

# Fuzzy Logic for Preferences expressible by convolutions

Krystian Jobczyk<sup>1</sup> and Maroua Bouzid<sup>2</sup> and Antoni Ligeza<sup>3</sup> and Jerzy Karczmarczuk<sup>4</sup>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In this paper we introduce a new extension of the Predicate Pavelka Logic [4], extended by P. Hajek [1], with the convolution integrals – to be called Fuzzy Integral Logic (*FLI*) suitable to express the preferences expressible by convolutions from the initial functions. We base on some observation from [2] and [3] and in Rossi *et al.* [5].

## 2 LOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE ANALYSIS

We begin our construction of *FLI* with some introductory remarks on many-valuated Łukasiewicz Propositional Logic *LukPL*, Rational Pavelka (Propositional) Logic (*RPL*) and Rational Pavelka (Predicate) Logic (*RPLV*).

**Łukasiewicz propositional calculus *LukPL*** is based on a language with the following connectives and constants:  $\rightarrow, \neg, \leftrightarrow, \wedge$  (weak conjunction),  $\otimes$  (strong conjunction),  $\vee$  (weak disjunction),  $\oplus$  (strong disjunction) and propositional constants  $\bar{0}$  and  $\bar{1}$ , interpreted as follows:  $\|\neg(\phi)\| = 1 - x$ ,  $\|\rightarrow(\phi, \psi)\| = \min\{1, 1 - x + y\}$ ,  $\|\wedge(\phi, \psi)\| = \min\{x, y\}$ ,  $\|\vee(\phi, \psi)\| = \max\{x, y\}$ ,  $\|\otimes(\phi, \psi)\| = \max\{0, x + y - 1\}$ , and  $\|\oplus(\phi, \psi)\| = \min\{1, x + y\}$  for any  $x, y \in \text{MV-algebra } A$ . *LukPL* could be characterized as an extension of basic fuzzy logic BL by the axiom  $\neg\neg\phi \rightarrow \phi$ . The axiomatics of *LukPL* and BL could be found in [1]. *LukPL* is complete with respect to: all MV-algebras (*general completeness*).

**Rational Pavelka Logic *RPL*** extends *LukPL* and is based on the language of *LukPL* extended by new constants:  $\widehat{r}_1, \widehat{r}_2, \widehat{r}_3, \dots$ , representing in the language  $\mathcal{L}(\text{FLI})$  the rational numbers:  $r_1, r_2, \dots, s_1, s_2, \dots$  etc. from the universe of MV-algebras. Axioms of *RPL* are the axioms of *LukPL* plus the following ones:

$$\widehat{r} \rightarrow \widehat{s} = \widehat{r \rightarrow s}, \quad \neg\widehat{r} = \widehat{1 - r}$$

**Example:**  $\widehat{0.6} \rightarrow \widehat{0.5} = \widehat{0.6 \rightarrow 0.5} = \widehat{1 - 0.6 + 0.5} = \widehat{0.9}$ ;  $\neg\widehat{0.3} = \widehat{0.7}$  because of Łukasiewicz's implication.

**Rational Pavelka Predicate Logic *RPLV*** extends the propositional language of *RPL* with general and existential quantifiers and by adding to them the axioms of first order predicate logic. The only inferential rule in *RPLV* in *Modus Ponens*.

**Completeness** of *RPLV* is usually expressed in the terms of the *Truth degree* of  $\phi$  over  $T$ , which is defined as follows:

$$\|\phi\|_T = \inf\{\|\phi\|_M \mid M \models T \text{ over MV-algebra } [0, 1]\} \quad (1)$$

<sup>1</sup> University of Caen, France; e-mail: Krystian.Jobczyk@unicaen.fr

<sup>2</sup> University of Caen, France, email: Maroua.Bouzid@unicaen.fr

<sup>3</sup> AGH University of Technology and Science, Kraków, Poland, email: ligeza@agh.edu.pl

<sup>4</sup> University of Caen, France, email: jerzy.karczmarczuk@unicaen.fr

and the so-called *Provability degree* defined as follows:

$$|\phi|_T = \sup\{r \text{ rational} \mid T \vdash (\widehat{r} \rightarrow \phi)\} \quad (2)$$

*Completeness* in such terms is equivalent to the condition:  $\|\phi\|_T = |\phi|_T$  for each  $\phi$  of fixed language of theory  $T$ .

