

## IFS WITH EXTENDED MODAL OPERATORS FOR NEGATION IN MEDICAL DIAGNOSIS

<sup>1</sup>A. EDWARD SAMUEL & <sup>2</sup>S. RAJAKUMAR

<sup>1,2</sup>Ramanujan Research Centre, P.G. & Research Department of Mathematics,  
 Government Arts College (Autonomous), Kumbakonam, Tamil Nadu, India.

E-mail: [aedward74\\_thrc@yahoo.co.in](mailto:aedward74_thrc@yahoo.co.in) & [tplrajakumar@gmail.com](mailto:tplrajakumar@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*In this paper we propose a new approach for Medical diagnosis with the symptoms of disease using IFS with Extended Modal Operators For Negation. This operators apply to identified the disease of the patient with symptoms in the data. The membership and non-membership values are not always possible upto our satisfaction, but in deterministic (hesitation) part has more important role here, the fact that in decision making, particularly in case of medical diagnosis, there is a fair chance of the existence of a non-zero hesitation part at each moment of evaluation.*

**AMS Mathematics Subject Classification (2010):** 54A40, 03E72, 06D72, 03F55.

**Key Words:** Intuitionistic Fuzzy set(IFS), Intuitionistic Fuzzy Relation (IFR), Extended Modal Operators For Negation (EMON), Intuitionistic Medical Diagnosis(IMD).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The field of medicine is one of the best areas of application of fuzzy set theory. In the discrimination analysis, the symptoms are ranked according to the grade of discrimination of each disease by a particular symptom.

In real world, we frequently deal with vague or imprecise information. Information available is sometimes vague, sometimes inexact or sometimes insufficient. Out of several higher order fuzzy sets, intuitionistic fuzzy sets (IFS)[2,3] have been found to be highly useful to deal with vagueness. There are situations where due to insufficiency in the information available, the evaluation of membership values is not possible to our satisfaction. Due to some reason, evaluation of non-membership values is not also always possible and consequently there remains a part in deterministic on which hesitation survives. Certainly Fuzzy sets theory is not appropriate to deal with such problem, rather IFS theory is more suitable. Out of several generalizations of fuzzy set theory for various objectives, the notion introduced by Atanassov[2] in defining intuitionistic fuzzy sets is interesting and useful. Fuzzy sets are intuitionistic fuzzy sets but the converse is not necessarily true [2]. In fact there are situations where IFS theory is more appropriate to deal with[5]. Besides, it has been cultured in [6] that vague sets[7] are nothing but IFS.

In the present paper we study Sanchez's method[8] for medical diagnosis using the name as Extended Modal Operators For Negation[EMON] of IFS theory. The method of intuitionistic medical diagnosis[IMD] involves intuitionistic fuzzy relations [IFR] as defined in [4].

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We give here some basic definitions, which are used in our next section.

**2.1 Definition:** Let a set E be fixed. An intuitionistic fuzzy set (IFS) A in E is an object having the form

$$\tilde{A} = \{ \langle x, \mu_A(x), \gamma_A(x) \rangle / x \in X \}$$

where the function  $\mu_A: E \rightarrow [0,1]$  and  $\gamma_A: E \rightarrow [0,1]$  define the degree of membership and degree of non-membership respectively of the element  $x \in E$  to the set A. which is a subset of E and for every  $x \in E$ ,  $0 \leq \mu_A(x) + \gamma_A(x) \leq 1$ .

The amount  $\pi_A(x) = 1 - (\mu_A(x) + \gamma_A(x))$  is called the hesitation part which may cater to either membership value or non-membership value or both.

### 3. METHODOLOGY I

**3.1 Definition:** If A and B are two IFS of the set E, then

$$A \cap B = \{(x, \min(\mu_A(x), \mu_B(x)), \max(\gamma_A(x), \gamma_B(x))) / x \in E\}$$

$$A \cup B = \{(x, \max(\mu_A(x), \mu_B(x)), \min(\gamma_A(x), \gamma_B(x))) / x \in E\}$$

**3.2 Definition:** An operator over an intuitionistic fuzzy set A (IFS A), given the fixed numbers  $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$ , as

$$h_{\alpha, \beta}^*(A) = \{(x, \alpha \cdot \gamma_A(x), \mu_A(x) + \beta \cdot (1 - \alpha \cdot \gamma_A(x) - \mu_A(x))) / x \in E\}$$

$$\text{Where } \alpha + \beta \leq 1$$

### 4. MEDICAL DIAGNOSIS

Suppose S is a set of symptoms, D is a set of Disease and P is a set of patient. Let  $T_1$  be an intuitionistic fuzzy relations[IFR]  $T_1(P \rightarrow S)$  and  $T_2$  be an intuitionistic fuzzy relations[IFR]  $T_2(S \rightarrow D)$ .

