

SOME WEAK ORDER ON THE SET OF
HOMOGENEOUS INTERVAL NUMBERS

Krzysztof PIASECKI

Department of Mathematics, Academy of Economy,
ul. Marchlewskiego 146/150, 60-967 Poznań, Poland.

Let $\mathbb{R} = [-\infty, +\infty]$. A weak order (see for example [1], [2]) on \mathbb{R} can be given in following manner.

Definition 1 [3] : Each mapping $\zeta: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0,1]$ such that

$$\zeta(x,y) \geq 1 - \zeta(y,x) , \quad (1)$$

$$\zeta(x,y) + \zeta(z,x) \leq 1 , \quad (2)$$

for each $(x,y,z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $y < z$, is called a fuzzy relation "less or equal" (FLE).

Definition 2 [3] : The mapping $\zeta_s: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0,1]$ given by the identity

$$\forall (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \quad \zeta_s(x,y) = 1 - \zeta(y,x) \quad (3)$$

where ζ is a fixed FLE, is called a fuzzy relation "less than" (FLT) generated by FLE ζ .

Additionally we distinguish the following kinds of FLE.

Definition 3 [3] : Each FLE ξ satisfying

$$\xi(x, y) \wedge \xi(y, x) < \frac{1}{2} \quad (4)$$

for each $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $x \neq y$, is called quasi-anti-symmetrical.

Derinition 4 [3] : Each FLE ξ satisfying the next conditions:

$$\forall \{x_n\} \downarrow x \quad \{\xi(\cdot, x_n)\} \downarrow \xi(\cdot, x), \quad (5)$$

$$\forall \{y_n\} \uparrow y \quad \{\xi(y_n, \cdot)\} \uparrow \xi(y, \cdot) \quad (6)$$

is called a continuous from above FLE.

Definition 5 [3] : Any FLE ξ unfuzzily bounds the real line if it satisfies

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \quad \xi(x, +\infty) = \xi(-\infty, x) = 1 \quad (7)$$

Let us look on the set of interval numbers. By on interval we mean a closed bounded set of "real" numbers from \mathbb{R}

$$[a, b] = \{x: a \leq x \leq b\}.$$

If A is an interval, we will denote its end points by \underline{A} and \bar{A} . Thus $A = [\underline{A}, \bar{A}]$. The family of all intervals will be indicated by $I(\mathbb{R})$. We can extend the order relation, \leq , on \mathbb{R} to $I(\mathbb{R})$ as follows:

$$A \leq B \quad \text{iff} \quad \underline{A} \leq \underline{B} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{A} \leq \bar{B}.$$

Moreover, we shall use the following "ordering" relation on $I(\mathbb{R})$

$$A \prec B \quad \text{iff} \quad \bar{A} \leq \underline{B}.$$

A family of homogeneous interval numbers will be given by the mapping which is presented below.

Definition 6: Each mapping $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow I(\mathbb{R})$ having the next properties:

$$\mathcal{J}(-\infty) = [-\infty, -\infty] , \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{J}(+\infty) = [+ \infty, + \infty] , \quad (9)$$

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \quad -\infty < \underline{\mathcal{J}}(x) \leq \bar{\mathcal{J}}(x) < +\infty , \quad (10)$$

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \quad \bar{\mathcal{J}}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{J}}(x) = \Delta , \quad (11)$$

$$\forall (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \quad x \leq y \Rightarrow \mathcal{J}(x) \leq \mathcal{J}(y) \quad (12)$$

is called a homogeneous nondecreasing interval function.