**Examples:** If  $T$  is complete: its tautologies of  $T$  have both truth and provability degree 1; the contratautologies – 0.

## 3 NEW FUZZY LOGIC OF INTEGRALS FLI

We want to introduce now *FLI* based on  $\mathcal{L}(\text{RPLV})$  as a system able to express the convolution of type:  $\int_0^x f(t)g(x-t)dt$  for  $f, g \in L(\mathbf{R})$ . We will aim at the expressing typical properties of convolutions such as: commutativity, distributivity and associativity wrt a scalar multiplication in our language  $\mathcal{L}(\text{FLI})$ . The approach is based at the definition of the integral  $\int f d\mu$  (for each function  $f: M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $M$ -countable or finite and a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $M$ ) defined as  $\sum_{m \in M} f(m)\mu(m)$  and denoted shortly by  $\int f dx$ .

### 3.1 Syntax

The alphabet of  $\mathcal{L}(\text{FLI})$  consists of:

- propositional variables:  $\phi, \chi, \psi, \dots, x, y, \dots, \phi_t, \phi_{x-t}, \chi_t, \chi_{x-t}$
- rational constant names:  $\widehat{r}_1, \widehat{r}_2, \dots, \bar{0}, \bar{1}$ ,
- quantifiers:  $\forall, \exists \int()dx, \int \int()dxdy, \int_0^x()dt$
- operations:  $\rightarrow, \neg, \vee, \wedge, \bullet, \oplus, \otimes, =$ .

**Set of formulae *FOR*:** The class of well-formed formulae *FOR* of  $\mathcal{L}(\text{FLI})$  form *propositional variables* and *rational constants* as *atomic* formulae. The next - formulae obtained from given  $\phi, \chi \in \text{FOR}$  by operations  $\neg, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, \oplus, \otimes, \forall, \exists, \int()dx$  and the formulae obtained from  $\phi_i, \chi_i \in \text{FOR}$  by operations  $\neg, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, \oplus, \otimes, \bullet, \forall, \exists, \int_0^x()dt$ . Finally, formulae obtained from  $\phi_i \in \text{FOR}$  and rational numbers by operations  $\neg, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, \oplus, \otimes, \bullet$  belong to *FOR* as well. These classes of formulae exhaust the list of *FOR* of  $\mathcal{L}(\text{FLI})$ .

**Example:**  $\int_0^x \phi_t \bullet \chi_{x-t} dt \rightarrow \widehat{r} \in \text{FOR}$ , but  $\int \phi dx \rightarrow \int_0^x \chi_t dt$  does not.

**Axioms:** We extend now the list of the following axioms considered by Hajek in [1]:

$$\int(\neg\phi)dx = \neg \int \phi dx, \int(\phi \rightarrow \chi)dx \rightarrow (\int \phi dx \rightarrow \int \chi dx)$$

$$\int(\phi \otimes \chi)dx = ((\int \phi dx \rightarrow \int(\phi \wedge \chi)dx) \rightarrow \int \chi dx)$$

$$\int \int \phi dxdy = \int \int \phi dydx^5 \text{ (Fubini theorem):}$$

by new axioms defining the algebraic properties of convolutions:

$$\int_0^x \phi_t \bullet \chi_{x-t} dt = \int_0^x \phi_{x-t} \bullet \chi_t dt$$

<sup>5</sup> If both sides are defined.

associativity wrt the scalar multiplication:

$$\widehat{r} \int_0^x \phi_t \bullet \chi_{x-t} dt = \int_0^x (\widehat{r}\phi_t) \bullet \chi_{x-t} dt, (r - \text{constant})$$

distributivity:

$$\int_0^x \phi_t \bullet (\chi_{x-t} \oplus \psi_t) dt = \int_0^x \phi_t \bullet \chi_{x-t} dt \oplus \int_0^x \phi_t \bullet \psi_{x-t} dt$$

As inference rules we assume *Modus Ponens*, generalization rule (like in *RPL*) and two new specific rules:

$\frac{\phi}{\int \phi dx}, \frac{\phi \rightarrow \chi}{\int \phi dx \rightarrow \int \chi dx}$  and the same rules for indexed formulae and convolution integrals.

