Journal of Algorithms and Computation

journal homepage: http://jac.ut.ac.ir

LP Problems on the max - Fuzzy Or inequalities systems

Amin Ghodousian[*1] and Parmida Mirhashemi[†2]

[1,2]University of Tehran, College of Engineering, Faculty of Engineering Science, P.O.Box 11365-4563, Tehran, Iran.

ABSTRACT

In this paper, optimization of a linear objective function with fuzzy relational inequality constraints is investigated whereby the feasible region is formed as the intersection of two inequality fuzzy systems and Fuzzy Or operator is considered as fuzzy composition. It is shown that a lower bound is always attainable for the optimal objective value. Also, it is proved that the optimal solution of the problem is always resulted from the unique maximum solution and a minimal solution of the feasible region. An algorithm is presented to solve the problem and an example is described to illustrate the algorithm.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 11, December 2019
Received in revised form 18, October 2020
Accepted 19 November 2020
Available online30, December 2020
Research paper

Keyword: Fuzzy relation, fuzzy relational inequality, linear optimization, fuzzy compositions and fuzzy averaging operator.

AMS subject Classification: 05C78.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the following linear problem in which the constraints are formed as the intersection of two fuzzy systems of relational inequalities defined by Fuzzy Or

[*]Corresponding author: A. Ghodousian. Email: a.ghodousian@ut.ac.ir
[†]par.mirhashemi@ut.ac.ir

Operator:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & Z = c^T x \\
& A \bigtriangledown x \leq b^1 \\
& D \bigtriangledown x \geq b^2 \\
& x \in [0,1]^n
\end{aligned} \tag{1}
$$

where $I_1 = \{1, 2, .., m_1\}$, $I_2 = \{m_1 + 1, m_1 + 2, .., m_1 + m_2\}$ and $J = \{1, 2, .., n\}$. $A = (a_{ij})_{m_1 \times n}$ and $D = (d_{ij})_{m_2 \times n}$ are fuzzy matrices such that $0 \leq a_{ij} \leq 1$ ($\forall i \in I_1$ and $\forall j \in J$) and $0 \leq d_{ij} \leq 1$ ($\forall i \in I_2$ and $\forall j \in J$).$b^1 = (b_i^1)_{m_1 \times 1}$ is an $m_1$dimensional fuzzy vector in $[0,1]^{m_1}$ (i.e.,$0 \leq b_i^1 \leq 1$,$\forall i \in I_1$) , $b^2 = (b_i^2)_{m_2 \times 1}$ s an $m_2$dimensional fuzzy vector in $[0,1]^{m_2}$ (i.e.,$0 \leq b_i^2 \leq 1$,$\forall i \in I_2$), and c is a vector in R^n. Moreover, $\bigtriangledown$ is the max-$\bigtriangledown$composition where $\bigtriangledown$ is Fuzzy Or Operator, that is,

$$
\triangle(x, y) = \gamma max\{x, y\} + \frac{(1-\gamma)(x+y)}{2}
$$

in which $\gamma \in [0,1]$. Furthermore, let $S(A, b^1)$ and $S(D, b^2)$ denote the feasible solutions sets of inequalities type1 $A \bigtriangledown x \leq b^1$ and type2 $D \bigtriangledown x \geq b^2$, respectively, that is, $S(A, b^1) = \{x \in [0,1]^n : A \bigtriangledown x \leq b^1\}$ and $S(D, b^2) = \{x \in [0,1]^n : D \bigtriangledown x \geq b^2\}$. Also, let $S(A, D, b^1, b^2)$ denote the feasible solutions set of problem (1). Based on the foregoing notations, it is clear that $S(A, D, b^1, b^2) = S(A, b^1) \cap S(D, b^2)$. By these notations, problem (1) can be also expressed as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & Z = c^T x \\
& \{\bigtriangledown(a_{ij}, x_j)\} \leq b_i^1, i \in I_1 \\
& \max_{j \in J}\{\bigtriangledown(d_{ij}, x_j)\} \geq b_i^2, i \in I_2 \\
& x \in [0,1]^n
\end{aligned} \tag{2}
$$

Especially, by setting $A = D$ and $b^1 = b^2$, the above problem is converted to max-Fuzzy Or fuzzy relational equations.

The theory of fuzzy relational equations (FRE) was firstly proposed by Sanchez and applied in problems of the medical diagnosis [23]. Nowadays, it is well known that many issues associated with a body knowledge can be treated as FRE problems [51]. In addition to the preceding applications, FRE theory has been applied in many fields, including fuzzy control, discrete dynamic systems, prediction of fuzzy systems, fuzzy decision making, fuzzy pattern recognition, fuzzy clustering, image compression and reconstruction, fuzzy information retrieval, and so on. Generally, when inference rules and their consequences are known, the problem of determining antecedents is reduced to solving an FRE [41, 49]. The solvability determination and the finding of solutions set are the primary (and the most fundamental) subject concerning with FRE problems. Actually, The solution set of FRE is often a non-convex set that is completely determined by one maximum solution and a finite number of minimal solutions [5]. This non-convexity property is one of two bottlenecks making major contribution to the increase of complexity in problems that are related to FRE, especially in the optimization problems subjected to a system of fuzzy relations. The

