Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, Vol. 90, 2025

University of New Mexico

# Neutrosophic Decision Path Algebra: A Novel Framework for Evaluating Graphic Design Quality under Art and Technology Integration

Yong Yang*
Shaanxi Open School, Cultural Communication and Art Design University, Shanxi, 710119, China
*Corresponding author, E-mail: artdesignyy@163.com

**Abstract:** Evaluating graphic design quality presents a multidimensional challenge that involves subjective artistic judgment and objective technological execution. Traditional assessment methods rely on static scoring or binary judgments that fail to capture the dynamic evolution of quality over a design process. This paper introduces a novel mathematical model, the Neutrosophic Decision Path Algebra (NDPA), grounded in the principles of neutrosophic logic. The NDPA framework models the design evaluation process as a dynamic path of decisions, each carrying degrees of truth, indeterminacy, and falsity. The model includes a new algebraic structure for combining, transforming, and collapsing decision paths into a final assessment. The paper further defines multiple quantitative indicators, such as design maturity, stability, and fluctuation, and demonstrates their application to evaluate graphic design projects that integrate art and technology. NDPA enables a more realistic, flexible, and mathematically robust framework for quality evaluation in creative domains.

**Keywords:** Neutrosophic Logic, Decision Path Algebra, Graphic Design Evaluation, Art-Technology Fusion, Quality Assessment, Indeterminacy, Multi-Criteria Decision Making.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background and Motivation

Graphic design is a dynamic discipline that integrates creativity, communication, and technology to produce solutions that are both visually compelling and functionally effective. As design practices have evolved, particularly in digital and interactive contexts such as user interfaces, motion graphics, and virtual reality, evaluating the quality of graphic design has become increasingly complex [1, 2]. Traditional evaluation methods—such as static rubrics, peer reviews, or aesthetic scoring often fail to capture the iterative and multifaceted nature of the design process [3, 4]. For example, a motion graphic may excel in visual appeal but suffer from technical flaws, or a user interface may be functionally robust yet lack artistic engagement. These challenges highlight the need for a sophisticated evaluation framework that accounts for the interplay of artistic expression and technological precision.

The complexity of graphic design evaluation arises from several factors: subjective interpretation, contextual dependencies, iterative revisions, and the partial fulfillment of design objectives [5]. These elements introduce ambiguity, uncertainty, and evolving perceptions of quality over time, rendering binary assessments of "good" or "bad" inadequate [6, 7]. Instead, modern design evaluation requires a nuanced approach that embraces degrees of conformity, indeterminacy, and even failure as integral components of the creative process. Such an approach must systematically track how design quality evolves through multiple stages, from initial conceptualization to final implementation, while accommodating feedback loops and iterative refinements [8]. This need is particularly pronounced in design projects that blend artistic vision with technological innovation, such as interactive media or data-driven visualizations [9].

### 1.2 Theoretical Gap

Despite extensive research in design evaluation, fuzzy logic, and decision theory, no formal model has been developed to represent the evolution of design quality as a dynamic, multi-stage process under uncertainty [10, 11]. Existing evaluation frameworks, including those based on fuzzy logic, typically focus on static assessments or single-point evaluations, which do not adequately capture the temporal and iterative aspects of design development [3, 12]. Neutrosophic logic, introduced by Smarandache, provides a powerful framework for handling truth, indeterminacy, and falsity simultaneously, making it well-suited for complex decision-making scenarios [13]. However, its applications have primarily been limited to static contexts or extensions of fuzzy decision-making models, with little exploration of dynamic, multi-stage processes [14, 15].

Two critical theoretical gaps remain:

1. Lack of a Dynamic Evaluation Model; No structured framework exists to describe how design evaluations evolve across multiple stages, incorporating iterative feedback, contextual shifts, and changing perceptions of quality.
2. Absence of a Neutrosophic Algebra for Decision Dynamics; While neutrosophic logic offers significant expressive power, no algebraic structure has been developed to model the dynamic paths through which design quality assessments form, adapt, and stabilize over time [16].

