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#### Abstract

Proposition 4 and Theorem 1 of the article "Belief Functions Contextual Discounting and Canonical Decompositions" [International Journal of Approximate Reasoning 53 (2012) 146-158] provide an erroneous result. We give here the true result with a correct proof.


Keywords: Belief functions, Contextual Discounting.

We hereby correct Proposition 4 and Theorem 1 in [2], which contained erroneous results.

Let us first recall the problem. A source $S$ of information provides to agent $A g$ a piece of information represented by a mass function $m_{S}^{\Omega}$ (with $\Omega=\left\{\omega_{1}, \ldots, \omega_{K}\right\}$ ), simply denoted by $m$ in this corrigendum. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a non empty set of subsets of $\Omega$ called contexts. Agent $A g$ owns a metaknowledge regarding the reliability of $S$ conditionally on each set $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Formally, for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, we suppose that

$$
\begin{cases}m_{A g}^{\mathcal{R}}[A](\{R\}) & =1-\alpha_{A}=\beta_{A}  \tag{1}\\ m_{A g}^{\mathcal{R}}[A](\mathcal{R}) & =\alpha_{A},\end{cases}
$$

where $\alpha_{A} \in[0,1]$ and $\mathcal{R}=\{R, N R\}$ ( $R$ meaning the source is reliable, $N R$ otherwise), and the notation $m[\cdot]$ denotes conditioning.

With the same reasoning as in [1] (where $\mathcal{A}$ was supposed to form a partition of $\Omega$ ), the knowledge $m_{A g}^{\Omega}$ held by agent $A g$ on $\Omega$, based on the in-

[^0]formation $m$ provided by $S$ and his metaknowledge regarding $S$ represented by (1) for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, can be obtained by the following computation,
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(m^{\Omega}[\{R\}]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}} @_{A \in \mathcal{A}} m^{\mathcal{R}}[A]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}\right)^{\downarrow \Omega} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

where symbol $\Uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ denote, respectively, the deconditioning and projection operations, and $m^{\Omega}[\{R\}]=m$.

It is stated in [2] that, for $\mathcal{A}=2^{\Omega}$ (Proposition 4) and more generally for any set $\mathcal{A}$ of contexts (Theorem 1), Equation (2) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.m(())()_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A_{\beta_{A}}\right) . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

This statement is incorrect. In the general case, for any non empty $\mathcal{A}$, Equation (2) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
m\left(()\left(\cap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \bar{A}^{\alpha_{A}}\right),\right. \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

as shown by the following proof, which corrects Theorem 1 from [2]. The fact that, in general, (4) is not equivalent to (3) (and particularly when $\mathcal{A}=2^{\Omega}$ ), and therefore (2) is not equivalent in general to (3), is shown below by Example 1.

Proof 1. Let us denote by $A_{i}, i \in I=\{1, \ldots, n\}$, the contexts present in $\mathcal{A}$, and let us write $\beta_{A_{i}}$ simply by $\beta_{i}$, for all $i \in I$. For all $A_{i} \in \mathcal{A}$, the deconditioning of $m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{i}\right]$ over $\Omega \times \mathcal{R}$ is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{i}\right]^{\uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}\left(A_{i} \times\{R\} \cup \overline{A_{i}} \times \mathcal{R}\right) & =\beta_{i},  \tag{5a}\\
m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{i}\right]^{\uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}(\Omega \times \mathcal{R}) & =\alpha_{i} . \tag{5b}
\end{align*}
$$

Moreover, for all $\left(A_{i}, A_{j}\right) \in \mathcal{A}^{2}$, such that $j \neq i$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(A_{i} \times\{R\} \cup \overline{A_{i}} \times \mathcal{R}\right) \cap\left(A_{j} \times\{R\} \cup \overline{A_{j}} \times \mathcal{R}\right) \\
= & \left(A_{i} \cap A_{j}\right) \times\{R\} \cup\left(A_{i} \cap \overline{A_{j}}\right) \times\{R\} \cup\left(\overline{A_{i}} \cap A_{j}\right) \times\{R\} \cup \overline{\left(A_{i} \cup A_{j}\right)} \times \mathcal{R} \\
= & \left(A_{i} \cup A_{j}\right) \times\{R\} \cup \overline{\left(A_{i} \cup A_{j}\right)} \times \mathcal{R} .
\end{aligned}
$$

