Reliability and Importance Discounting of Neutrosophic Masses

Florentin Smarandache

Originally published in Smarandache, F. - *Neutrosophic Theory and its Applications, Collected Papers*, Vol. I. 2014. <hal-01092887v2>, and reprinted with permission.

*> ⁻°**®sc** In this paper, we introduce for the first time the discounting of a neutrosophic mass in terms of reliability and respectively the importance of the source.

We show that reliability and importance discounts commute when dealing with classical masses.

L^a°**®**·**Ÿ**±**o**^{**}***** Let $\Phi = {\Phi_1, \Phi_2, ..., \Phi_n}$ be the frame of discernment, where $n \ge 2$, and the set of **&o**^{**}**eleme**^{ao-}:

$$F = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m\}, \text{ for } m \ge 1, F \subset G^{\Phi}.$$
 (1)

Let $G^{\Phi} = (\Phi, \cup, \cap, \mathcal{C})$ be the $\mathbf{E}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{k} \mathbf{n} \neg \mathbf{\tilde{s}oe}$.

A ^a; ±°®«⁻«¬¤¥xe® š⁻⁻ is defined as follows:

 $m_n: G \rightarrow [0, 1]^3$

for any $x \in G$, $m_n(x) = (t(x), i(x), f(x))$, (2)

where t(x) = believe that x will occur (truth);

i(x) = indeterminacy about occurrence;

and f(x) = believe that x will not occur (falsity).

Simply, we say in neutrosophic logic:

t(x) = believe in x; i(x) = believe in neut(x)[the neutral of x, i.e. neither x nor anti(x)]; and f(x) = believe in anti(x) [the opposite of x]. Of course, t(x), i(x), $f(x) \in [0, 1]$, and $\sum_{x \in G} [t(x) + i(x) + f(x)] = 1, (3)$

while

$$m_n(\phi) = (0, 0, 0).$$
 (4)

It is possible that according to some parameters (or data) a source is able to predict the believe in a hypothesis x to occur, while according to other parameters (or other data) the same source may be able to find the believe in x not occuring, and upon a third category of parameters (or data) the source may find some indeterminacy (ambiguity) about hypothesis occurence.

An element $x \in G$ is called **&** $\check{\mathbf{w}}$ $\check{\mathbf{w}}$ $\check{\mathbf{w}}$ if

$$n_m(x) \neq (0, 0, 0), (5)$$

i.e. t(x) > 0 or i(x) > 0 or f(x) > 0.

Any os "¥e mš":

$$m: G^{\phi} \rightarrow [0,1] (6)$$

can be simply written as a neutrosophic mass as:

$$m(A) = (m(A), 0, 0).$$
 (7)

[~] ¥œ±^a°¥£š Neu°®«⁻«¬¤¥æ š⁻⁻ due °« Rel¥s> ¥¥µof °¤; ' «±®œ

Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ be the reliability coefficient of the source, $\alpha \in [0,1]^3$.

Then, for any $x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\theta, I_t\},\$

where θ = the empty set

and I_t = total ignorance,

$$m_n(x)_a = \left(\alpha_1 t(x), \alpha_2 i(x), \alpha_3 f(x)\right), (8)$$

and /

$$\begin{split} m_n(I_t)_{\alpha} &= \left(t(I_t) + (1 - \alpha_1) \sum_{x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi, I_t\}} t(x), \\ &i(I_t) + (1 - \alpha_2) \sum_{x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi, I_t\}} i(x), f(I_t) + (1 - \alpha_3) \sum_{x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi, I_t\}} f(x) \right) \end{split}$$

and, of course,

$$m_n(\phi)_{\alpha} = (0, 0, 0).$$

(9),

The missing mass of each element x, for $x \neq \phi$, $x \neq I_t$, is transferred to the mass of the total ignorance in the following way:

$$t(x) - \alpha_1 t(x) = (1 - \alpha_1) \cdot t(x) \text{ is transferred to } t(l_t), (10)$$
$$i(x) - \alpha_2 i(x) = (1 - \alpha_2) \cdot i(x) \text{ is transferred to } i(l_t), (11)$$
and $f(x) - \alpha_3 f(x) = (1 - \alpha_3) \cdot f(x) \text{ is transferred to } f(l_t). (12)$