other bottleneck is concerned with detecting the minimal solutions for FREs [2]. Markovskii showed that solving max-product FRE is closely related to the covering problem which is an NP-hard problem [48]. In fact, the same result holds true for a more general t-norms instead of the minimum and product operators [2, 3, 12, 13, 22–30, 44, 45, 48].
Over the last decades, the solvability of FRE defined with different max-t compositions have been investigated by many researchers [22–30, 50, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 61, 64, 67]. Moreover, some researchers introduced and improved theoretical aspects and applications of fuzzy relational inequalities (FRI) [12, 13, 15–21, 32, 33, 42, 66]. Li and Yang [42] studied a FRI with addition-min composition and presented an algorithm to search for minimal solutions. Ghodousian et al. [13] focused on the algebraic structure of two fuzzy relational inequalities $A\varphi x \preceq b^1$ and $D\varphi x \geq b^2$, and studied a mixed fuzzy system formed by the two preceding FRIs, where φ is an operator with (closed) convex solutions.
The problem of optimization subject to FRE and FRI is one of the most interesting and on-going research topic among the problems related to FRE and FRI theory [1, 8, 11–30, 39, 43, 46, 54, 57, 62, 66]. Fang and Li [9] converted a linear optimization problem subjected to FRE constraints with max-min operation into an integer programming problem and solved it by branch and bound method using jump-tracking technique. In [39] an application of optimizing the linear objective with max-min composition was employed for the streaming media provider. Wu et al. [60] improved the method used by Fang and Li, by decreasing the search domain. The topic of the linear optimization problem was also investigated with max-product operation [11, 35, 47]. Loetamonphong and Fang defined two sub-problems by separating negative and non-negative coefficients in the objective function and then obtained the optimal solution by combining those of the two sub-problems [47]. Also, in [35] and [11] some necessary conditions of the feasibility and simplification techniques were presented for solving FRE with max-product composition. Moreover, some generalizations of the linear optimization with respect to FRE have been studied with the replacement of max-min and max-product compositions with different fuzzy compositions such as max-average composition [14, 38, 62], max-Discontinuous t-norms composition [29], max-monotone operators composition [30] and max-t-norm composition [15–20, 22–28, 36, 43, 57]. Recently, many interesting generalizations of the linear programming subject to a system of fuzzy relations have been introduced and developed based on composite operations used in FRE, fuzzy relations used in the definition of the constraints, some developments on the objective function of the problems and other ideas [6, 10, 22–28, 33, 40, 46, 63]. For example, Dempe and Ruziyeva [4] generalized the fuzzy linear optimization problem by considering fuzzy coefficients.
The optimization problem subjected to various versions of FRI could be found in the literature as well [12, 13, 15–21, 29–33, 65, 66]. Xiao et al. [66] introduced the latticized linear programming problem subject to max-product fuzzy relation inequalities. Ghodousian et al. [12] introduced a system of fuzzy relational inequalities with fuzzy constraints (FRI-FC) in which the constraints were defined with max-min composition.
The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 takes a brief look at some basic results on the feasible region of Problem (1). These results provide a proper background to design an algorithm for solving the problem. In section 3, Problem (1)

is resolved by optimization of the linear objective function considered in section 2. In addition, the existence of an optimal solution is proved if problem (1) is not empty. The preceding results are summarized as an algorithm and, finally in section 4 some numerical examples are described to illustrate.

2 Feasible solutions set of Problem (1)

This section describes the basic definitions and structural properties concerning the intersection of two systems $A \bigtriangledown x \leq b^1$ and $D \bigtriangledown x \geq b^2$. The interesting reader is referred to [31] for the proofs of the lemmas, theorems and corollaries.

Let $S(a_{ij}, b_i^1) = \{x_j \in [0,1]^n : \bigtriangledown(a_{ij}, x_j) \leq b_i^1\}$, $\forall i \in I_1$ and $\forall j \in J$. Also, define $S(a_i, b_i^1) = \{x_j \in [0,1]^n : \max\limits_{j\in J}\{\bigtriangledown(a_{ij}, x_j)\} \leq b_i^1\}$, $\forall i \in I_1$. The following lemma determines set $S(a_i, b_i^1)$, $\forall i \in I_1$, where $\underline{W}_{ij}^1 = (2b_i^1 - (1+\gamma)a_{ij})/(1-\gamma)$ and $\underline{W}_{ij}^2 = (2b_i^1 - (1-\gamma)a_{ij})/(1+\gamma)$.

Lemma 1. For each $i \in I_1$ and each $j \in J$,

$$S(a_{ij}, b_i^1) = \begin{cases} \left[0,\ \min\left\{\underline{W}_{ij}^2, 1\right\}\right] & , a_{ij} \leq b_i^1 \\ \left[0,\ \underline{W}_{ij}^1\right] & , a_{ij} > b_i^1, 0 \leq \gamma \leq (2b_i^1 - a_{ij})/a_{ij} \\ \varnothing & , a_{ij} > b_i^1, \gamma > (2b_i^1 - a_{ij})/a_{ij} \end{cases}$$

By the following lemma, the shape of set $S(a_i, b_i^1)$ is attained.

Lemma 2. Suppose that $S(a_i, b_i^1) \neq \varnothing$. Then, $S(a_i, b_i^1) = \left[0, \overline{X}(i)\right]$,$\forall i \in I_1$, where, $\overline{X}(i) = \left[\overline{X}(i)_1, \overline{X}(i)_2, ..., \overline{X}(i)_n\right]$ and

$$\overline{X}(i)_j = \begin{cases} \min\left\{\underline{W}_{ij}^2, 1\right\} & , a_{ij} \leq b_i^1 \\ \underline{W}_{ij}^1 & , a_{ij} > b_i^1, 0 \leq \gamma \leq (2b_i^1 - a_{ij})/a_{ij} \end{cases}$$

The following theorem shows that set $S(A, b^1)$ is actually a closed convex cell.

