

Higher Bi-derivations of algebraic lattice

Enaam Farhan¹, Mazen Omran Karim² and Abdelkarim Boua³

Communicated by Mozibur Rahman Mozumder

MSC 2010 Classifications: 06-XX, 16W25.

Keywords and phrases: Order, lattices, higher derivations.

Abstract Lattices are ubiquitous in mathematics and computer science, with applications in fields as diverse as order theory, algebra, logic, and computer programming. They provide a formal framework for reasoning about relations and structures using special maps, making them an essential tool in both theoretical and applied studies. This paper introduces the concept of higher bi-derivation as a generalization of higher derivation on a lattice, and it explores some essential properties for higher bi-derivation.

1 Introduction

The history of the lattice spans several disciplines, including for example mathematics and computer science. Here's a brief overview:

The notion of lattices in mathematics has its origins in antiquity, with early applications found in geometry and crystallography. In geometry, a lattice is defined as a regular arrangement of points or objects in space, often forming a repeating pattern. In crystallography, lattices signify the regular three-dimensional configuration of atoms or molecules within a crystal structure.

Lattices received significant attention in number theory, particularly through the work of Gauss and his investigations of quadratic forms. Gauss introduced the concept of Gaussian integers, which form a two-dimensional lattice in the complex plane. Later mathematicians extended these ideas to higher dimensions, leading to the study of lattices in n -dimensional Euclidean space.

Lattices have also found applications in the domain of computer science, particularly in the study of cryptography and computational complexity theory. In the field of cryptography, lattice-based cryptography has emerged as a promising alternative to traditional cryptographic systems based on number theory problems such as factoring and discrete logarithms. Lattice-based cryptography provides security based on the difficulty of certain lattice problems, such as the shortest vector problem (SVP) and the closest vector problem (CVP).

The triple (L, \wedge, \vee) is a nonempty set L endowed with two operations \wedge and \vee is called a lattice if satisfies the following conditions: (i) $x \wedge x = x$, $x \vee x = x$, (ii) $x \wedge y = y \wedge x$, $x \vee y = y \vee x$, (iii) $(x \wedge y) \wedge z = x \wedge (y \wedge z)$, $(x \vee y) \vee z = x \vee (y \vee z)$ and (iv) $(x \wedge y) \vee x = x$, $(x \vee y) \wedge x = x$ for all $x, y, z \in L$. When the binary relation " \leq " which is defined by: $x \leq y$ if and only if $x \wedge y = x$ and $x \vee y = y$. Then (L, \wedge, \vee, \leq) is called a poset and for any $x, y \in L$, $x \wedge y$ is the g. l. b of x, y and $x \vee y$ is the l. u. b. of x, y [[8], Birkhoff 1940].

Lattices play an important role in many areas, including information retrieval (see [9], Carpineto et al. 1996), information access control (see [17], Sandhu 1996), cryptanalysis (see [14], Durfee 2002), and information theory (see [7], Bell 2003). More recently, extensive research has been conducted on the properties of lattices with significant contributions from numerous scholars including (see [8], Birkhoff 1940, [1], Abbott 1969, [5], Balbes and Dwinger 1974, [9], Carpineto and Romano 1996, [14], Durfee 2002, [7], Bell 2003, [13], Degang et al. 2006, [16], and Honda and Grabisch 2006). In 1975, the notion of lattice derivation was introduced and developed by Szász (see reference [18]):

Let L be a lattice and $d : L \rightarrow L$ be a function, then d is said to be a derivation on L if $d(x \wedge y) = (x \wedge d(y)) \vee (d(x) \wedge y)$, he established the main properties of lattice derivations. Until then, many researchers had studied derivations and generalizations of derivations on a lattice and discussed some related properties ([15], Ferrari 2001, [12], Çeven and Öztürk 2008, [19], Xin et al. 2008, [10], Çeven 2009, [2], Alshehri 2010, [3], Aşci et al. 2011, Chaudhry et al. 2011, [4], Aşci et al. 2013, [6], Balogun 2014, [11], Yilmaz Çeven, 2017). As a generalization of derivation on a lattice, the notion of higher derivation of a lattice is first introduced by Yilmaz Çeven in 2017, he investigates some related properties for the higher derivation on a lattice:

Let L be a lattice, $I = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, t\}$ or $I = \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ (with $t \rightarrow \infty$ in this case) and $D = \{d_n\}_{n \in I}$ be a family of mappings from L into L such that $d_0 = id_L$. D is said to be a higher derivation of length t on L if for every $n \in I$ and $x, y, z, w \in L$, we have: $d_n(x \wedge y) = \bigvee_{n=i+j} (d_i(x) \wedge d_j(y))$ Motivated by the above studies, this paper introduces the notion of higher bi-derivations of a lattice and explores some interesting results for higher bi-derivations on a lattice.