These gaps underscore the need for a novel framework that combines the flexibility of neutrosophic logic with a formal representation of decision-making dynamics in design evaluation.

### 1.3 Research Objective

This study proposes a pioneering formal framework, NDPA, which extends neutrosophic logic to model the dynamic evolution of design evaluation paths. Unlike conventional neutrosophic models that assign a single triple of truth (T), indeterminacy (I), and falsity (F) to evaluate a design, NDPA represents the evaluation process as a sequence of neutrosophic states: $P = \{d_1, d_2, ..., d_n\}$, where each $d_k = (T_k, I_k, F_k)$ captures the design's quality at a specific stage. This approach enables:

1. Tracking changes in the perception of design quality over time.

2. Incorporating feedback, iterative revisions, ambiguity, and divergence in the evaluation process.
3. Applying mathematical operations to analyze and compare evaluation paths systematically.

By modeling design quality as a dynamic process, NDPA provides a mathematically rigorous and flexible framework for evaluating complex graphic design projects that integrate artistic creativity and technological functionality [9, 17].

### 1.4 Research Contributions

This paper makes the following significant contributions to the fields of design evaluation and decision theory:

1. We define Neutrosophic Decision Path Algebra as a formal algebraic structure for modeling sequences of decision states, supported by well-defined operations such as fusion, transformation, and aggregation.
2. We introduce new indicators, including decision path maturity, stability, and fluctuation, to quantify the characteristics of evolving design evaluations.
3. NDPA is applied to assess graphic design quality in contexts where artistic vision and technological implementation converge, providing a practical tool for designers, evaluators, and researchers.
4. Through detailed examples and visual models, we demonstrate NDPA's utility in real-world scenarios, such as design prototyping, collaborative feedback, and iterative refinement processes.

These contributions advance the theoretical and practical understanding of design evaluation, offering a robust framework for addressing the complexities of modern graphic design.

### 1.5 Structure of the Paper

The paper is organized as follows:

Section 2: Reviews the foundations of neutrosophic logic and articulates the need to extend it for modeling dynamic decision paths.

Section 3: Defines the structure and core algebraic operations of Neutrosophic Decision Path Algebra (NDPA).

Section 4: Presents novel evaluation indicators for analyzing the properties of decision paths.

Section 5: Demonstrates the practical application of NDPA to a graphic design project, highlighting its ability to evaluate both artistic and technological dimensions.

Section 6: Concludes with a summary of findings and directions for future research.

## 2. Neutrosophic Foundations and the Need for Path-Based Modeling

### 2.1 Introduction to Neutrosophic Logic

Neutrosophic logic, introduced by Florentin Smarandache [13], extends classical and fuzzy logic by allowing for the simultaneous expression of truth, indeterminacy, and falsity in a single logical statement or evaluation.

Each proposition or assessment is expressed as a triplet:
(T, I, F),where T, I, F∈[0,1]
T: the degree to which the proposition is considered true
I: the degree of indeterminacy or uncertainty
F: the degree to which it is considered false
Unlike fuzzy logic or intuitionistic fuzzy logic, these components are independent, and their sum is not required to equal 1. This flexibility makes neutrosophic logic well-suited for modeling real-world scenarios that are ambiguous, contradictory, or incomplete.
Example: A graphic design concept may be 70% successful in conveying the intended aesthetic, 20% uncertain due to a lack of feedback, and 30% misaligned with technical constraints. This can be represented as (T=0.7, I=0.2, F=0.3)

**2.2 Why Neutrosophic Logic Matters for Design Evaluation**

Evaluating graphic design, especially when artistic and technological criteria are integrated, involves subjective judgment, technical standards, and incomplete knowledge. These dimensions cannot be reduced to a binary yes/no decision or a single numerical score.

Most current evaluation methods suffer from limitations:

a) They assess the design at one final stage only (e.g., a review or critique session)
b) They do not represent how feedback, iteration, and uncertainty evolve over time
c) They fail to track the fluctuations in evaluation quality during the design process

Neutrosophic logic enables modeling these evaluations in a granular and expressive way by incorporating degrees of truth, indeterminacy, and falsity.

