Energy and Entropy Measures of Fuzzy Relations for Data Analysis
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Abstract: We present a new method for assessing the strength of fuzzy rules with respect to a dataset, based on the measures of the greatest energy and smallest entropy of a fuzzy relation. Considering a fuzzy automaton (relation), in which A is the input fuzzy set and B the output fuzzy set, the fuzzy relation $R_1$ with greatest energy provides information about the greatest strength of the input-output, and the fuzzy relation $R_2$ with the smallest entropy provides information about uncertainty of the input-output relationship. We consider a new index of the fuzziness of the input-output based on $R_1$ and $R_2$. In our method, this index is calculated for each pair of input and output fuzzy sets in a fuzzy rule. A threshold value is set in order to choose the most relevant fuzzy rules with respect to the data.
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1. Introduction

Let $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ be a finite set and $A$ be a fuzzy set of $X$. In [1,2] two categories of fuzziness, measures are defined as energy and entropy (see, e.g., also [3]). The energy measure of the fuzziness of $A$ is given by:

$$E(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} e(A(x_i))$$

where $e: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ is a monotonically increasing continuous function, with $e(0) = 0$ and $e(1) = 1$. A particular energy function is given by $e(u) = u$ for any $u \in [0,1]$. In this case, the minimum value of the energy is 0, and the maximum is given by $E(A) = \text{Card}(X) = m$. The entropy measure of fuzziness of the fuzzy set $A$ is defined as:

$$H(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} h(A(x_i))$$

where $h: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ is a monotonically increasing continuous function in $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and monotonically decreasing in $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, with $h(0) = h(1) = 0$ and $h(u) = h(1 - u)$. A simple entropy function is given by $h(u) = u$ if $u \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $h(u) = 1 - u$ if $u > \frac{1}{2}$.

Now we consider another finite set, $Y = \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$, and a fuzzy relation $R$ defined by $X \times Y$:

$$E(R) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} e(R(x_i, y_j))$$

and

$$H(R) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} h(R(x_i, y_j))$$
We now take a continuous t-norm t and a max-t fuzzy relation equation, that is of the following type:
\[ \bigvee_{i=1}^{m} (R(x_i, y_j) t A(x_i)) = B(y_j) \quad j = 1, \ldots, n \] (5)
where A (resp., B) is a known input (resp., output) fuzzy set, and R is an n unknown fuzzy automaton (relation) connecting the inputs-output via fuzzy rules.

Solutions for the fuzzy relation Equation (5) were proposed in [4–6] (see, e.g., [7] if t = min). In particular, if we consider the t-norm of Yager [8], the unique greatest fuzzy relation R₁ is defined as
\[ R_1(x, y) = A(x) \tau B(y), \] where
\[ \tau : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \to [0, 1] \] (6)
\[ \tau(a, b) = \begin{cases} \left( (1 - a)^p - (1 - b)^p \right)^{1/p} & \text{if } a \geq b \\ 1 & \text{if } a < b \end{cases} \]
a, b \in [0, 1], p \geq 1

R₁ is the fuzzy relation having the maximum energy E. Furthermore, in [4,5] the authors propose an algorithm for finding the relation R₂, solution of (5) not unique, having the minimum entropy H.

Many works in data and decision analysis present methods to minimize the fuzzy entropy for obtaining the solution with the smallest ambiguity. Some research works, such as [9–17], present fuzzy decision algorithms for classification analysis using minimum fuzzy entropy.

We propose a new method for measuring the strength of fuzzy rules with respect to a set of input-output data, based on the maximum energy and minimum entropy measures.

Our idea is to calculate, for any pair of input and output fuzzy sets, a normalized index of the strength of the rule with respect to the data, which is a function of the maximum energy and minimum entropy. We find the best input-output fuzzy sets pair to be that for which the corresponding index is maximum. If this index is greater or equal to a pre-defined threshold, then we consider the fuzzy rule which is more relevant with respect to the data.

In Section 2, we describe the algorithm presented in [4,5] for calculating the solutions R₁ and R₂ of the Equation (5) with the Yager t-norm. In Section 3, our algorithm is presented for evaluating the strength of fuzzy rules with respect to the data. In Section 4, we present the results of two experiments in which we apply our algorithm. Final considerations are shown in Section 5.

