## Carathéodory's Measurability of Fuzzy Events

Radko MESIAR, Slovak Technical University, Radlinského 11, 813 68 Bratislava, Czechoslovakia

Krzysztof PIASECKI, Academy of Economics, Al. Niepodleglosci 146/150 Poznaň, Poland

Abstract. For a given fuzzy measurable space  $(X,\sigma)$  and a fuzzy set function  $m:\sigma \to R$  we define the system  $\sigma_m$  of all fuzzy sets measurable in the sense of Carathéodory. We study the properties of  $\sigma_m$ . Under simple general conditions we show that  $\sigma_m$  is a soft fuzzy algebra and m is a fuzzy P-measure on  $\sigma_m$ .

Let X be a nonempty set. The symbol  $\mathcal{F}(X)$  denotes the family of all fuzzy subsets of X, i.e.  $\mathcal{F}(X) = [0,1]^{X}$ . The operations of the fuzzy union, fuzzy intersection and fuzzy complement are defined in the traditional Zadeh's sense [5],

$$(A \cup B)(x) = \sup (A(x), B(x))$$

$$(A \cap B)(x) = inf(A(x), B(x))$$

$$A'(x) = 1 - A(x)$$

for any A,  $B \in \mathcal{F}(X)$  and  $x \in X$ .

A family  $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}(X)$  of fuzzy subsets of X is called a fuzzy algebra (fuzzy  $\sigma$ -algebra), see [2], iff:

- (A1)  $0_{\mathbf{X}} \in \sigma$  (we put  $c_{\mathbf{X}}(x) = c$  for any  $x \in \mathbf{X}$ ,  $c \in [0,1]$ )
- (A2)  $A \in \sigma$  implies  $A' \in \sigma$
- (A3) A, B  $\in$   $\sigma$  implies A  $\cup$  B  $\in$   $\sigma$  ({A}  $\in$  implies  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A \in \sigma$  in the case of a fuzzy  $\sigma$ -algebra).

Let **m** be a function defined on the fuzzy sets from  $\sigma$ ,  $\mathbf{m}: \sigma \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathbf{R}$  is the set of all real numbers. We will distinguish a family  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}} \subset \sigma$  of fuzzy sets measurable in the Carathéodory's sense following the classical concept introduced in [1],

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{m}} = \left\{ A \in \sigma; \forall B \in \sigma: \mathbf{m}(B) = \mathbf{m}(B \cap A) + \mathbf{m}(B \cap A') \right\}$$

For the above defined system  $\sigma_{m}$  we have the following results.