With $\mathcal{A}$ composed of two elements denoted by $A_{i}$ and $A_{j}$, we then have

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{ccc}
\left(m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{i}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}} \odot m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{j}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}\right)\left(\left(A_{i} \cup A_{j}\right) \times\{R\} \cup \overline{\left(A_{i} \cup A_{j}\right)} \times \mathcal{R}\right) & =\beta_{i} \beta_{j} \\
\left(m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{i}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}} \odot m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{j} j \Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}\right)\left(A_{i} \times\{R\} \cup \overline{A_{i}} \times \mathcal{R}\right)\right. & =\beta_{i} \alpha_{j} \\
\left(m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{i}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}} \odot m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{j}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}\right)\left(A_{j} \times\{R\} \cup \overline{A_{j}} \times \mathcal{R}\right) & =\alpha_{i} \beta_{j} \\
\left(m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{i}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}} \odot m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{j}\right] \Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}\right)(\Omega \times \mathcal{R}) & =\alpha_{i} \alpha_{j}
\end{array} .\right.
$$

In other words, all the focal elements of $\cap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} m^{\mathcal{R}}[A]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}$ are the elements $C \times\{R\} \cup \bar{C} \times \mathcal{R}$ with $C$ composed of a union of elements $A_{i}$ in $\mathcal{A}, I^{\prime}$ being the set of indices of the $A_{i}$ 's, which means with $C=\cup_{i \in I^{\prime} \subseteq I} A_{i}$. Moreover, each focal element has a mass equal to $\prod_{i \in I^{\prime}} \beta_{i} \prod_{j \in I \backslash I^{\prime}} \alpha_{j}$. Let us note that this latter result is also true if $\mathcal{A}$ is composed of one element $A \subseteq \Omega$ (directly from Equations (5)).

By induction, we can show that this property remains true with $\mathcal{A}$ composed of $n$ contexts $A_{i}, i \in I=\{1, \ldots, n\}$. Indeed, let us suppose the property true with $\mathcal{A}$ composed of $n-1$ contexts $A_{i}, i \in I=\{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, we then have for all focal elements $C \times\{R\} \cup \bar{C} \times \mathcal{R}$ of $\bigcirc_{i \in I} m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{i}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}$, with $C=\cup_{i \in I^{\prime} \subseteq I} A_{i}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\cap_{i \in I} m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{i}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}} \oplus m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{n}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}\right)\left(\left(C \cup A_{n}\right) \times\{R\} \cup \overline{\left(C \cup A_{n}\right)} \times \mathcal{R}\right) \\
&=\beta_{n} \prod_{i \in I^{\prime}} \beta_{i} \prod_{j \in I \backslash I^{\prime}} \alpha_{j}=\prod_{i \in I^{\prime} \cup\{n\}} \beta_{i} \prod_{j \in(I \cup\{n\}) \backslash\left(I^{\prime} \cup\{n\}\right)} \alpha_{j},
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\bigcirc_{i \in I} m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{i}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}} \odot m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{n}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}\right)(C \times\{R\} \cup \bar{C} \times \mathcal{R}) \\
&=\alpha_{n} \prod_{i \in I^{\prime}} \beta_{i} \prod_{j \in I \backslash I^{\prime}} \alpha_{j}=\prod_{i \in I^{\prime}} \beta_{i} \prod_{j \in(I \cup\{n\}) \backslash I^{\prime}} \alpha_{j}
\end{aligned}
$$

which means that focal elements of $\cap_{i \in\{1, \ldots, n-1\}} m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{i}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}} \bigcirc m^{\mathcal{R}}\left[A_{n}\right]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}$ are also of the form $C \times\{R\} \cup \bar{C} \times \mathcal{R}$, with $C=\cup_{i \in I^{\prime} \subseteq I} A_{i}, I=\{1, \ldots, n\}$, $A_{i} \in \mathcal{A}$, and have for mass: $\prod_{i \in I^{\prime}} \beta_{i} \prod_{j \in I \backslash I^{\prime}} \alpha_{j}$.