**2.3 Limitations of Traditional Evaluation Methods**

Table 1 compares classical evaluation frameworks with neutrosophic logic in terms of their suitability for modeling design quality.

Table 1. Comparison Between Traditional and Neutrosophic Evaluation Models[13]

| Feature | Traditional Logic/Fuzzy Logic | Neutrosophic Logic |
|---|---|---|
| Single truth value | √ | X |
| Models indeterminacy explicitly | X | √ |
| Allows contradiction | X | √ |
| Suitable for iterative design | X | √ |
| Independent (T, I, F) values | X (dependent) | √ (independent) |

As shown in Table 1, neutrosophic logic provides significant advantages in expressing ambiguity and change, which are key in creative processes like graphic design. This justifies its use as a foundation for our model.

**2.4 The Case for Path-Based Evaluation**

In real-world design workflows, especially in projects that blend artistic creativity and technical execution, quality is not constant. It evolves through:

a) Brainstorming

b) Sketching and prototyping
c) Technical development
d) Feedback and revision
e) Final refinement

Each of these stages may produce different quality evaluations, with changing levels of confidence, uncertainty, and perceived failure.

Thus, we introduce the concept of a Neutrosophic Decision Path: a sequence of neutrosophic evaluations that represent the trajectory of a design's perceived quality over time.

### 2.5 Modeling Design Evaluation as a Decision Path

Let a design decision or evaluation at stage k be represented as a neutrosophic triplet:

$$d_k = (T_k, I_k, F_k)$$

Then the full decision path is defined as:

$$\mathcal{P} = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}, d_k \in [0,1]^3$$

Each $d_k$ represents an evaluation at a distinct design stage.

Table 2. Sample Decision Path Across Design Stages

| Stage | Description | Evaluation ( $T_k, I_k, F_k$ ) |
|---|---|---|
| $d_1$ | Initial concept sketch | (0.6, 0.3, 0.2) |
| $d_2$ | Digital wireframe | (0.7, 0.2, 0.1) |
| $d_3$ | Client feedback | (0.5, 0.4, 0.3) |
| $d_4$ | Prototype implementation | (0.8, 0.1, 0.2) |
| $d_5$ | Final polished version | (0.9, 0.05, 0.1) |

Table 2 illustrates how a design evolves through different quality evaluations over time. This table highlights the fluctuation and progression in all three components (T, I, F). For example:

a) Truth value (T) gradually increases as the design matures.
b) Indeterminacy (I) decreases as feedback clarifies decisions.
c) Falsity (F) reflects ongoing issues, which may temporarily increase after critical feedback.

Such changes cannot be captured in static models but are central to real design workflows.

## 3. Formal Definition of Neutrosophic Decision Path Algebra

### 3.1 Overview

This section introduces the full mathematical formulation of NDPA. NDPA models decision-making (specifically design evaluation) as a dynamic process, where each stage is evaluated using neutrosophic logic. The algebra includes:

a) A structured representation of decision paths
b) Operations to combine, transform, and summarize these paths
c) Indicators that quantify the behavior of the decision trajectory

### 3.2 Basic Definitions

**Definition** 1: Neutrosophic Evaluation Point

A Neutrosophic Evaluation Point $d_k$ is an ordered triple:

$$d_k = (T_k, I_k, F_k), T_k, I_k, F_k \in [0,1]$$

Where:

- $T_k$ = truth degree at stage $k$
- $I_k$ = indeterminacy degree
- $F_k$ = falsity degree

Each $d_k$ represents the evaluation of the design at a specific stage.

**Definition** 2: Neutrosophic Decision Path

A Neutrosophic Decision Path $\mathcal{P}$ of length $n$ is:

$$\mathcal{P} = \{d_k = (T_k, I_k, F_k)\}_{k=1}^{n}$$

Where:

- $n$ : the number of stages in the design process
- Each $d_k \in [0,1]^3$

**Definition** 3: Path Space

Let $\mathbb{D}$ be the set of all possible decision paths:

$$\mathbb{D} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{\mathcal{P} \mid \mathcal{P} \text{ has length } n\}$$

### 3.3 Algebraic Operations on Decision Paths

We now define a set of operations that allow manipulation and analysis of decision paths within the NDPA framework.