Then

$$T_1 = A \cap B = \{(x, \min(\mu_A(x), \mu_B(x)), \max(\gamma_A(x), \gamma_B(x))) / x \in E\}$$

$$T_2 = A \cup B = \{(x, \max(\mu_A(x), \mu_B(x)), \min(\gamma_A(x), \gamma_B(x))) / x \in E\}$$

$$T_3 = (T_1 \circ T_2)$$

$$T_4 = h_{\alpha, \beta}^*(A) = \{(x, \alpha \cdot \gamma_A(x), \mu_A(x) + \beta \cdot (1 - \alpha \cdot \gamma_A(x) - \mu_A(x))) / x \in E\}$$

$$\text{Here } \alpha, \beta = 0.5$$

$$T_5 = \mu_A(x) \vee \gamma_A(x) = \max\{\mu_A(x), \gamma_A(x)\}$$

#### 4.1 Algorithm

**Step-1:**  $T_1(P \rightarrow S)$  and  $T_2(S \rightarrow D)$  are applied in Table 1 and Table 2, we get the results is named Table 3 (ie, compute  $T_3 = (T_1 \circ T_2)$ )

**Step-2:** The Table 3 values are applied in the formula  $T_4$ , and get the results is named Table 4.

**Step-3:** The Table 4 values applied in  $T_5$  and get the result is named Table 5.

**Step-4:** Finally, we select the maximum value from (Table 5) each row, and then we conclude that the Patients  $P_i (i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$  is suffering from the Disease  $D_j (j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$

#### 4.2 Case Study

Let there be four Patients  $P = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4\}$  and the set of symptoms  $S = \{\text{Headache, Acidity, Burning Eyes, Back pain, Depression}\}$ . Let the set of Disease be  $D = \{\text{Stress, Ulcer, Vision problem, Spinal problems, Blood pressure}\}$

**Table-1:** IFR  $T_1(P \rightarrow S)$

	Headache	Acidity	Burning Eyes	Back Pain	Depression
$P_1$	(0.9, 0.1)	(0.7, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.8)	(0.7, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.7)
$P_2$	(0.0, 0.7)	(0.4, 0.5)	(0.6, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.7)	(0.1, 0.2)
$P_3$	(0.7, 0.1)	(0.7, 0.1)	(0.0, 0.5)	(0.1, 0.7)	(0.0, 0.6)
$P_4$	(0.5, 0.1)	(0.4, 0.3)	(0.4, 0.5)	(0.8, 0.2)	(0.3, 0.4)

**Table-2:** IFR  $T_2(S \rightarrow D)$

	Stress	Ulcer	Vision Problem	Spinal Problems	Blood Pressure
Headache	(0.3, 0.0)	(0.0, 0.6)	(0.2, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.8)	(0.2, 0.8)
Acidity	(0.3, 0.5)	(0.2, 0.6)	(0.5, 0.2)	(0.1, 0.5)	(0.0, 0.7)
Burning Eyes	(0.2, 0.8)	(0.0, 0.8)	(0.1, 0.7)	(0.7, 0.0)	(0.2, 0.8)
Back Pain	(0.7, 0.3)	(0.5, 0.0)	(0.2, 0.6)	(0.1, 0.7)	(0.1, 0.8)
Depression	(0.2, 0.6)	(0.1, 0.8)	(0.2, 0.8)	(0.2, 0.7)	(0.8, 0.1)