2 Preliminaries

Definition 2.1. Let L be a lattice, $I = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, t\}$ or $I = \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ (with $t \rightarrow \infty$ in this case) and $D = \{d_n\}_{n \in I}$ be a family of mappings from $L \times L$ into L such that $d_0(x, y) = x \wedge y$. D is said to be a higher bi-derivation of length t on L if for every $n \in I$ and $x, y, z, w \in L$

$$d_n(x \wedge y, z \wedge w) = \bigvee_{n=i+j} (d_i(x, z) \wedge d_j(y, w)) \tag{2.1}$$

From (2.1), we can get the following result

$$d_n(x \wedge y, z \wedge w) = (d_0(x, z) \wedge d_n(y, w)) \vee (d_1(x, z) \wedge d_{n-1}(y, w)) \vee \dots \vee (d_n(x, z) \wedge d_0(y, w))$$

it is obvious that

$$d_i(x, z) \wedge d_j(y, w) \leq d_n(x \wedge y, z \wedge w), \text{ where } n = i + j, \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(x, y) &= d_n(x \wedge x, y \wedge y) \\ &= (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_n(x, y)) \vee (d_1(x, y) \wedge d_{n-1}(x, y)) \vee \dots \\ &\quad \vee (d_n(x, y) \wedge d_0(x, y)) \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

If n is an even number, then

$$d_n(x, y) = (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_n(x, y)) \vee (d_1(x, y) \wedge d_{n-1}(x, y)) \vee \dots \vee d_{\frac{n}{2}}(x, y)$$

Therefore,

$$d_{\frac{n}{2}}(x, y) \leq d_n(x, y) \tag{2.4}$$

If n is an odd number, we get

$$d_n(x, y) = (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_n(x, y)) \vee (d_1(x, y) \wedge d_{n-1}(x, y)) \vee \dots \vee (d_{\frac{n-1}{2}}(x, y) \wedge d_{\frac{n+1}{2}}(x, y)). \tag{2.5}$$

Definition 2.2. Let L be a lattice and $D = \{d_n\}_{n \in I}$ be a higher bi-derivation of length t on L . Define $H = \{h_n\}_{n \in I}$ a family of mappings from L into L such that $h_n(x) = d_n(x, x)$, i.e. h_n is the trace of d_n for every $n \in I$, then H is called a trace of D .

For every $n \in I$ and $x, y \in L$, we have $h_0(x) = d_0(x, x) = x$. It follows that $h_0 = Ih_L$ and

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(x \wedge y) &= d_1(x \wedge y, x \wedge y) \\ &= (d_0(x, x) \wedge d_1(y, y)) \vee (d_1(x, x) \wedge d_0(y, y)) \\ &= (h_0(x) \wedge h_1(y)) \vee (h_1(x) \wedge h_0(y)) \\ &= (x \wedge h_1(y)) \vee (h_1(x) \wedge y). \end{aligned}$$

Then, h_1 is a derivation on L

$$\begin{aligned} h_n(x \wedge y) &= d_n(x \wedge y, x \wedge y) \\ &= \bigvee_{n=i+j} (d_i(x, x) \wedge d_j(y, y)) \\ &= \bigvee_{n=i+j} (h_i(x) \wedge h_j(y)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, H is a higher derivation of length t on L .

Example 2.3. Let $L = \{0, a, b, 1\}$ be a lattice with the following figure:



Let $D = \{d_0, d_1, d_2, d_3\}$ be a family of mappings from $L \times L$ into L . We define d_0, d_1, d_2, d_3 in the following table

$L \times L$	d_0	d_1	d_2	d_3
(0, 0)	0	0	0	0
(0, a)	0	0	0	0
(0, b)	0	0	0	0
(0, 1)	0	0	0	0
(a, 0)	0	0	0	0
(a, a)	a	b	b	a
(a, b)	b	b	b	b
(a, 1)	a	0	b	a
(b, 0)	0	0	0	0
(b, a)	b	b	b	b
(b, b)	b	b	b	b
(b, 1)	b	0	b	b
(1, 0)	0	0	0	0
(1, a)	a	0	b	a
(1, b)	b	0	b	b
(1, 1)	1	0	b	a

Then it is easy to see that D is a higher bi-derivation of length 3 on L and H the trace of D is a higher derivation of length 3 on L .