Let \mathcal{J} be the fixed homogeneous nondecreasing interval function. It generates the homogeneous family of interval numbers $\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{R}) = \{A, \exists x \in \mathbb{R}, A = \mathcal{J}(x)\}$. Take into account the measurable families of subsets in \mathbb{R} , given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{-\infty} &= \{\emptyset, [-\infty, -\infty]\} , \\ \mathcal{B}_{+\infty} &= \{\emptyset, [+ \infty, + \infty]\} , \\ \mathcal{B}_x &= \{A: \exists B \in \mathcal{B}^1 \quad A = \mathcal{J}(x) \cap B\} , \end{aligned}$$

for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ where \mathcal{B}^n is the usual Borel field in \mathbb{R}^n . Since the measures with uniform distribution are well suited for the homogeneity of interval numbers, we propose to define such denumerable additive measures m_x on each \mathcal{B}_x ($x \in \mathbb{R}$) that they fulfil:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \quad m_x(\mathcal{J}(x)) = 1 \quad (13)$$

$$\forall (x, c) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{J}(x) \quad \Delta > 0 \Rightarrow m_x([\underline{\mathcal{J}}(x), c]) = \frac{c - \underline{\mathcal{J}}(x)}{\Delta} \quad (14)$$

Then, for each pair $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, there exists the unique product measure m_{xy} on $\mathcal{B}_{xy} = \{A, \exists B \in \mathcal{B}^2: A = (\mathcal{J}(x) \times \mathcal{J}(y)) \cap B\}$

[4] with

$$\forall (A, B) \in \mathcal{J}(x) \times \mathcal{J}(y) \quad m_{xy}(A \times B) = m_x(A) \cdot m_y(B) . \quad (15)$$

Since $\mathcal{B}_{-\infty}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{+\infty}$ are two-elements families, the class of measurable subsets in $\mathcal{J}(x) \times \mathcal{J}(y)$ is given by $\mathcal{B}_{xy} = \{A: \exists (B, C) \in \mathcal{B}_x \times \mathcal{B}_y: A = B \times C\}$ for each pair $(x, y) \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. Thus the product measure m_{xy} is explicitly gi-

ven by (15), for each $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

In agreement with the intuition, we can say that $x \leq y$ in degree equal to the measure of the set $\{(t,s): t \in J(x), s \in J(y), t \leq s\}$ for each $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Also, in like manner we can define a degree of $x < y$.

Definition 7: The mapping $\tilde{\zeta}: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0,1]$ given by

$$\tilde{\zeta}(x,y) = m_{xy}(\{(t,s): t \in J(x), s \in J(y), t \leq s\}) \quad (16)$$

for each $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, is called a order with interval imprecision (OII).

Definition 8: The mapping $\tilde{\zeta}_s: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0,1]$ given by

$$\tilde{\zeta}_s(x,y) = m_{xy}(\{(t,s): t \in J(x), s \in J(y), t < s\}) \quad (17)$$

for each $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, is called a strict order with interval imprecision (SOII).

It is very easy to check that if mapping $J: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow I(\mathbb{R})$ is degenerate (i.e. $\Delta = 0$) then the OII and SOII describe respectively the usual order relations \leq and $<$ in \mathbb{R} .

Consider now the case when $\Delta > 0$. For any pair $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $x < +\infty$ and $y > -\infty$, using (13), (15), (16) and (17) we have:

$$\tilde{\zeta}(+\infty, +\infty) = m_{+\infty+\infty}(J(+\infty) \times J(+\infty)) = 1, \quad (18)$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}(x, +\infty) = m_{x+\infty}(J(x) \times J(+\infty)) = 1, \quad (19)$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}(+\infty, x) = m_{+\infty x}(\emptyset \times \emptyset) = 0, \quad (20)$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}(y, -\infty) = m_{y-\infty}(\emptyset \times \emptyset) = 0, \quad (21)$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}(-\infty, y) = m_{-\infty y}(J(-\infty) \times J(y)) = 1, \quad (22)$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}(-\infty, -\infty) = m_{-\infty-\infty}(J(-\infty) \times J(-\infty)) = 1, \quad (23)$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}_s(+\infty, +\infty) = m_{+\infty+\infty}(\emptyset \times \emptyset) = 0, \quad (24)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_S(+\infty, x) = m_{+\infty x}(\emptyset \times \emptyset) = 0, \quad (25)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_S(x, +\infty) = m_{x+\infty}(\mathcal{I}(x) \times \mathcal{I}(+\infty)) = 1, \quad (26)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_S(-\infty, y) = m_{-\infty y}(\mathcal{I}(-\infty) \times \mathcal{I}(y)) = 1, \quad (27)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_S(y, -\infty) = m_{y-\infty}(\emptyset \times \emptyset) = 0, \quad (28)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_S(-\infty, -\infty) = m_{-\infty, -\infty}(\emptyset \times \emptyset) = 0. \quad (29)$$