**Table-3:** Using Step 1 (ie, compute  $T_3 = (T_1 \circ T_2)$ )

	Stress	Ulcer	Vision Problem	Spinal Problems	Blood Pressure
$P_1$	(0.7, 0.1)	(0.5, 0.2)	(0.5, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.5)	(0.2, 0.7)
$P_2$	(0.3, 0.5)	(0.2, 0.6)	(0.4, 0.5)	(0.6, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.2)
$P_3$	(0.3, 0.1)	(0.2, 0.6)	(0.5, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.5)	(0.2, 0.6)
$P_4$	(0.7, 0.1)	(0.5, 0.2)	(0.4, 0.2)	(0.4, 0.5)	(0.3, 0.4)

**Table-4:** Using Step 2

	Stress	Ulcer	Vision Problem	Spinal Problems	Blood Pressure
$P_1$	(0.05, 0.82)	(0.10, 0.70)	(0.10, 0.70)	(0.25, 0.47)	(0.35, 0.42)
$P_2$	(0.25, 0.52)	(0.30, 0.45)	(0.25, 0.57)	(0.10, 0.75)	(0.30, 0.55)
$P_3$	(0.05, 0.62)	(0.30, 0.45)	(0.10, 0.70)	(0.25, 0.47)	(0.30, 0.45)
$P_4$	(0.05, 0.82)	(0.10, 0.70)	(0.10, 0.65)	(0.25, 0.57)	(0.20, 0.55)

**Table-5:** Using Step 3 and Step 4

	Stress	Ulcer	Vision Problem	Spinal Problems	Blood Pressure
$P_1$	<b>0.82</b>	0.70	0.70	0.47	0.42
$P_2$	0.52	0.45	0.57	<b>0.75</b>	0.55
$P_3$	0.62	0.45	<b>0.70</b>	0.47	0.45
$P_4$	<b>0.82</b>	0.70	0.65	0.57	0.55

From the results of the disease from Table 5, we see that the max value of  $P_1$  and  $P_4$  is 0.82 and therefore both of them suffer from Stress. The max value of  $P_2$  is 0.75. This concludes that  $P_2$  faces Spinal Problem. Whereas the max value of  $P_3$  is 0.70 and therefore  $P_3$  faces Vision Problem.

## 5. METHODOLOGY II

**5.1 Definition:** If A and B are two IFS of the set E, then

$$A \cap B = \{ \langle x, \min(\mu_A(x), \mu_B(x)), \max(\gamma_A(x), \gamma_B(x)) \rangle / x \in E \}$$

$$A \cup B = \{ \langle x, \max(\mu_A(x), \mu_B(x)), \min(\gamma_A(x), \gamma_B(x)) \rangle / x \in E \}$$

**5.2 Definition:** An operator over an intuitionistic fuzzy set A (IFS A), given the fixed numbers  $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$ , as

$$j_{\alpha, \beta}^*(A) = \{ \langle x, \gamma_A(x) + \alpha \cdot (1 - \gamma_A(x) - \beta \cdot \mu_A(x)), \beta \cdot \mu_A(x) \rangle / x \in E \}$$

Where  $\alpha + \beta \leq 1$

## 6. MEDICAL DIAGNOSIS

Suppose S is a set of symptoms, D is a set of Disease and P is a set of patient. Let  $R_1$  be an intuitionistic fuzzy relations[IFR]  $R_1(P \rightarrow S)$  and  $R_2$  be an intuitionistic fuzzy relations[IFR]  $R_2(S \rightarrow D)$ .  
Then

$$R_1 = A \cap B = \{ \langle x, \min(\mu_A(x), \mu_B(x)), \max(\gamma_A(x), \gamma_B(x)) \rangle / x \in E \}$$

$$R_2 = A \cup B = \{ \langle x, \max(\mu_A(x), \mu_B(x)), \min(\gamma_A(x), \gamma_B(x)) \rangle / x \in E \}$$

$$R_3 = (R_1 \circ R_2)$$

$$R_4 = j_{\alpha, \beta}^*(A) = \{ \langle x, \gamma_A(x) + \alpha \cdot (1 - \gamma_A(x) - \beta \cdot \mu_A(x)), \beta \cdot \mu_A(x) \rangle / x \in E \}$$

Here  $\alpha, \beta = 0.5$

$$R_5 = \mu_A(x) \wedge \gamma_A(x) = \min\{\mu_A(x), \gamma_A(x)\}$$

## 6.1 Algorithm

**Step-1:**  $R_1(P \rightarrow S)$  and  $R_2(S \rightarrow D)$  are applied in Table 1 and Table 2, we get the results is named Table 3 (ie, compute  $R_3 = (R_1 \circ R_2)$ )