**Operation** 1: Path Fusion

Let $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ There are two paths of equal length $n$ :

$$\mathcal{P}_1 = \left\{\left(T_k^{(1)}, I_k^{(1)}, F_k^{(1)}\right)\right\}, \mathcal{P}_2 = \left\{\left(T_k^{(2)}, I_k^{(2)}, F_k^{(2)}\right)\right\}$$

Then the fusion path is:

$$\mathcal{P}_3 = \mathcal{P}_1 \oplus \mathcal{P}_2 = \left\{\left(\frac{T_k^{(1)} + T_k^{(2)}}{2}, \frac{I_k^{(1)} + I_k^{(2)}}{2}, \frac{F_k^{(1)} + F_k^{(2)}}{2}\right)\right\}_{k=1}^{n}$$

This operation is useful when two evaluators (e.g., designer and client) provide assessments for the same design stages.

**Operation** 2: Weighted Path Fusion $\oplus_w$

For weights $w_1, w_2 \in [0,1]$ with $w_1 + w_2 = 1$, define:

$$\mathcal{P}_1 \oplus_w \mathcal{P}_2 = \left\{\left(w_1 T_k^{(1)} + w_2 T_k^{(2)}, w_1 I_k^{(1)} + w_2 I_k^{(2)}, w_1 F_k^{(1)} + w_2 F_k^{(2)}\right)\right\}$$

**Operation** 3: Path Collapse

This operation collapses a full decision path $\mathcal{P}$ into a single evaluation triple:

$$\downarrow \mathcal{P} = (\bar{T}, \bar{I}, \bar{F})$$

Where:

$$\bar{T}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} T_k, \bar{I}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} I_k, \bar{F}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} F_k$$

This is useful when we want to summarize the overall quality of the design process.

**Operation** 4: Path Transformation $\Phi_\sigma$

Let $\sigma=(\alpha_T,\alpha_I,\alpha_F)\in[0,1]^3$ be a transformation strategy (e.g., increasing confidence, reducing ambiguity). The transformation is:

$$\Phi_\sigma(\mathcal{P})=\{(T_k',I_k',F_k')\}$$

Where:

$$T_k'=T_k+\alpha_T(1-T_k), I_k'=I_k(1-\alpha_I), F_k'=F_k(1-\alpha_F)$$

This operation simulates applying a design refinement strategy or receiving more complete feedback.

3.4 Example of Algebraic Operations

Let us consider two paths with 3 stages each:

$$\mathcal{P}_1=\{(0.6,0.3,0.2),(0.7,0.2,0.1),(0.8,0.1,0.1)\}$$
$$\mathcal{P}_2=\{(0.5,0.4,0.3),(0.6,0.3,0.2),(0.7,0.2,0.2)\}$$

Fusion:

$$\mathcal{P}_1\oplus\mathcal{P}_2=\{(0.55,0.35,0.25),(0.65,0.25,0.15),(0.75,0.15,0.15)\}$$

Collapse:

$$\mathcal{P}_1=\left(\frac{0.6+0.7+0.8}{3},\frac{0.3+0.2+0.1}{3},\frac{0.2+0.1+0.1}{3}\right)=(0.7,0.2,0.13)$$

**3.5 Algebraic Properties**

Let $\mathcal{P}_1,\mathcal{P}_2,\mathcal{P}_3\in\mathbb{D}$ be paths of equal length.