### 2. Algorithm for Calculating Fuzzy Relations Having the Greatest Energy and Smallest Entropy

Let X = \{x₁, \ldots, xₘ\}, Y = \{y₁, \ldots, yₙ\}, A (resp., B) be a fuzzy set on X (resp., Y). In [4,5] it is proven that R₁ is the solution of the Equation (5) with maximum energy. For the calculus of R₂, the following algorithm is developed in [4,5]. Let h be defined as in Section 1. For each yⱼ ∈ Y, we consider \( \Gamma(y_j) = \{x_i \in X : A(x_i) \geq B(y_j)\} \). If B(yⱼ) > 0, the algorithm finds some x_c ∈ \( \Gamma(y_j) \) (generally not unique), such that A(x_c) τ B(yⱼ) is not zero and h(A(x_c) τ B(yⱼ)) assumes the minimum value. Then, R₂(xᵢ, yⱼ) = A(xᵢ) τ B(yⱼ) if xᵢ = x_c and R₂(xᵢ, yⱼ) = 0 if xᵢ ≠ x_c. If B(yⱼ) = 0, R₂(xᵢ, yⱼ) = 0 for each i = 1, \ldots, m.

Below, we show the pseudocodes for calculating R₁ (Algorithm 1) and R₂ (Algorithm 2).

| Algorithm 1 Calculate R₁ |
|--------------------------|
| **Description:**          | Calculate the matrix R₁ |
| **Input:**               | X, Y, A, B               |
| **Output:**              | R₁                        |
| 1                        | FOR j = 1 TO n           |
| 2                        |                         |
| 3                        | FOR i = 1 TO m           |
| 4                        |                         |
| 5                        | R₁(xᵢ, yⱼ); = A(xᵢ) τ B(yⱼ); |
| 6                        |                         |
| 7                        |                         |
| 8                        | END                      |
Algorithm 2 Calculate $R_2$

Description: Calculate the matrix $R_2$

Input: $X, Y, A, B$

Output: $R_2$

1 FOR $j = 1$ TO $n$
2   { 
3     IF $B(y_j) > 0$
4       { 
5         $x_c: = 0$;
6         $h_{min}: = 1$;
7         FOR each $x$ in $\Gamma(y_j)$
8           { 
9             IF $h(A(x), B(y_j)) < h_{min}$ THEN
10                { 
11                    $h_{min}: = h(A(x), B(y_j))$;
12                    $x_c: = x$;
13                } 
14           } 
15         FOR $i = 1$ TO $m$
16           { 
17             IF ($x_i = x_c$)
18               $R_2(x_i, y_j): = A(x_i) \tau B(y_j)$ ;
19             ELSE
20               $R_2(x_i, y_j): = 0$;
21           } 
22       } 
23 ELSE
24   { 
25     FOR $i = 1$ TO $m$
26       $R_2(x_i, y_j): = 0$;
27   } 
28 } 
29 END

As example, let $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$, $Y = \{y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$, $A = (0.2, 0.3, 0.5, 0.8)$ and $B = (0.4, 0.0, 0.6, 0.7)$. For $p = 2$ in Formula (6), we obtain that

$$R_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
1.00 & 0.40 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
1.00 & 0.29 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
0.67  & 0.13 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
0.43  & 0.02 & 0.65 & 0.78 \\
\end{bmatrix}$$

For $R_2$, we have $\Gamma(y_1) = \{x_3, x_4\}$, $\Gamma(y_3) = \{x_4\}$, $\Gamma(y_4) = \{x_4\}$ and hence $R_2(x_3, y_1) = 0.67$, $R_2(x_4, y_3) = 0.65$ and $R_2(x_4, y_4) = 0.78$. For $B(y_2) = 0$, we have that $R_2(x_i, y_2) = 0$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, 4$. Then, the fuzzy relation with minimum entropy is given by:

$$R_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\
0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\
0.67  & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\
0.00  & 0.00 & 0.65 & 0.78 \\
\end{bmatrix}$$
3. Evaluating the Strength of the Fuzzy Rules with Respect to the Data