From practical point-view, all above result are sensible. Nextly we have:

Theorem 1: The OII $\tilde{\xi}$ and SOII $\tilde{\xi}_S$ fulfil the condition (3).

Proof: For any pair $(x, y) \in M(\tilde{\mathbb{R}})$, the condition (3) follows from the identities (18) - (29). If $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ then the Fubini's Theorem [4] says $m_{xy} = m_{yx}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\xi}_S(x, y) &= m_{xy}(\{(t, s): t \in \mathcal{I}(x), s \in \mathcal{I}(y), t < s\}) = \\ &= m_{xy}((\mathcal{I}(x) \times \mathcal{I}(y)) \setminus \{(t, s): t \in \mathcal{I}(x), s \in \mathcal{I}(y), t > s\}) = \\ &= 1 - m_{xy}(\{(t, s): t \in \mathcal{I}(x), s \in \mathcal{I}(y), s \leq t\}) = \\ &= 1 - m_{yx}(\{(s, t): s \in \mathcal{I}(y), t \in \mathcal{I}(x), s \leq t\}) = \tilde{\xi}(y, x). \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2: If $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathcal{I}(x) \cap \mathcal{I}(y) \neq \emptyset$ then

$$\tilde{\xi}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\overline{\mathcal{I}}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(y))^2 & x \leq y \\ \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\overline{\mathcal{I}}(y) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(x))^2 & x > y \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_S(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\overline{\mathcal{I}}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(y))^2 & x < y \\ \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\overline{\mathcal{I}}(y) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(x))^2 & x \geq y \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

Proof: The identity (30) follows from (14) and (16). The identity (31) is an immediate consequence of (3) and (30). \blacksquare

Theorem 3: If $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathcal{I}(x) \prec \mathcal{I}(y)$ then $\tilde{\xi}(x, y) = 1$.

Proof: $\xi(x, y) = \mu_{xy}(\{(t, s): t \in \mathcal{I}(x), s \in \mathcal{I}(y), t \leq s\}) =$
 $= \mu_{xy}(\mathcal{I}(x) \times \mathcal{I}(y)) = 1 \quad \blacksquare$

Theorem 4: If $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathcal{I}(y) \prec \mathcal{I}(x)$ then $\tilde{\xi}(x, y) = 0$.

Proof: $\tilde{\xi}(x, y) = \mu_{xy}(\{(t, s): t \in \mathcal{I}(x), s \in \mathcal{I}(y), t \leq s\}) \leq$
 $\mu_{xy}([\bar{\mathcal{I}}(x), \bar{\mathcal{I}}(x)] \times \mathcal{I}(y)) = 0 \quad \blacksquare$

Theorem 5: Any OII $\tilde{\xi}$ is a FLE.

Proof: Using the Theorem 2 we get

$$1 - \tilde{\xi}(x, y) = \tilde{\xi}_s(y, x) = \mu_{yx}(\{(t, s): t \in \mathcal{I}(y), s \in \mathcal{I}(x), t < s\}) \leq$$

$$\leq \mu_{yx}(\{(t, s): t \in \mathcal{I}(y), s \in \mathcal{I}(x), t \leq s\}) =$$

$$= \tilde{\xi}(y, x)$$

for each pair $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. So, the condition (1) holds.

