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## I.Introduction

- Fuzzy set (L. Zadeh, 1965): a useful method study in the problems of imprecision and uncertainty.
We denote $\left(A, \mu_{A}(x)\right)$ is a fuzzy set A on universe set $U$.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mu: U \rightarrow[0,1] \\
u \mapsto \mu_{A}(u)
\end{gathered}
$$

- Intuitionistic set (Atanassov, 1986): $\left(A, \mu_{A}(u), \gamma_{A}(u)\right)$ where $\mu_{A}$ is a membership, $\gamma_{A}$ is a non-membership of A and

$$
\mu_{A}(u)+\gamma_{A}(u) \leq 1, \forall u \in U
$$

## I. Introduction

- Neutrosophic set (NS) (F. Smarandache, 1999): $\left(A, \mu_{A}(u), \eta_{A}(u), \gamma_{A}(u)\right)$ where $\mu_{A}(u)$ is a degree of truth (T), $\eta_{A}(u)$ is a degree of indeterminacy (I) and $\gamma_{A}(u)$ is a degree of falsity (F) statisfy $0 \leq \mu_{A}(u), \eta_{A}(u), \gamma_{A}(u) \leq 1$.
- A tandard neutrosophic set (SNS) (Picture fuzzy set) (B.C. Cuong, 2013): $\left(A, \mu_{A}(u), \eta_{A}(u), \gamma_{A}(u)\right)$ in which $0 \leq \mu_{A}(u)+\eta_{A}(u)+\gamma_{A}(u) \leq 1$.
The family of all standard neutrosophic set in $U$ is denoted by PFS(U)
- Neutrosophic set and standard neutrosophic set have many application, see [7],[8],...


## I. Introduction

- An information system (IS) is any organized system for the collection, organization, storage and communication of information.
- Rough set (Z. Pawlak, 1980s): a usefully mathematical tool for data mining, especially for information systems.
- A standard neutrosophic information system (SNIS) is an information system in which have using standard neutrosophic values, such as voting information systems,...
- Rough standard neutrosophic set (RSNS) is a usefully mathematical tool for SNIS,...


## II. Basic notions of standard neutrosophic

## and rough set

Definition 2. (Lattice $\left(\mathrm{D}^{*}, \leq_{\mathrm{D}^{*}}\right)$ ). Let
$\mathrm{D}^{*}=\left\{\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}, \mathrm{x}_{2}, x_{3}\right) \in[0,1]^{3}: \mathrm{x}_{1}+\mathrm{x}_{2}+\mathrm{x}_{3} \leq 1\right\}$.
We define a relation $\leq_{D^{*}}$ on $D^{*}$ as follows: $\forall\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}, \mathrm{x}_{2}, \mathrm{x}_{3}\right),\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{2}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{3}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{D}^{*}$ then
$\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}, \mathrm{x}_{2}, \mathrm{x}_{3}\right) \leq_{\mathrm{D}^{*}}\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{2}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{3}^{\prime}\right)$ iff (or $\quad \mathrm{x}_{1}<\mathrm{x}_{1}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{3} \geq$ $\left.\mathrm{x}_{3}^{\prime}\right)$ or $\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}=\mathrm{x}_{1}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{3}>x_{3}^{\prime}\right)$ or $\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}=\mathrm{x}_{1}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{3}=x_{3}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{2} \leq\right.$ $\left.\mathrm{x}_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ ) and $\quad\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}, \mathrm{x}_{2}, \mathrm{x}_{3}\right)=_{D}^{*}\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{2}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{3}^{\prime}\right) \Leftrightarrow$
$\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}=\mathrm{x}_{1}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{2}=\mathrm{x}_{2}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{3}=\mathrm{x}_{3}^{\prime}\right)$.
We put $x_{4}=1-\left(x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{3}\right)$

