On Nie-Tan Operator and Type-Reduction of Interval Type-2 Fuzzy Sets

Jiawei Li^D, *Member, IEEE*, Robert John^D, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Simon Coupland, *Member, IEEE*, and Graham Kendall, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Type-reduction of type-2 fuzzy sets is considered to be a defuzzification bottleneck because of the computational complexity involved in the process of type-reduction. In this paper, we prove that the closedform Nie-Tan operator, which outputs the average of the upper and lower bounds of the footprint of uncertainty, is actually an accurate method for defuzzifying interval type-2 fuzzy sets.

Index Terms—Defuzzification, interval type-2 fuzzy sets (T2 FSs), Nie-Tan operator, type-reduction.

I. INTRODUCTION

Type-2 fuzzy sets (T2 FSs) generalize T1 FSs so that uncertainty associated with the membership function is taken into account [1]. Compared with a T1 FS, in which the membership is represented by crisp numbers, the membership of a T2 FS is represented by an FS, which is known as the secondary membership. Defuzzification is the final stage of a fuzzy inference system, in which an FS is converted into a crisp number. Unfortunately, defuzzification of a T2 FS can be so computationally complex that it has been known as the defuzzification bottleneck [2]. Defuzzification of T2 FSs usually contains two stages [3]: a type-reduction stage, in which the T2 FS is converted to a T1 FS, and a defuzzification of the T1 FS stage. It is the type-reduction stage that leads to the defuzzification bottleneck since there have been a number of efficient methods for the defuzzification of T1 FSs. One of the most popular methods to defuzzify T1 FSs is the centroid [4], [5]

$$d_c(\mu(x)) = \frac{\int_{x_{\min}}^{x_{\max}} \mu(x) \cdot x dx}{\int_{x_{\min}}^{x_{\max}} \mu(x) dx}$$
(1)

where $\mu(x)$ is the membership function of the T1 FS.

The difficulty in the extension of the centroid method to T2 defuzzification lies in the fact that, according to the representation theorem [6], a T2 FS is represented by the union of its embedded sets. The center of gravity (COG) of a T2 FS is the average of the centroids of all the embedded sets. An exhaustive type-reduction method [7] is usually

Manuscript received October 19, 2016; accepted January 18, 2017. Date of publication February 9, 2017; date of current version March 29, 2018. This work was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council U.K. under Grant reference EP/H000968/1 and Grant reference EP/J017515/1.

J. Li is with the Department of Computer Science and Mathematics, University of Stirling, Stirling FK9 4LA, U.K. (e-mail: lij@cs.stir.ac.uk).

R. John is with the School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham, Jubilee Campus, Nottingham NG8 1BB, U.K. (e-mail: robert.john@ nottingham.ac.uk).

S. Coupland is with the School of Computer Science and Informatics, De Montfort University, The Gateway, Leicester LE1 9BH, U.K. (e-mail: simon. coupland@gmail.com).

G. Kendall is with the School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham, Jubilee Campus, Nottingham NG8 1BB, U.K., and also with the School of Computer Science, University of Nottingham, Malaysia Campus, Semenyih 43500, Malaysia (e-mail: graham.kendall@nottingham.edu.my).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TFUZZ.2017.2666842

impractical, depending on the scales of discretization. The sampling method, in which a number of randomly selected samples are used to represent the whole union of embedded sets, is an efficient, cut-down alternative to the exhaustive method [2], [8], [9]. Some other general T2 defuzzification methods include vertical slice centroid type-reduction [10], plane presentation [11], [22], geometric method [24], and the collapsing method [12]. There is still not an accurate type-reduction of general T2 FSs other than the exhaustive algorithm.

Interval type-2 (IT2) FSs have received more attention in recent years because the mathematics that is needed for IT2 FSs is much simpler than the mathematics for general type-2 FSs[13]–[15]. The secondary memberships of IT2 FSs can be ignored because they are all set to one. Some operators have been proposed for IT2 defuzzification.

The Karnik–Mendel (KM) algorithm [16], which computes the smallest and largest centroid of embedded T1 FSs iteratively and then uses the average of two values as the result of defuzzification, is the most commonly used type-reduction method. A number of enhancements to KM algorithm have been made in order either to reduce the computational burden or to improve the accuracy [17]–[21].

