



HAL
open science

A dimensionality Reduction Approach for Qualitative Preference Aggregation

Quentin Brabant, Miguel Couceiro, Fabien Labernia, Amedeo Napoli

► To cite this version:

Quentin Brabant, Miguel Couceiro, Fabien Labernia, Amedeo Napoli. A dimensionality Reduction Approach for Qualitative Preference Aggregation. International Symposium on Aggregation and Structures (ISAS 2016), Jul 2016, Luxembourg, Luxembourg. hal-02074061

HAL Id: hal-02074061

<https://hal.science/hal-02074061v1>

Submitted on 20 Mar 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

A Dimensionality Reduction Approach for Qualitative Preference Aggregation

Quentin Brabant¹, Miguel Couceiro¹, Fabien Labernia², Amedeo Naponi¹

¹ LORIA (CNRS, Inria Nancy Grand Est - Université de Lorraine
{quentin.brabant, miguel.couceiro, amedeo.naponi}@inria.fr

² LAMSADE (CNRS - Université Paris-Dauphine)
fabien.labernia@dauphine.fr

1 Qualitative preference aggregation models

In this paper we briefly present a method for reducing the dimensionality of data in a qualitative preference aggregation framework. For a more complete description of this approach, see [4]. For an alternative approach based on rough sets theory, see [1].

We consider the following setting. X is a set of alternatives that are evaluated according to a set of criteria represented by their indices: $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For an alternative $x \in X$ we denote by $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in L^n$ the tuple of the evaluations of x in each criterion. L is called the *evaluation space*, and is a distributive lattice for which we denote respectively by 0 and 1 the minimal and maximal element. We consider a binary preference relation \preceq between the alternatives that can be expressed in terms of a *utility function*:

$$\forall x, y \in X : x \preceq y \Rightarrow U(x) \leq U(y),$$

where $U : X \rightarrow L$ associates a global evaluation on L to each alternative, and is obtained through the aggregation of the evaluations in criteria by a Sugeno integral $\mathcal{S}_\mu : L^n \rightarrow L$. In other words we have $U(x) = \mathcal{S}_\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. The Sugeno integral defined over distributive lattices [3], is expressed

$$\mathcal{S}_\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \bigvee_{I \subseteq [n]} \mu(I) \bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i,$$

where $\mu : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow L$ a capacity, that is to say a non-decreasing set function on $[n]$, with $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\mu([n]) = 1$. Capacities (and Sugeno integrals) are defined by a value on L for each subset of $[n]$, and therefore carry an intrinsic complexity, that grows exponentially with n . We now consider a set $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}^1, y^1), \dots, (\mathbf{x}^m, y^m)\} \subseteq L^n \times L$, where each $\mathbf{x}^i = (x_1^i, \dots, x_n^i) \in L^n$ is a tuple of evaluations in n criteria, and y^i is a utility value associated to \mathbf{x}^i . We want to learn a Sugeno integral \mathcal{S}_μ that generalizes these data. Ideally this function would be such that $\mathcal{S}_\mu(\mathbf{x}^j) = y^j$ for any $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. However, it is very common that no such function exists: in that case \mathcal{D} is said to be *inconsistent*, and we aim at learning a Sugeno integral that realizes the prediction of y^j for each element, with an error as low as possible. Because of the nature of capacities, this optimization problem is on 2^n variables, and is therefore hard to solve when a high number of criteria is considered.

2 Dimensionality reduction based on quality measure

By a *quality measure* over \mathcal{D} we mean a degree with which \mathcal{D} satisfies a certain hypothesis. In this presentation we consider two of such measures.

The first quality measure is the *monotonicity degree*, that is, the ratio of pairs $\{i, j\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ that satisfy the following condition

$$y^i > y^j \Rightarrow \exists k \in [n] : y_k^i > y_k^j.$$

This condition can be seen as a generalization of the Pareto condition to partially ordered evaluation spaces. The second quality measure is the *compatibility degree*, that is, the ratio of pairs satisfying the the condition

$$\exists \mathcal{S}_\mu : [\mathcal{S}_\mu(\mathbf{x}^i) = y^i \text{ and } \mathcal{S}_\mu(\mathbf{x}^j) = y^j]. \quad (1)$$

This condition is justified by results from [2] that apply only when L is totally ordered. Indeed it can be shown that \mathcal{D} is consistent if and only if (2) is true for any pair from \mathcal{D} . Moreover, for a given pair this condition can be checked in a linear time w.r.t. n . Hence, provided that L is totally ordered, the compatibility degree is both theoretically meaningful and practically interesting. If L is not totally ordered, the monotonicity degree is the quality measure that makes sense.

The principle of the algorithm for dimensionality reduction that we propose is to iteratively remove a criterion, in order to minimize the decrease of the quality of the dataset at each step. Criteria are deleted until it is impossible to remove a criterion without decreasing the quality of the data below a certain ratio α . This algorithm was tested on empirical data¹ and allowed a reduction of the number of criteria from 7 to 3. Aggregation models trained on original data and on data reduced to 3 criteria showed to have similar accuracy. On the other hand, models trained on data with only 2 criteria left had significantly worse accuracy, suggesting that a reduction to 3 criteria constitutes the best compromise between simplicity and accuracy for these data.

Future research work should include further empirical studies and should aim to determining a procedure for deciding the optimal value of α , currently being set by hand.

References

1. Greco, S., Matarazzo, B., Slowinski, R.: Rough sets methodology for sorting problems in presence of multiple attributes and criteria. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 138(2), 247–259 (2002)
2. Prade, H., Rico, A., Serrurier, M., Raufaste, E.: Eliciting Sugeno integrals: Methodology and a case study. *Proceedings of the 10th European Conference Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning with Uncertainty*, 712–723 (2009)
3. Couceiro, M., Marichal, J.-L.: Characterizations of discrete Sugeno integrals as polynomial functions over distributive lattices. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 161(5), 694–707 (2010)
4. Brabant, Q., Couceiro, M., Labernia, F., Napoli, A.: Une approche de réduction de dimensionnalité pour l'agrégation de préférences qualitatives. *Proceedings of the 16th Conférence francophone sur l'Extraction et la Gestion des Connaissances*, 345–350 (2016)

¹Tripadvisor: <http://sifaka.cs.uiuc.edu/~wang296/Data/index.html>