## II. Basic notions of standard neutrosophic and rough set

Previous surveys of voters in the US presidential election of 2017. Many people believe that Mrs Clinton will win. But, when the election results were announced, Mr Trumpt win. Those who carried out the survey has no statistical omission to those who have not been surveyed or comments about the survey. These people in the elections could actually participate very strong decision to actually vote results. It is $x_{4}=1-\left(x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{3}\right)$, where $\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}, \mathrm{x}_{2}, x_{3}\right) \in D^{*}$

## II. Basic notions of standard neutrosophic

## and rough set

- Standard neutrosophic set (SNS) $\left(A, \mu_{A}(u), \eta_{A}(u), \gamma_{A}(u)\right)$ in which

$$
0 \leq \mu_{A}(u)+\eta_{A}(u)+\gamma_{A}(u) \leq 1 .
$$

- Level set of SNS: $(\alpha, \beta, \theta)$-level of a SNS $A$ defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{\beta}^{\alpha, \theta} & =\left\{x \in U \mid\left(\mu_{A}(x), \eta_{A}(x), \gamma_{A}(x)\right)\right. \\
& \geq(\alpha, \beta, \theta)\}
\end{aligned}
$$

## II. Basic notions of standard neutrosophic and rough set

- Let $U$ be a nonempty universe of discourse. A subset $R \in P(U \times U)$ is referred to as a (crisp) binary relation on $U$.
- Denote $R_{s}(x)=\{y \in U \mid(x, y) \in R\}, x \in U$.
- Rough set: Let ( $\mathrm{U}, \mathrm{R}$ ) be a crisp approximation space. For each crisp set $A \subseteq U$, we define the upper and lower approximations of $A$ (w.r.t) ( $U, R$ ) denoted by $\bar{R}(A)$ and $\underline{R}(A)$, respectively, are defined as follows

$$
\begin{gathered}
\overline{\mathrm{R}}(\mathrm{~A})=\left\{\mathrm{x} \in \mathrm{U}: \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{x}) \cap \mathrm{A} \neq \emptyset\right\} \\
\underline{R}(A)=\left\{x \in U: R_{s}(x) \subseteq A\right\}
\end{gathered}
$$

## III. Rough standard neutrosophic set

- RSNS: Let ( $\mathrm{U}, \mathrm{R}$ ) be a crisp approximation space. For $\mathrm{A} \in$ PFS(U), the upper and lower approximations of A (w.r.t) (U, R) denoted by $\overline{\mathrm{RP}}(\mathrm{A})$ and $\underline{\mathrm{RP}}(\mathrm{A})$, respectively, are defined as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \overline{\mathrm{RP}}(\mathrm{~A})=\left\{\left(\mathrm{x}, \mu_{\overline{\mathrm{RP}}(\mathrm{~A})}(\mathrm{x}), \eta_{\overline{\mathrm{RP}}(\mathrm{~A})}(\mathrm{x}), \gamma_{\overline{\mathrm{RP}}(\mathrm{~A})}(\mathrm{x})\right) \mid \mathrm{x} \in \mathrm{U}\right\} \\
& \quad \underline{\mathrm{RP}}(\mathrm{~A})=\left\{\left(\mathrm{x}, \mu_{\underline{\mathrm{RP}}(\mathrm{~A})}(\mathrm{x}), \eta_{\underline{\mathrm{RP}}(\mathrm{~A})}(\mathrm{x}), \gamma_{\underline{\mathrm{RP}}(\mathrm{~A})}(\mathrm{x})\right) \mid \mathrm{x} \in \mathrm{U}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mu_{\overline{\operatorname{RP}}(\mathrm{A})}(\mathrm{x})=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{x})} \mu_{\mathrm{A}}(\mathrm{y}), \gamma_{\overline{\operatorname{RP}}(\mathrm{A})}(\mathrm{x})=\Lambda_{\mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{x})} \gamma_{\mathrm{A}}(\mathrm{y}), \\
& \eta_{\overline{\mathrm{RP}}(\mathrm{~A})}(\mathrm{x})=\Lambda_{\mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{x})} \eta_{\mathrm{A}}(\mathrm{y}),
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mu_{\underline{R P}(A)}(x)=\Lambda_{y \in R_{s}(x)} \mu_{A}(y), \quad \gamma_{\underline{R P}(A)}(x)=V_{y \in R_{s}(x)} \gamma_{A}(y), \\
& \eta_{\underline{R P}(A)}(x)=\Lambda_{y \in R_{s}(x)} \eta_{A}(y)
\end{aligned}
$$

- Some properties of RSNS are studied in full paper.