| Property | Description | Holds? |
|---|---|---|
| Closure | $\mathcal{P}_1\oplus\mathcal{P}_2\in\mathbb{D}$ | √ |
| Commutativity | $\mathcal{P}_1\oplus\mathcal{P}_2=\mathcal{P}_2\oplus\mathcal{P}_1$ | √ |
| Associativity | $(\mathcal{P}_1\oplus\mathcal{P}_2)\oplus\mathcal{P}_3=\mathcal{P}_1\oplus(\mathcal{P}_2\oplus\mathcal{P}_3)$ | √ |
| Identity element | Exists: $\mathcal{P}_0=\{(0,0,0)\}^n$ | √ |
| Idempotency | $\mathcal{P}\oplus\mathcal{P}=\mathcal{P}$ | √ |

**4. Decision Path Indicators in NDPA**

**4.1 Introduction**

The Neutrosophic Decision Path Algebra (NDPA) provides a rich mathematical framework to model the progression of evaluations through time. However, to make these paths practically useful, we must define quantitative indicators that help:

a) Summarize the behavior of a path
b) Compare different design trajectories
c) Interpret strengths, weaknesses, and instability

In this section, we define and illustrate original neutrosophic indicators, including:

a) Maturity
b) Stability
c) Volatility
d) Drift
e) Confidence Loss

Each of these metrics is rigorously defined, with supporting examples and interpretations.

**4.2 Notation**

Let a neutrosophic decision path be:

$$\mathcal{P} = \{d_k = (T_k, I_k, F_k)\}_{k=1}^{n}$$

Let the average values be:

$$\bar{T} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} T_k, \bar{I} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} I_k, \bar{F} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} F_k$$

Let the standard deviations be:

$$\sigma_T = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} (T_k - \bar{T})^2}, \text{ and similarly for } \sigma_I, \sigma_F$$

**4.3 Indicator 1: Path Maturity $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$**

**Definition:**

Path maturity measures how developed and conclusive the decision path is - favoring high truth, low indeterminacy, and low falsity.

$$\mu(\mathcal{P}) = \bar{T} \cdot (1 - \bar{I}) \cdot (1 - \bar{F})$$

$\mu \in [0,1]$

Higher values indicate a mature, trustworthy design conclusion

Interpretation:

$\mu \approx 1$ : The design is evaluated positively with low confusion and minimal errors.

$\mu \approx 0$ : The design is uncertain or contradictory.

**4.4 Indicator 2: Path Stability $\boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$**

**Definition**:

Stability measures the consistency of evaluations across all stages.

$$S(\mathcal{P}) = 1 - (\sigma_T + \sigma_I + \sigma_F)$$

$S \in (-\infty, 1]$

Higher values → more consistent path

Negative values indicate large fluctuations

Remark: Values close to 1 mean evaluations are stable (no surprises); values far from 1 suggest erratic changes in judgment.

**4.5 Indicator 3: Path Volatility $\boldsymbol{V}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}})$**

**Definition:**

Volatility focuses on how much the evaluations jump between stages. We compute the average pointwise difference:

$$V(\mathcal{P}) = \frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [|T_{k+1} - T_k| + |I_{k+1} - I_k| + |F_{k+1} - F_k|]$$

$V \geq 0$

Lower $V$ : smoother evaluation

Higher $V$ : more back-and-forth judgment shifts

### 4.6 Indicator 4: Directional Drift $D(\mathcal{P})$

**Definition:**

Drift measures whether the overall evaluation is getting better or worse over time. It compares the final and initial states.

$$D(\mathcal{P}) = (T_n - T_1) - (F_n - F_1)$$

$D > 0$: design improves overall

$D < 0$: design declines

$D = 0$ : neutral or balanced change

You can normalize $D$ by dividing by 2 to keep it within $[-1,1]$.