Nie-Tan type-reduction operator has a simple closed-form representation [23]. To date, it is considered to be an approximation of KM algorithms, i.e., Nie-Tan operator is a first-order Taylor series approximation of KM+defuzzification and an improved Nie-Tan operator is a third-order approximation of KM+defuzzification [20], [27]. We will prove that Nie-Tan operator is equivalent to exhaustive type-reduction and is actually an accurate type-reduction method for both discrete and continuous IT2 FSs in this paper.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces some basic terms on IT2 FSs. Section III presents a theorem and the proof of it. Section IV compares three type-reduction methods in defuzzifying four IT2 FSs. The paper is concluded in Section V.

II. BACKGROUND

Let X be a universe of discourse. A T1 FS on X is characterized by a membership function $\mu_A : X \to [0, 1]$, where the membership grades are crisp numbers. A T2 FS in X is a fuzzy set whose membership grades are themselves fuzzy

$$\mu_{\tilde{A}} : X \to [0,1]^{[0,1]}. \tag{2}$$

It can be expressed as

$$\widetilde{A} = \{ (x, \mu_{\widetilde{A}}(x)) \mid \mu_{\widetilde{A}}(x) \in \widetilde{P}(U), \forall x \in X \}$$
(3)

where X is called the primary domain and U is the secondary domain and $\tilde{P}(U)$ is the set of fuzzy sets in U [2]. The membership function of a general T2 FS is three dimensional, where the third dimension is called secondary membership, which may take any value from 0 to 1. For an interval T2 FS the secondary membership grades are all 1. Some terms used in this paper are now defined.

1063-6706 © 2017 IEEE. Personal use is permitted, but republication/redistribution requires IEEE permission. See http://www.ieee.org/publications_standards/publications/rights/index.html for more information.



Fig. 1. Membership function of a random chosen embedded T1 FS, $\mu_i(x)$, depicted by the black dots, satisfies $\underline{\mu}(x) \le \mu_i(x) \le \overline{\mu}(x)$ at any x. The secondary membership grade at any vertical slice x_j is 1.

The *footprint of uncertainty* (FOU) is the projection of the T2 FS onto the x - u plane.

The upper membership functions (UMF) and lower membership functions (LMF) of a T2 FS are the T1 membership functions associated with the upper and lower bounds of the FOU, respectively. The upper and lower membership functions are denoted by $\overline{\mu}(x)$ and $\underline{\mu}(x)$ in this paper.

An *embedded T1 set* of an IT2 FS is a T1 FS whose membership function $\mu(x)$ which is within the FOU. For example, there must be $\underline{\mu}(x) \leq \mu(x) \leq \overline{\mu}(x)$ at any x. Based on the concept of wavy slice [6], an IT2 FS can be considered as the union of all its embedded T1 sets.

A random embedded set is an embedded T1 FS whose membership function is randomly chosen, i.e., for each nonzero x-value a random μ -value ($\mu \le \mu \le \overline{\mu}$) is chosen.

A *representative embedded set* of an IT2 FS is a T1 FS, the centroid of which is equivalent to the COG of the IT2 FS [2]. Note that there might be unlimited number of representative embedded sets for an IT2 FS.

In Nie-Tan method, the average of UMF and LMF is computed as the membership function of a representative T1 embedded set. Let $\mu^*(x)$ be the membership function

$$\mu^*(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\overline{\mu}(x) + \underline{\mu}(x) \right). \tag{4}$$

The COG of \hat{A} is equivalent to the centroid of $\mu^*(x)$. The advantages of the Nie-Tan method include low computation cost and closed-form solutions [27].

III. COG OF AN IT2 FS

The random sampling is an approximate method for IT2 typereduction and defuzzification. It is intuitive to deduce that, if the sample size approaches infinity, a random sampling turns to be an accurate type-reduction and defuzzification method. We have the following theorems.

Theorem 1: A random sampling method computes the accurate COG of an IT2 FS when the number of sampling is infinity.

Proof: Let us first consider a discrete IT2 FS, \tilde{A} , defined in a universe of discourse X. Let M and L denote the number of vertical slices along the x-axis and the number of horizontal slices along the μ -axis, respectively. Since a T1 FS contains M vertical slices, there are totally L^M embedded T1 FSs in \tilde{A} .

