

A law for large numbers for non convex fuzzy sets fo the real line

Didier Dubois

▶ To cite this version:

Didier Dubois. A law for large numbers for non convex fuzzy sets fo the real line. Bulletin pour les sous-ensembles flous et leurs applications, 1981, 9, pp.31–38. hal-04199816v2

HAL Id: hal-04199816 https://hal.science/hal-04199816v2

Submitted on 29 Apr 2024

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 LAW OF LARGE NUMBERS FOR NON CONVEX FUZZY SETS OF THE REAL LINE

Didier DUBOIS
CERT/DERA
TOULOUSE

Recently there have been a few papers trying to establish laws of large numbers in the framework of fuzzy set theory; namely Stein and Talati [6] consider a sum $\frac{(X_1 + X_2 \dots + X_n)}{n}$ where the X_i 's are possibilistic variables with the same convex distribution π , π is thus the membership function of a fuzzy number [2]. It is proved that under this convexity assumption, the above sum is a possibilistic variable with distribution π . These authors then take advantage of this result in deriving similar properties for fuzzy random variables as stated by Nahmias [5] . Another paper by Badard [1] also mentions the same results and moreover deals with the case of sup product extension principle (see also [3])

In this short note, we address the case of X' s represented by a non convex possibility distribution on the real line $\mathbb R$, in the framework of sup min extension principle First let M be the fuzzy set of the real line such that $\mathfrak R \triangleq \mathfrak L$. We have the first preliminary result, which invalidates a theorem by Stein and Talatti [6]: Let $\mathfrak p_1, \dots, \mathfrak p_n$ be n strictly positive numbers summing to 1

PROPOSITION 1 if M is a convex fuzzy set, then $p_1 M \oplus \cdots \oplus p_n M = M$; the converse does not hold.

Proof: the membership of $p_1 M \oplus \cdots p_n M$ is p_i such that, $\forall 3$ $p_i(3) \triangleq \sup_{x_1, \dots, x_n} \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i x_i = 3 \quad \underset{i=1,n}{\min} p_i(x_i) \quad \Rightarrow p_i(3) \quad (\text{Choose } x_i = 3, \forall i)$

but $\mu(z)$ min $\mu(x_i)$ $\forall (x_i \dots x_n)$ s.t. $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i x_i = z_i$, due to convexity of M. Q.E.D.

That the converse does not hold can be checked on the following counter-example.

Let $M = [0,1] \cap Q$, i.e. the set of rational numbers in the unit interval. Then M is obviously not convex. Assume $p_1 \cdots p_n$ are rational.

Then $\forall (x_1 \cdots x_n) \in M^n$ $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i \in [0,1]$ and is rational, thus belongs to M i.e

Since the converse inequality always holds, we have an example of non convex distribution such that $p_1 M \oplus \cdots \oplus p_n M = M$

However the converse of proposition 1 does hold for a broad class of fuzzy sets of ${\mathbb R}$

PROPOSITION 2 if M is the union of a finite number of convex fuzzy sets of $\mathbb R$ then M is a convex if and only if $p_1M \oplus \ldots \oplus p_nM = M$

Proof: it is sufficient to show that when M is not convex then

$$p_{i} \stackrel{M}{\oplus} \cdots \stackrel{\oplus}{\oplus} p_{i} \stackrel{M}{\neq} \stackrel{M}{\downarrow}$$
 Assume M is not convex . M $\stackrel{\triangle}{\Rightarrow} \stackrel{U}{\downarrow} \stackrel{M}{\downarrow}$

where $M_{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}}$ is convex $\forall i$, It is not restrictive to assume :

-)
$$\forall i \neq j$$
, $M_i \cap M_j = \emptyset$ and $M_i \cup M_j$ is not convex

-)
$$i \langle j \Rightarrow \forall x \in S(M_{\lambda}), \forall y \in S(M_{\tilde{\lambda}}), x \langle y \rangle$$

where $S(M_{\hat{\mathcal{L}}})$ denotes the support of $M_{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}$, i.e. $\{x \mid \mu_{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}}(x) > 0\}$

In other words the $M_{\dot{1}}$'s are disjoint, ranked in increasing order, and in representing M as

k is minimum, i.e. we have a minimal representation of M.

Now denote

$$\alpha_i = \sup_{M_i} \mu_{M_i}$$

for two consecutive M_i 's.