Besides, for all $B \subseteq \Omega$,

$$
m^{\Omega}[\{R\}]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}(B \times\{R\} \cup \Omega \times\{N R\})=m(B)
$$

and, for all $B \subseteq \Omega$, for all $C=\cup_{i \in I^{\prime} \subseteq I} A_{i}$,

$$
(C \times\{R\} \cup \bar{C} \times \mathcal{R}) \cap(B \times\{R\} \cup \Omega \times\{N R\})=B \times\{R\} \cup \bar{C} \times\{N R\}
$$

Therefore, after the projection on $\Omega,\left(m^{\Omega}[\{R\}]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}} \cap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} m^{\mathcal{R}}[A]^{\Uparrow \Omega \times \mathcal{R}}\right)^{\downarrow \Omega}$ consists in transferring a part $\prod_{i \in I^{\prime}} \beta_{i} \prod_{j \in I \backslash I^{\prime}} \alpha_{j}$ of each mass $m(B), B \subseteq$ $\Omega$, from $B$ to $B \cup \bar{C}$, for all $C=\cup_{i \in I^{\prime} \subseteq I} A_{i}$.

On the other hand, $m\left(()(\cap) A_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \bar{A}^{\bar{\alpha}_{A}}\right)$ can be written as

$$
m\left(()\left(\cap_{i \in I}{\overline{A_{i}}}^{\alpha_{i}}\right)=m(())\left(\cap_{i \in I}\left\{\begin{array}{ccc}
\Omega & \mapsto & \alpha_{i} \\
\overline{A_{i}} & \mapsto & \beta_{i}
\end{array}\right)\right.\right.
$$

As for all $(i, j) \in I^{2}$ s.t. $i \neq j, \overline{A_{i}} \cap \overline{A_{j}}=\overline{A_{i} \cup A_{j}}$, it can be shown (with an induction for example) that the focal elements of $\cap_{i \in I}{\overline{A_{i}}}^{\alpha_{i}}$ are the elements $\bar{C}$ with $C=\cup_{i \in I^{\prime} \subseteq I} A_{i}$ and have a mass equal to $\prod_{i \in I^{\prime}} \beta_{i} \prod_{j \in I \backslash I^{\prime}} \alpha_{j}$.

Consequently, operation $m(1)\left(\cap_{i \in I} \bar{A}_{i}^{\alpha_{i}}\right)$ also consists in transferring a part $\prod_{i \in I^{\prime}} \beta_{i} \prod_{j \in I \backslash I^{\prime}} \alpha_{j}$ of each mass $m(B), B \subseteq \Omega$, from $B$ to $B \cup \bar{C}$, for all $C=\cup_{i \in I^{\prime} \subseteq I} A_{i}$. We can then conclude that Equations (2) and (4) are equivalent for any non empty set of contexts $\mathcal{A}$.