### 4.7 Indicator 5: Confidence Loss $CL(\mathcal{P})$

**Definition:**

Confidence loss tracks how much uncertainty remains in the path:

$$CL(\mathcal{P}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} I_k$$

$CL \in [0,1]$

High values: the decision path is persistently uncertain

Low values: clarity improves throughout

### 4.8 Example: Computing Indicators for a Design Path

Let:

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(0.6,0.3,0.2), (0.7,0.2,0.1), (0.5,0.4,0.3), (0.8,0.1,0.2), (0.9,0.05,0.1)\}$$

We compute:

$$\bar{T} = \frac{0.6 + 0.7 + 0.5 + 0.8 + 0.9}{5} = 0.7$$

$\bar{I} = 0.21, \bar{F} = 0.18$

$$\mu(\mathcal{P}) = 0.7 \cdot (1 - 0.21) \cdot (1 - 0.18) = 0.7 \cdot 0.79 \cdot 0.82 \approx 0.453$$

Assume standard deviations (after full calculation):

$\sigma_T = 0.14, \sigma_I = 0.13, \sigma_F = 0.08$

Then:

$$S(\mathcal{P}) = 1 - (0.14 + 0.13 + 0.08) = 0.65$$

Compute Volatility:

$$V(\mathcal{P}) = \frac{1}{4}[0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1, 0.2 + 0.2 + 0.2, 0.3 + 0.3 + 0.1, 0.1 + 0.05 + 0.1] = \frac{2.3}{4} = 0.575$$

Compute Drift:

$$D(\mathcal{P}) = (0.9 - 0.6) - (0.1 - 0.2) = 0.3 + 0.1 = 0.4$$

Confidence Loss:

$$CL = \bar{I} = 0.21$$

Table 3. Computed Indicators for Sample Path

| Metric | Value | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| Maturity $\mu$ | 0.453 | Medium maturity; still some uncertainty |
| Stability $S$ | 0.65 | Moderately stable decision progression |
| Volatility $V$ | 0.575 | Moderate fluctuations in evaluation |
| Drift $D$ | 0.4 | Positive improvement over time |
| Conf. Loss $CL$ | 0.21 | Acceptable but notable uncertainty remained |

## 5. Application of NDPA in Evaluating Graphic Design under Art Technology Integration

### 5.1 Purpose of This Section

This section demonstrates the practical use of the Neutrosophic Decision Path Algebra (NDPA) in evaluating a real-world graphic design project that fuses artistic creativity and technological execution.

We will:

1. Define design stages
2. Assign neutrosophic evaluations
3. Apply algebraic operations
4. Calculate all path indicators
5. Interpret the results clearly

### 5.2 Case Study Overview

Interactive Digital Poster for an art exhibition designed to run as a motion-responsive visual on large digital screens.

Evaluation Context:

| Artistic Dimension | Technological Dimension |
|---|---|
| Aesthetic appeal, visual balance | Code stability, interaction response |
| Concept originality, emotional tone | Hardware compatibility, performance metrics |

Stakeholders:

a) Designer
b) Developer
c) Client (museum curator)

Each stakeholder provides input at specific stages. The combined evaluation across five stages defines the decision path.

### 5.3 Design Stages and Evaluation Triples

Each stage was evaluated by a panel (weighted average of designer, developer, and client opinions). Neutrosophic scores were agreed upon based on qualitative rubrics.

Table 4. Neutrosophic Evaluation of Each Stage

| Stage No. | Design Phase | Evaluation Triple ( $T_k, I_k, F_k$ ) |
|---|---|---|
| $d_1$ | Initial Concept (art draft) | (0.60, 0.30, 0.20) |
| $d_2$ | Digital Wireframe | (0.70, 0.20, 0.15) |
| $d_3$ | Interactive Prototype | (0.50, 0.35, 0.30) |
| $d_4$ | Feedback & Refinement | (0.80, 0.10, 0.10) |
| $d_5$ | Final Launch-ready Design | (0.90, 0.05, 0.05) |

Thus, the decision path is:

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(0.6,0.3,0.2), (0.7,0.2,0.15), (0.5,0.35,0.3), (0.8,0.1,0.1), (0.9,0.05,0.05)\}$$

**5.4 Applying NDPA Operations**

1. Collapse Operation

$$\mathcal{P} = (\bar{T}, \bar{I}, \bar{F}) = \left(\frac{0.6 + 0.7 + 0.5 + 0.8 + 0.9}{5}, \frac{0.3 + 0.2 + 0.35 + 0.1 + 0.05}{5}, \frac{0.2 + 0.15 + 0.3 + 0.1 + 0.05}{5}\right)$$

$$\bar{T} = 0.7, \bar{I} = 0.2, \bar{F} = 0.16$$

This summarizes the overall performance of the project.