Let
$$x = \lim_{\alpha \uparrow \alpha_i} \sup_{\alpha \downarrow \alpha} (M_i)_{\alpha}$$
 $y = \lim_{\alpha \uparrow \alpha_{i+1}} \inf_{\alpha \downarrow \alpha} (M_{i+1})_{\alpha}$

where (M) denotes the α -cut of M, i.e. $\{x \mid \mathcal{M}(x) > \alpha\}$

Assume X ≠ Y

Let
$$z = (p_1 + p_2 + \dots + p_k) \times (p_{k+1} + \dots + p_n) y (k \nmid n), z \in]x,y[$$

for k \langle n. Then if μ is the membership function of β $M \oplus \dots \oplus \beta$ M

$$\frac{\mu(z)}{\mu(z)} = \min(\mu(x)) = \min(\mu(z)) = \min(\mu(z)) = \min(\mu(z))$$
Hence

Hence

$$p_1^M \oplus \dots \oplus p_n^M \neq M$$
 Q.E.D.

NB : If X = Y it can be proved that)4 (x)=0; y(x)>0 and thus the result still holds

Note that if we change proposition 2 from "finite unions" to "countable unions" then this proposition becomes false :

[0,1] 10 is made of such a countable union of convex "fuzzy sets" (singletons actually)

Any way , when M is not convex there are many instances when the quantity

is not the same as the fuzzy set nM, such that $\mu(z) = \mu(3/n)$

However when M is continuous, then $\frac{M \oplus \ldots \oplus M}{n}$ has a limit when n becomes large. This is the topic of the following proposition which requires the preliminary definition (Lowen[4])

Convex hull: let M a fuzzy set of R; the convex hull M of M is defined by :

$$\mathcal{H}^{(z)} = \sup_{x,y: x \leq z \leq y} \min(\mu(x), \mu(y))$$

PROPOSITION 3 Let $X_1 \dots X_n$ be possibilistic variables with a continuous non convex distribution $\pi \triangleq \mu_{M}$ then

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{X_4 \dots + X_n}{n}$$

has distribution \mathcal{M} , i.e. the convex hull of M. (Here we prove pointwise convergence).

Proof : Let μ be the membership function associated with

$$\frac{X_1 + X_2 \dots + X_n}{n}$$

i.e

$$\forall t, \ /_{n}^{(t)} = \sup_{x_{1}, \dots, x_{n}} x_{n} = \inf_{i=1, n} x_{i}^{(x_{i})}$$

$$x_{1} + \dots + x_{n} = nt$$
(1)

a) - $\forall t$, μ (t) μ (t)

Indeed μ (t) is obtained from(1) by adding the constraint $x_i = t$, $\forall i = 1$, n

b) -
$$\forall t$$
, $\gamma_m(t) \leqslant \gamma_m(t)$

To see this first note the following inclusion
$$\left\{ (x_1 \dots x_n) \mid x_1 + \dots + x_n = nt \right\} \subseteq \left\{ x_1 \dots x_n \mid \min_{i} x_i \leqslant t \leqslant \max_{i} x_i \right\}$$

Hence we have

$$\mathcal{V}_{\eta}^{(t)} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x}_{1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{h}: \min_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}} \leq t \leq \max_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}} \min_{\mathbf{i}} \mathcal{V}_{\eta}^{(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{i}})}$$

The expression on the right hand side is easily recognized as being $\mu_{\lambda}(t)$ since the supremum is always reached for some $(x_{\lambda}...x_{h})$ such that $x_{\lambda} = x^{*}$ and $x_{\lambda} = ... = x_{h} = y^{*}$ with $x^{*}(t)$ owing to the symmetry of the expression. Hence we have proved

$$M \subseteq \frac{M \oplus \ldots \oplus M}{n} \subseteq \widehat{M}$$
 so far.

c) -
$$\forall t$$
, \exists a sequence $\{u_m\}_m$ such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} u_n = t$ and \lim_{n

Let x^* and y^* such that $x^* \neq y^*$ and :

We know that, say, $x^* \le t \le y^*$, and $x^* \ne y^*$ for some t, otherwise M = M. Let us share $[x^*, y^*]$ into n equal parts (n > 1)

$$\left[\frac{j x^{*} + (n-j) y^{*}}{n}, \frac{(j-1) x^{*} + (n-j+1) y^{*}}{n}\right]$$

and assume t belongs to the $\overline{j}(n)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ part, $\forall n$.

$$u_{n}^{-} = \frac{\bar{j}(n) \times *_{+}(n - \bar{j}(n)) y^{*}}{n} \qquad u_{n}^{+} = \frac{(\bar{j}(n) - 1) \times *_{+}(n - \bar{j}(n) + 1) y^{*}}{n}$$

Clearly
$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} u_n^+ - u_n^- = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{y^* - x^*}{n} = 0$$

Hence since

$$u_n^- \leqslant t \leqslant u_n^+$$
, $\lim_{n \to +\infty} u_n^- = \lim_{n \to +\infty} u_n^+ = t$