## IV. The standard neutrosophic information systems

- Information systems (IS) Let $(U, A, F, D, G)$ be a information system. Here $U$ is the (nonempty) set of objects, i.e., $U=\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots, u_{n}\right\}$, $A=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{m}\right\}$ is the conditional attribute set, and $F$ is the relation set of $U$ and $A$, i.e., $F=\left\{f_{j}: U \rightarrow V_{j}, j=\right.$ $1,2, \ldots, m\}$ where $V_{j}$ is the domain of the attribute $a_{j}$ $(j=1,2, \ldots, m) ; D=\left\{d_{1}, d_{2}, \ldots, d_{p}\right\}$ is the decision attribute set; G is the relation set of $U$ and $D$.
- The $(U, A, F)$ is called a classical information system.
- Relation $R_{B}=I N D(B)($ where $B \subset A)$, as follows, $\forall x, y \in U:$
$x \operatorname{IND}(B) y \Leftrightarrow f_{j}(x)=f_{j}(y)$ for all $j \in\left\{j: a_{j} \in B\right\}$.


## IV. The standard neutrosophic <br> information systems

- SNIS: Let $(U, A, F, D, G)$ be the information system. If $D=\left\{D_{k} \mid k=1,2, \ldots, q\right\}$ where $D_{k}$ is a standard neutrosophic subset of $U$ and G is the relation set of $U$ and $D$, then ( $U, A, F, D, G$ ) is called a standard neutrosophic information system.
- Example: A SNIS (see Tabble 1) $U=\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots, u_{10}\right\}$, condition attribute set is $A=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}\right\}$ and the decision attribute set is $D=\left\{D_{1}, D_{2}, D_{3}\right\}$, where $D_{k}(k=1,2,3)$ is a standarf neutrosophic subset of $U$.


## IV. The standard neutrosophic information systems (SNIS)

Table 1: A standard neutrosophic information system

| U | $a_{1}$ | $a_{2}$ | $a_{3}$ | $D_{1}$ | $D_{2}$ | $D_{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $u_{1}$ | 3 | 2 | 1 | $(0.2,0.5,0.3)$ | $(0.15,0.2,0.6)$ | $(0.4,0.5,0.05)$ |
| $u_{2}$ | 1 | 3 | 2 | $(0.3,0.5,0.1)$ | $(0.3,0.3,0.3)$ | $(0.35,0.4,0.1)$ |
| $u_{3}$ | 3 | 2 | 1 | $(0.6,0.4,0)$ | $(0.3,0.6,0.05)$ | $(0.1,0.4,0.45)$ |
| $u_{4}$ | 3 | 3 | 1 | $(0.15,0.7,0.1)$ | $(0.1,0.8,0.05)$ | $(0.2,0.3,0.4)$ |
| $u_{5}$ | 2 | 2 | 4 | $(0.05,0.7,0.2)$ | $(0.2,0.3,0.4)$ | $(0.05,0.5,0.4)$ |
| $u_{6}$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | $(0.1,0.5,0.3)$ | $(0.2,0.4,0.3)$ | $(1,0,0)$ |
| $u_{7}$ | 1 | 3 | 2 | $(0.25,0.4,0.3)$ | $(1,0,0)$ | $(0.3,0.4,0.3)$ |
| $u_{8}$ | 2 | 2 | 4 | $(0.1,0.2,0.6)$ | $(0.25,0.4,0.3)$ | $(0.4,0.6,0)$ |
| $u_{9}$ | 3 | 2 | 1 | $(0.45,0.45,0.1)$ | $(0.25,0.3,0.4)$ | $(0.2,0.3,0.5)$ |
| $u_{10}$ | 1 | 3 | 2 | $(0.05,0.9,0.05)$ | $(0.4,0.3,0.2)$ | $(0.05,0.2,0.7)$ |