3 Main Results

Theorem 3.1. Let L be a lattice and $D = \{d_n\}_{n \in I}$ be a higher bi-derivation of length t on L , then

- i) $d_1 \leq d_n$,
- ii) $d_n(x, y) \leq d_0(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in L, n \in I$.

Proof. **i)** From (2.5), we get

$$d_1(x, y) = d_0(x, y) \wedge d_1(x, y). \quad (3.1)$$

Which implies $d_1 \leq d_0$. Similarly, from (2.5), we get

$$d_2(x, y) = (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_2(x, y)) \vee d_1(x, y). \quad (3.2)$$

That is $d_1 \leq d_2$.

Now, we assume that $d_1 \leq d_n$ for $n = 3, 4, \dots, k - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} d_k(x, y) &= d_k(x \wedge x, y \wedge y) \\ &= (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_k(x, y)) \vee (d_1(x, y) \wedge d_{k-1}(x, y)) \vee \dots \vee (d_k(x, y) \wedge d_0(x, y)) \\ &= (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_k(x, y)) \vee d_1(x, y) \vee \dots \vee (d_k(x, y) \wedge d_0(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $d_1 \leq d_k$, so $d_1 \leq d_n$ for all $n \in I$.

ii) Using **i)**, we get

$$d_1(x, y) \leq d_0(x, y) \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$d_1(x, y) \leq d_2(x, y) \quad (3.4)$$

From (3.3) and (3.4), we get

$$d_1(x, y) \leq d_0(x, y) \wedge d_2(x, y). \quad (3.5)$$

But,

$$d_2(x, y) = (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_2(x, y)) \vee d_1(x, y) \quad (3.6)$$

From (3.5) and (3.6), we conclude $d_2(x, y) = d_0(x, y) \wedge d_2(x, y)$, so $d_2(x, y) \leq d_0(x, y)$.

Now, assume that $d_n(x, y) \leq d_0(x, y)$ for all $n = 3, 4, \dots, k - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} d_k(x, y) &= (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_k(x, y)) \vee (d_1(x, y) \wedge d_{k-1}(x, y)) \vee \dots \vee (d_k(x, y) \wedge d_0(x, y)) \\ &\leq (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_k(x, y)) \vee d_0(x, y) \\ &= d_0(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $d_k(x, y) \leq d_0(x, y)$, thus $d_n(x, y) \leq d_0(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in L$ and $n \in I$. \square

The following corollary is a direct result of Theorem 3.1(ii).

Corollary 3.2. Let L be a lattice and $D = \{d_n\}_{n \in I}$ be a higher bi-derivation of length t on L , then $d_n(x, y) \leq x$ and $d_n(x, y) \leq y$ for all $x, y \in L$ and $n \in I$.

Theorem 3.3. Let L be a lattice and $D = \{d_n\}_{n \in I}$ be a higher bi-derivation of length t on L , then

(i) If L has a least element 0 , then $d_n(0, x) = d_n(x, 0) = 0$ for all $x \in L$.

(ii) If L has greatest element 1 , then $d_n(1, 1) = 1$ for all $x \in L$, $n \in I$ if and only if $d_n(x, y) = x \wedge y$ for all $x \in L$.

(iii) If $x \wedge y \leq d_n(1, 1)$ for all $x \in L$, then $d_n(x, y) = x \wedge y$ for all $x \in L$.

(iv) If L has the least element 0 and the greatest element 1 , then $d_n(1, 1) = 0$ if and only if $d_n(x, y) = 0$ for all $x \in L$.

Proof. **(i)** By definition of D , we have $d_0(0, x) = 0 \wedge x = 0$ for all $x \in L$ and

$$\begin{aligned} d_1(0, x) &= d_1(0 \wedge 0, x \wedge x) \\ &= (d_0(0, x) \wedge d_1(0, x)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_2(0, x) &= d_2(0 \wedge 0, x \wedge x) \\
 &= (d_0(0, x) \wedge d_2(0, x)) \vee (d_1(0, x) \wedge d_1(0, x)) \\
 &= 0 \vee 0 \\
 &= 0 \text{ for all } x \in L.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, we assume that $d_n(0, x) = 0$ for $n = 3, 4, \dots, k - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_k(0, x) &= d_k(0 \wedge 0, x \wedge x) \\
 &= (d_0(0, x) \wedge d_k(0, x)) \vee (d_1(0, x) \wedge d_{k-1}(0, x)) \vee \dots \vee (d_k(0, x) \wedge d_0(0, x)) \\
 &= 0 \vee 0 \vee \dots \vee 0 \\
 &= 0 \text{ for all } x \in L.
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $d_n(0, x) = 0$ for all $x \in L, n \in I$. Similarly, we can prove $d_n(x, 0) = 0$ for all $x \in L, n \in I$.