Theorem 1. Let $\overline{X} = \min\limits_{i\in I_1}\left\{\overline{X}(i)\right\}$ and Suppose that $S(a_i, b_i^1) \neq \varnothing$. Then, $S(A, b^1) = \left[0, \overline{X}\right]$.

Remark 1. $S(A, b^1) = \varnothing$ iff $0 \in S(A, b^1)$

Let $S(d_{ij}, b_i^2) = \{x_j \in [0,1] : \bigtriangledown(d_{ij}, x_j) \geq b_i^2\}$,$\forall i \in I_2$ and $\forall j \in J$. Also, define $S(d_i, b_i^2) = \{x \in [0,1]^n : \bigtriangledown(d_{ij}, x_j) \geq b_i^2\}$, . The following lemma determines set $S(a_i, b_i^1)$, $\forall i \in I_2$, where $\underline{W}_{ij}^1 = (2b_i^1 - (1+\gamma)d_{ij})/(1-\gamma)$ and $\underline{W}_{ij}^2 = (2b_i^1 - (1-\gamma)d_{ij})/(1+\gamma)$.

Lemma 3. For each $i \in I_2$ and each $j \in J$,

$$S(d_{ij}, b_i^2) = \begin{cases} \left[\max\left\{0, \overline{W}_{ij}^1\right\}, 1\right] & , d_{ij} \geq b_i^2,\ 0 \leq \gamma < 1 \\ [0,1] & , d_{ij} \geq b_i^2,\ \gamma = 1 \\ \left[\overline{W}_{ij}^2, 1\right] & , d_{ij} < b_i^2,\ (2b_i^2 - d_{ij} - 1)/(1 - d_{ij}) \leq \gamma \leq 1 \\ \varnothing & , d_{ij} < b_i^2,\ \gamma < (2b_i^2 - d_{ij} - 1)/(1 - d_{ij}) \end{cases}$$

By the following lemma, the shape of set $S(d_i, b_i^2)$ is attained.

Lemma 4. Suppose that $S(d_i, b_i^2) \neq \varnothing$. Then, $S(d_i, b_i^2) = \bigcup\limits_{j \in J_1 \cup J_2}$, $\forall i \in I_2$, where $J_1 = \{j \in J : d_{ij} \geq b_i^2, \gamma < 1\}$, $J_2 = \{j \in J : d_{ij} \geq b_i^2, \gamma = 1\}$, $J_3 = \{j \in J : d_{ij} < b_i^2, \gamma \geq (2{b_i}^2 - d_{ij} - 1)/(1 - d_{ij})\}$ and $\underline{X}(i,j) = \left[\underline{X}(i,j)_1, \underline{X}(i,j)_2, ..., \underline{X}(i,j)_n\right]$ such that

$$\underline{X}(i,j)_k = \begin{cases} \max\left\{0, \overline{W}_{ij}^1\right\} & , k = j, j \in J_1 \\ 0 & , k = j, j \in J_2 \\ \overline{W}_{ij}^2 & , k = j, j \in J_3 \\ 0 & , \textit{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The following theorem shows that set $S(d_i, b_i^2)$ is the union of the finite number of closed convex cells.

Theorem 2. Suppose that $S(d_i, {b_i}^2) \neq \varnothing$, $\forall i \in I_2$. Then, $S(D, b^2) = \bigcup\limits_{e \in E_D} \left[\underline{X}(e), 1\right]$, where $\underline{X}(e) = \left[\underline{X}(e)_1, \underline{X}(e)_2, ..., \underline{X}(e)_n\right]$ and such that $\underline{X}(e)_j = \max\limits_{i \in I_2}\left\{\underline{X}(i, e(i))_j\right\} = \max\limits_{i \in I_2}\left\{\underline{X}(i, j_i)_j\right\}$, $\forall j \in J$.

Remark 2. $S(D, b^2) \neq \varnothing$ iff $1 \in S(D, b^2)$.

The following theorem characterizes the feasible region of Problem (1).

Theorem 3. Suppose that $S(A, D, b^1, b^2) \neq \varnothing$. Then $S(A, D, b^1, b^2) = \bigcup\limits_{e \in E_D} \left[\underline{X}(e), \overline{X}\right]$

Remark 3. Assume that $S(D, b^1) \neq \varnothing$ and $S(D, b^2) \neq \varnothing$. Then, $S(A, D, b^1, b^2) \neq \varnothing$ iff $\overline{X} \in S(D, b^2)$

3 Optimization of the linear objective function

According to the well-known schemes used for optimization of linear problems such as (1) [9, 13, 15–20, 33, 43], problem (1) is converted to the following two sub-problems:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & Z_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j^+ x_j \\ & A \bigtriangledown x \leq b^1 \\ & D \bigtriangledown x \geq b^2 \\ & x \in [0,1]^n \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & Z_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j^- x_j \\ & A \bigtriangledown x \le b^1 \\ & D \bigtriangledown x \ge b^2 \\ & x \in [0,1]^n \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Where ${c_j}^+ = \max\{c_j, 0\}$ and $c_j^- = \min\{c_j, 0\}$ for $j = 1, 2, ..., n$. It is easy to prove that $\overline{X}$ is the optimal solution of (4), and the optimal solution of (3) is $\underline{X}(e')$ for some $e' \in E_D$.

