



*Journal of Advances and  
Scholarly Researches in  
Allied Education*

*Vol. XI, Issue No. XXI,  
April-2016, ISSN 2230-7540*

**STUDY OF PROBLEMS WITH FUZZY  
CONSTRAINTS WITH LINEAR AND NON LINEAR  
EQUATIONS IN REAL WORLD**

AN  
INTERNATIONALLY  
INDEXED PEER  
REVIEWED &  
REFEREED JOURNAL

# Study of Problems with Fuzzy Constraints with Linear and Non Linear Equations in Real World

Ashok Kumar<sup>1\*</sup> Dr. Yogesh Kumar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Department of Mathematics, OPJS University, Churu, Rajasthan, India

**Abstract –** The study of relations is proportional to the general study of framework. Thus, examination of relations is significant for understanding the general hypothesis of frameworks. Fundamentally, a framework is "a set or course of action of things, so related or associated as to shape solidarity or an organic entirety." Extracting the embodiment of this definition, we presume that each framework comprises of two components: an arrangement of specific things and a few relations among them. All the more formally,  $S = (T, R)$ , where images  $S, T, R$  signify a framework, an arrangement of things, and relation among these things individually. The components may be exact or loose as our environment teem with the subjective data, data that is obscure, loose, unverifiable, and uncertain by nature. Besides, it is normal when the connection among the distinctive components brings about dubiousness and it winds up noticeably hard disregarding the subjectivity that generally shows up in the relations.

-----X-----

## INTRODUCTION

Fluffy set hypothesis is intended to deal with the specific sort of vulnerability to be specific vagueness—which comes about when a property possessed by a protest differing degrees. At the end of the day, any thought is said to be ambiguous when its importance is not settled by sharp limits. As per the Oxford English Dictionary, "fluffy" is characterized as "obscured, ill defined; imprecisely characterized; confounded, dubious." Fuzzy set hypothesis goes about as apparatus to change the fuzziness (vagueness and imprecision) inborn in human speculation to the data that can be prepared together with the established numerical techniques. The energy of the worldview is that it is equipped for dealing with equivocality that shows up in regular dialect and articulations.

Philosophical refinement amongst likelihood and fuzziness can be effortlessly set apart out. To achieve this, let the estimation of the enrollment capacity of an in  $x$  be equivalent to an, i.e.  $A(x) = A$  and the likelihood that  $x$  has a place with  $A$  be equivalent to an, i.e.  $P\{x \in A\} = a \in [0, 1]$ . Endless supply of  $x$ , the from the earlier likelihood  $P\{x \in A\} = a$  turns into a posteriori likelihood, i.e. either  $P\{x \in A\} = 1$  or  $P\{x \in A\} = 0$ . Be that as it may,  $A(x)$ , a measure of the degree to which  $x$  has a place with the given classification, continues as before, as it were the irregularity vanishes, yet the fuzziness remains.

In this way, the significance of studying relations is evident from the above proclamation. Truth be told, the study of relations is proportional to the general study of framework. Consequently, examination of relations is significant for understanding the general hypothesis of

frameworks. Fundamentally, a framework is "a set or course of action of things, so related or connected as to shape solidarity or an organic entirety." Extracting the embodiment of this definition, we reason that each framework comprises of two components: an arrangement of specific things and a few relations among them. All the more formally,  $S = (T, R)$ , where images  $S, T, R$  mean a framework, an arrangement of things, and relation among these things separately. The components may be precise or imprecise as our environment swarm with the subjective data, data that is dubious, imprecise, indeterminate, and vague by nature. In addition, it is regular when the collaboration among the diverse components brings about vagueness and it ends up noticeably hard to disregard the subjectivity that typically shows up in the relations.

Fluffy relations are the key numerical apparatus to demonstrate frameworks having imprecise relationships that swarm everywhere throughout the world. Traditional relations depend on the possibility that whether two items are connected or nonrelated. The idea of a fluffy relation as opposed to managing related or non-related articles, considering objects that are identified with some degree, has completely enhanced the relevance of this major idea. Being hard the established relations have the downside that they are not sufficiently productive to display certifiable circumstances. This constrains us to stay upon the universe of fluffy relations permitting continuous relationships.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Lin [1] considered the issue of comprehending fluffy relation conditions with Archimedean t-standards and gave a coordinated correspondence between the negligible arrangements of the conditions and the irredundant covers for fluffy relation conditions with max-item organization.

Luoh et al. [2] considered the issue of tackling fluffy relation conditions with max-min or max-item synthesis. A PC based calculation was proposed to take care of the issue which works methodically and graphically on a framework example to get every one of the arrangements of the issue.

Nola and Sessa [3] talked about the hypothesis of fluffy relation conditions under lower and upper semicontinuous t-standards.

Chen and Wang [4] built up another method and calculation to illuminate an arrangement of fluffy relation conditions and declared that discovering every single negligible answer for a general arrangement of fluffy relation conditions is a NP-difficult issue as far as computational intricacy.

The fundamental hypothesis of resolution of limited fluffy relation conditions can be found in Higashi and Klir [7].