2. Transformation Operation $\Phi_\sigma$

Suppose the designer applies a confidence-enhancing transformation with:

$$\sigma = (\alpha_T = 0.2, \alpha_I = 0.3, \alpha_F = 0.1)$$

For each stage:

$$T'_k = T_k + 0.2(1 - T_k), I'_k = I_k(1 - 0.3), F'_k = F_k(1 - 0.1)$$

Example for $d_1$ :

$$T'_1 = 0.6 + 0.2(1 - 0.6) = 0.6 + 0.08 = 0.68$$

$$I'_1 = 0.3 \cdot 0.7 = 0.21, F'_1 = 0.2 \cdot 0.9 = 0.18$$

This models the impact of design improvement strategies.

**5.5 Calculating Path Indicators**

Let us compute the full set of indicators for $\mathcal{P}$.

Averages:

$$\bar{T} = 0.7, \bar{I} = 0.2, \bar{F} = 0.16$$

Maturity:

$$\mu(\mathcal{P}) = \bar{T} \cdot (1 - \bar{I}) \cdot (1 - \bar{F}) = 0.7 \cdot 0.8 \cdot 0.84 = 0.4704$$

Stability:

We calculate sample standard deviations:

$$\sigma_T = \sqrt{\frac{(0.6 - 0.7)^2 + (0.7 - 0.7)^2 + (0.5 - 0.7)^2 + (0.8 - 0.7)^2 + (0.9 - 0.7)^2}{5}} = \sqrt{0.02} = 0.1414$$

$$\sigma_I = \sqrt{\frac{(0.3 - 0.2)^2 + (0.2 - 0.2)^2 + (0.35 - 0.2)^2 + (0.1 - 0.2)^2 + (0.05 - 0.2)^2}{5}} \approx 0.1082$$

$$\sigma_F \approx 0.0935$$

Then:

$$S(\mathcal{P}) = 1 - (\sigma_T + \sigma_I + \sigma_F) = 1 - (0.1414 + 0.1082 + 0.0935) = 0.657$$

Volatility:

$$V(\mathcal{P}) = \frac{1}{4}[|0.7 - 0.6| + |0.2 - 0.3| + |0.15 - 0.2| + |0.5 - 0.7| + |0.35 - 0.2| + |0.3 - 0.15| + \cdots]$$

Stepwise differences:

| From → To | T diff | I diff | F diff | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **d1 → d2** | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.25 |
| **d2 → d3** | 0.2 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.50 |
| **d3 → d4** | 0.3 | 0.25 | 0.2 | 0.75 |
| **d4 → d5** | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.20 |

$$V = \frac{0.25 + 0.5 + 0.75 + 0.2}{4} = \frac{1.7}{4} = 0.425$$

Drift:

$$D = (T_5 - T_1) - (F_5 - F_1) = (0.9 - 0.6) - (0.05 - 0.2) = 0.3 + 0.15 = 0.45$$

Confidence Loss:

$$CL = \bar{I} = 0.2$$

Explanation of Results above as:

| Indicator | Value | Meaning |
|---|---|---|
| Maturity | 0.470 | Medium-high development and clarity |
| Stability | 0.657 | Moderately stable across stages |
| Volatility | 0.425 | Moderate variation in judgment |
| Drift | 0.45 | Clear improvement over time |
| Confidence Loss | 0.2 | Acceptable uncertainty decreases by the final stage |

Overall Analysis:

a) The project showed positive drift, improving across evaluations.
b) Truth increased, falsity decreased, and indeterminacy was reduced over time.
c) Maturity and stability indicate a successful iterative design process.
d) The volatility reflects real-world creative fluctuation - not too smooth, not too erratic.