[~]¥oæ±^a°¥£š ";±°®«⁻«¬¤¥be!š⁻s Ÿ±e °« °¤; I© ¬«®š^ace «f °¤; '«±®ope

Let $\beta \in [0, 1]$ be the importance coefficient of the source. This discounting can be done in several ways.

a. For any $x \in G^{\theta} \setminus {\{\phi\}}$,

$$m_n(x)_{\beta_1} = (\beta \cdot t(x), i(x), f(x) + (1 - \beta) \cdot t(x)), (13)$$

which means that t(x), the believe in x, is diminished to $\beta \cdot t(x)$, and the missing mass, $t(x) - \beta \cdot t(x) = (1 - \beta) \cdot t(x)$, is transferred to the believe in anti(x).

b. Another way:

For any $x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi\}$, $m_n(x)_{\beta_2} = (\beta \cdot t(x), i(x) + (1 - \beta) \cdot t(x), f(x)), (14)$

which means that t(x), the believe in x, is similarly diminished to $\beta \cdot t(x)$, and the missing mass $(1 - \beta) \cdot t(x)$ is now transferred to the believe in neut(x).

c. The third way is the most general, putting together the first and second ways.

For any $x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi\}$,

$$m_n(x)_{\beta_3} = (\beta \cdot t(x), i(x) + (1 - \beta) \cdot t(x) \cdot \gamma, f(x) + (1 - \beta) \cdot t(x) + (1 - \beta) \cdot t(x))$$

$$(1 - \gamma)), (15)$$

where $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ is a parameter that splits the missing mass $(1 - \beta) \cdot t(x)$ a part to i(x) and the other part to f(x).

For $\gamma = 0$, one gets the first way of distribution, and when $\gamma = 1$, one gets the second way of distribution.

č¥œ±ª°¥£«f&;`\$>¥¥yšªŸE¬«@tance «f'«±®ces ¥fi;a;®s¨ č«Not Co©©±°;

a. Reliability first, Importance second.

For any $x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi, I_t\}$, one has after reliability α discounting, where

$$\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3):$$

$$m_n(x)_{\alpha} = (\alpha_1 \cdot t(x), \alpha_2 \cdot t(x), \alpha_3 \cdot f(x)), (16)$$
and
$$m_n(I_t)_{\alpha} = \left(t(I_t) + (1 - \alpha_1) \cdot \sum_{x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi, I_t\}} t(x), i(I_t) + (1 - \alpha_2)\right)$$

$$\cdot \sum_{x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi, I_t\}} i(x), f(I_t) + (1 - \alpha_3) \cdot \sum_{x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi, I_t\}} f(x)\right)$$

$$\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(T_{I_t}, I_{I_t}, F_{I_t}\right). \tag{17}$$

Now we do the importance β discounting method, the third importance discounting way which is the most general:

$$m_n(x)_{\alpha\beta_3} = \left(\beta\alpha_1 t(x), \alpha_2 i(x) + (1-\beta)\alpha_1 t(x)\gamma, \alpha_3 f(x) + (1-\beta)\alpha_1 t(x)(1-\gamma)\right)$$
(18)

and

$$m_n(I_t)_{\alpha\beta_3} = \left(\beta \cdot T_{I_t}, I_{I_t} + (1-\beta)T_{I_t} \cdot \gamma, F_{I_t} + (1-\beta)T_{I_t}(1-\gamma)\right).$$
(19)

b. Importance first, Reliability second.

For any $x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi, I_t\}$, one has after importance β discounting (third way): $m_n(x)_{\beta_3} = (\beta \cdot t(x), i(x) + (1 - \beta)t(x)\gamma, f(x) + (1 - \beta)t(x)(1 - \gamma))$ (20) and

$$m_n(I_t)_{\beta_3} = \left(\beta \cdot t(I_{I_t}), i(I_{I_t}) + (1 - \beta)t(I_t)\gamma, \ f(I_t) + (1 - \beta)t(I_t)(1 - \gamma)\right).$$
(21)

Now we do the reliability
$$\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$$
 discounting, and one gets:
 $m_n(x)_{\beta_3\alpha} = (\alpha_1 \cdot \beta \cdot t(x), \alpha_2 \cdot i(x) + \alpha_2(1 - \beta)t(x)\gamma, \alpha_3 \cdot f(x) + \alpha_3 \cdot (1 - \beta)t(x)(1 - \gamma))$ (22)

and

$$m_n(I_t)_{\beta_3\alpha} = \left(\alpha_1 \cdot \beta \cdot t(I_t), \alpha_2 \cdot i(I_t) + \alpha_2(1-\beta)t(I_t)\gamma, \alpha_3 \cdot f(I_t) + \alpha_3(1-\beta)t(I_t)(1-\gamma)\right). (23)$$

&emark.