Noburah, Hirota, Pedrycz and Sessa [8] considered a disintegration issue of a fluffy relation and talked about picture decay as a utilization of fluffy relations.

Rotshtein and Rakityanskaya [9] considered the utilization of in reverse consistent deduction in master indicative frameworks. A genetic calculation (GA) based approach was utilized to discover the arrangements of fluffy rationale condition shaped.

Vigier and Terceno [10] talked about the model of sicknesses of firms. The center thought was to decide a network of monetary and financial information expressing the fluffy relations amongst indications and causes that create oddities in the organizations.

Baets [11] examined the expository conduct of fluffy relation conditions and proposed diagnostic methods for determining complete arrangement set of arrangement of polynomial cross section conditions in distributive grids.

Peeva [12] proposed a general calculation and programming for tackling maxmin and min-max fluffy relation condition.

## OBJECTIVES

1. The foremost objective behind the work lies in the exposition of characteristics of fuzzy relations and nonlinear and multi-objective optimization problems with fuzzy constraints.

2. To study the characteristics of fuzzy linear and nonlinear feasible domains of different resolution.
3. To study the fuzzy programming results having unique solutions.
4. To study the diagnosis and application of fuzzy relation

## METHODOLOGY

We propose a real valued genetic algorithm (RVGA) that is designed specifically for the considered optimization problem. The genetic operators are designed such that they accelerate the procedure and help the algorithm to converge easily.

The resolution problem of fuzzy relation equations is to determine a vector  $[0, 1]^m$  such that (2) holds.

Let  $(A, b) = \{x \in [0, 1]^m | x \cdot A = b\}$  be the solution set of fuzzy relation equations (2). The system  $x \cdot A = b$  is called consistent if  $X(A, b) \neq \emptyset$  and inconsistent otherwise. For any  $x^1, x^2 \in X$  we say  $x^1 \leq x^2$  if and only if  $x_i^1 \leq x_i^2 \forall i \in I$ . Hence,  $\leq$  establishes a partial ordering relation on  $X$  and  $(X, \leq)$  becomes a lattice. Basically, equations in (3.2) establish a system of latticized polynomial equations. Since the solution set  $X(A, b)$  of a consistent system of sup-equations is "order convex", i.e., if  $x^1, x^2 \in X$  then for any  $x \in X$ , satisfying  $x^1 \leq x \leq x^2$  is in  $X(A, b)$ . Therefore, the attention could be focused on the so called extremely solutions, i.e., minimal/minimum (lower/least) solutions and maximal/maximum (upper/greatest) solutions.  $x \in X(A, b)$  is the maximum solution, if  $x \leq \forall x' \in X(A, b)$ . Similarly,  $x \in X(A, b)$  is a minimal solution, if implies  $x \leq x', \forall x' \in X(A, b)$ .

The first step for the resolution of a FRE is to establish the existence of the solution. If the equation is solvable i.e.  $X(A, b) \neq \emptyset$  the solution set contains a maximum solution  $x$  and possibly several minimum solutions  $x$ . The maximum solution can be computed explicitly by the residual implicator (pseudo complement) by assigning

$$x = A \circ b = [\min_{j \in J} (a_{ij} \circ b_j)] \quad (1)$$

Where,

$$a_{ij} \circ b_j = \sup \{x_i \in [0, 1] | (x_i \circ a_{ij}) \leq b_j\} \quad (2)$$

If  $X(A, b)$  denotes the set of all minimal solutions, then the complete solution set of fuzzy relation equations (2) can be formed as (5).

$$X(A, b) = U \{x \in [0, 1]^m | x \leq x \leq x'\} \quad (3)$$

The solution space is the union of all convex sub-feasible regions formed with the help of obtained

minimal solutions and may be convex or non-convex. This nature of  $X(A, b)$  signifies that the feasible domain is separable and non-convex in general.

## ANALYSIS

The technique begins with producing a population of limited size with every chromosome as a string of irregular esteems in the unit interim (0, 1). Once the population has been made, the people are assessed utilizing some wellness basis (or wellness work). By and large genuine esteemed genetic calculation, the target work is itself utilized as the wellness work. In the considered case, the achievable area has no correct arrangement so the objective is only streamlining as well as the intriguing investigation of the inquiry space in order to discover great approximate and merging arrangements of the enhancement issue. For this, a pre-settled edge blunder esteem  $\max \varepsilon$  is set and the point is to discover arrangements having separation (or mistake) lesser than this limit mistake  $\max \varepsilon$  and optimizing the target work too. To fill the need, an altered rendition of consolidated target is defined as takes after that enhances the goal and limits the blunder work in parallel:

$$\begin{cases} f(x) \\ f_{\max}(x) + \sum_{j \in I} (b_j - \max_{i \in I} ((x_i \ominus a_{ij})))^2, \text{ if } \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_{\max} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Algorithm 1: Procedure to solve optimization problem

