

Correction

Comment on “Improvement of the distance between intuitionistic fuzzy sets and its applications”

Changlin Xu*

School of Mathematics and Information Science, North Minzu University, Yinchuan, China

Abstract. Here, necessary corrections on the proof the Theorem 1 of Xu (J Intell Fuzzy Syst 33(3): 1563-1575, 2017) are stated in brief. Throughout, we use the same notations and equation numbers as in Xu.

Keywords: Intuitionistic fuzzy sets, distance measure, Euclidean distance

Intuitionistic fuzzy sets (IFSs) were proposed by Atanassov [1] as a generalization of the fuzzy sets. As the most interesting topics in IFSs theory, distance measures are involved in fuzzy decision making, pattern recognition, fuzzy reasoning, etc. [2–6].

In 2017, a measuring distance between intuitionistic fuzzy sets, proposed by Xu [5], was successfully applied into pattern recognition problems and medical diagnosis. However, there is a small mistake about the proof of the Theorem 1 in Xu [5]. In order to show the detailed correction instructions, the definitions involved in the paper [5] are as follows.

Definition 1. A metric distance D in a non-empty set X is a real value function $D : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, which satisfies the following conditions, $\forall x, y, z \in X$:

- (MD1) $D(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$;
- (MD2) $D(x, y) = D(y, x)$;
- (MD3) $D(x, y) + D(y, z) \geq D(x, z)$.

Definition 2. [7] Let D be a mapping: $\text{IFSs}(X) \times \text{IFSs}(X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$. For $\forall A, B, C \in \text{IFSs}(X)$, $D(A, B)$ is a distance measure between IFSs A and B , if D satisfies the following properties:

- (DP1) $0 \leq D(A, B) \leq 1$;
- (DP2) $D(A, B) = 0$ if and only if $A = B$;
- (DP3) $D(A, B) = D(B, A)$;
- (DP4) If $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$, then $D(A, C) \geq D(A, B)$, $D(A, C) \geq D(B, C)$.

Definition 3. [5] Let $A = \{ \langle x, \mu_A(x), \nu_A(x) \rangle | x \in X \}$ be a IFSs in $X = \{x\}$, then the assignments of the hesitancy degree $\pi_A(x)$ to membership degree $\mu_A(x)$ and non-membership degree $\nu_A(x)$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Assign}_A^{\pi\mu}(x) &= [\pi_A(x) + 2\mu_A(x)]/2, \\ \text{Assign}_A^{\pi\nu}(x) &= [\pi_A(x) + 2\nu_A(x)]/2. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

We take the four parts $\mu_A(x)$, $\nu_A(x)$, $\text{Assign}_A^{\pi\mu}(x)$ and $\text{Assign}_A^{\pi\nu}(x)$ into account the distances between IFSs, thereby a new distance measure, denoted as D_{IFSs} , is defined.

Definition 4. [5] Let $A = \{ \langle x, \mu_A(x), \nu_A(x) \rangle | x \in X \}$, $B = \{ \langle x, \mu_B(x), \nu_B(x) \rangle | x \in X \}$ be two IFSs in $X = \{x\}$, then the distance measure between A and B is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{IFSs}}(A, B) &= \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\Delta_{\mu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\nu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{AB})^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

*Corresponding author. Changlin Xu, School of Mathematics and Information Science, North Minzu University, Yinchuan 750021, China. E-mail: xu_changlin@nun.edu.cn.

where, $\Delta_{\mu}^{AB} = \mu_A - \mu_B$, $\Delta_{\nu}^{AB} = \nu_A - \nu_B$, $\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{AB} = Assign_A^{\pi\mu} - Assign_B^{\pi\mu}$ and $\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{AB} = Assign_A^{\pi\nu} - Assign_B^{\pi\nu}$.

Theorem 1. [5] Let $A = \{ \langle x, \mu_A(x), \nu_A(x) \rangle | x \in X \}$, $B = \{ \langle x, \mu_B(x), \nu_B(x) \rangle | x \in X \}$ be two IFSs in $X = \{x\}$, then $D_{IFSs}(A, B)$ is a distance measure satisfying the Definition 1 and Definition 2.

In the paper [5], the proof of the third step is as follows.

3) For $\forall A, B, C \in IFSs(X)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta_{\mu}^{AC})^2 &= (\Delta_{\mu}^{AB} + \Delta_{\mu}^{BC})^2 \leq (\Delta_{\mu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\mu}^{BC})^2; \\ (\Delta_{\nu}^{AC})^2 &= (\Delta_{\nu}^{AB} + \Delta_{\nu}^{BC})^2 \leq (\Delta_{\nu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\nu}^{BC})^2; \\ (\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{AC})^2 &= (\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{AB} + \Delta_{\pi\mu}^{BC})^2 \leq (\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{BC})^2; \\ (\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{AC})^2 &= (\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{AB} + \Delta_{\pi\nu}^{BC})^2 \leq (\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{BC})^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Thus, $D_{IFSs}(A, C) \leq D_{IFSs}(A, B) + D_{IFSs}(B, C)$, which indicates that D_{IFSs} satisfies (MD3).