Our goal is to evaluate the strength of the fuzzy rules considered in a domain’s expert with respect to dataset [18]. Transferring its knowledge of the domain, the expert builds a fuzzy partition of q fuzzy sets \( \{A_1, \ldots, A_q\} \) of the universe of the discourse \( U_x \) of the input variable \( x \), and a fuzzy partition of s fuzzy sets \( \{B_1, \ldots, B_s\} \) of the universe of the discourse \( U_y \) of the output variable \( y \). Subsequently, he defines a set of fuzzy rules relating the input and the output variables in the following form:

\[
\text{rk: if } x \text{ is } A_w \text{ Then } y \text{ is } B_z, \quad w = 1, \ldots, q, \quad z = 1, \ldots, s
\]  

(7)

where \( \text{rk} \) is the \( k \)th fuzzy rule of the fuzzy rule set. For instance, let a dataset be composed by \( m \) measures of the input variable \( x \), \( X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\} \), and a dataset composed by \( n \) measures of the output variable \( y \), \( Y = \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\} \). For each rule we extract the pair \( (A_w, B_z) \) formed by the input and the output fuzzy sets in (7), and we calculate a normalized index based on the maximum energy and minimum entropy. The index represents the strength of the \( k \)th fuzzy rule with respect to the data. Let \( R \) be the fuzzy automaton (relation) connecting \( A_w \) and \( B_z \) by means of Equation (5) with the Yager \( t \)-norm. Let \( R_{1wz} \) and \( R_{2wz} \) serve as the solutions of (5), with maximum energy and minimum entropy calculated using the algorithms of Section 2. The index of strength for the pair \( (A_w, B_z) \) is defined [4] as:

\[
I_{wz} = \frac{E(R_{1wz}) - H(R_{2wz})}{m \cdot n}
\]

(8)

For \( I_{wz} = 1 \), we obtain \( E(R_{1wz}) = n \cdot m \) and \( H(R_{2wz}) = 0 \). If \( I_{wz} \) is greater or equal to a pre-defined threshold, then the fuzzy rule is confirmed by the data. In Figure 1, this process is schematized.

![Figure 1. Schema of the process.](image-url)
then the rule is considered to be significant to the fuzzy rule set with respect to the input/output data. We can generalize this model to the case in which two or more input variables are considered. The generalized form of a fuzzy rule is given by the form:

\[ r_k : \text{if } (x_1 \text{ is } A_{w_1}^{(1)}) \text{ and } (x_2 \text{ is } A_{w_2}^{(2)}) \text{ and } \ldots \text{ and } (x_v \text{ is } A_{w_v}^{(v)}) \text{ then } y \text{ is } B_z \]  

(9)

where \( A_{w_1}^{(1)}, l = 1, \ldots, v, \) is a fuzzy set of the fuzzy partition of the universe of the discourse of the input variable.

For each pair \( A_{w_1}^{(1)}, B_z, \ldots, A_{w_v}^{(v)}, B_z, \) we calculate the corresponding indices \( I_{w_1}^{(l)} \) for \( l = 1, \ldots, v \) and assign a measure of strength of the fuzzy rule with respect to the data given by:

\[ I_k = \min_{l=1,\ldots,v} I_{w_1}^{(l)} \]

(10)

Below we show the pseudocode of the algorithm (Algorithm 3).

| Algorithm 3 Energy-Entropy fuzzy rules evaluation |
|--------------------------------------------------|
| **Description:** Calculate the matrix \( R_2 \) |
| **Input:** \( X, Y, A, B \) |
| **Output:** \( R_2 \) |
| 1 | SET \( I_{th} \) \(/\) set the threshold value |
| 2 | FOR \( k = 1 \) TO \( D \) \(/\) for all the \( D \) fuzzy rules in the dataset |
| 2 | \{ |
| 3 | Imin := 2; \(/\) Imin is initialized to a value greater than 1 |
| 4 | Create the fuzzy subsets \( B_z(y_1), \ldots, B_z(y_n) \) |
| 5 | FOR \( l = 1 \) to \( v \) |
| 6 | \{ |
| 7 | Create the fuzzy subsets \( A_{w_1}^{(l)}(x_1), \ldots, A_{w_1}^{(l)}(x_m) \) |
| 8 | Calculate \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) |
| 9 | Calculate \( E \) and \( H \) |
| 10 | Calculate \( I \) |
| 11 | IF \( I < I_{min} \) |
| 12 | \( I_{min} = I \) |
| 13 | \} |
| 14 | IF \( I_{min} \geq I_{th} \) |
| 15 | Annotate the \( k \)-th fuzzy rule as significant; |
| 16 | \} |
| 17 | END |

The threshold value \( I_{th} \) can be settled by the expert by using an opportune calibration. This calibration can be obtained by testing the algorithm applied on a sample dataset for which the expert can evaluate the strength of fuzzy rules with respect to the data. In Section 4, we present some results obtained by using various datasets. The first experiment is used for calibrating the threshold value \( I_{th} \). Obviously the computational time is polynomial, being given by \( O(n \cdot m \cdot v) \).