We see that (a) and (b) are in general different, so reliability of sources does not commute with the importance of sources.

\$š®¥je`šr įšse ³ ¤en & '¥s>¥¥y š^ad ł© ¬«®š^aœ` ¥œ±^a°¥g «¢

```
! š<sup>--</sup>; <sup>-</sup> Co©©±°;
```

Let's consider a classical mass $m: G^{\theta} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ (24)

and the focal set $F \subset G^{\theta}$, $F = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m\}, m \ge 1, (25)$

and of course $m(A_i) > 0$, for $1 \le i \le m$.

Suppose $m(A_i) = a_i \in (0,1]$. (26)

a. Reliability first, Importance second.

Let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ be the reliability coefficient of $m(\cdot)$. For $x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi, I_t\}$, one has $m(x)_{\alpha} = \alpha \cdot m(x)$, (27)

and $m(I_t) = \alpha \cdot m(I_t) + 1 - \alpha$. (28)

Let $\beta \in [0, 1]$ be the importance coefficient of $m(\cdot)$.

Then, for $x \in G^{\theta} \setminus {\phi, I_t}$,

$$m(x)_{\alpha\beta} = (\beta \alpha m(x), \alpha m(x) - \beta \alpha m(x)) = \alpha \cdot m(x) \cdot (\beta, 1 - \beta), (29)$$

considering only two components: believe that *x* occurs and, respectively, believe that *x* does not occur.

Further on,

$$m(I_t)_{\alpha\beta} = (\beta \alpha m(I_t) + \beta - \beta \alpha, \alpha m(I_t) + 1 - \alpha - \beta \alpha m(I_t) - \beta + \beta \alpha) = [\alpha m(I_t) + 1 - \alpha] \cdot (\beta, 1 - \beta). (30)$$

b. Importance first, Reliability second.

For $x \in G^{\theta} \setminus {\phi, I_t}$, one has

$$m(x)_{\beta} = \left(\beta \cdot m(x), m(x) - \beta \cdot m(x)\right) = m(x) \cdot (\beta, 1 - \beta), (31)$$

and
$$m(I_t)_{\beta} = (\beta m(I_t), m(I_t) - \beta m(I_t)) = m(I_t) \cdot (\beta, 1 - \beta).$$
 (32)

Then, for the reliability discounting scaler α one has:

$$m(x)_{\beta\alpha} = \alpha m(x)(\beta, 1 - \beta) = (\alpha m(x)\beta, \alpha m(x) - \alpha\beta m(m)) (33)$$

and $m(I_t)_{\beta\alpha} = \alpha \cdot m(I_t)(\beta, 1 - \beta) + (1 - \alpha)(\beta, 1 - \beta) = [\alpha m(I_t) + 1 - \alpha] \cdot (\beta, 1 - \beta) = (\alpha m(I_t)\beta, \alpha m(I_t) - \alpha m(I_t)\beta) + (\beta - \alpha\beta, 1 - \alpha - \beta + \alpha\beta) = (\alpha\beta m(I_t) + \beta - \alpha\beta, \alpha m(I_t) - \alpha\beta m(I_t) + 1 - \alpha - \beta - \alpha\beta).$ (34)

Hence (a) and (b) are equal in this case.

ı´š©¬";⁻

1. Classical mass.

The following classical is given on $\theta = \{A, B\}$:

	А	В	AUB	
т	0.4	0.5	0.1 (35)	

Let $\alpha = 0.8$ be the reliability coefficient and $\beta = 0.7$ be the importance coefficient.

a. Reliability first, Importance second.