## Proposition 1.

- i)  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$  is closed under complementation, i.e.  $\mathbf{A} \in \sigma_{\mathbf{m}} \Longrightarrow \mathbf{A}' \in \sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$
- ii)  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$  is nonempty iff  $\mathbf{m}(O_{\mathbf{X}}) = 0$  iff  $\{O_{\mathbf{X}}; 1_{\mathbf{X}}\} \in \sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$
- iii)  $A \in \sigma_{\mathbf{m}} \implies \mathbf{m}(A \cap A') = 0$  and  $\mathbf{m}(A \cup A') = \mathbf{m}(A) + \mathbf{m}(A') = \mathbf{m}(1_{\mathbf{v}})$
- iv) Let  $(1/2)_{\mathbf{X}} \in \sigma$ ; then  $(1/2)_{\mathbf{X}} \in \sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$  iff  $\mathbf{m}(A) = 0$  for all  $A \in \sigma$ .
- i) is obvious because of A'' = A.
- ii) Let  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}} \neq \emptyset$ . Then there is an element  $A \in \sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$  and hence  $\mathbf{m}(0_{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbf{m}(0_{\mathbf{X}} \cap A) + \mathbf{m}(0_{\mathbf{X}} \cap A') = 2\mathbf{m}(0_{\mathbf{X}})$  and consequently  $\mathbf{m}(0_{\mathbf{X}}) = 0$ . Now, let  $\mathbf{m}(0_{\mathbf{X}}) = 0$ . For any  $A \in \sigma$  it is  $\mathbf{m}(A) = \mathbf{m}(A \cap 0_{\mathbf{X}}) + \mathbf{m}(A \cap 1_{\mathbf{X}})$  and hence both  $0_{\mathbf{X}}$  and  $1_{\mathbf{X}}$  are contained in  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$ . The last implication, namely that  $\{0_{\mathbf{X}}; 1_{\mathbf{X}}\} \subset \sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$  implies that  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$  is nonempty, is obvious. iii) Let  $A \in \sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$ . Then
- $m(A \cap A') = m(A \cap A' \cap A) + m(A \cap A' \cap A') = 2m(A \cap A') = 0$ . Further  $m(A \cup A') = m((A \cup A') \cap A) = m((A \cup A') \cap A') = m(A) + m(A') = m(1_X \cap A) + m(1_X \cap A') = m(1_X)$ .
- iv) Let  $(1/2)_{\mathbf{X}} \in \sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$ . Then  $(1/2)_{\mathbf{X}} = (1/2)_{\mathbf{X}}$  and for any  $A \in \sigma$  it is  $\mathbf{m}(A) = \mathbf{m}(A \cap (1/2)_{\mathbf{X}}) + \mathbf{m}(A \cap (1/2)_{\mathbf{X}}') = 2\mathbf{m}(A \cap (1/2)_{\mathbf{X}}) = 2.2\mathbf{m}(A \cap (1/2)_{\mathbf{Y}})$  and consequently  $\mathbf{m}(A) = 0$ .

On the other hand, if  $\mathbf{m}(A) = 0$  for any  $A \in \sigma$ , then  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}} = \sigma$  and hence  $(1/2)_{\mathbf{X}} \in \sigma$  implies  $(1/2)_{\mathbf{X}} \in \sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$ .

To ensure  $\sigma_{m}$  to be a fuzzy algebra, it is enough to ensure  $\sigma_{m}$  to be nonempty and closed under fuzzy union (or fuzzy intersection).

<u>Proposition</u> 2. Let  $m(0_X) = 0$  and let m satisfies the null-additivity condition

(\*)  $N \in \sigma$ ,  $m(N) = 0 \implies \forall A \in \sigma \text{ it is } m(A) = m(A \cup N)$ Then  $\sigma_m$  is a fuzzy algebra. Proof.

Let A, B  $\in$   $\sigma_{\underline{m}}$  . Then for any C  $\in$   $\sigma$  we have

 $\mathbf{m}(C) = \mathbf{m}(C \cap A) + \mathbf{m}(C \cap A') = \mathbf{m}(C \cap A \cap B) + \mathbf{m}(C \cap A \cap B') + \mathbf{m}(C \cap A')$ On the other hand, it is

 $\mathbf{m}(\mathsf{C} \cap (\mathsf{A} \cap \mathsf{B})') = \mathbf{m}((\mathsf{C} \cap \mathsf{A}') \cup (\mathsf{C} \cap \mathsf{B}')) =$ 

 $= \mathbf{m}((C \cap A' \cap A) \cup (C \cap B' \cap A)) + \mathbf{m}((C \cap A' \cap A') \cup (C \cap B' \cap A')) =$   $= \mathbf{m}(C \cap B' \cap A) + \mathbf{m}(C \cap A').$ 

The previous equality follows from  $\mathbf{m}(A' \cap A) = 0$  and the null-additivity of  $\mathbf{m}$ . Note that the null-additivity implies  $\mathbf{m}(H) = 0$  for any fuzzy subset  $H \in \sigma$  such that  $H \subset N$  for some N fulfilling  $\mathbf{m}(N) = 0$ .