4. Test Results

Here we use \( e(u) = u \) for \( u \in [0,1] \) and, in accordance with \([2,3]\), the following fuzzy entropy:

\[ h(u) = -u \cdot \log_2(u) - (1-u) \cdot \log_2(1-u) \quad u \in [0,1] \]

(11)

and the Equation (5) with the Yager t-norm.
Our tests are applied to datasets extracted from the open data of the city of Naples (Italy) (www.opendata.comune.napoli.it/) and from database of the 15° census population performed during 2011 on the Italian territory by the ISTAT (Italian Statistical National Institute), available at http://dati-censimentopopolazione.istat.it. For brevity, we show the results obtained in two experiments.

The city of Naples is partitioned into 10 municipalities. In turn, each municipality includes a set of districts, as listed in Table 1.

| Municipality Number | Districts                                      |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 1                   | Chiaia, Posillipo, S.Ferdinando                |
| 2                   | Avvocata, Montecalvario, Porto, S.Giuseppe, Pendino, Mercato |
| 3                   | Stella, S.Carlo all’Arena                     |
| 4                   | Vicaria, S.Lorenzo, Poggioreale               |
| 5                   | Vomero, Arenella                              |
| 6                   | Ponticelli, Barra, S.Giovanni a Teduccio      |
| 7                   | Miano, Secondigliano, S.Pietro a Patierno     |
| 8                   | Chiaiano, Piscinola-Marianella, Scampia       |
| 9                   | Pianura, Socavo                               |
| 10                  | Bagnoli, Fuorigrotta                          |

Table 1. Municipalities of the city of Naples and their districts.

In the first experiment, we consider the input \( x \) = Percentage of inhabitants with less than 5 years old and the output \( y \) = Number of public kindergartens. The data extracted are shown in Table 2.

| Municipality Number | \( x \) | \( y \) |
|---------------------|--------|--------|
| 1                   | 4.26%  | 5      |
| 2                   | 4.77%  | 6      |
| 3                   | 5.05%  | 6      |
| 4                   | 4.93%  | 3      |
| 5                   | 3.80%  | 3      |
| 6                   | 5.61%  | 9      |
| 7                   | 5.40%  | 5      |
| 8                   | 5.35%  | 8      |
| 9                   | 5.29%  | 6      |
| 10                  | 4.11%  | 5      |

Table 2. The I/O data extracted for the 10 municipalities.

The fuzzy partitions are composed by fuzzy numbers given by semi-trapezoidal or triangular fuzzy sets [19]. The first and last fuzzy sets are semi-trapezoidal, and the intermediate fuzzy sets are triangular. The triangular fuzzy numbers are represented with three number, as \( A = (a_1, a_2, a_3) \) and \( B = (b_1, b_2, b_3) \). In Table 3 we show the four fuzzy sets forming the fuzzy partition of the domain \( U_x \).

| Label    | \( a_1 \) | \( a_2 \) | \( a_3 \) |
|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| low      | 0         | 2         | 4         |
| adequate | 2         | 4         | 5         |
| fair     | 4         | 5         | 6         |
| high     | 5         | 6         | 8         |

Table 3. The fuzzy partition for \( U_x \).

In Table 4 we show the five fuzzy sets forming the fuzzy partition of the domain \( U_y \).
Table 4. The fuzzy partition for $U_y$.

| Label    | $a_1$ | $a_2$ | $a_3$ |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| very low | 0     | 1     | 3     |
| low      | 1     | 3     | 4     |
| mean     | 3     | 4     | 7     |
| high     | 4     | 7     | 10    |
| very high| 7     | 10    | 12    |

In Figures 2 and 3 we show the graphs of the fuzzy sets of the fuzzy partitions for the domains $U_x$ and $U_y$, respectively.

Figure 2. Graph of the fuzzy sets of the fuzzy partition for $U_x$.