Step 1: Get the matrices  $A$  and  $b$ , and the nonlinear objective function  $f$ .  
 Step 2: Find the maximum solution  $x$  using.  
 Step 3: If system of FRE is not solvable i.e.  $x A b \neq$ , go to step 4, else stop.  
 Step 4: Initialize population of fixed size, say  $k$ , and set the threshold error value as  $\max \varepsilon = -||x A b$  and set generations counter  $\text{gen}=1$ .  
 Step 5: Evaluate population using the fitness function defined in equation.  
 Step 6: Select fixed no. of good solutions by the binary tournament selection operator described in section 5.4.1 and the best fit individual for that generation say  $x'$  and determine its corresponding error  $\varepsilon' = -||x A b$ .  
 Step 7: Apply crossover and mutation operators as described in section  
 Step 8: If  $\max \varepsilon \varepsilon' <$ , update the threshold error as  $\max \varepsilon \varepsilon'$ .  
 Step 9: If the termination criterion is meet stop, otherwise set  $\text{gen}=\text{gen}+1$  and go to step 5.

## RESULT

The issue of approximating fluffy relation conditions is to discover at least one vectors  $[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] = m$  having the minimum separation (mistake) between the left and right parts of arrangement of (5.1) i.e. finding the approximate arrangements that have least separation of  $x A$  from  $b$ .

To get such arrangements a genuine coded genetic calculation (RCGA) is planned that finds a vector  $\min [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m] = m$  which gives minimal separation between the left and right parts of framework (5.1) among all the arrangement vectors i.e.  $\min (x(e)) = e x$  Once the arrangement giving slightest blunder esteem is gotten, the instability interim giving the fundamental scope of every choice variable is resolved. For this,

the calculation is worked till an arrangement of arrangement vectors having an indistinguishable separation from the arrangement vector  $\min x$  is gotten. At the point when an arrangement of such identical arrangements and vector  $\min x$  has been gotten, upper and lower limits of the individual components of the acquired vectors are found. Let  $\{l_1, l_2, l_n\}$  be the accumulation of such  $L$  proportional vectors acquired.

The chromosomes are assessed utilizing the separation work (mistake) as the wellness work given as follows:

$$e(x) = x A - b = \sum_{j \in J} [b_j - \max((x_i \ominus a_{ij}))]^2$$

## CONCLUSION

A fluffy relational multi objective optimization issue has been considered. Utilizing the utility capacity approach, the issue is first changed into a solitary objective optimization issue. A hybridized genetic calculation has been recommended that viably chooses and brings about great approximations of the Pareto arrangements in cases with both straight and nonlinear optimization issues. Two sorts of utility capacities have been considered. Weighted Tchebycheff capacities perform uncommonly well notwithstanding when the state of no overwhelmed front is muddled in nature and result in more differentiated and nearer approximations of proficient arrangements in examination of the weighted direct utility capacities. Tests are performed with three neighborhood change methods and their proficiency examination is introduced. Despite the fact that the proposed method experiences a few insufficiencies, for example, coming about problematic arrangements at end and more run time execution however can be utilized for the issues with countless included.

## REFERENCES

1. J. L. Lin (2009) on the relation between fuzzy max-Archimedean t-norm relational equations and the covering problem, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 160, pp. 2328- 2344.
2. L. Luoh, W.J. Wang, Y.K. Liaw (2003). Matrix-pattern-based computer algorithm for solving fuzzy relation equations, IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems 11, pp. 100-108.
3. Di Nola, W. Pedrycz, S. Sessa, P. Z. Wang (1984). Fuzzy relation equations under a class of triangular norms: a survey and new results, Stochastica 8, pp. 99-145.
4. L. Chen, P. P. Wang (2002). Fuzzy relation equations (I): the general and specialized

solving algorithms, Soft computing 6, pp. 428-435.

5. M. Higashi, G. J. Klir (1984). Resolution of finite fuzzy relation equations, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 13, pp. 65-82.
6. V. Markovskii (2005) on the relation between equations with max-product composition and the covering problem, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 153, pp. 261- 273.
7. L. Chen, P. P. Wang (2007). Fuzzy relation equations (II): the branch point solutions and categorized minimal solutions, Soft computing 11, pp. 33-40.
8. Nobuhara, W. Pedrycz, S. Sessa, K. Hirota (2006). A motion compression/reconstruction method based on max t-norm composite fuzzy relational equations, Information Sciences 176, pp. 2526-2552.
9. P. Rothstein, A. B. Rakityanskaya (2001). Solution of a Diagnostics Problem on the Basis of Fuzzy Relations and a Genetic Algorithm, Cybernetics and System analysis I 37 No. 6.
10. H. P. Vigier, A. Terceño (2008). A model for the prediction of “diseases” of firms by means of fuzzy relations, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 159, pp. 2299-2316.
11. B. De Baets (2000). Analytical solution methods for fuzzy relational equations, in: D. Dubois and H. Prade (Eds.), Fundamentals of Fuzzy Sets, The Handbooks of Fuzzy Sets Series, Vol. 1, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, pp. 291- 340 (Chapter 6).
12. K. Peeva, Y. Kyosev (2004). Fuzzy relational calculus: Theory, applications and software. New Jersey: World Scientific.

---

### Corresponding Author

**Ashok Kumar\***

Department of Mathematics, OPJS University, Churu,  
Rajasthan, India