Let $\overline{\mu}(x)$ and $\underline{\mu}(x)$ denote the upper and lower memberships of FOU, respectively. We randomly choose N embedded T1 FSs of \tilde{A} . Let $\mu_i(x)$ be the membership function of the *i*th embedded set, as shown in Fig. 1. The aggregation of N random embedded T1 FSs can be computed by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i(x_j).$$

Thus

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i(x) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \mu_i(x_j).$$

Because $\mu_i(x_j)$ is a random value uniformly distributed within $[\underline{\mu}_i(x_j), \overline{\mu}_i(x_j)]$, the right-hand side of the above equation can be transformed to

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \mu_i(x_j) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k=1}^{L} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \mu_k(x_j)$$

Thus

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{L}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{L} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \mu_k(x_j)).$$
(5)

The right-hand side of the equation is exactly the aggregation of membership functions of all embedded FSs of \tilde{A} , while the left-hand side is a random sampling with $N \to \infty$. Note that $\frac{L}{N}$ in the left-hand side of the equation has no influence in computing the COG of \tilde{A} because it is a constant. For example, if we replace $\mu_i(x)$ with $\mu'_i(x) = \frac{L}{N}\mu_i(x)$, the centroid remains the same according to (1).

When \tilde{A} is a continuous IT2 FS, we can simply replace $\sum_{j=1}^{M}$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{L}$ by $\int_{x_{\min}}^{x_{\max}}$ and $\int_{\underline{\mu}(x)}^{\overline{\mu}(x)}$ respectively and we have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{L}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i(x) = \int_{x_{\min}}^{x_{\max}} \int_{\underline{\mu}(x)}^{\overline{\mu}(x)} \mu(x) d\mu dx.$$
(6)

Theorem 2: A representative T1 embedded set of \tilde{A} has the membership function

$$\mu^*(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\overline{\mu}(x) + \underline{\mu}(x) \right) \tag{7}$$

and the COG of \tilde{A} can be computed by

$$C(\tilde{A}) = \frac{\int_{x_{\min}}^{x_{\min}} \mu^*(x) \cdot x dx}{\int_{x_{\min}}^{x_{\max}} \mu^*(x) dx}.$$
(8)

Proof: Suppose that we randomly choose N embedded T1 FSs of a discretised IT2 FS \tilde{A} . Let $\mu_i(x)$ be the membership function of the *i*th embedded set and x_j be an arbitrary vertical slice, as shown in Fig. 1. $\mu_i(x_j)$ can be represented by $\mu_i(x_j) = \underline{\mu}(x_j) + \omega_i (\overline{\mu}(x_j) - \underline{\mu}(x_j))$, where ω_i is an random number uniformly distributed within [0, 1]. We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i(x_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\underline{\mu}(x_j) + \omega_i \left(\overline{\mu}(x_j) - \underline{\mu}(x_j) \right) \right)$$
$$= N \underline{\mu}(x_j) + \left(\overline{\mu}(x_j) - \underline{\mu}(x_j) \right) \sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_i.$$
(9)

There must be

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_i = \frac{N}{2}$$

because ω_i uniformly distributes within [0, 1]. Then

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i(x_j) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\overline{\mu}(x_j) + \underline{\mu}(x_j) \right). \tag{10}$$

This equation holds for all x since x_j is an arbitrary vertical slice. Thus, we have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_i(x) = \frac{1}{2} \big(\overline{\mu}(x) + \underline{\mu}(x) \big).$$
(11)

According to Theorem 1 and (1), $\mu^* = \frac{1}{2} (\overline{\mu}(x) + \underline{\mu}(x))$ is the membership function of a representative T1 FS and it computes the accurate COG of \tilde{A} .

It is easy to verify that the above proof applies to a continuous IT2 FS if we replace $\sum_{i=1}^{N}$ in the right-hand side of (9) with $\int_{x_{\min}}^{x_{\max}}$.

Theorem 2 shows that the Nie-Tan operator, in which the membership function of the output T1 FS is the average of upper and lower membership functions, is equivalent to an exhaustive type-reduction. Thus, it computes the accurate COG of an IT2 FS.

IV. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, we compare the Nie-Tan operator with KM and the sampling methods on defuzzifying four IT2 FSs. Four examples of IT2 FSs are considered in a number of papers, such as [10]–[13]. The UMF and LMF of four IT2 FSs are defined by the following.