Theorem 4. Suppose that $S(A, D, b^1, b^2) \neq \varnothing$, and $\overline{X}$ and $\underline{X}(e^*)_j$ are the optimal solutions of sub-problems (4) and (3), respectively. Then $c^T x^*$ is the lower bound of the optimal objective function in (1), where $x^* = [{x_1}^*, {x_2}^*, ..., {x_n}^*]$ is defined as follows:

$${x_j}^* = \begin{cases} \overline{X}_j & c_j < 0 \\ \underline{X}(e^*)_j & c_j \ge 0 \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

for $j = 1, 2, ..., n$.

Proof. Let $x \in S(A, D, b^1, b^2)$. Then, from Theorem 3 we have $x \in \bigcup_{e \in E_D} \left[\underline{X}(e), \overline{X}\right]$. Therefore, for each $j \in J$ such that $c_j \ge 0$, inequality $x_j^* \le x_j$ implies $c_j^+ {x_j}^* \le {c_j}^+ x_j$. In addition, for each $j \in J$ such that $c_j < 0$, inequality $c_j \le 0$ implies $c_j^- {x_j}^* \le {c_j}^- x_j$. Hence, $\sum_{j=1}^n {c_j}^+ {x_j}^* \le \sum_{j=1}^n {c_j}^+ x_j$. □

Corollary 1. Suppose that $S(A, D, b^1, b^2) \neq \varnothing$. Then, $x^* = [{x_1}^*, {x_2}^*, ..., {x_n}^*]$ as defined in (5), is the optimal solution of problem (1).

Proof. According to the definition of vector x^*, we have $\underline{X}(e^*)_j \le {x_j}^* \le \overline{X}_j, \forall j \in J$, which implies $x^* \in \bigcup_{e \in E_D} \left[\underline{X}(e), \overline{X}\right] = S_{T_F^S}(A, D, b^1, b^2)$. □

We now summarize the preceding discussion as an algorithm. Also, see [31] for the algorithm finding the feasible region of Problem (1).

Algorithm 1 (optimization of problem (1))
Given problem (1):

1. If $0 \notin S(A, b^1)$, then stop; $S(A, b^1)$ is infeasible (Remark 1).
2. If $1 \notin S(D, b^2)$, then stop; $S(D, b^2)$ is infeasible (Remark 2).
3. If $\overline{X} \notin S(A, D, b^1, b^2)$, then stop; $S(A, D, b^1, b^2)$ is infeasible (Remark 3).
4. Find the optimal solution $\underline{X}(e^*)$ for the sub-problem (3) by considering vectors $\underline{X}(e)$, $\forall e in E_D$.
5. Find the optimal solution $x^* = [{x_1}^*, {x_2}^*, ..., {x_n}^*]$ for the problem (1) by (5) (Theorem 4)

4 Numerical examples

Example 1. Consider the following linear optimization problem (1):

$$\min \qquad Z = 4.8815x_1 + 0.0004x_2 - 0.4016X_3 + 8.0944x_4 + 2.1973x_5$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.2967 & 0.0855 & 0.9289 & 0.2373 & 0.5211 \\ 0.3188 & 0.2625 & 0.7303 & 0.4588 & 0.2316 \\ 0.4242 & 0.8010 & 0.4886 & 0.9631 & 0.4889 \\ 0.5079 & 0.0292 & 0.5785 & 0.5468 & 0.6241 \end{bmatrix} \triangle\, x \leq \begin{bmatrix} 0.9562 \\ 0.7644 \\ 0.9768 \\ 0.7331 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.6791 & 0.8852 & 0.3354 & 0.6538 & 0.8909 \\ 0.3955 & 0.9133 & 0.6797 & 0.4942 & 0.3342 \\ 0.3674 & 0.7962 & 0.1366 & 0.7791 & 0.6987 \\ 0.9880 & 0.0987 & 0.7212 & 0.7150 & 0.1978 \\ 0.0377 & 0.2619 & 0.1068 & 0.9037 & 0.0305 \end{bmatrix} \triangle\, x \geq \begin{bmatrix} 0.3021 \\ 0.2841 \\ 0.1290 \\ 0.0467 \\ 0.0219 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$x \in [0,1]^n$$

step1: Since $0 \in S(A, b^1)$, set $S(A, b^2)$ is feasible:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.2967 & 0.0855 & 0.9289 & 0.2373 & 0.5211 \\ 0.3188 & 0.2625 & 0.7303 & 0.4588 & 0.2316 \\ 0.4242 & 0.8010 & 0.4886 & 0.9631 & 0.4889 \\ 0.5079 & 0.0292 & 0.5785 & 0.5468 & 0.6241 \end{bmatrix} \triangle \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.9562 \\ 0.7644 \\ 0.9768 \\ 0.7331 \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} 0.9562 \\ 0.7644 \\ 0.9768 \\ 0.7331 \end{bmatrix}$$

step2: Since $1 \in S(D, b^2)$, set $S(D, b^2)$ is feasible:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.6791 & 0.8852 & 0.3354 & 0.6538 & 0.8909 \\ 0.3955 & 0.9133 & 0.6797 & 0.4942 & 0.3342 \\ 0.3674 & 0.7962 & 0.1366 & 0.7791 & 0.6987 \\ 0.9880 & 0.0987 & 0.7212 & 0.7150 & 0.1978 \\ 0.0377 & 0.2619 & 0.1068 & 0.9037 & 0.0305 \end{bmatrix} \triangle \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.9727 \\ 0.9783 \\ 0.9490 \\ 0.9970 \\ 0.9759 \end{bmatrix} \geq \begin{bmatrix} 0.3021 \\ 0.2841 \\ 0.1290 \\ 0.0467 \\ 0.0219 \end{bmatrix}$$