However, the conclusion $D_{IFSs}(A, C) \leq D_{IFSs}(A, B) + D_{IFSs}(B, C)$ is derived from the formula (3), which is a wrong logical reasoning. Where, it should be noted that the formula (3) is correct. In fact, from the formula (3) and the property of inequality, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & [(\Delta_{\mu}^{AC})^2 + (\Delta_{\nu}^{AC})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{AC})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{AC})^2] \leq \\ & \{[(\Delta_{\mu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\nu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{AB})^2] \\ & + [(\Delta_{\mu}^{BC})^2 + (\Delta_{\nu}^{BC})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{BC})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{BC})^2]\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

While, from the Definition 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 4[D_{IFSs}(A, C)]^2 &= (\Delta_{\mu}^{AC})^2 + (\Delta_{\nu}^{AC})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{AC})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{AC})^2, \\ 4[D_{IFSs}(A, B)]^2 &= (\Delta_{\mu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\nu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{AB})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{AB})^2, \\ 4[D_{IFSs}(B, C)]^2 &= (\Delta_{\mu}^{BC})^2 + (\Delta_{\nu}^{BC})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\mu}^{BC})^2 + (\Delta_{\pi\nu}^{BC})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$[D_{IFSs}(A, C)]^2 \leq [D_{IFSs}(A, B)]^2 + [D_{IFSs}(B, C)]^2. \tag{5}$$

However, based on the formula (5), it is not obtained

$$D_{IFSs}(A, C) \leq D_{IFSs}(A, B) + D_{IFSs}(B, C).$$

This shows that the proof of the paper [5] is incorrect.

The proper proof of the third step is as follows.

3) According to the Definition 4, the distance measure $2D_{IFSs}(A, B)$ can be viewed

as the Euclidean distance between two points $(\mu_A, \nu_A, Assign_A^{\pi\mu}, Assign_A^{\pi\nu})$ and $(\mu_B, \nu_B, Assign_B^{\pi\mu}, Assign_B^{\pi\nu})$ in a four-dimensional real number space. For $\forall A, B, C \in IFSs(X)$, there are three real points.

$$\begin{aligned} A &: (\mu_A, \nu_A, Assign_A^{\pi\mu}, Assign_A^{\pi\nu}), \\ B &: (\mu_B, \nu_B, Assign_B^{\pi\mu}, Assign_B^{\pi\nu}), \\ C &: (\mu_C, \nu_C, Assign_C^{\pi\mu}, Assign_C^{\pi\nu}). \end{aligned}$$

Since the distance measure $2D_{IFSs}(A, B)$ is a metric distance, based on the third condition (MD3) of the Definition 1 (The properties of triangular inequalities for Euclidean distance), we have

$$2D_{IFSs}(A, C) \leq 2D_{IFSs}(A, B) + 2D_{IFSs}(B, C),$$

which yields

$$D_{IFSs}(A, C) \leq D_{IFSs}(A, B) + D_{IFSs}(B, C).$$

The result shows that D_{IFSs} satisfies (MD3).

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank for a grant from the Ningxia Natural Science Foundation (No. 2018AAC03253), the First-Class Disciplines Foundation of Ningxia (No. NXYLXK2017B09), the key project of North Minzu University (No. ZDZX201801, ZDZX201804), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 61662001, 11761002)

References

- [1] K.T. Atanassov, Intuitionistic fuzzy sets, *Fuzzy Sets Syst* **20** (1986), 87–96.
- [2] A.G. Hatzimichailidis, G.A. Papakostas and V.G. Kaburlasos, Anovel distance measure of intuitionistic fuzzy sets and its application to pattern recognition problems, *Int J Intell Syst* **27** (2012), 396–409.
- [3] Y. Yang and F. Chiclana, Consistency of 2d and 3d distances of intuitionistic fuzzy sets, *Expert Syst Appl* **39** (2012), 8865–8670.
- [4] Y.W. Du and W.M. Xu, Multiattribute group decision making based on interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy sets and analytically evidential reasoning methodology, *J Intell Fuzzy Syst* **33** (2017), 2953–2960.
- [5] C.L. Xu, Improvement of the distance between intuitionistic fuzzy sets and its applications, *J Intell Fuzzy Syst* **33** (2017), 1563–1575.
- [6] R. Joshi, S. Kumar, D. Gupta and H. Kaur, A Jensen-alpha-Norm dissimilarity measure for intuitionistic fuzzy sets and its applications in multiple attribute decision making, *Int J Fuzzy Syst* **20** (2018), 1188–1202.
- [7] D. Wang and X. Xin, Distance measure between intuitionistic fuzzy sets, *Pattern Recogn Lett* **26** (2005), 2063–2069.