(ii) Let $d_n(1, 1) = 1$ for all $n \in I$, by a simple calculation and application of Theorem 3.1(ii), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_n(x, y) &= d_n(x \wedge 1, y \wedge 1) \\
 &= (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_n(1, 1)) \vee (d_1(x, y) \wedge d_{n-1}(1, 1)) \vee \dots \vee (d_n(x, y) \wedge d_0(1, 1)) \\
 &= (d_0(x, y) \wedge 1) \vee (d_1(x, y) \wedge 1) \vee \dots \vee (d_n(x, y) \wedge 1) \\
 &= d_0(x, y) \vee d_1(x, y) \vee \dots \vee d_n(x, y) \\
 &= d_0(x, y) \\
 &= x \wedge y \text{ for all } x, y \in L, n \in I.
 \end{aligned}$$

The converse part is clear.

(iii) We have

$$d_n(x, y) \leq d_0(x, y) = x \wedge y \leq d_n(1, 1) \text{ for all } x, y \in L, n \in I.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_n(x, y) &= d_n(x \wedge 1, y \wedge 1) \\
 &= (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_n(1, 1)) \vee (d_1(x, y) \wedge d_{n-1}(1, 1)) \vee \dots \vee (d_n(x, y) \wedge d_0(1, 1)) \\
 &= x \wedge y \text{ for all } x, y \in L, n \in I.
 \end{aligned}$$

(iv) Let $d_n(1, 1) = 0$ for all $n \in I$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_n(x, y) &= d_n(x \wedge 1, y \wedge 1) \\
 &= (d_0(x, y) \wedge d_n(1, 1)) \vee (d_1(x, y) \wedge d_{n-1}(1, 1)) \vee \dots \vee (d_n(x, y) \wedge d_0(1, 1)) \\
 &= (d_0(x, y) \wedge 0) \vee (d_1(x, y) \wedge 0) \vee \dots \vee (d_n(x, y) \wedge 0) \\
 &= 0 \vee 0 \vee \dots \vee 0 = 0 \text{ for all } x, y \in L, n \in I.
 \end{aligned}$$

The converse part is clear. □

Theorem 3.4. Let L be a lattice and $D = \{d_n\}_{n \in I}$ be a higher bi-derivation of length t on L , then

(i) $d_n(x, z) \wedge d_n(y, w) \leq d_n(x \wedge y, z \wedge w)$ for all $x, y, z, w \in L$ and $n \in I$.

(ii) For $x \leq z$ and $y \leq w$, then

$$d_n(x, y) \leq d_n(z, w) \Leftrightarrow d_n(x \wedge z, y \wedge w) = d_n(x, y) \wedge d_n(z, w) \text{ for all } x, y, z, w \in L, n \in I.$$

(iii) If L is a distributive lattice, for $x \leq z$ and $y \leq w$, then

$$d_n(x, y) \leq d_n(z, w) \Leftrightarrow d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w) = d_n(x, y) \vee d_n(z, w) \text{ for all } x, y, z, w \in L, n \in I.$$

Proof. (i) From (2.2), we get

$$d_0(x, z) \wedge d_n(y, w) \leq d_n(x \wedge y, z \wedge w). \quad (3.7)$$

By Theorem 3.1 (ii), we have $d_n(x, z) \leq d_0(x, z)$, so

$$d_n(x, z) \wedge d_n(y, w) \leq d_0(x, z) \wedge d_n(y, w) \quad (3.8)$$

From (3.7) and (3.8), we conclude

$$d_n(x, z) \wedge d_n(y, w) \leq d_n(x \wedge y, z \wedge w) \text{ for all } x, y, z, w \in L, n \in I.$$