step3: From Lemma 2 and Theorem 1, $\overline{X} = [0.8082 \;\; 0.9317 \;\; 0.7758 \;\; 0.7952 \;\; 0.7694]$. Since $\overline{X} \in S(D, b^2)$, set $S(A, D, b^1, b^2)$ is feasible:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.6791 & 0.8852 & 0.3354 & 0.6538 & 0.8909 \\ 0.3955 & 0.9133 & 0.6797 & 0.4942 & 0.3342 \\ 0.3674 & 0.7962 & 0.1366 & 0.7791 & 0.6987 \\ 0.9880 & 0.0987 & 0.7212 & 0.7150 & 0.1978 \\ 0.0377 & 0.2619 & 0.1068 & 0.9037 & 0.0305 \end{bmatrix} \triangle \begin{bmatrix} 0.8082 \\ 0.9317 \\ 0.7758 \\ 0.7952 \\ 0.7694 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.9727 \\ 0.9783 \\ 0.9490 \\ 0.9970 \\ 0.9759 \end{bmatrix} \geq \begin{bmatrix} 0.3021 \\ 0.2841 \\ 0.1290 \\ 0.0467 \\ 0.0219 \end{bmatrix}$$

step4: For this example, there are 3125 feasible vectors $\underline{X}(e)$ (i.e., $\underline{X}(e) \leq \overline{X}$). However, there is only one minimal solution:

$$e_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow \underline{X}(e_1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Vector $\underline{X}(e_1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ is the optimal solution of the sub-problem (3) that is obtained by $e^* = e_1$.
step5: The optimal solution of Problem (1) is resulted as $x^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0.77577 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ with optimal objective value $Z^* = -0.31155$.

Example 2. Consider the following linear optimization problem (1):

$$\min \quad Z = -5.4762x_1 - 2.3076x_2 + 1.6597X_3 - 4.9639x_4 - 4.1912x_5 + 2.3418x_6 - 4.6944x_7$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.6177 & 0.0287 & 0.0596 & 0.8175 & 0.8003 & 0.3909 & 0.6569 \\ 0.8594 & 0.4899 & 0.6820 & 0.7224 & 0.4538 & 0.8314 & 0.6280 \\ 0.8055 & 0.1679 & 0.0424 & 0.1499 & 0.4324 & 0.8034 & 0.2920 \\ 0.5767 & 0.9787 & 0.0714 & 0.6596 & 0.8253 & 0.0605 & 0.4317 \\ 0.1829 & 0.7127 & 0.5216 & 0.5186 & 0.0835 & 0.3993 & 0.0155 \\ 0.2399 & 0.5005 & 0.0967 & 0.9730 & 0.1332 & 0.5269 & 0.9841 \\ 0.8865 & 0.4711 & 0.8181 & 0.6490 & 0.1734 & 0.4168 & 0.1672 \end{bmatrix} \triangle\, x \leq \begin{bmatrix} 0.8534 \\ 0.8742 \\ 0.8137 \\ 0.9888 \\ 0.7432 \\ 0.9902 \\ 0.9165 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1062 & 0.9203 & 0.9427 & 0.5391 & 0.1711 & 0.3689 & 0.3763 \\ 0.3724 & 0.0527 & 0.4177 & 0.6981 & 0.0326 & 0.4607 & 0.1909 \\ 0.1981 & 0.7379 & 0.9831 & 0.6665 & 0.5612 & 0.9816 & 0.4283 \\ 0.4897 & 0.2691 & 0.3015 & 0.1781 & 0.8819 & 0.1564 & 0.4820 \\ 0.3395 & 0.4228 & 0.7011 & 0.1280 & 0.6692 & 0.8555 & 0.1206 \\ 0.9516 & 0.5479 & 0.6663 & 0.9991 & 0.1904 & 0.6448 & 0.5895 \end{bmatrix} \triangle\, x \geq \begin{bmatrix} 0.0903 \\ 0.0138 \\ 0.1744 \\ 0.1293 \\ 0.1178 \\ 0.1888 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$x \in [0,1]^n$$

step1: Since $0 \in S(A, b^1)$, set $S(A, b^2)$ is feasible:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.6177 & 0.0287 & 0.0596 & 0.8175 & 0.8003 & 0.3909 & 0.6569 \\ 0.8594 & 0.4899 & 0.6820 & 0.7224 & 0.4538 & 0.8314 & 0.6280 \\ 0.8055 & 0.1679 & 0.0424 & 0.1499 & 0.4324 & 0.8034 & 0.2920 \\ 0.5767 & 0.9787 & 0.0714 & 0.6596 & 0.8253 & 0.0605 & 0.4317 \\ 0.1829 & 0.7127 & 0.5216 & 0.5186 & 0.0835 & 0.3993 & 0.0155 \\ 0.2399 & 0.5005 & 0.0967 & 0.9730 & 0.1332 & 0.5269 & 0.9841 \\ 0.8865 & 0.4711 & 0.8181 & 0.6490 & 0.1734 & 0.4168 & 0.1672 \end{bmatrix} \triangle \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6131 \\ 0.6446 \\ 0.6041 \\ 0.7340 \\ 0.5345 \\ 0.7381 \\ 0.6649 \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} 0.8534 \\ 0.8742 \\ 0.8137 \\ 0.9888 \\ 0.7432 \\ 0.9902 \\ 0.9165 \end{bmatrix}$$