### 3.2 Semantics

Our intention is to interpret the axioms in another type of models, so-called *weak probabilistic model* for *FLI*. For this purpose we introduce the definition of the integrals *I* to interpret the  $\int$ -formulae of  $\mathcal{L}(FLI)$ . Let *Alg* be an algebra of the functions from  $M \rightarrow \emptyset$  to  $[0, 1]$  containing each rational constant function  $r \in [0, 1]$  and closed on  $\Rightarrow$  (See: [1], p. 240). We define *weak integrals* on *Alg* as a mapping  $I: f \in Alg \mapsto If(x) \in [0, 1]$  satisfying the conditions:

$$I(1 - f)dx = 1 - Ifdx, I(f \Rightarrow g)dx \leq (Ifdx \Rightarrow Igdx) \quad (3)$$

$$I(f \otimes_{sem} g)dx = Ifdx + Igdx - I(f \wedge g)dx \quad (4)$$

$$I(Ifdx)dy = I(Ifdy)dx \quad (5)$$

We extend the above conditions, also considered in [1] by the following ones: (the commutativity of convolution:)

$$I_0^x(f(t)g(x-t))dt = I_0^x(g(t)f(x-t))dt \quad (6)$$

$$rI_0^x f(t)g(x-t)dt = I_0^x(rf(t))g(x-t)dt \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & I_0^x f(t) \star (g(x-t) \oplus_{sem} h(x-t))dt = \\ & \min\{1, I_0^x f(t) \star g(x-t)dt + I_0^x f(t) \star h(x-t)dt\} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

**Interpretation** Let assume that  $Int = (\Delta, \|\phi\|)$  with  $\Delta \rightarrow \emptyset$  and the truth-value interpretation-function:  $\| \cdot \|$  of formulae of  $\mathcal{L}(RPL\forall)$ . We inductively expand now this interpretation for new elements of the grammar  $\mathcal{L}(FLI)$  as below.

syntax ( $\phi \in \mathcal{L}(FLI)$ )	fuzzy semantics ( $\ \phi\ _{FLI}$ )
$\phi_i$	$f(i)$ for $i \in \{x, t, x-t, t-x\}$
$\int \phi dx, (\int_0^x \phi dx)$	$Ifdx, (I_0^x f dx)$
$\phi_i \bullet \chi_i$	$\ \phi_i\  \star \ \chi_i\ $ ( $i$ like above)
$\ \phi \otimes \chi\ , (\ \phi_i \otimes \chi_i\ )$	$\ \phi\  \otimes_{sem} \ \chi\ , (\ \phi_i\  \otimes_{sem} \ \chi_i\ )$
$\int_0^x \phi_t \bullet \chi_{x-t} dt$	$I_0^x g(t) \star f(x-t)dt$
$\widehat{r} \int_0^x dt$	$\ \widehat{r}\  \star \ I_0^x f\ dt = rI_0^x f dt$

The other operators of *FLI* are interpreted like in *RPL* for formulae of  $\phi$  and  $\phi_i$ -type, especially:  $\|\phi \oplus \chi\| = \|\phi\| \oplus_{sem} \|\chi\| = \min\{1, \|\phi\| + \|\chi\|\}$ .

**Definition of the model:** We define a *weak probabilistic model* *M* as a *n*-tuple of the form:  $M = \langle |M|, \{r_0, r_1, \dots\}, f_i, If_i dx, I_0^x f_i g_j dt, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \star \rangle$  where  $|M|$  is a countable (or finite) set  $\{r_0, r_1, \dots\}$ ,  $f_i$  are respectively: a set of rational numbers belonging to  $|M|$ , and atomic integrable functions.  $If_i$  are integrals on the algebra *Alg* of subsets of  $|M|$  and  $I_0^x f_i g_j dt$  are convolutions of  $f_i$  and  $g_j$  expressing *preferences*, and  $\mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{1}$  are distinguished *min* and *max* elements (*the best, the worst preferences*).  $\star$  is a convolution multiplication.