	А	В	AUB
m_{lpha}	0.32	0.40	0.28
$m_{lphaeta}$	(0.224, 0.096)	(0.280, 0.120)	(0.196, 0.084)
			(36)

We have computed in the following way:

$$m_{\alpha}(A) = 0.8m(A) = 0.8(0.4) = 0.32, (37)$$

$$m_{\alpha}(B) = 0.8m(B) = 0.8(0.5) = 0.40, (38)$$

$$m_{\alpha}(AUB) = 0.8(AUB) + 1 - 0.8 = 0.8(0.1) + 0.2 = 0.28, (39)$$
and
$$m_{\alpha\beta}(B) = (0.7m_{\alpha}(A), m_{\alpha}(A) - 0.7m_{\alpha}(A)) = (0.7(0.32), 0.32 - 0.7(0.32)) = (0.224, 0.096), (40)$$

$$m_{\alpha\beta}(B) = (0.7m_{\alpha}(B), m_{\alpha}(B) - 0.7m_{\alpha}(B)) = (0.7(0.40), 0.40 - 0.7(0.40)) = (0.280, 0.120), (41)$$

$$m_{\alpha\beta}(AUB) = (0.7m_{\alpha}(AUB), m_{\alpha}(AUB) - 0.7m_{\alpha}(AUB)) = (0.7(0.28), 0.28 - 0.7(0.28)) = (0.196, 0.084). (42)$$

b. Importance first, Reliability second.

	А	В	AUB
т	0.4	0.5	0.1
m_{eta}	(0.28, 0.12)	(0.35, 0.15)	(0.07, 0.03)
$m_{etalpha}$	(0.224, 0.096	(0.280, 0.120)	(0.196, 0.084)
			(43)

We computed in the following way:

$$\begin{split} m_{\beta}(A) &= \left(\beta m(A), (1-\beta)m(A)\right) = \left(0.7(0.4), (1-0.7)(0.4)\right) = \\ &\quad (0.280, 0.120), (44) \\ m_{\beta}(B) &= \left(\beta m(B), (1-\beta)m(B)\right) = \left(0.7(0.5), (1-0.7)(0.5)\right) = \\ &\quad (0.35, 0.15), (45) \\ m_{\beta}(AUB) &= \left(\beta m(AUB), (1-\beta)m(AUB)\right) = \left(0.7(0.1), (1-0.1)(0.1)\right) = \\ &\quad (0.07, 0.03), (46) \\ \text{and } m_{\beta\alpha}(A) &= \alpha m_{\beta}(A) = 0.8(0.28, 0.12) = \left(0.8(0.28), 0.8(0.12)\right) = \\ &\quad (0.224, 0.096), (47) \\ m_{\beta\alpha}(B) &= \alpha m_{\beta}(B) = 0.8(0.35, 0.15) = \left(0.8(0.35), 0.8(0.15)\right) = \\ &\quad (0.280, 0.120), (48) \end{split}$$

$$m_{\beta\alpha}(AUB) = \alpha m(AUB)(\beta, 1 - \beta) + (1 - \alpha)(\beta, 1 - \beta) = 0.8(0.1)(0.7, 1 - 0.7) + (1 - 0.8)(0.7, 1 - 0.7) = 0.08(0.7, 0.3) + 0.2(0.7, 0.3) = (0.056, 0.024) + (0.140, 0.060) = (0.056 + 0.140, 0.024 + 0.060) = (0.196, 0.084). (49)$$

Therefore reliability discount commutes with importance discount of sources when one has classical masses.

The result is interpreted this way: believe in *A* is 0.224 and believe in *nonA* is 0.096, believe in *B* is 0.280 and believe in *nonB* is 0.120, and believe in total ignorance *AUB* is 0.196, and believe in non-ignorance is 0.084.

Let's consider the third way of redistribution of masses related to importance coefficient of sources. $\beta = 0.7$, but $\gamma = 0.4$, which means that 40% of β is redistributed to i(x) and 60% of β is redistributed to f(x) for each $x \in G^{\theta} \setminus \{\phi\}$; and $\alpha = 0.8$.

a. Reliability first, Importance second.