Figure 3. Graph of the fuzzy sets of the fuzzy partition for $U_y$.

The expert considers the following rules to be significant:

Rule 1 $\rightarrow$ IF $A =$ low THEN $B =$ very low
Rule 2 $\rightarrow$ IF $A =$ adequate THEN $B =$ mean
Rule 3 $\rightarrow$ IF $A =$ fair THEN $B =$ high

Then, the index of strength of each fuzzy rule is calculated. Table 5 (resp., Table 6) shows $E$, $H$, $I$, corresponding to the three rules for $p = 1$ (resp., $p = 2$).
Table 5. E, H, I value obtained by setting \( p = 1 \).

| Rule   | \( E \)   | \( H \)   | \( I \)   |
|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Rule 1 | 99.00     | 0.00      | 0.99      |
| Rule 2 | 82.50     | 3.68      | 0.79      |
| Rule 3 | 75.78     | 5.76      | 0.70      |

Table 6. E, H, I value obtained by setting \( p = 2 \).

| Rule   | \( E \)   | \( H \)   | \( I \)   |
|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Rule 1 | 95.60     | 0.00      | 0.95      |
| Rule 2 | 75.85     | 4.36      | 0.71      |
| Rule 3 | 64.66     | 6.87      | 0.58      |

For calibrating the threshold value for the index I, after extracting the data \( x \) and \( y \), the expert analyzes how each fuzzy rule appears consistent with respect to the data, i.e., which the degree of the fuzzy rule is confirmed from the data. He considers Rule 1 completely consistent with the data, and Rule 2 sufficiently consistent; therefore, Rule 3 is not sufficiently consistent with the data. For this reason, we set the threshold value to less or equal to the strength index I calculated for Rule 2. This value is 0.79 for \( p = 1 \) and 0.71 for \( p = 2 \). Then we set \( p = 2 \) and \( I_{th} = 0.7 \) in all the experiments.

Below we present the results of the second experiment in which two input variables are considered. The inputs are the following: \( x_1 \) = Percentage of families in residential properties with respect to the total resident families and \( x_2 \) = Percentage of graduates with respect to the total workforce. The output is \( y \) = Unemployment rate.

In Table 7, we show the data extracted for the 10 municipalities.

Table 7. The I/O data extracted for the 10 municipalities.

| Municipality | \( x_1 \)   | \( x_2 \)   | \( y \)   |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| 1            | 30.86%      | 60.86%      | 13.46     |
| 2            | 13.62%      | 52.52%      | 26.77     |
| 3            | 11.58%      | 53.47%      | 26.53     |
| 4            | 8.330%      | 48.41%      | 30.34     |
| 5            | 29.94%      | 69.54%      | 13.53     |
| 6            | 4.410%      | 43.85%      | 36.51     |
| 7            | 4.280%      | 36.34%      | 41.52     |
| 8            | 5.640%      | 36.21%      | 40.69     |
| 9            | 6.880%      | 54.69%      | 31.42     |
| 10           | 12.84%      | 62.39%      | 22.76     |

In Tables 8–10, we show the fuzzy sets forming the fuzzy partitions of the domain \( U_{x1}, U_{x2}, U_y \), respectively.

Table 8. The fuzzy partition for \( U_{x1} \).

| Label     | \( a_1 \) | \( a_2 \) | \( a_3 \) |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| very low  | 0         | 1         | 3         |
| low       | 1         | 3         | 4         |
| mean      | 3         | 4         | 7         |
| high      | 4         | 7         | 10        |
| very high | 7         | 10        | 12        |
Table 9. The fuzzy partition for $U_{x2}$.

| Label  | $a_1$ | $a_2$ | $a_3$ |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| low    | 0     | 30    | 40    |
| adequate | 30   | 40    | 60    |
| fair   | 40    | 60    | 80    |
| high   | 60    | 80    | 100   |

Table 10. The fuzzy partition for $U_y$.

| Label            | $a_1$ | $a_2$ | $a_3$ |
|------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| very low         | 0     | 10    | 15    |
| low              | 10    | 15    | 30    |
| mean             | 15    | 30    | 50    |
| high             | 30    | 50    | 60    |
| very high        | 50    | 60    | 100   |

In Figures 4–6, we show the graphs of the fuzzy sets of the fuzzy partitions for the domains $U_{x1}$, $U_{x2}$, $U_y$, respectively.