Example 1. Let us consider $\Omega=\left\{\omega_{1}, \omega_{2}\right\}$ and $\mathcal{A}=2^{\Omega}$, and let us denote $\alpha_{\left\{\omega_{1}\right\}}$ by $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{\left\{\omega_{2}\right\}}$ by $\alpha_{2}$, and $\alpha_{\Omega}$ by $\alpha_{12}$. Equation (4) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& m \text { (()) }\left(\cap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \bar{A}^{\alpha_{A}}\right) \\
& =m \text { (()) }\left(\bar{\emptyset}^{\alpha_{\|}} \cap{\overline{\left\{\omega_{1}\right\}}}^{\alpha_{1}} \cap{\overline{\left\{\omega_{2}\right\}}}^{\alpha_{2}} \cap \bar{\Omega}^{\alpha_{12}}\right) \\
& =m \quad(1) \quad\left(\left\{\omega_{2}\right\}^{\alpha_{1}} \cap\left\{\omega_{1}\right\}^{\alpha_{2}} \cap \emptyset^{\alpha_{12}}\right) \\
& =m\left(( ) \quad \left(\begin{array} { c c c } 
{ \{ \omega _ { 2 } \} } & { \mapsto } & { \beta _ { 1 } } \\
{ \Omega } & { \mapsto } & { \alpha _ { 1 } }
\end{array} \bigcirc \left\{\begin{array}{ccc}
\left\{\omega_{1}\right\} & \mapsto & \beta_{2} \\
\Omega & \mapsto & \alpha_{2}
\end{array} \bigcirc\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
\emptyset & \mapsto & \beta_{12} \\
\Omega & \mapsto & \alpha_{12}
\end{array}\right)\right.\right.\right. \\
& =m \text { (U) }\left\{\begin{array}{rll}
\emptyset & \mapsto & \beta_{1} \beta_{2} \alpha_{12}+\beta_{12} \\
\left\{\omega_{1}\right\} & \mapsto & \alpha_{1} \beta_{2} \alpha_{12} \\
\left\{\omega_{2}\right\} & \mapsto & \beta_{1} \alpha_{2} \alpha_{12} \\
\Omega & \mapsto & \alpha_{1} \alpha_{2} \alpha_{12}
\end{array} .\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

In contrast, Equation (3) leads to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& m \text { (ㄷ) }\left(\text { (1) }_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A_{\beta_{A}}\right) \\
& =m \text { (()) } \emptyset_{\beta_{\emptyset}}(1)\left\{\omega_{1}\right\}_{\beta_{1}}(\subseteq)\left\{\omega_{2}\right\}_{\beta_{2}}\left(() \Omega_{\beta_{12}}\right. \\
& =m \text { (()) }\left\{\omega_{1}\right\}_{\beta_{1}}(1)\left\{\omega_{2}\right\}_{\beta_{2}}(1) \Omega_{\beta_{12}} \\
& =m \text { (()) }\left\{\begin{array} { c c c c } 
{ \emptyset } & { \mapsto } & { \beta _ { 1 } } \\
{ \{ \omega _ { 1 } \} } & { \mapsto } & { \alpha _ { 1 } }
\end{array} ( \bigcirc ) \left\{\begin{array} { l l l } 
{ \emptyset } & { \mapsto } & { \beta _ { 2 } } \\
{ \{ \omega _ { 2 } \} } & { \mapsto } & { \alpha _ { 2 } }
\end{array} \odot \left\{\begin{array}{lll}
\emptyset & \mapsto & \beta_{12} \\
\Omega & \mapsto & \alpha_{12}
\end{array}\right.\right.\right. \\
& =m \text { (1) }\left\{\begin{array}{rll}
\emptyset & \mapsto & \beta_{1} \beta_{2} \beta_{12} \\
\left\{\omega_{1}\right\} & \mapsto & \alpha_{1} \beta_{2} \beta_{12} \\
\left\{\omega_{2}\right\} & \mapsto & \beta_{1} \alpha_{2} \beta_{12} \\
\Omega & \mapsto & \alpha_{1} \alpha_{2} \beta_{12}+\alpha_{12}
\end{array} .\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

To summarize, in [1], the equivalence was shown between (2) and (3) when $\mathcal{A}$ forms a partition of $\Omega$. This corrigendum shows that this equivalence does not hold for any $\mathcal{A}$, and that (2) is actually equivalent to (4) for any (non empty) $\mathcal{A}$.
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