Now, it is evident that

$$\mathbf{m}(C) = \mathbf{m}(C \cap (A \cap B)) + \mathbf{m}(C \cap (A \cap B)')$$

and hence the fuzzy intersection (A  $\cap$  B) is an element of  $\sigma_m$  . Thus  $\sigma_m$  is a fuzzy algebra.  $\quad\blacksquare$ 

Note that the null-additivity (\*) is fulfilled e.g. for subadditive fuzzy measures. If the condition (\*) is not fulfilled,  $\sigma_{m}$  may be not closed under union and intersection.

Example 1. Let  $X = \{x_1, x_2\}, \sigma = \mathcal{F}(X) = \{A = (a_1, a_2) \in [0, 1]^2\}, \text{ and let } \mathbf{m}(A) = \min \{2a_1, 2a_2, 1\}$ . Then

- 1)  $\mathbf{m}(0_{\mathbf{X}}) = 0$  and hence  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$  is nonempty
- 2)  $\mathbf{m}(1_{\mathbf{X}}) = 1$  and hence  $(1/2)_{\mathbf{X}}$  is not contained in  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$
- 3) Let A = (1/2,0). Then for any  $B \in \sigma$  it is

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}) &= \min \left\{ \min \left\{ 1, \ 2\mathbf{b}_{1} \right\}, \ \min \left\{ 0, \ 2\mathbf{b}_{2} \right\}, \ 1 \right\} = 0 \\ \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{A}' \cap \mathbf{B}) &= \min \left\{ \min \left\{ 1, \ 2\mathbf{b}_{1} \right\}, \ \min \left\{ 2, \ 2\mathbf{b}_{2} \right\}, \ 1 \right\} = \\ &= \min \left\{ 2\mathbf{b}_{1}, \ 2\mathbf{b}_{2}, \ 1 \right\} = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{B}) \ , \ \text{so that} \end{split}$$

 $\begin{array}{lll} m(B) = m(B \cap A) + m(B \cap A'). & \text{This implies } A \in \sigma_{\underline{m}} & \text{. Similarly we can show that } C = (0,1/2) \in \sigma_{\underline{m}} & \text{. But then } A \cup C = (1/2)_{\underline{X}} & \text{,} \\ so & \text{that } \sigma_{\underline{m}} & \text{is not closed under fuzzy union.} & \blacksquare \end{array}$ 

<u>Proposition</u> 3. Let  $\{A_1, \ldots, A_k\} \in \sigma_m$ ,  $k \in N$ , be a system of pairwise W-disjoint fuzzy subsets (see e.g. [4]), i.e.  $A_i \leq A_j$ , whenever  $i \neq j$ . Then under the condition of Proposition 2 it is

$$\mathbf{m}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \mathbf{A}_{i}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{A}_{i}) .$$

Proof.

Let k=2, i.e.  $A_1=A$ ,  $A_2=B$  and  $A\le B'$ , A,  $B\in\sigma_m$ . Then  $m(A\cap A')$  is zero and  $(A\cap B)\le (A\cap A')$ , so that  $m(A\cap B)=0$ . Then the null additivity of m implies

 $\mathbf{m}(A \cup B) = \mathbf{m}((A \cup B) \cap A) + \mathbf{m}((A \cup B) \cap A') = \mathbf{m}(A) + \mathbf{m}(B \cap A')$  and  $\mathbf{m}(B) = \mathbf{m}(B \cap A) + \mathbf{m}(B \cap A') = \mathbf{m}(B \cap A')$ . It follows

 $\mathbf{m}(A \cup B) = \mathbf{m}(A) + \mathbf{m}(B)$ . For  $k \ge 2$  we can use the induction because of the pairwise W-disjointness of  $\{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$  implies the W-disjointness of  $\{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$  and  $\{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$  implies the W-disjointness of  $\{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$  implies  $\{A$ 

<u>Definition</u> (see [3]). Let  $\sigma$  be a soft (i.e.  $(1/2)_{\chi} \notin \sigma$ ) fuzzy algebra (fuzzy  $\sigma$ -algebra). A mapping  $\mathbf{p}: \sigma \to [0,1]$  is called a fuzzy P-measure on  $\sigma$  if the followings are fulfilled:

- i)  $\forall A \in \sigma : p(A \cup A') = 1$
- ii)  $\forall$   $\{A_n\}$   $\subset$   $\sigma$  ,  $A_n \leq A_n$  whenever  $n \neq m$  , and  $(\bigcup A_n) \in \sigma$  :  $p(\bigcup A_n) = \sum p(A_n)$  .