### 5.7 Linking to NDPA Theory

This application demonstrates the full integration of the theoretical model:

1. Section 2 (neutrosophic logic) allowed expressive stage-wise modeling.
2. Section 3 (NDPA algebra) structured these stages and operations.
3. Section 4 (indicators) quantified trajectory behavior.
4. Section 5 (this section) confirms that NDPA provides interpretable, actionable, and mathematically grounded insights in a real design workflow.

## 6. Conclusion and Future Work

### 6.1 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced a new mathematical model called the NDPA. This model helps us evaluate graphic design quality step by step from the first sketch to the final product, especially when the design combines art and technology.

Instead of using a single score or decision, NDPA uses a sequence of evaluations, where each stage is rated using three values:

a) Truth (T): how good the design is
b) Indeterminacy (I): how uncertain or unclear the judgment is
c) Falsity (F): how much the design fails

We also created:

a) Mathematical operations to combine and transform these evaluations
b) New indicators (like maturity, stability, volatility, drift, and confidence loss) to help us understand the design process

Then, we used a real case an interactive digital poster to show how this model works in practice. We calculated all values, step by step, and found that NDPA gave rich, detailed insights that normal evaluation methods cannot provide.

**6.2 Why NDPA is Useful**

NDPA is powerful because:

1. It works well for creative processes
2. It captures change over time
3. It deals with uncertainty and disagreement
4. It provides numbers and meaning not just opinions

This makes it useful for:

a) Designers
b) Teams with multiple reviewers
c) Projects involving feedback and iteration

**6.3 Future Work**

In future research, NDPA can be extended to:

1. Include automated learning of patterns in decision paths
2. Combine with AI design tools to give real-time feedback
3. Apply to other fields, like architecture, industrial design, or education
4. Explore different types of weights and transformations
5. Create software tools that let people use NDPA without needing equations

**References**

1. Norman, D. A. (2013). *The Design of Everyday Things* (Revised and Expanded Edition). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
2. Schön, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
3. Roca de Viñaspre, M. E., & San Pedro, J. B. (2017). Evaluation of design alternatives using fuzzy sets: A creative design support system. *Expert Systems with Applications, 87*, 165–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2017.06.016
4. Lopez-Morales, J. S., & Diaz, E. (2020). Creative decision-making in graphic design: A fuzzy logic perspective. *Design Studies, 66*, 123–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2019.11.002
5. Kosko, B. (1993). *Fuzzy Thinking: The New Science of Fuzzy Logic*. New York, NY: Hyperion.
6. Cross, N. (2006). *Designerly Ways of Knowing*. London: Springer.
7. Lawson, B. (2004). *What Designers Know*. Oxford: Architectural Press.

8. Lupton, E. (2017). *Design Is Storytelling*. New York, NY: Cooper Hewitt, Smithsonian Design Museum.
9. Bertol, D., & Foell, J. (1997). *Designing Digital Space: An Architect's Guide to Virtual Reality*. New York, NY: Wiley.
10. Zadeh, L. A. (1965). Fuzzy sets. *Information and Control, 8*(3), 338–353. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(65)90241-X
11. Dubois, D., & Prade, H. (1988). *Possibility Theory: An Approach to Computerized Processing of Uncertainty*. New York, NY: Springer.
12. Chen, S. J., & Chen, S. M. (2003). Fuzzy risk analysis based on similarity measures of generalized fuzzy numbers. *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems, 11*(1), 45–56. https://doi.org/10.1109/TFUZZ.2002.806316
13. Smarandache, F. (2005). *A Unifying Field in Logics: Neutrosophic Logic, Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Probability and Statistics*. Rehoboth, NM: American Research Press.
14. Salama, A. A., & Smarandache, F. (2014). Neutrosophic decision-making processes: An overview. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 5*, 3–8.
15. Ali, M., Broumi, S., & Smarandache, F. (2016). Decision making with neutrosophic sets. In *Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing* (pp. 123–145). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-30324-5_6
16. Broumi, S., & Smarandache, F. (2018). *Neutrosophic Graph Theory and Applications*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-9380-5
17. Manovich, L. (2013). *Software Takes Command*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.


Received: Jan 7, 2025. Accepted: July 22, 2025