Now

$$|\mathcal{L}(u_n)| \geqslant \min(|\mathcal{L}(x^*)|, |\mathcal{L}(y^*)|) \triangleq |\mathcal{L}(u_n)| \text{ since we can choose}$$

$$|\mathcal{L}(u_n)| \geqslant \min(|\mathcal{L}(x^*)|, |\mathcal{L}(y^*)|) \triangleq |\mathcal{L}(u_n)| \text{ since we can choose}$$

$$|\mathcal{L}(u_n)| \geqslant \min(|\mathcal{L}(x^*)|, |\mathcal{L}(y^*)|) \triangleq |\mathcal{L}(u_n)| \text{ since we can choose}$$

$$|\mathcal{L}(u_n)| \geqslant \min(|\mathcal{L}(x^*)|, |\mathcal{L}(y^*)|) \triangleq |\mathcal{L}(u_n)| \text{ since we can choose}$$

$$|\mathcal{L}(u_n)| \geqslant \min(|\mathcal{L}(x^*)|, |\mathcal{L}(y^*)|) \triangleq |\mathcal{L}(u_n)| \text{ since we can choose}$$

From b) we conclude

$$\mu_n(u_n) = \mu_n(u_n), \forall n$$

The same holds for u_n^+ ,

d) - Lim
$$\gamma_n(t) = \gamma_n(t)$$

From c) we have

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \mu(u_n^-) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \mu(u_n^-) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} (\lim_{n\to+\infty} u_n^-) = \mu(E) \quad (2)$$

due to the continuity of μ , hence that of μ

Now since the is continuous, the is too; more-over

$$|\mu_{n}(t) - \mu_{\widehat{n}}(t)| \leq |\mu_{n}(t) - \mu_{n}(u_{n}^{-})| + |\mu_{n}(u_{n}^{-}) - \mu_{\widehat{n}}(t)|$$
 (3)

it is patent that because $\lim_{N\to +\infty} U_{\eta} = t$ and μ is continuous we have

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \left| \mu_n(t) - \mu_n(u_n) \right| = 0$$

Clearly, the other quantity in the right-hand side of (3) has a limit O, from (2). Hence the quantity on the left-hand side of (3) is bounded by arbitrary small numbers as n increases; hence

$$\lim_{N\to+\infty}\mu_n(t)=\mu_n(t)$$

with establishes the pointwise convergence of the possibility distribution of

$$\frac{X_4 + \ldots + X_n}{n}$$

toward the convex hull of the possibility distribution of the x_i 's QED

For fuzzy sets of the real line satisfying assumptions of proposition 2, i.e. finite union of convex fuzzy sets, without continuity proposition 3 does not hold. For instance, consider the fuzzy set made of the union of two singletons, i.e.

$$M = \{0,1\}$$
, and $\widehat{M} = [0,1]$

then

$$\frac{\mathbb{M} \oplus \mathbb{M}}{2} = \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{M} \oplus \mathbf{M} \oplus \mathbf{M}}{3} = \left\{ 0, \frac{1}{3}, 1 \right\} \dots \text{ etc...}$$

Let $\frac{h}{q}$ be a rational number lying in [0,1]. It is clear that if h=kq, $h(\frac{h}{q})=1$, $\forall k>1$; and $h(\frac{h}{q})=0$ $\forall n\neq kq$ for all positive integers k; hence:

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} \mu \left(\frac{h}{q} \right) \qquad \text{does not exist}$$

If t is irrational then $\mu_{m}(t) = 0 \neq \mu_{m}(t)$ Hence $\lim_{\eta \to +0} \mu_{n}(t) = 0$. In otherwords $\lim_{\eta \to +0} \frac{X_{1} + \dots + X_{n}}{m}$ has no limiting distribution

In the proof of proposition 3, it is clear that using

$$M = \{0,1\}$$

 μ_n is not continuous and $\mu_n(u_n^-) - \mu_n(t) = 1$ in eqn (3) when-ever t is irrational.

REFERENCES

- Badard R. (1981) The law of large numbers for fuzzy processes and the estimation problem (to appear in Fuzzy Sets and Systems)

 INSA Lyon France
- Dubois D., Prad e H. (1980) Fuzzy sets and systems: theory and applications" Academic Press
- Dubois D., Prade H. (1981) "Additions of interactive fuzzy numbers" <u>IEEE Trans. Automatic Control</u>, 26, n°4, 916-926
- Lowen R. (1980) Convex fuzzy sets

 Fuzzy Sets and Systems 3, 291-310
- Nahmias S. (1979) Fuzzy variables in a random environment in Advances in fuzzy set theory and applications (MM.Gupta R.K. Ragade, R.R.Yager), North Holland, 165-180
- Stein W.E., Talati K. (1981) Convex fuzzy random variables
 Fuzzy sets and Systems, 6, 271 283