(ii) \Rightarrow) Suppose that, if $x \leq z$ and $y \leq w$, then $d_n(x, y) \leq d_n(z, w)$. Since $x \wedge z \leq x$ and $y \wedge w \leq y$, by hypothesis we find that

$$d_n(x \wedge z, y \wedge w) \leq d_n(x, y) \quad (3.9)$$

Also, $x \wedge z \leq z$ and $y \wedge w \leq w$, so

$$d_n(x \wedge z, y \wedge w) \leq d_n(z, w). \quad (3.10)$$

From (3.9) and (3.10) we arrive at

$$d_n(x \wedge z, y \wedge w) \leq d_n(x, y) \wedge d_n(z, w), \text{ together with the result of (i) we obtain}$$

$$d_n(x \wedge z, y \wedge w) = d_n(x, y) \wedge d_n(z, w) \text{ for all } x, y, z, w \in L \text{ and } n \in I.$$

\Leftarrow) Suppose that $x \leq z, y \leq w$ and

$$d_n(x \wedge z, y \wedge w) = d_n(x, y) \wedge d_n(z, w) \text{ for all } x, y, z, w \in L, n \in I.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(x, y) &= d_n(x \wedge z, y \wedge w) \\ &= d_n(x, y) \wedge d_n(z, w), \end{aligned}$$

which means that $d_n(x, y) \leq d_n(z, w)$.

(iii) \Rightarrow) Suppose that, if $x \leq z$ and $y \leq w$ for all $x, y, z, w \in L, n \in I$, then $d_n(x, y) \leq d_n(z, w)$. Since $x \leq x \vee z, z \leq x \vee z$ and $y \leq y \vee w, w \leq y \vee w$, by hypothesis we obtain

$$d_n(x, y) \leq d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w) \text{ and } d_n(z, w) \leq d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w),$$

so

$$d_n(x, y) \vee d_n(z, w) \leq d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w) \text{ for all } x, y, z, w \in L, n \in I \quad (3.11)$$

On the other hand, by using (2.2) we get

$$d_0(x, y) \wedge d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w) \leq d_n(x \wedge (x \vee z), y \wedge (y \vee w)) = d_n(x, y) \text{ for all } x, y, z, w \in L, n \in I \quad (3.12)$$

and,

$$d_0(z, w) \wedge d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w) \leq d_n(z \wedge (x \vee z), w \wedge (y \vee w)) = d_n(z, w) \text{ for all } x, y, z, w \in L, n \in I \quad (3.13)$$

From (3.12) and (3.13), we obtain

$$(d_0(x, y) \wedge d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w)) \vee (d_0(z, w) \wedge d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w)) \leq d_n(x, y) \vee d_n(z, w). \quad (3.14)$$

Since L is a distributive lattice, (3.14) can be rewritten as

$$((d_0(x, y) \vee d_0(z, w)) \wedge d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w)) \leq d_n(x, y) \vee d_n(z, w). \quad (3.15)$$

From Theorem 3.1 (ii), we get $d_n(x, y) \vee d_n(z, w) \leq d_0(x, y) \vee d_0(z, w)$, and using (3.11) and (3.15), we conclude that

$$d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w) \leq d_n(x, y) \vee d_n(z, w) \text{ for all } x, y, z, w \in L, n \in I \quad (3.16)$$

By (3.11) and (3.16), we get the required result.

\Leftarrow) Suppose that $x \leq z, y \leq w$ and

$$d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w) = d_n(x, y) \vee d_n(z, w) \text{ for all } x, y, z, w \in L, n \in I.$$

Since $x \vee z = z$ and $y \vee w = w$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(z, w) &= d_n(x \vee z, y \vee w) \\ &= d_n(x, y) \vee d_n(z, w), \end{aligned}$$

so $d_n(x, y) \leq d_n(z, w)$ for all $x, y, z, w \in L$ and $n \in I$. \square

Theorem 3.5. Let L be a lattice and $D = \{d_n\}_{n \in I}$ be a higher derivation of length t on L ,

(i) If A be an ideal of L , then $d_n(A \times L) \subseteq A$ for all $n \in I$.

(ii) If $A = \{a \in L : d_n(a, x) = a \text{ for all } x \in L, n \in I\}$, and d_n satisfies the condition for $x \leq z$ and $y \leq w$, then $d_n(x, y) \leq d_n(z, w)$, then A is an ideal of L .

Proof. (i) Let $(a, x) \in A \times L$, we know that $d_n(a, x) \leq a$, but $a \in A$, so $d_n(a, x) \in A$ for all $a \in A, x \in L, n \in I$.

(ii) If $a \in A$ and $x \in L$, then $d_0(a, x) = a$. Since $d_0(a, x) = a \wedge x$, we obtain $a \wedge x = a$ for all $x \in L$, that is, $a \leq x$ for all $x \in L$. Let $x \in L$ and $a \in A$ such that $x \leq a$, then $x = a$, i.e. $x \in A$.