A. Symmetric Gaussian MFs With Uncertainty Deviation

$$\underline{\mu}(x) = \exp\left(-0.5((x-5)/0.25)^2\right) \quad x \in [0, 10]$$

$$\overline{\mu}(x) = \exp\left(-0.5((x-5)/1.75)^2\right) \quad x \in [0, 10]$$

B. Triangular LMF and Gaussian UMF

$$\underline{\mu}(x) = \begin{cases} 0.6(x+5)/19 & \text{if } x \in [-5, 2.6] \\ 0.4(14-x)/19 & \text{if } x \in [2.6, 14] \end{cases}$$
$$\overline{\mu}(x) = \begin{cases} \exp\left(-0.5\left((x-2)/5\right)^2\right) & \text{if } x \in [-5, 7.185] \\ \exp\left(-0.5\left((x-9)/1.75\right)^2\right) & \text{if } x \in [7.185, 14]. \end{cases}$$

C. Piecewise Gaussian MFs

$$\underline{\mu}(x) = \max \left\{ 0.5 \exp\left(-(x-3)^2/2\right), 0.4 \exp\left(-(x-6)^2/2\right) \right\}$$
$$x \in [0, 10]$$
$$\overline{\mu}(x) = \max \left\{ \exp\left(-(x-3)^2/8\right), 0.8 \exp\left(-(x-6)^2/8\right) \right\}$$
$$x \in [0, 10].$$

TABLE I Computation Results

IT2 FS			Methods					
		NT	S20	S50	S100	S1000	KM*	
A	COG	5.0	5.0002	5.0005	5.0003	5.0001	5.0	
	Error	0	0.02%	0.05%	0.03%	0.01%	0	
В	COG	3.714	3.7104	3.7138	3.7134	3.7135	3.7985	
	Error	0	0.01%	0.01%	0.02%	0.01%	2.28%	
С	COG	4.3952	4.394	4.3953	4.3951	4.395	4.4152	
	Error	0	0.03%	< 0.01%	< 0.01%	< 0.01%	0.46%	
D	COG	4.3208	4.3198	4.3208	4.3206	4.3207	4.3261	
	Error	0	0.02%	< 0.01%	< 0.01%	< 0.01%	0.12%	

*Data derived from [20].

D. Piecewise Linear MFs

$$\underline{\mu}(x) = \max \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} (x-1)/6 & \text{if } 1 \le x \le 4\\ (7-x)/6 & \text{if } 4 < x \le 7\\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{bmatrix} \right\}, \\ \begin{bmatrix} (x-3)/6 & \text{if } 3 \le x \le 5\\ (8-x)/9 & \text{if } 5 < x \le 8\\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$
$$\overline{\mu}(x) = \max \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} (x-1)/2 & \text{if } 1 \le x \le 3\\ (7-x)/4 & \text{if } 3 < x \le 7\\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \begin{bmatrix} (x-2)/5 & \text{if } 2 \le x \le 6\\ (16-2x)/5 & \text{if } 6 < x \le 8\\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

The accuracy of a sampling method depends on the number of samples. We adopt four random sampling methods in which the number of samples are 20, 50, 100, and 1000, respectively. The scale of discretization is set to be 0.01. The results of defuzzification of four IT2 FSs are shown in Table I.

It shows that a random sampling method can be a close approximation of the Nie-Tan operator, even with 20 samples. The KM method is not an accurate method although it provides the range of uncertainty involved in an IT2 FS. The KM method coincides with the Nie-Tan operator when both UMF and LMF are symmetric, as in example A. However, the KM method deviates from the accurate type reductions when either UMF or LMF is asymmetric.

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

We have proved in two theorems that the Nie-Tan operator computes accurate COGs of IT2 FSs. A closed-form type-reduction operator has at least two advantages. First, it has less computational complexity than any numerical methods in defuzzifying continuous IT2 FSs. Second, it satisfies most of the desirable properties (so-called axioms) of type-1 defuzzification because of the closed-form nature, which could be important for a given application. For example, the Nie-Tan operator satisfies the 12 properties of type-2 defuzzification suggested in [25]. The method we used to prove Theorem 2 has a close relationship with the sampling method. The error of a random sampling method tends to zero when the number of samples approaches infinity. Our future research is to apply this method to general T2 FSs type-reduction in order to generate a closed-form operator.