## V. The knowledge discovery in SNIS

- Let $(U, A, F, D, G)$ be the NSIS and $B \subseteq A$, we denote $\underline{R P_{B}}\left(D_{j}\right)$ is the lower rough SN approximation of $D_{j} \in P F S(U)$ on approximation space $\left(U, R_{B}\right)$.
- Theorem 5: Let $(U, A, F, D, G)$ be the SNIS and $B \subseteq A$. If

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { for any } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\left(\mu_{D_{i}}(x), \eta_{D_{i}}(x), \gamma_{D_{i}}(x)\right) \geq(\alpha(x), \theta(x), \beta(x))= \\
\underline{R P_{B}\left(D_{i}\right)(x)>\underline{R P_{B}}\left(D_{j}\right)(x)(i \neq j),}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
x \in U:
$$

then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {[x]_{B} \cap\left(\sim D_{j}\right)_{\alpha(x)}^{\beta(x), 0} \neq \emptyset \quad \text { and }} \\
& {[\mathrm{x}]_{\mathrm{B}} \subseteq\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)_{\beta(\mathrm{x})}^{\alpha(\mathrm{x}), \theta(\mathrm{x})} \text { where }(\alpha(x), \theta(x), \beta(x)) \in D^{*} .}
\end{aligned}
$$

## V. The knowledge discovery in SNIS

- Let $(U, A, F, D, G)$ be a SNIS, $R_{A}=\operatorname{IND}(A)$. The universe is divided by $R_{A}$ as following: $U / R_{A}=\left\{X_{1}, X_{2} \ldots, X_{k}\right\}$. Then the approximation of the SN decision denoted as, for all $i=1,2, \ldots, k$
$R P_{A}\left(D\left(X_{i}\right)\right)=$

$$
\left(\underline{R P_{A}}\left(D_{1}\left(X_{i}\right)\right), \underline{R P_{A}}\left(D_{2}\left(X_{i}\right)\right), \ldots, \underline{R P}_{A}\left(D_{q}\left(X_{i}\right)\right)\right)
$$

- Example 3. The SNIS in Table 1. The equivalent classes

$$
\begin{gathered}
U / R_{A}=\left\{X_{1}=\left\{u_{1}, u_{3}, u_{9}\right\}, X_{2}=\left\{u_{2}, u_{7}, u_{10}\right\},\right. \\
\left.X_{3}=\left\{u_{4}\right\}, X_{4}=\left\{u_{5}, u_{8}\right\}, X_{5}=\left\{u_{6}\right\}\right\}
\end{gathered}
$$

The approximation of the standard neutrosophic decision is in Table 2.

## V. The knowledge discovery in SNIS

| $U / R_{A}$ | $\underline{R P_{A}}\left(D_{1}\left(X_{i}\right)\right)$ | $\underline{R P_{A}}\left(D_{2}\left(X_{i}\right)\right)$ | $\underline{R P_{A}\left(D_{3}\left(X_{i}\right)\right)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $X_{1}$ | $(0.2,0.5,0)$ | $(0.15,0.6,0,05)$ | $(0.1,0.5,0.05)$ |
| $X_{2}$ | $(0.05,0.9,0.05)$ | $(0.3,0.3,0.1)$ | $(0.05,0.4,0.1)$ |
| $X_{3}$ | $(0.15,0.7,0.1)$ | $(0.1,0.8,0.05)$ | $(0.2,0.3,0.4)$ |
| $X_{4}$ | $(0.05,0.7,0.2)$ | $(0.2,0.4,0.3)$ | $(0.05,0.6,0)$ |
| $X_{5}$ | $(0.1,0.5,0.3)$ | $(0.2,0.4,0.3)$ | $(1,0,0)$ |