Corollary 1. Let  $\mathbf{m}(0_{\mathbf{X}}) = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{m}(1_{\mathbf{X}}) = 1$  and let  $\mathbf{m}$  be null-additive on  $\sigma$ . Then  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$  is a soft fuzzy algebra and if  $\mathbf{m}$  is continuous from below, then  $\mathbf{m}$  restricted to  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$  is a fuzzy P-measure on  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$ . Proof.

It is enough to prove the validity of the condition ii) for  $m/\sigma_m$  . For finite sequences the result is contained in Proposition 3. For infinite sequences  $\{A_n\}$  , the continuity from below of m implies

$$\mathbf{m}(\bigcup_{\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{n}}} \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{n}}) = \lim_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{1}} \cup \ldots \cup \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{k}}) = \lim_{\mathbf{k}} (\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{1}}) + \ldots + \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{k}})) = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{n}}). \quad \blacksquare$$

Note that if  $\boldsymbol{n}$  is continuous on a fuzzy  $\sigma\text{-algebra}\ \sigma$  , then if  $\sigma_{\boldsymbol{m}}$  is a soft fuzzy algebra, it is also a soft fuzzy  $\sigma\text{-algebra}.$  However, this condition is not a necessary one.

Example 2. We take X and  $\sigma$  from Example 1. We put

$$\mathbf{m}(A) = (1_{11/4,11}(a_1) + 1_{11/4,11}(a_2))/2 \text{ for any } A \in \sigma.$$

Then **m** is not continuous on  $\sigma$ , as  $(1/4)_{\mathbf{X}} = \lim_{n} (1/4 + 1/n)_{\mathbf{X}}$ , but

 $\mathbf{m}((1/4)_{\mathbf{X}}) = 0 \neq 1 = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbf{m}((1/4 + 1/n)_{\mathbf{X}})$ . On the other hand,

$$\sigma_{\underline{\mathbf{m}}} = \left\{ \mathbf{A} \in \sigma, \ \mathbf{a}_{\underline{\mathbf{i}}} \notin ]1/4, 3/4[ \right\}$$

is a soft fuzzy σ-algebra.

<u>Proposition</u> 4. Let  $(X, \sigma, p)$  be a given fuzzy probability space, i.e.  $\sigma$  is a soft fuzzy algebra and p is a fuzzy P-measure on  $\sigma$ . Then  $\sigma_p = \sigma$ .

Proof.

Let  $A \in \sigma$ . For any  $B \in \sigma$  it is  $(B \cap A) \leq (B \cap A')' = (B \cup A')$  and hence  $(B \cap A)$  and  $(B \cap A')$  are W-disjoint elements of  $\sigma$ . Then  $p(B \cap A) + p(B \cap A') = p((B \cap A) \cup (B \cap A')) = p(B \cup (A \cap A')) = p(B)$ , and consequently  $A \in \sigma_m$ . For the last equality see e.g. [4].

Remark. Proposition 4 shows that under the conditions of Corollary 1,  $\sigma$  is the greatest soft fuzzy subalgebra of  $\sigma$  on which m is a fuzzy P-measure.

The assertion iii) of Proposition 1 gives a necessary condition for an element A of  $\sigma$  to be an element of  $\sigma_m$ , namely  $m(A\cap A')=0$  and  $m(A\cup A')=m(1_\chi)$ . However, this condition is not sufficient.