REFERENCES

- L. A. Zadeh, "The concept of a linguistic variable and its application to approximate reasoning-1," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 199–249, 1975.
- [2] S. Greenfield, "Type-2 fuzzy logic: Circumventing the defuzzification Bottleneck," Ph.D. thesis, De Montfort Univ., Leicester, U.K., 2012.
- [3] J. M. Mendel, Uncertain Rule-Based Fuzzy Logic System: Introduction and New Directions. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, 2001.
- [4] T. A. Runkler, "Selection of appropriate defuzzification methods using application specific properties," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 72–79, Feb. 1997.
- [5] P. Fortemps and M. Roubens, "Ranking and defuzzification methods based on area compensation," *Fuzzy Sets Syst.*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 319–330, 1996.
- [6] J. Mendel and R. John, "Type-2 fuzzy sets made simple," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 117–127, Apr. 2002.
- [7] S. Greenfield, F. Chiclana, and R. John," Type-reduction of the discretised interval type-2 fuzzy set," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Fuzzy Syst.*, Jeju Island, South Korea, 2009, pp. 738–743.
- [8] S. Greenfield, R. John, and S. Coupland, "A novel sampling method for type-2 defuzzification," in *Proc. U.K. Workshop Comput. Intell.*, London, U.K., 2005, pp. 120–127.
- [9] S. Greenfield, F. Chiclana, R. John, and S. Coupland, "The sampling method of defuzzification for type-2 fuzzy sets: Experimental evaluation," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 189, pp. 77–92, 2012.
- [10] R. John, "Perception modelling using type-2 fuzzy sets," Ph.D. thesis, De Montfort Univ., Leicester, U.K., 2000.
- [11] F. Liu, "An efficient centroid type-reduction strategy for general type-2 fuzzy logic system," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 178, no. 9, pp. 2224–2236, 2008.
- [12] S. Greenfield, F. Chiclana, S. Coupland, and R. John, "The collapsing method of defuzzification for discretised interval type-2 fuzzy sets," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 179, no. 13, pp. 2055–2069, 2009.

- [13] J. Mendel, R. John, and F. Liu, "Interval Type-2 fuzzy logic systems made simple," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 808–821, Dec. 2006.
- [14] J. Mendel, F. Liu, and D. Zhai, "α-plane representation for type-2 fuzzy sets: Theory and applications," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 1189–1207, Oct. 2009.
- [15] Q. Liang and J. Mendel, "Interval type-2 fuzzy logic systems: Theory and design," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 535–550, Oct. 2000.
- [16] N. Karnik and J. Mendel, "Centroid of a type-2 fuzzy set," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 132, pp. 195–220, 2001.
- [17] D. Wu and J. Mendel, "Enhanced Karnik-Mendel algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 923–934, Aug. 2009.
- [18] J. Mendel and F. Liu, "Super-exponential convergence of the Karnik-Mendel algorithms for computing the centroid of an interval type-2 fuzzy set," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 309–320, Apr. 2007.
- [19] M. Melgarejo, "A fast recursive method to compute the generalized centroid of an interval type-2 fuzzy set," in *Proc. IEEE Annu. Meeting North Amer. Fuzzy Inf. Process. Soc.*, 2007, pp. 190–194.
- [20] J. Mendel, and X. Liu," New closed form solutions for Karnik-Mendel algorithm +defuzzification of an interval type-2 fuzzy set," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Fuzzy Syst.*, 2012, pp. 1–8.
- [21] X. Liu, J. Mendel, and D. Wu, "Study on enhanced Karnik-Mendel algorithms: Initialization explanations and computation improvements," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 184, no. 1, pp. 75–91, 2012.
- [22] C. Wagner and H. Hagras, "z slices-towards bridging the gap between interval and general type-2 fuzzy logic," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Fuzzy Syst.*, Hong Kong, 2008, pp. 489–497.
- [23] M. Nie and W. Tan, "Towards an efficient type-reduction method for interval type-2 fuzzy logic systems," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Fuzzy Syst.*, 2008, pp. 1425–1432.
- [24] S. Coupland, and R. John, "Geometric type-1 and type-2 fuzzy logic systems," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 3–15, Feb. 2007.
- [25] T. Runkler, S. Coupland, and R. John, "Properties of interval type-2 defuzzification operators," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Fuzzy Syst.*, 2015, pp. 1–7.
- [26] J. Bezdek, "Fuzzy models-what are they, and why?" IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst., vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–6, Mar. 1993.
- [27] J. Mendel and X. Liu, "Simplified interval Type-2 fuzzy logic systems," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1056–1069, Dec. 2013.