Table 2: $\quad$ The approximation of the Standard neutrosophic decision

## VI. The knowledge reduction and extension of SNIS

Definition 7. Let $(U, A, F)$ be the classical IS and $B \subseteq A$.
(i) $\quad B$ is called the SN reduction of $(U, A, F)$, if $B$ is the minimum set which satisfies the following relations: $\forall X \in P F S(U), x \in U$,

$$
\underline{R P_{A}}(X)=\underline{R P_{B}}(X), \quad \overline{R P}_{A}(X)=\overline{R P}_{B}(X)
$$

(ii) $B$ is called the SN lower approximation reduction of $(U, A, F)$, if $B$ is the minimum set which satisfies the following relations: $\forall X \in \operatorname{PFS}(U), x \in U$ :

$$
\underline{R P}_{A}(X)=\underline{R} P_{B}(X)
$$

(iii) $B$ is called the SN upper approximation reduction of $(U, A, F)$, if $B$ is the minimum set which satisfies the following relations: $\forall X \in P F S(U), x \in U \overline{R P}_{A}(X)=\overline{R P}_{B}(X)$
Where $\underline{R P_{A}}(X), \underline{R P_{B}}(X), \overline{R P}_{A}(X), \overline{R P}_{B}(X)$ are SN lower and SN upper approximation sets of SN set $X \in P F S(U)$ based on $R_{A}, R_{B}$, respectively

## V. The knowledge reduction and

## extension of SNIS

- Definition 8. Let $(U, A, F, D, G)$ be the SNIS $D_{i j}$

$$
=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
\left\{a_{l} \in A: f_{l}\left(X_{i}\right) \neq f_{l}\left(X_{j}\right)\right\} ; & g_{X_{i}}\left(D_{k}\right) \neq g_{X_{j}}\left(D_{k}\right) \\
A & ; g_{X_{i}}\left(D_{k}\right)=g_{X_{j}}\left(D_{k}\right)
\end{array}\right.
$$

is called the discernibility matrix of $(U, A, F, D, G)$ (where $g_{X_{i}}\left(D_{k}\right)$ is the maximum of $\underline{R P_{A}}\left(D\left(X_{i}\right)\right)$ obtained at $D_{k}$, i.e., $g_{X_{i}}\left(D_{k}\right)=$ $R P_{A}\left(D_{k}\left(X_{i}\right)\right)=$ $\max \left\{\underline{R P_{A}}\left(D_{t}\left(X_{i}\right)\right), t=1,2, \ldots, q\right\}$.

## VI. The knowledge reduction and <br> extension of SNIS

Definition 9. Let $(U, A, F, D, G)$ be the standard neutrosophic information system, for any $B \subseteq$ $A$, if the following relations holds, for any $x \in U$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underline{R P_{B}}\left(D_{i}\right)(x)>\underline{R P_{B}}\left(D_{j}\right)(x) \Leftrightarrow \underline{R P}_{A}\left(D_{i}\right)(x) \\
& \quad>\underline{R P_{A}}\left(D_{j}\right)(x)(i \neq j)
\end{aligned}
$$

then $B$ is called the consistent set of $A$.
Theorem 6. Let ( $U, A, F, D, G$ ) be the standard neutrosophic information system. If there exists a subset $B \subseteq A$ such that $B \cap D_{i j} \neq \emptyset$, then $B$ is the consistent set of $A$.

## VI. The knowledge reduction and extension of SNIS

Definition 11. Let $(U, A, F)$ be the classical IS and $A \subseteq B$.
(i) $B$ is called the SN extension of $(U, A, F)$, if $B$ satisfies the following relations: $\forall X \in P F S(U), x \in U$

$$
\underline{R P_{A}}(X)=\underline{R P_{B}}(X), \quad \overline{R P}_{A}(X)=\overline{R P}_{B}(X)
$$

(ii) $B$ is called the SN lower approximation extension of $(U, A, F)$, if $B$ satisfies the following relations: $\forall X \in P F S(U), x \in U$,

$$
\underline{R P_{A}}(X)=\underline{R} P_{B}(X),
$$

(iii) $B$ is called the SN upper approximation extension of $(U, A, F)$, if $B$ satisfies the following relations: for any $X \in P F S(U), x \in U$

$$
\overline{R P}_{A}(X)=\overline{R P}_{B}(X)
$$

Theorem 8. Let $(U, A, F)$ be the classical IS, for any hyper set $B$, such that $A \subseteq B$, if $A$ is the SN reduction of the classical IS $(U, B, F)$, then ( $U, B, F$ ) is the SN extension of $(U, A, F)$, but not conversely necessary.