Example 3. Again we take X and  $\sigma$  from Example 1. Now, we define

$$\mathbf{m}(A) = \max \left\{ (2\max \{a_1, a_2\} -1), 0 \right\} \text{ for any } A \in \sigma.$$

m is null-additive and  $\sigma_{\bf m}$  is a soft fuzzy  $\sigma$ -algebra. Take A = (1,1/4). Then  ${\bf m}(A\cap A')={\bf m}((0,1/4))=0$  and  ${\bf m}(A\cup A')={\bf m}((1,3/4))=1$ , but  ${\bf m}(1_{\bf X})=1\neq 3/2={\bf m}(A)+{\bf m}(A')={\bf m}(1_{\bf X}\cap A)+{\bf m}(1_{\bf X}\cap A')$ . It follows that A is not an element of  $\sigma_{\bf m}$ .

In the following proposition we give the conditions which make the previous necessary condition for an element of  $\sigma_m$  a sufficient one.

<u>Proposition</u> 5. Let **m** be a monotone valuation on  $\sigma$ , i.e. for  $A \subset B$  it is  $\mathbf{m}(A) \leq \mathbf{m}(B)$  and  $\mathbf{m}(A) + \mathbf{m}(B) = \mathbf{m}(A \cap B) + \mathbf{m}(A \cup B)$  for any  $A, B \in \sigma$ . Then

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{m}} = \left\{ \mathbf{A} \in \sigma; \ \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{A}') = 0 \ \text{and} \ \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{A}') = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{X}}) \right\}.$$

Proof.

It is enough to prove that  $\mathbf{m}(A \cap A') = 0$  and  $\mathbf{m}(A \cup A') = \mathbf{m}(1_{\mathbf{X}})$  for an element  $A \in \sigma$  implies  $A \in \sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$ . Recall that  $\sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$  is nonempty iff  $\mathbf{m}(0_{\mathbf{X}})$  equals zero. Take any  $B \in \sigma$ . Then the valuation property of  $\mathbf{m}$  implies  $\mathbf{m}(B \cap A) + \mathbf{m}(B \cap A') = \mathbf{m}((B \cap A) \cup (B \cap A')) + \mathbf{m}((B \cap A) \cap (B \cap A')) = \mathbf{m}(B \cap (A \cup A')) + \mathbf{m}(B \cap (A \cap A'))$ .

From the monotonicity of m it is  $0 \le m(B \cap (A \cap A')) \le m(A \cap A') = 0$ , i.e.  $m(B \cap (A \cap A')) = 0$ . Further, the valuation property implies

$$\mathbf{m}(\mathsf{B} \, \cap \, (\mathsf{A} \, \cup \, \mathsf{A}')) = \mathbf{m}(\mathsf{B}) + \mathbf{m}(\mathsf{A} \, \cup \, \mathsf{A}') - \mathbf{m}(\mathsf{B} \, \cup \, (\mathsf{A} \, \cup \, \mathsf{A}')) = 1$$
 because of  $1 = \mathbf{m}(\mathsf{A} \, \cup \, \mathsf{A}') \leq \mathbf{m}(\mathsf{B} \, \cup \, (\mathsf{A} \, \cup \, \mathsf{A}')) \leq 1$ . It follows 
$$\mathbf{m}(\mathsf{B}) = \mathbf{m}(\mathsf{B} \, \cap \, \mathsf{A}) + \mathbf{m}(\mathsf{B} \, \cap \, \mathsf{A}') \text{, so that } \mathsf{A} \in \sigma_{\mathbf{m}} \text{.} \quad \blacksquare$$

## References

- [1] Carathéodory, C., Vorlesungen ther reele Funktionen. Leipzig Berlin, 1927.
- [2] Khalili, S., Fuzzy measures and mappings. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 68 (1979), 92-99.
- [3] Piasecki, K., Probability of fuzzy events defined as denumerable additivity measure. Fuzzy Sets and Systems 17 (1985), 271-287.
- [4] Piasecki, K., Fuzzy partitions of sets. Busefal 25 (1986), 52-60.
- [5] Zadeh, L.A., Fuzzy sets. Inform. Control 8 (1965), 338-353.