step2: Since $1 \in S(D, b^2)$, set $S(D, b^2)$ is feasible:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1062 & 0.9203 & 0.9427 & 0.5391 & 0.1711 & 0.3689 & 0.3763 \\ 0.3724 & 0.0527 & 0.4177 & 0.6981 & 0.0326 & 0.4607 & 0.1909 \\ 0.1981 & 0.7379 & 0.9831 & 0.6665 & 0.5612 & 0.9816 & 0.4283 \\ 0.4897 & 0.2691 & 0.3015 & 0.1781 & 0.8819 & 0.1564 & 0.4820 \\ 0.3395 & 0.4228 & 0.7011 & 0.1280 & 0.6692 & 0.8555 & 0.1206 \\ 0.9516 & 0.5479 & 0.6663 & 0.9991 & 0.1904 & 0.6448 & 0.5895 \end{bmatrix} \triangle \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.9857 \\ 0.9245 \\ 0.9958 \\ 0.9705 \\ 0.9639 \\ 0.9998 \end{bmatrix} \geq \begin{bmatrix} 0.0903 \\ 0.0138 \\ 0.1744 \\ 0.1293 \\ 0.1178 \\ 0.1888 \end{bmatrix}$$

step3: From Lemma 2 and Theorem 1, $\overline{X} = [0.8164 \;\; 0.7534 \;\; 0.8171 \;\; 0.8181 \;\; 0.8711 \;\; 0.8171 \;\; 0.9189]$. Since $\overline{X} \in S(D, b^2)$, set $S(A, D, b^1, b^2)$ is feasible:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1062 & 0.9203 & 0.9427 & 0.5391 & 0.1711 & 0.3689 & 0.3763 \\ 0.3724 & 0.0527 & 0.4177 & 0.6981 & 0.0326 & 0.4607 & 0.1909 \\ 0.1981 & 0.7379 & 0.9831 & 0.6665 & 0.5612 & 0.9816 & 0.4283 \\ 0.4897 & 0.2691 & 0.3015 & 0.1781 & 0.8819 & 0.1564 & 0.4820 \\ 0.3395 & 0.4228 & 0.7011 & 0.1280 & 0.6692 & 0.8555 & 0.1206 \\ 0.9516 & 0.5479 & 0.6663 & 0.9991 & 0.1904 & 0.6448 & 0.5895 \end{bmatrix} \triangle \begin{bmatrix} 0.8164 \\ 0.7524 \\ 0.8171 \\ 0.8181 \\ 0.8711 \\ 0.8171 \\ 0.9189 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.9113 \\ 0.7881 \\ 0.9416 \\ 0.8792 \\ 0.8459 \\ 0.9538 \end{bmatrix} \geq \begin{bmatrix} 0.0903 \\ 0.0138 \\ 0.1744 \\ 0.1293 \\ 0.1178 \\ 0.1888 \end{bmatrix}$$

step4: For this example, there are 3125 feasible vectors $\underline{X}(e)$ (i.e., $\underline{X}(e) \leq \overline{X}$). However, there is only one minimal solution:

$$e_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow \underline{X}(e_1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Vector $\underline{X}(e_1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ is the optimal solution of the sub-problem (3) that is obtained by $e^* = e_1$.

step5: The optimal solution of Problem (1) is resulted as $x^* = [0.81643 \;\; 0.75337 \;\; 0 \;\; 0.81807 \;\; 0.8711 \;\; 0 \;\; 0.9189]$ with optimal objective value $Z^* = -18.2349$.

Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed an algorithm to find the optimal solution of linear problems subjected to two fuzzy relational inequalities with Fuzzy Or operator. Some test problems were then solved by the proposed algorithm. As future works, we aim at testing our algorithm in other type of linear optimization problems whose constraints are defined as FRI with other well-known t-norms.

References

[1] Chang, C. W., and Shieh, B. S., Linear optimization problem constrained by fuzzy maxmin relation equations, Information Sciences 234 (2013) 7179.

[2] Chen, L., and Wang, P. P., Fuzzy relation equations (i): the general and specialized solving algorithms, Soft Computing 6 (5) (2002) 428-435.

[3] Chen, L., and Wang, P. P., Fuzzy relation equations (ii): the branch-point-solutions and the categorized minimal solutions, Soft Computing 11 (1) (2007) 33-40.

[4] Dempe, S., and Ruziyeva, A., On the calculation of a membership function for the solution of a fuzzy linear optimization problem, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 188 (2012) 58-67.

[5] Di Nola, A., Sessa, S., Pedrycz, W., and Sanchez, E., Fuzzy relational Equations and their applications in knowledge engineering, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press, 1989.

[6] Dubey, D., Chandra, S., and Mehra, A., Fuzzy linear programming under interval uncertainty based on IFS representation, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 188 (2012) 68-87.

[7] Dubois, D., and Prade, H., Fundamentals of Fuzzy Sets, Kluwer, Boston, 2000.

[8] Fan, Y. R., Huang, G. H., and Yang, A. L., Generalized fuzzy linear programming for decision making under uncertainty: Feasibility of fuzzy solutions and solving approach, Information Sciences 241 (2013) 12-27.