	А	В	AUB
т	0.4	0.5	0.1
m_{lpha}	0.32	0.40	0.28
$m_{lphaeta}$	(0.2240, 0.0384,	(0.2800, 0.0480,	(0.1960, 0.0336,
	0.0576)	0.0720)	0.0504).
			(50)

We computed m_{α} in the same way.

But:

$$m_{\alpha\beta}(A) = \left(\beta \cdot m_{\alpha}(A), i_{\alpha}(A) + (1 - \beta)m_{\alpha}(A) \cdot \gamma, f_{\alpha}(A) + (1 - \beta)m_{\alpha}(A)(1 - \gamma)\right) = \left(0.7(0.32), 0 + (1 - 0.7)(0.32)(0.4), 0 + (1 - 0.7)(0.32)(1 - 0.4)\right) = (0.2240, 0.0384, 0.0576). (51)$$

Similarly for $m_{\alpha\beta}(B)$ and $m_{\alpha\beta}(AUB)$.

b. Importance first, Reliability second.

	А	В	AUB
m	0.4	0.5	0.1
m_{eta}	(0.280, 0.048,	(0.350, 0.060,	(0.070, 0.012,
	0.072)	0.090)	0.018)
$m_{eta} lpha$	(0.2240, 0.0384,	(0.2800, 0.0480,	(0.1960, 0.0336,
	0.0576)	0.0720)	0.0504).
			(52)

We computed $m_{\beta}(\cdot)$ in the following way:

 $m_{\beta}(A) = \left(\beta \cdot t(A), i(A) + (1 - \beta)t(A) \cdot \gamma, f(A) + (1 - \beta)t(A)(1 - \gamma)\right) = \left(0.7(0.4), 0 + (1 - 0.7)(0.4)(0.4), 0 + (1 - 0.7)0.4(1 - 0.4)\right) = (0.280, 0.048, 0.072). (53)$

Similarly for $m_{\beta}(B)$ and $m_{\beta}(AUB)$.

To compute $m_{\beta\alpha}(\cdot)$, we take $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0.8$, (54)

in formulas (8) and (9).

$$m_{\beta\alpha}(A) = \alpha \cdot m_{\beta}(A) = 0.8(0.280, 0.048, 0.072)$$
$$= (0.8(0.280), 0.8(0.048), 0.8(0.072))$$
$$= (0.2240, 0.0384, 0.0576). (55)$$

Similarly $m_{\beta\alpha}(B) = 0.8(0.350, 0.060, 0.090) =$

(0.2800, 0.0480, 0.0720). (56)

For $m_{\beta\alpha}(AUB)$ we use formula (9):

$$\begin{split} m_{\beta\alpha}(AUB) &= \left(t_{\beta}(AUB) + (1-\alpha) [t_{\beta}(A) + t_{\beta}(B)], i_{\beta}(AUB) \right. \\ &+ (1-\alpha) [i_{\beta}(A) + i_{\beta}(B)], \\ f_{\beta}(AUB) + (1-\alpha) [f_{\beta}(A) + f_{\beta}(B)] \right) \\ &= (0.070 + (1-0.8) [0.280 + 0.350], 0.012 \\ &+ (1-0.8) [0.048 + 0.060], 0.018 + (1-0.8) [0.072 + 0.090]) \\ &= (0.1960, 0.0336, 0.0504). \end{split}$$

Again, the reliability discount and importance discount commute.

ૃ«^aoë±⁻¥^a

In this paper we have defined a new way of discounting a classical and neutrosophic mass with respect to its importance. We have also defined the discounting of a neutrosophic source with respect to its reliability.

In general, the reliability discount and importance discount do not commute. But if one uses classical masses, they commute (as in Examples 1 and 2).

° @^a«³ '' Ÿ£j © ; ^a°

The author would like to thank Dr. Jean Dezert for his opinions about this paper.

& ¢ @ ^a œ⁻

1. F. Smarandache, J. Dezert, J.-M. Tacnet, *Fusion of Sources of Evidence with Different Importances and Reliabilities*, Fusion 2010 International Conference, Edinburgh, Scotland, 26-29 July, 2010.

2. Florentin Smarandache, *Neutrosophic Masses & Indeterminate Models. Applications to Information Fusion*, Proceedings of the International Conference on Advanced Mechatronic Systems [ICAMechS 2012], Tokyo, Japan, 18-21 September 2012.