Let $a, b \in A$, then $d_n(a, x) = a$ and $d_n(b, x) = b$, by corollary 3.2, we get $d_n(a \vee b, x) \leq a \vee b$.

We have $a \leq a \vee b$ and $b \leq a \vee b$, so $d_n(a, x) \leq d_n(a \vee b, x)$ and $d_n(b, x) \leq d_n(a \vee b, x)$, it follows that $a \vee b = d_n(a, x) \vee d_n(b, x) \leq d_n(a \vee b, x)$, so $d_n(a \vee b, x) = a \vee b$. Therefore, $a \vee b \in A$, which completes the proof. \square

Acknowledgment: I would like to express my profound gratitude to the editor and reviewer for their efforts and valuable suggestions, which have greatly contributed to improving this work.

References

- [1] J. C. Abbott, Sets, Lattices and Boolean Algebras, Allyn and Bacon, Boston (1969).
- [2] N. O. Alshehri, Generalized Derivations of Lattices, Int. J. Contemp. Math. Sciences, 5 (13) ((2010), 629-640.
- [3] M. Aşci, O. Kecilioglu and S. Ceran, Permuting tri- (f, g) -derivations on lattices, Annals of Fuzzy Mathematics and Informatics 1(2) (2011), 189-196.
- [4] M. Aşci, S. Ceran, Generalized (f, g) -Derivations of Lattices, Mathematical Sciences And Applications E-Notes, 1(2)(2013), 56-62.
- [5] R. Balbes, P. Dwinger, Distributive Lattices, University of Missouri Press, Columbia, Mo (1974).
- [6] F. Balogun, A Study of Derivations on Lattices, Mathematical Theory and Modeling, 4(11)(2014), 14-19.
- [7] A. J. Bell, The co-information lattice, 4th Int. Symposium on Independent Component Analysis and Blind Signal Separation (ICA 2003), Nara, Japan, 921-926.
- [8] G. Birkhoof, Lattice Theory, American Mathematical Society, New York (1940).
- [9] C. Carpineto, G. Romano, Information retrieval through hybrid navigation of lattice representations, International Journal of Human-Computers Studies 45(1996), 553-578.
- [10] Y. Çeven, Symmetric bi-derivations of lattices, Quaestiones Mathematicae, 32(2)(2009), 241-245.
- [11] Y. Çeven, On Higher Derivations of Lattices, Mathematical Theory and Modeling. 7(6)(2017), 116-122.
- [12] Y. Çeven, M. A. Ozturk, On f -derivations of lattices, Bulletin of the Korean Mathematical Society, 45(4)(2008), 701-707.
- [13] C. Degang, Z. Wenxiu, D. Yeung and E. C. C. Tsang, Rough approximations on a complete completely distributive lattice with applications to generalized rough sets, Inform. Sci. 176(13)(2006), 1829-1848.

- [14] G. Durfee, Cryptanalysis of RSA using algebraic and lattice methods, A dissertation submitted to the department of computer sciences and the committee on graduate studies of Stanford University, (2002), 1-114.
- [15] L. Ferrari, On derivations of lattices, *Pure Math. Appl.*, 12(4)(2001), 365-382.
- [16] A. Honda and M. Grabisch, Entropy of capacities on lattices and set systems, *Inform. Sci.* 176(23)(2006), 3472-3489.
- [17] R. S. Sandhu, Role hierarchies and constraints for lattice-based access controls, *Proceedings of the 4th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security, Rome, Italy.* (1996), 65-79.
- [18] G. Szász, Derivations of lattices, *Acta Scientiarum Mathematicarum*, 37(1-2)(1975), 149-154.
- [19] Xin, Xiao Long, Ti Yao Li, and Jing Hua Lu, On derivations of lattices, *Information sciences*, 178(2)(2008), 307-316.

Author information

Enaam Farhan¹, Directorate General of Education in AL-Qadisiyah, AL-Qadisiyah, Iraq.
E-mail: enaamfa9@gmail.com

Mazen Omran Karim², Department of Mathematics, Alqadisyiah university-collage of education, Iraq.
E-mail: mazen.karim@qu.edu.iq

Abdelkarim Boua³, Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah university-FEZ, Department of Mathematics, FP, Taza, Morocco.
E-mail: abdelkarimboua@yahoo.fr

Received: 2024-06-21

Accepted: 2025-01-06