[9] Fang, S.C., and Li, G., Solving fuzzy relational equations with a linear objective function, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 103 (1999) 107-113.

[10] Freson, S., De Baets, B., and De Meyer, H., Linear optimization with bipolar maxmin constraints, Information Sciences 234 (2013) 315.

[11] Ghodousian, A., and Khorram, E., An algorithm for optimizing the linear function with fuzzy relation equation constraints regarding max-prod composition, Applied Mathematics and Computation 178 (2006) 502-509.

[12] Ghodousian, A., and Khorram, E., Fuzzy linear optimization in the presence of the fuzzy relation inequality constraints with max-min composition, Information Sciences 178 (2008) 501-519.

[13] Ghodousian, A., and Khorram, E., Linear optimization with an arbitrary fuzzy relational inequality, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 206 (2012) 89-102.

[14] Ghodousian, A., and Khorram, E., Solving a linear programming problem with the convex combination of the max-min and the max-average fuzzy relation equations, Applied Mathematics and computation 180 (2006) 411-418.

[15] Ghodousian, A., and Zarghani, R., Linear optimization on the intersection of two fuzzy relational inequalities dened with Yager family of t-norms, Journal of Algorithms and Computation 49 (1) (2017) 55 82.

[16] Ghodousian, A., and Nouri, M., Linear optimization on Hamacher-fuzzy relational inequalities (H-FRI), Journal of Algorithms and Computation 49 (1) (2017) 115 150.

[17] Ghodousian, A., An algorithm for solving linear optimization problems subjected to the intersection of two fuzzy relational inequalities defined by Frank family of t-norms, International Journal in Foundations of Computer Science and Technology 8(3)(2018) 1-20.

[18] Ghodousian, A., and Oveisi, S., Linear programming on SS-fuzzy inequality constrained problems, Journal of Algorithms and Computation 50 (2) (2018) 13 36.

[19] Ghodousian, A., and Azarnejad, T., Optimizing of linear problems subjected to Sugeno-Weber FRI, Archives of Industrial Engineering 1(1) (2018) 1-26.

[20] Ghodousian, A., and Jafarpour, M., LP problems constrained with D-FRIs, Journal of Algorithms and Computation 50 (2) (2018) 59 79.

[21] Ghodousian, A., and Raeisian Parvari, M., A modied PSO algorithm for linear optimization problem subject to the generalized fuzzy relational inequalities with fuzzy constraints (FRI-FC), Information Sciences 418419 (2017) 317345.

[22] Ghodousian, A., Ahmadi, A., and Dehghani, A., Solving a non-convex non-linear optimization problem constrained by fuzzy relational equations and Sugeno-Weber family of t-norms, Journal of Algorithms and Computation 49 (2) (2017) 63 101.

[23] Ghodousian, A., A Nonlinear Optimization Problem subjected To Hamacher -FRE Restrictions, International Journal Of Modern Engineering Research 8(6) (2018)1-20.

[24] Ghodousian, A., Raeisian Parvari, M., Rabie, R., and Azarnejad, T., Solving a Non-Linear Optimization Problem Constrained by a Non-Convex Region Defined by Fuzzy Relational Equations and Schweizer-Sklar Family of T-Norms, American Journal of Computation, Communication and Control 5(2)(2018) 68-87.

[25] Ghodousian, A., Naeeimib, M., and Babalhavaeji, A., Nonlinear optimization problem subjected to fuzzy relational equations dened by Dubois-Prade family of t-norms, Computers & Industrial Engineering 119 (2018) 167180.

[26] Ghodousian, A., and Babalhavaeji, A., An efcient genetic algorithm for solving nonlinear optimization problems dened with fuzzy relational equations and max-Lukasiewicz composition, Applied Soft Computing 69 (2018) 475492.

[27] Ghodousian, A., Javan, A., and Khoshnood, A., Solving a non-linear optimization problem in the presence of Yager-FRE constraints, Journal of Algorithms and Computation 50 (1) (2018) 155 183.

[28] Ghodousian, A., On The Frank FREs and Its Application in Optimization Problems, Journal of Computer Science Applications and Information Technology 3(2) (2018) 1-14.

[29] Ghodousian, A., Ghazvini N., Fardshad M., and Naeeimi M., On the Discontinuous t-norms in FRI and Linear programming problems, International Research in Computer Science 1(1) (2018) 1-15.

[30] Ghodousian, A., Optimization of the reducible objective functions with monotone factors subject to FRI constraints defined with continuous t-norms, Archives of Industrial Engineering 1(1) (2018) 1-19.

[31] Ghodousian, A., Babalhavaej, A., and Bashir, E., On the max - Fuzzy Or composition fuzzy inequalities systems, Journal of Algorithms and Computation 51 (2) (2019) 13 34.

[32] Guo, F. F., Pang, L. P., Meng, D., and Xia, Z. Q., An algorithm for solving optimization problems with fuzzy relational inequality constraints, Information Sciences 252 (2013) 20-31.

[33] Guo, F., and Xia, Z. Q., An algorithm for solving optimization problems with one linear objective function and finitely many constraints of fuzzy relation inequalities, Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making 5 (2006) 33-47.

[34] Guu, S. M., and Wu, Y. K., Minimizing a linear objective function under a max-t-norm fuzzy relational equation constraint, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 161 (2010) 285-297.

[35] Guu, S. M., and Wu, Y. K., Minimizing a linear objective function with fuzzy relation equation constraints, Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making 12 (2002) 1568-4539.