If $(x, y) \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ then the condition (2) follows from the identities (18) - (29). Suppose now that $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $z = +\infty$. Then, using (20), we obtain

$$\tilde{\xi}(x, y) + \tilde{\xi}(+\infty, x) = \tilde{\xi}(x, y) \leq 1.$$

For the case, when $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $y < z$, we get:

- if $\mathcal{I}(x) \prec \mathcal{I}(z)$ then, using the Theorem 4,

$$1 - \tilde{\xi}(z, x) = 1 > \tilde{\xi}(x, y);$$

- if $\mathcal{I}(y) \prec \mathcal{I}(x)$ then, in like manner as above,

$$\tilde{\xi}(x, y) = 0 \leq \tilde{\xi}_s(x, z) = 1 - \tilde{\xi}(z, x);$$

- otherwise, we have $\bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) > \bar{\mathcal{I}}(z)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{I}}(y) > \bar{\mathcal{I}}(x)$.

Thus for each $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $x \leq y < z$ we obtain $\bar{\mathcal{I}}(z) \gg$
 $\gg \bar{\mathcal{I}}(y) \gg \bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) > \bar{\mathcal{I}}(z) \gg \bar{\mathcal{I}}(y) \gg \bar{\mathcal{I}}(x)$. So, $\mathcal{I}(x) \cap \mathcal{I}(y) \neq \emptyset$ and

$\mathcal{I}(x) \cap \mathcal{I}(z) \neq \emptyset$. Hence, by the identity (30), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\xi}(x, y) + \tilde{\xi}(z, x) &= 1 - \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(y))^2 + \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(z))^2 = \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(z))^2 - (\bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(y))^2 \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover if $y < x \leq z$ then $\bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) > \underline{\mathcal{I}}(z) > \underline{\mathcal{I}}(x) > \underline{\mathcal{I}}(y)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{I}}(z) > \bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) > \bar{\mathcal{I}}(y) > \underline{\mathcal{I}}(x) > \underline{\mathcal{I}}(y)$. It shows that $\mathcal{I}(x) \cap \mathcal{I}(y) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{I}(x) \cap \mathcal{I}(z) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, by (30), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\xi}(x, y) + \tilde{\xi}(z, x) &= \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{\mathcal{I}}(y) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(x))^2 + \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(z))^2 \leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(x))^2 + \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{\mathcal{I}}(z) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(z))^2 = 1 \end{aligned}$$

If $y < z < x$ then $\bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) > \underline{\mathcal{I}}(z) > \underline{\mathcal{I}}(y)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{I}}(x) > \bar{\mathcal{I}}(z) > \bar{\mathcal{I}}(y) > \underline{\mathcal{I}}(x) > \underline{\mathcal{I}}(z) > \underline{\mathcal{I}}(y)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{I}(x) \cap \mathcal{I}(y) = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{I}(x) \cap \mathcal{I}(z) \neq \emptyset$. Using (30), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\xi}(x, y) + \tilde{\xi}(z, x) &= \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{\mathcal{I}}(y) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(x))^2 + \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{\mathcal{I}}(z) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(x))^2 = \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} ((\bar{\mathcal{I}}(y) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(x))^2 - (\bar{\mathcal{I}}(z) - \underline{\mathcal{I}}(x))^2) \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is ended. ■

The last theorem together with the Theorem 1 shows that any SOII is a FIT generated by OII. Furthermore, we have:

Theorem 6: Any OII unfuzzily bounds the real line.

Proof: See (18), (19), (22) and (23). ■

Theorem 7: The OII $\tilde{\xi}$ is quasi-antisymmetrical in $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{R})$ iff the interval mapping $\mathcal{I}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{R})$ has the property:

$$\forall (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \quad x \neq y \Rightarrow \mathcal{I}(x) \neq \mathcal{I}(y). \quad (32)$$

Proof: If $x \neq y$ then $x < y$ or $x > y$. Suppose now that $x > y$. Then, for the case $J(y) < J(x)$, the Theorem 4 shows

$\tilde{g}(x, y) = 0$. Otherwise we have $J(y) \leq J(x) < \bar{J}(y) \leq \bar{J}(x)$ and $J(y) < J(x)$ or $\bar{J}(y) < \bar{J}(x)$. Thus, by (30), we get:

$$\tilde{g}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{J}(y) - J(x))^2 < \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{J}(x) - J(x))^2 = \frac{1}{2}$$

or

$$\tilde{g}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{J}(y) - J(x))^2 < \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{J}(y) - J(y))^2 = \frac{1}{2}$$

