iff \exists E \in \mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), E_{\mathcal{C}_2} \ll E \ll E_{\mathcal{C}_1} \text{ (by Lemma 2.3)} \\
&\iff \exists F \in \mathcal{F}, F \subseteq E_{\mathcal{C}_1}, E_{\mathcal{C}_2} \ll \overline{R}(F) \text{ (by taking } E = \overline{R}(F) \text{ and Lemma 2.15)} \\
&\iff \exists F \in \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{C}_1, F) \in \Omega, (F, \mathcal{C}_2) \in \Upsilon \text{ (by definitions of } \Omega \text{ and } \Upsilon) \\
&\iff (\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) \in \Upsilon \circ \Omega.
\end{aligned}$$

These show that $(U, R, \mathcal{F}) \cong (V, Q, \mathcal{G})$ in **FS-APPS**. □

Lemma 5.7. ([1]) *Let \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} be two categories. If there is a functor $\Phi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that*

(1) *Φ is full, namely, for all $A, B \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{C}), g \in \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{D}}(\Phi(A), \Phi(B))$, there is $f \in \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$ such that $\Phi(f) = g$;*

(2) *Φ is faithful, namely, for all $A, B \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{C}), f, g \in \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$, if $f \neq g$, then $\Phi(f) \neq \Phi(g)$;*

(3) *for all $B \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{D})$, there is $A \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{C})$ such that $\Phi(A) \cong B$,*
then \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} are equivalent.

Theorem 5.8. *The categories **FS-APPS** and **FS-DOM** are equivalent.*

Proof. Define $\Phi : \mathbf{FS-DOM} \rightarrow \mathbf{FS-APPS}$, such that

$$\forall L \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{FS-DOM}), \Phi(L) = (L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L); \quad \forall g \in \text{Mor}(\mathbf{FS-DOM}), \Phi(g) = \Omega_g,$$

where the Ω_g is defined in Proposition 4.1. By Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.2, we know Φ is well-defined. We then prove that Φ is a functor from **FS-DOM** to **FS-APPS**. Let L be an FS-domain, id_L the identity on L . Then for all $F, G \in \mathcal{F}_L$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (F, G) \in \Phi(id_L) &\iff c_G \ll id_L(c_F) = c_F \\ &\iff G \subseteq \overline{R_L}(F) = \downarrow c_F \\ &\iff (F, G) \in \text{Id}_{(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L)}, \end{aligned}$$

where c_F is the top element of F . This shows that $\Phi(id_L) = \text{Id}_{(L, R_L, \mathcal{F}_L)}$.

Let L_1, L_2, L_3 be FS-domains, $h : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ and $g : L_2 \rightarrow L_3$ Scott continuous maps. Then for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{L_1}, G \in \mathcal{F}_{L_3}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (F, G) \in \Phi(g) \circ \Phi(h) &\iff \exists K \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2} \text{ such that } (F, K) \in \Phi(h) \text{ and } (K, G) \in \Phi(g) \\ &\iff \exists K \in \mathcal{F}_{L_2}, c_K \ll h(c_F), c_G \ll g(c_K) \\ &\iff c_G \ll g(h(c_F)) \text{ (" } \Leftarrow \text{ " follows from } g(h(c_F)) = \sup\{g(x) \mid x \ll h(c_F)\}) \\ &\iff (F, G) \in \Phi(g \circ h). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\Phi(g) \circ \Phi(h) = \Phi(g \circ h)$. Thus Φ is a functor from **FS-DOM** to **FS-APPS**.

It follows from Proposition 5.5 that Φ is full and faithful. By Theorem 5.6, we see that Φ satisfies the condition (3) in Lemma 5.7. Thus, **FS-DOM** and **FS-APPS** are equivalent. \square

Theorem 5.9. *The categories **TopFS-APPS** and **BF-DOM** are equivalent.*

Proof. Define $\Psi : \mathbf{TopFS-APPS} \rightarrow \mathbf{BF-DOM}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall (U, R, \mathcal{F}) \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{FS-DOM}), \quad \Psi((U, R, \mathcal{F})) &= (\mathfrak{C}(U, R, \mathcal{F}), \subseteq); \\ \forall \Theta \in \text{Mor}(\mathbf{TopFS-APPS}), \quad \Psi(\Theta) &= f_\Theta, \end{aligned}$$

where f_Θ is defined in Lemma 3.5. By Lemma 3.5 and Theorem 4.7, we know that Ψ is well-defined. Similar to the proof of Theorem 5.8, it is routine to check that Ψ is a functor. It follows from Theorem 4.7 and Lemma 5.4 that Ψ satisfies all the conditions in Lemma 5.7, showing that categories **TopFS-APPS** and **BF-DOM** are equivalent. \square

Similarly, the category **StFS-APPS** of strong FS-approximation spaces and CF-approximable relations is equivalent to category **FS-DOM**, and the category **TopBF-APPS** of topological BF-approximation spaces and CF-approximable relations is equivalent to category **BF-DOM**. We leave the details of these to the interested reader.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