**Completeness theorem for *FLI*:** For each theory *T* over predicate  $\mathcal{L}(FLI)$  and for each formula  $\phi \in \mathcal{L}(FLI)$  it holds:  $|\phi|_T = \|\phi\|_T$ .

**Undecidability theorem for *FLI*:** The set  $TAUT_{FLI}$  of tautologies of the system *FLI* is undecidable and it is  $\Pi_2$ -hard.

## 4 FLI AS LOGIC OF PREFERENCES

Here we justify that *FLI* could be recognized as a logic for preferences on a base of a short physical example.

**Example:** Consider that a compressible fluid A flows through two tubes  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Assume that both tubes are joined at the end and form one tube *P* with the same diameter as the tubes  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Assume that the fluid A has a density  $\rho_1$  in  $P_1$  and  $\rho_2$  in  $P_2$ . Let  $f_{\rho_1}$  and  $f_{\rho_2}$  be the probability density functions for  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  (resp.). We are interested in a computation of the probability density function *f* for the density  $\rho$  of the fluid A in a joined tube *P*. We prefer, however, that *f* should be smaller than a fixed  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Our task is to build a weak probabilistic model for this preference.

*Sketch of the solution:* The densities  $\rho_1, \rho_2$  of the fluid A are (together) independent random variables, hence the new density  $\rho = \rho_1 + \rho_2$  and the new probability density function *f* for  $\rho_1 + \rho_2$  is defined as follows:

$$f(x) = \int_0^x f_{\rho_1}(\rho) f_{\rho_2}(x - \rho) d\rho \quad (9)$$

Because (12) has to be smaller than  $\alpha$  (in accordance with the preference of the physicists) we obtain:

$$Pref(x) : f(x) = \int_0^x f_{\rho_1}(\rho) f_{\rho_2}(x - \rho) d\rho < \alpha (\alpha \in [0, 1]) \quad (10)$$

as a condition for the considered preference and after reformulation:

$$f(x)_{Pref} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^x f_{\rho_1}(\rho) f_{\rho_2}(x - \rho) d\rho < 1 \quad (11)$$

Let moreover  $F(x)_{Pref}$  - defined as follow:

$$F(x)_{Pref} = \frac{1}{\alpha} I_0^x f_{\rho_1}(\rho) f_{\rho_2}(x - \rho) d\rho < 1 \quad (12)$$

be a semantic integral representing  $f(x)_{Pref}$  in a newly constructed weak possibilistic model *M*. (12) ensures that the condition  $F(x_{Pref}) \in [0, 1]$ . After having the appropriate computation we can obtain from (12) a condition for a domain, say  $|M|$ , which must be countable, thus we take-for any case-a set  $|M| \cap Q$  as our domain of *M*. In result, the required model will be as follows:  $\langle |M| \cap Q, f_{\rho_1}(t), f_{\rho_2}, \frac{1}{\alpha} I_0^x f_{\rho_1}(\rho) f_{\rho_2}(x - \rho) d\rho, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \star \rangle$ .

## 5 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

The new complete and undecidable extensions of Pavelka-Hajek logic for convolutions has just been given. It has been also explained why *FLI* could be recognized as the logic for preferences.

It seems to be promising to expand the *FLI* towards a system able to express the problems of automatic generation of hypotheses based on empirical data (GUHA). Finally, *FLI* seems to be implementable inso-called  $\pi$ -calculus.

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. Hajek, *Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1998.
- [2] L. Khatib, P. Morris, R. Morris, and F. Rossi, 'Temporal reasoning about preferences', in *Proceedings of IJCAI-01*, pp. 322-327, (2001).
- [3] P. Morris, N. Muscettola, and F. Rossi, 'Dynamic control of plans with temporal uncertainty', in *Proceedings of IJCAI-01*, pp. 494-502, (2001).
- [4] J. Pavelka, 'On fuzzy logic i, ii, iii', in *Zeitschrift f. Math. Logik und Grundlagen der Math.*, volume 25, pp. 45-52, 119-134, 447-464, (1979).
- [5] F. Rossi, N. Yorke-Smith, and K. Venable, 'Temporal reasoning with preferences and uncertainty', in *Proceedings of AAIL*, volume 8, pp. 1385-1386, (2003).