Figure 4. Graph of the fuzzy sets of the fuzzy partition for $U_{x1}$.

Figure 5. Graph of the fuzzy sets of the fuzzy partition for $U_{x2}$. 

Figure 6...
The expert considers the following fuzzy rules:

Rule 1 \( \rightarrow \) IF \( A_1= \) very low AND \( A_2 = \) low THEN \( B = \) very high
Rule 2 \( \rightarrow \) IF \( A_1= \) low AND \( A_2 = \) low THEN \( B = \) high
Rule 3 \( \rightarrow \) IF \( A_1= \) mean AND \( A_2 = \) adequate THEN \( B = \) mean
Rule 4 \( \rightarrow \) IF \( A_1= \) mean AND \( A_2 = \) fair THEN \( B = \) mean
Rule 5 \( \rightarrow \) IF \( A_1= \) mean AND \( A_2 = \) high THEN \( B = \) low
Rule 6 \( \rightarrow \) IF \( A_1= \) high AND \( A_2 = \) fair THEN \( B = \) low
Rule 7 \( \rightarrow \) IF \( A_1= \) high AND \( A_2 = \) high THEN \( B = \) very low
Rule 8 \( \rightarrow \) IF \( A_1 = \) very high AND \( A_2 = \) high THEN \( B = \) very low

In Table 11, we show the value of the index \( I \) calculated for any fuzzy rule (column \( I \) rule), when \( p = 2 \). For each pair \((A^{(1)}_w, B_z)\) and \((A^{(2)}_w, B_z)\) in the rule, we show the values of \( E, H, I \).

| Rule | Pair | \( p = 2 \) |
|------|------|-------------|
|      | \((A_1 = \) very low, \( B = \) very high)\) | \( E \quad H \quad I \quad I \) |
| Rule 1 | \((A_1 = \) low, \( B = \) very high)\) | 32.00 0.00 0.32 0.32 |
|       | 84.50 0.00 0.84 0.84 |
| Rule 2 | \((A_1 = \) low, \( B = \) high)\) | 64.24 2.67 0.61 0.61 |
|       | 88.88 0.00 0.89 0.89 |
| Rule 3 | \((A_1 = \) mean, \( B = \) mean)\) | 84.65 1.20 0.83 0.80 |
|       | 82.92 2.67 0.80 0.80 |
| Rule 4 | \((A_1 = \) mean, \( B = \) mean)\) | 95.30 0.00 0.95 0.72 |
|       | 76.58 5.68 0.72 0.72 |
| Rule 5 | \((A_1 = \) mean, \( B = \) low)\) | 88.59 2.00 0.87 0.87 |
|       | 90.81 0.00 0.91 0.91 |
| Rule 6 | \((A_1 = \) high, \( B = \) low)\) | 90.60 2.00 0.89 0.89 |
|       | 90.81 0.00 0.91 0.91 |
| Rule 7 | \((A_1 = \) high, \( B = \) very low)\) | 86.68 1.85 0.85 0.85 |
|       | 86.20 0.00 0.86 0.86 |
| Rule 8 | \((A_1 = \) very high, \( B = \) very low)\) | 100.00 0.00 1.00 0.91 |
|       | 90.81 0.00 0.91 0.91 |
The results in Table 11 show that the final indices of the fuzzy rules are greater than the threshold $I_{th} = 0.7$, except for the fuzzy rules 1 and 2.

5. Conclusions

We present a new method that uses fuzzy energy and fuzzy entropy to evaluate the strength of fuzzy rules set by an expert, with respect to a set of data. We correlate the input and the output data via Equation (5), where $t$ is the Yager t-norm, and calculate the corresponding relations which are solutions of (5) with maximum energy and minimum entropy.

After the processes of the creation of the fuzzy partitions of the input and output variable domains, and of the significant fuzzy rule set by the expert, a normalized index of the strength of each fuzzy rule with respect to the data is measured.

If this index is greater than a calibrated threshold, then the fuzzy rule is considered significant with respect to the data. We extend this approach to fuzzy rules in which there are two or more input variables. In this case, we calculate the index of strength separately for each pair of input and output, and we assign a best index of strength to the rule(s) having the minimum value of these indices. The results of some experiments are presented in order to show how our algorithm works inside a fuzzy rule set.
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