- [1] M. Barr, C. Wells. Category theory for computing science (3rd edition). Prentice Hall, 1990.
- [2] B. A. Davey, H. A. Priestley. Introduction to lattices and order. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [3] B. Ganter, R. Wille. Formal concept analysis. Springer, Berlin, 1999.
- [4] G. Gierz, et al. Continuous Lattices and Domains. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [5] J. Goubault-Larrecq. Non-Hausdorff Topology and Domain Theory. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [6] L. K. Guo, Q. G. Li. The categorical equivalence between algebraic domains and F-augmented closure spaces. *Order*, 32(1)(2015) 101-116.
- [7] L. K. Guo, Q. G. Li, et al. Representation of algebraic domains by formal association rule systems. *Math. Struct. in Comp. Science*, 27 (2017) 470-490.
- [8] L. K. Guo, Q. G. Li, L. J. Yao. Locally complete consistent F-augmented contexts: A category-theoretic representation of algebraic L-domains. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 249 (2018) 53-63.
- [9] L. K. Guo, Q. G. Li, G. Q. Zhang. A representation of continuous domains via relationally approximable concepts in a generalized framework of formal concept analysis. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 114 (2019) 29-43.
- [10] Q. Y. He, L. S. Xu. Weak algebraic information systems and a new equivalent category of DOM of domains. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 763(2019) 1-19.
- [11] A. Jung. Cartesian closed categories of domains, volume 66 of CWI Tracts. Centrum voor Wiskunde en Informatica, Amsterdam, 1989.
- [12] A. Jung. The classification of continuous domains. In *Proceedings of Fifth Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, 35-40. IEEE Computer Society Press, 1990.
- [13] A. Jung. Cartesian closed categories of algebraic cpos. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 70(1990) 233-250.
- [14] J. Järvinen. Lattice theory for rough sets. *Transactions on Rough Sets VI, LNCS 4374*, 400-498, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg 2007.
- [15] G. L. Liu, W. Zhu. The algebraic structures of generalized rough set theory. *Information Sciences*, 178 (2008) 4105-4113.
- [16] Q. G. Li, L. C. Wang, L. J. Yao. A representation of continuous lattices based on closure spaces. *Quaestiones Mathematicae*, 44(11)(2021), 1513-1528.

- [17] Y. B. Lei., M. K. Luo. Rough concept lattices and domains. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 159 (2009) 333-340.
- [18] Z. Pawlak. Rough sets. *International Journal of Computer and Information Sciences*, 11(1982) 341-356.
- [19] D. S. Scott, Continuous lattices, *Topos, Algebraic Geometry and Logic*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 274, 97-136, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.
- [20] D. Spreen, L. S. Xu, X. X. Mao. Information systems revisited—the general continuous case. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 405 (2008) 176-187.
- [21] G. J. Wu, L. S. Xu. Representations of domains via CF-approximation spaces. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*. (to appear)
- [22] L. C. Wang, L. K. Guo, Q. G. Li. Continuous domains in formal concept analysis. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 179 (2021) 295-319.
- [23] L. C. Wang, L. K. Guo, Q. G. Li. Representations of continuous domains and continuous L-domains based an closure spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.05049*, 2022.
- [24] L. C. Wang, Q. G. Li. A representation of proper BC domains based on conjunctive sequent calculi. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 30(2020) 1-13.
- [25] L. C. Wang, Q. G. Li. Representations of stably continuous semi-lattices by information systems and abstract bases. *Information Processing Letters*, 165(2021) 1-8.
- [26] L. C. Wang, Q. G. Li, X. N. Zhou. Continuous L-domains in logical form. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 172(2021) 1-24.
- [27] L. C. Wang, X. N. Zhou, Q. G. Li. Information systems for continuous semi-lattices. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 913(2022) 138-150.
- [28] M. Y. Wu, L. K. Guo, Q. G. Li. New representatons of algebraic domains and algebraic L-domains via closure systems. *Semigroup Forum*, 103(2021) 700-712.
- [29] S. W. Wang, L. C. Wang, Q. G. Li. A representation of FS-domains by formal concept anlysis. *Bull. Malays. Maths. Sci. Soc.*, 45(2022) 483-499.
- [30] L. S. Xu, X. X. Mao. When do abstract bases generate continuous lattices and L-domains. *Algebra Universalis*, 58(2008) 95–104.
- [31] L. S. Xu, and X. X. Mao. Formal topological characterizations of various continuous domains. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 56(2008) 444-452.
- [32] L. S. Xu, X. X. Mao. Various constructions of continuous information systems. *Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 212(2008) 299-311.
- [33] L. J. Yao, Q. G. Li. Representation of FS-domains based on closure spaces. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 345(2019) 271-279.

- [34] L. J. Yao, Q. G. Li. Representation of BF-domains by BF-closure spaces. *Mathematica Slovaca*, 71(3)(2021) 565-572.
- [35] L. Y. Yang, L. S. Xu. Algebraic aspects of generalized approximation spaces. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 51(2009) 151-161.
- [36] L. Y. Yang, L. S. Xu. Topological properties of generalized approximation spaces. *Information Sciences*, 181(2011) 3570-3580.
- [37] Y. Y. Yao. Neighborhood systems and approximate retrieval. *Information Sciences* 176(2006) 3431-3452.
- [38] Z. W. Zhou, Q. G. Li, W. K. Ho. Domains via approximation operators. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 14(2018) 1-17.