[36] Guu, S. M., and Wu, Y. K., Minimizing an linear objective function under a max-t-norm fuzzy relational equation constraint, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 161 (2010) 285-297.

[37] Guu, S. M., and Wu, Y. K., Minimizing a linear objective function with fuzzy relation equation constraints, Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making 1 (3) (2002) 347-360.

[38] Khorram, E., and Ghodousian, A., Linear objective function optimization with fuzzy relation equation constraints regarding max-av composition, Applied Mathematics and Computation 173 (2006) 872-886.

[39] Lee, H. C., and Guu, S. M., On the optimal three-tier multimedia streaming services, Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making 2(1) (2002) 31-39.

[40] Li, P., and Liu, Y., Linear optimization with bipolar fuzzy relational equation constraints using lukasiewicz triangular norm, Soft Computing 18 (2014) 1399-1404.

[41] Li, P., and Fang, S. C., A survey on fuzzy relational equations, part I: classification and solvability, Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making 8 (2009) 179-229.

[42] Li, J. X., and Yang, S. J., Fuzzy relation inequalities about the data transmission mechanism in bittorrent-like peer-to-peer file sharing systems, in: Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Fuzzy Systems and Knowledge discovery (FSKD 2012), pp. 452-456.

[43] Li, P. K. , and Fang, S. C., On the resolution and optimization of a system of fuzzy relational equations with sup-t composition, Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making 7 (2008) 169-214.

[44] Lin, J. L., Wu, Y. K., and Guu, S. M., On fuzzy relational equations and the covering problem, Information Sciences 181 (2011) 2951-2963.

[45] Lin, J. L., On the relation between fuzzy max-archimedean t-norm relational equations and the covering problem, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 160 (2009) 2328-2344.

[46] Liu, C. C., Lur, Y. Y., and Wu, Y. K., Linear optimization of bipolar fuzzy relational equations with max-ukasiewicz composition, Information Sciences 360 (2016) 149162.

[47] Loetamonphong, J., and Fang, S. C., Optimization of fuzzy relation equations with max-product composition, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 118 (2001) 509-517.

[48] Markovskii, A. V., On the relation between equations with max-product composition and the covering problem, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 153 (2005) 261-273.

[49] Mizumoto, M., and Zimmermann, H. J., Comparison of fuzzy reasoning method, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 8 (1982) 253-283.

[50] Peeva, K., Resolution of fuzzy relational equations-methods, algorithm and software with applications, Information Sciences 234 (2013) 44-63.

[51] Pedrycz, W., Granular Computing: Analysis and Design of Intelligent Systems, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2013.

[52] Perfilieva, I., Finitary solvability conditions for systems of fuzzy relation equations, Information Sciences 234 (2013)29-43.

[53] Qu, X. B., and Wang, X. P., Man-hua. Lei H., Conditions under which the solution sets of fuzzy relational equations over complete Brouwerian lattices form lattices, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 234 (2014) 34-45.

[54] Qu, X. B., and Wang, X. P., Minimization of linear objective functions under the constraints expressed by a system of fuzzy relation equations, Information Sciences 178 (2008) 3482-3490.

[55] Sanchez, E., Solution in composite fuzzy relation equations: application to medical diagnosis in Brouwerian logic, in: M.M. Gupta. G.N. Saridis, B.R. Games (Eds.), Fuzzy Automata and Decision Processes, North-Holland, New York, 1977, pp. 221-234.

[56] Shieh, B. S., Infinite fuzzy relation equations with continuous t-norms, Information Sciences 178 (2008) 1961-1967.

[57] Shieh, B. S., Minimizing a linear objective function under a fuzzy max-t-norm relation equation constraint, Information Sciences 181 (2011) 832-841.

[58] Sun, F., Wang, X. P., and Qu, x. B., Minimal join decompositions and their applications to fuzzy relation equations over complete Brouwerian lattices, Information Sciences 224 (2013) 143-151.

[59] Sun, F., Conditions for the existence of the least solution and minimal solutions to fuzzy relation equations over complete Brouwerian lattices, Information Sciences 205 (2012) 86-92.

[60] Wu, Y. K., and Guu, S. M., Minimizing a linear function under a fuzzy max-min relational equation constraints, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 150 (2005) 147-162.

[61] Wu, Y. K., and Guu, S. M., An efficient procedure for solving a fuzzy relation equation with max-Archimedean t-norm composition, IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems 16 (2008) 73-84.

[62] Wu, Y. K., Optimization of fuzzy relational equations with max-av composition, Information Sciences 177 (2007) 4216-4229.

[63] Wu, Y. K., Guu, S. M., and Liu, J. Y., Reducing the search space of a linear fractional programming problem under fuzzy relational equations with max-Archimedean t-norm composition, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 159 (2008) 3347-3359.

[64] Xiong, Q. Q., and Wang, X. P., Fuzzy relational equations on complete Brouwerian lattices, Information Sciences 193 (2012) 141-152.

[65] Yang, S. J., An algorithm for minimizing a linear objective function subject to the fuzzy relation inequalities with addition-min composition, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 255 (2014) 41-51.

[66] Yang, X. P., Zhou, X. G., and Cao, B. Y., Latticized linear programming subject to max-product fuzzy relation inequalities with application in wireless communication, Information Sciences 358359 (2016) 4455.

[67] Yeh, C. T., On the minimal solutions of max-min fuzzy relation equations, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 159 (2008) 23-39.