Example 4. In the approximation of the SN decision in Table 1, Table 2. Let $B=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}\right\}$, then we obtained the family of all equivalent classes of $U$ based on the equivalent relation $R_{B}=I N D(B)$ as follows

$$
U / R_{B}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
X_{1}=\left\{u_{1}, u_{3}, u_{9}\right\}, X_{2}=\left\{u_{2}, u_{7}, u_{10}\right\}, \\
X_{3}=\left\{u_{4}\right\}, X_{4}=\left\{u_{5}, u_{8}\right\}, X_{5}=\left\{u_{6}\right\}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

We can get the approximation value given in Table 3. It is samed to the approximation value given in Table 2. It mean $B=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}\right\}$ is a reduction of $(U, A, F)$
The discernibility matrix of the standard neutrosophic information system ( $U, A, F, D, G$ ) will be presented in Table 4.

# V. The knowledge reduction and extension of SNIS 

| $U / R_{B}$ | $\underline{R P_{A}}\left(D_{1}\left(X_{i}\right)\right)$ | $\underline{R P_{A}}\left(D_{2}\left(X_{i}\right)\right)$ | $\underline{R P_{A}}\left(D_{3}\left(X_{i}\right)\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $X_{1}$ | $(0.2,0.5,0)$ | $(0.15,0.6,0,05)$ | $(0.1,0.5,0.05)$ |
| $X_{2}$ | $(0.05,0.9,0.05)$ | $(0.3,0.3,0.1)$ | $(0.05,0.4,0.1)$ |
| $X_{3}$ | $(0.15,0.7,0.1)$ | $(0.1,0.8,0.05)$ | $(0.2,0.3,0.4)$ |
| $X_{4}$ | $(0.05,0.7,0.2)$ | $(0.2,0.4,0.3)$ | $(0.05,0.6,0)$ |
| $X_{5}$ | $(0.1,0.5,0.3)$ | $(0.2,0.4,0.3)$ | $(1,0,0)$ |

Table 3: The approximation of the standard neutrosophic decision

## VI. The knowledge reduction and extension of SNIS

| $U / R_{B}$ | $X_{1}$ | $X_{2}$ | $X_{3}$ | $X_{4}$ | $X_{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $X_{1}$ | $A$ |  |  |  |  |
| $X_{2}$ | $A$ | $A$ |  |  |  |
| $X_{3}$ | $\left\{a_{2}\right\}$ | $\left\{a_{1}, a_{3}\right\}$ | $A$ |  |  |
| $X_{4}$ | $\left\{a_{1}, a_{3}\right\}$ | $A$ | $A$ | $A$ |  |
| $X_{5}$ | $\left\{a_{1}, a_{3}\right\}$ | $A$ | $A$ | $\left\{a_{2}\right\}$ | $A$ |

Table 4: The discernibility matrix of the standard neutrosophic information system

## Conclusion

- We introduce the concept of standard neutrosophic information system
- We study the knowledge discovery of standard neutrosophic information system based on rough standard neutrosophic sets
- knowledge reduction and extension of the standard neutrosophic information system


## THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!



## Reference

[1] Z. Pawlak, Rough sets, International Journal of Computer and Information Sciences, vol. 11, no.5 , pp $341-356$, 1982.
[2] L. A. Zadeh, Fuzzy Sets, Information and Control, Vol. 8, No. 3 (1965), p 338-353.
[3] K. Atanassov, Intuitionistic fuzzy sets, Fuzzy set and systems, vol.20, pp.87-96, 1986.
[4] B.C. Cuong, V. Kreinovick, Picture fuzzy sets - a new concept for computational intelligence problems, in the proceedings of the third world congress on information and communication technologies WICT'2013, Hanoi, Vietnam, December 15-18, pp 1-6, 2013.
[5] B.C. Cuong, Picture Fuzzy Sets, Journal of Computer Science and Cybernetics, Vol.30, n.4, 2014, 409-420.
[6] B.C. Cuong, P.H.Phong and F. Smarandache, Standard Neutrosophic Soft Theory: Some First Results, Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, vol.12, 2016, pp.80-91.
[7] L.H. Son, DPFCM: A novel distributed picture fuzzy clustering method on picture fuzzy sets, Expert systems with applications 42, pp 51-66, 2015.
[8] P.H. Thong and L.H.Son, Picture Fuzzy Clustering : A New Computational Intelligence Method, Soft Computing, v. 20 (9) 3544-3562, 2016.

## Reference

[9] D. Dubois, H. Prade, Rough fuzzy sets and fuzzy rough sets, International journal of general systems, Vol. 17, p 191209, 1990.
[10] Y.Y. Yao, Combination of rough and fuzzy sets based on $\alpha$ - level sets, Rough sets and Data mining: analysis for imprecise data, Kluwer Academic Publisher, Boston, p 301 - 321, 1997.
[11] W. Z. Wu, J. S. Mi, W. X. Zhang, Generalized fuzzy rough sets, Information Sciences 151, p. 263-282, 2003.
[12] W. Z. Wu, Y. H. Xu, On fuzzy topological structures of rough fuzzy sets, Transactions on rough sets XVI, LNCS 7736, Springer - Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, p 125-143, 2013.
[13] Y.H. Xu, W.Z. Wu, Intuitionistic fuzzy topologies in crisp approximation spaces, RSKT 2012, LNAI 7414, © Springer - Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, pp 496-503, 2012.
[14] B. Davvaz, M. Jafarzadeh, Rough intuitionistic fuzzy information systems, Fuzzy information and Engineering, vol.4, pp 445-458, 2013.
[15] N.X. Thao, N.V. Dinh, Rough picture fuzzy set and picture fuzzy topologies, Science computer and Cybernetics, Vol 31, No 3 (2015), pp 245-254.
[16] B. Sun, Z. Gong, Rough fuzzy set in generalized approximation space, Fifth Int. Conf. on Fuzzy Systems and Knowledge Discovery, IEEE computer society 2008, pp 416-420.

## Reference

[17] F. Smarandache, A unifying field in logics. Neutrosophy: Neutrosophic probability, set and logic, American Research Press, Rehoboth, 1998, 1999.
[18] H. Wang, F. Smarandache, Y.Q. Zhang et al., Interval neutrosophic sets and logic: Theory and applications in computing, Hexis, Phoenix, AZ 2005.
[19] H. Wang, F. Smarandache, Y.Q. Zhang, et al., Single valued neutrosophic sets, Multispace and Multistructure 4 (2010), 410-413.
[20] J. Ye, A multicriteria decision-making method using aggregation operators for simplified neutrosophic sets, Journal of Intelligent \& Fuzzy Systems 26 (2014) 2459-2466.
[21] P. Majumdar, Neutrosophic sets and its applications to decision making, Computation intelligentce for big data analysis (2015), V.19, pp 97-115.
[22] J. Peng, J. Q. Wang, J. Wang, H. Zhang, X. Chen, Simplified neutrosophic sets and their applications in multi-criteria group decision-making problems, International journal of systems science (2016), V.47, issue 10, pp 2342-2358.
[23] Florentin Smarandache, Degrees of Membership $>1$ and $<0$ of the Elements With Respect to a Neutrosophic OffSet, Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, vol. 12, 2016, pp. 3-8.
[24] Florentin Smarandache, Degree of Dependence and Independence of the (Sub)Components of Fuzzy Set and Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, vol. 11, 2016, pp. 95-97;
http://fs.gallup.unm.edu/NSS/DegreeOfDependenceAndIndependence.pdf.