So, (32) is sufficient for the quasi-antisymmetry. Suppose now

that there exists such pair $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that $x > y$ and

$J(x) = J(y)$. Thus

$$\tilde{g}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} (\bar{J}(y) - J(x))^2 = \frac{1}{2\Delta^2} \Delta^2 = \frac{1}{2}$$

We have seen that (32) is necessary for the quasi-antisymmetry. ■

Theorem 7: If the interval function $J: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow I(\mathbb{R})$ is continuous (i.e. $J: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{J}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous) then OII ξ is continuous from above.

Proof: Let $\{x_n\}$ be fixed sequence tending from above to $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

If $x = +\infty$ then $x_n = +\infty$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By (18) and (19) we get (5) because $\tilde{g}(\cdot, x) = \tilde{g}(\cdot, x_n) = 1$. Assume now that $x < +\infty$. Of course there exists such N_1 that $x_n < +\infty$ for each $n \gg N_1$.

Using (22) we get $1 = \tilde{g}(-\infty, x_n) = \tilde{g}(-\infty, x) = 1$. So,

$$\{\tilde{g}(-\infty, x_n)\} \downarrow \tilde{g}(-\infty, x). \quad (*)$$

If $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $J(y) < J(x)$ then $J(y) < J(x_n)$ for each positive integer n . Taking into account the Theorem 3 we obtain

$$\{\tilde{g}(y, x_n)\} \downarrow \tilde{g}(y, x) \quad (**)$$

because $\tilde{g}(y, x_n) = \tilde{g}(y, x) = 1$.

If $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $J(y) \cap J(x) \neq \emptyset$ then there exists such positive integer $N_2 \gg N_1$ that $J(y) \cap J(x_n) \neq \emptyset$ for each $n \gg N_2$.

Using (30) we obtain (**) from continuity of J .

If $y \in \mathbb{R}$ $J(x) \not\subset J(y)$ and $\bar{J}(x) < \underline{J}(y)$ then there exists such $N_3 \gg N_1$ that $\bar{J}(x_n) \leq \underline{J}(y)$. Then the condition (**) follows from the Theorem 4 because $\tilde{g}(y, x) = \tilde{g}(y, x_n) = 0$.

Using (20) we get $0 = \tilde{g}(+\infty, x_n) = \tilde{g}(+\infty, x) = 0$. So,

$$\{\tilde{g}(+\infty, x_n)\} \downarrow \tilde{g}(+\infty, x).$$

The last result along with (*) and (**) puts an end to the proof of (5). In like manner we can check the condition (6). ■

All foregoing considerations can be generalized for the case when the condition (14) is replaced by the following one

$$\forall (x, c) \in \mathbb{R} \times J(x) \quad \Delta > 0 \quad m_x([J(x), c]) = F\left(\frac{c - \underline{J}(x)}{\Delta}\right)$$

where $F: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a continuous nondecreasing function fulfilling $F(0) = 0$ and $F(1) = 1$.

On the other side, the above considerations cannot be generalized for the case when the interval function $J: \bar{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow I(\bar{\mathbb{R}})$ is not homogeneous (i.e. there exists such pair $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that $\bar{J}(x) - \underline{J}(x) \neq \bar{J}(y) - \underline{J}(y)$).

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Nakamura, Preference relations on a set of fuzzy utilities as a basis for decision making, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 20 (1986), 147-162.

- [2] K.Piasecki, On any class of fuzzy preference relation in the real line, part I, BUSEFAL 20 (1984), 90-97.
- [3] K.Piasecki, On any class of fuzzy preference relation in the real line, part II, BUSEFAL 21 (1985), 82-92.
- [4] L.Schwartz, Analyse Mathématique (Hermann, Paris, 1967).