**Step-2:** The Table 3 values are applied in the formula  $T_4$ , and get the results is named Table 4.

**Step-3:** The Table 4 values applied in  $T_5$  and get the result is named Table 5.

**Step-4:** Finally, we select the maximum value from (Table 5) each row, and then we conclude that the Patients  $P_i (i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$  is suffering from the Disease  $D_j (j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$

## 6.2 Case Study

Let there be four Patients  $P = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4\}$  and the set of symptom  $S = \{\text{Headache, Acidity, Burning Eyes, Back pain, Depression}\}$ . Let the set of Disease be  $D = \{\text{Stress, Ulcer, Vision problem, Spinal problems, Blood pressure}\}$

**Table-1: IFR  $R_1(P \rightarrow S)$**

	Headache	Acidity	Burning Eyes	Back Pain	Depression
$P_1$	(0.9, 0.1)	(0.7, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.8)	(0.7, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.7)
$P_2$	(0.0, 0.7)	(0.4, 0.5)	(0.6, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.7)	(0.1, 0.2)
$P_3$	(0.7, 0.1)	(0.7, 0.1)	(0.0, 0.5)	(0.1, 0.7)	(0.0, 0.6)
$P_4$	(0.5, 0.1)	(0.4, 0.3)	(0.4, 0.5)	(0.8, 0.2)	(0.3, 0.4)

**Table-2: IFR  $R_2(S \rightarrow D)$**

	Stress	Ulcer	Vision Problem	Spinal Problems	Blood Pressure
Headache	(0.3, 0.0)	(0.0, 0.6)	(0.2, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.8)	(0.2, 0.8)
Acidity	(0.3, 0.5)	(0.2, 0.6)	(0.5, 0.2)	(0.1, 0.5)	(0.0, 0.7)
Burning Eyes	(0.2, 0.8)	(0.0, 0.8)	(0.1, 0.7)	(0.7, 0.0)	(0.2, 0.8)
Back Pain	(0.7, 0.3)	(0.5, 0.0)	(0.2, 0.6)	(0.1, 0.7)	(0.1, 0.8)
Depression	(0.2, 0.6)	(0.1, 0.8)	(0.2, 0.8)	(0.2, 0.7)	(0.8, 0.1)

**Table-3: Using Step 1 (ie, compute  $R_3 = (R_1 \circ R_2)$ )**

	Stress	Ulcer	Vision Problem	Spinal Problems	Blood Pressure
$P_1$	(0.7, 0.1)	(0.5, 0.2)	(0.5, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.5)	(0.2, 0.7)
$P_2$	(0.3, 0.5)	(0.2, 0.6)	(0.4, 0.5)	(0.6, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.2)
$P_3$	(0.3, 0.1)	(0.2, 0.6)	(0.5, 0.2)	(0.2, 0.5)	(0.2, 0.6)
$P_4$	(0.7, 0.1)	(0.5, 0.2)	(0.4, 0.2)	(0.4, 0.5)	(0.3, 0.4)

**Table-4: Using Step 2**

	Stress	Ulcer	Vision Problem	Spinal Problems	Blood Pressure
$P_1$	(0.37, 0.35)	(0.47, 0.25)	(0.47, 0.25)	(0.70, 0.10)	(0.80, 0.10)
$P_2$	(0.67, 0.15)	(0.75, 0.10)	(0.65, 0.20)	(0.45, 0.30)	(0.55, 0.10)
$P_3$	(0.47, 0.15)	(0.75, 0.10)	(0.47, 0.25)	(0.70, 0.10)	(0.75, 0.10)
$P_4$	(0.37, 0.35)	(0.47, 0.25)	(0.50, 0.20)	(0.65, 0.20)	(0.62, 0.15)

**Table-5:** Using Step 3 and Step 4

	Stress	Ulcer	Vision Problem	Spinal Problems	Blood Pressure
$P_1$	<b>0.35</b>	0.25	0.25	0.10	0.10
$P_2$	0.15	0.10	0.20	<b>0.30</b>	0.10
$P_3$	0.15	0.10	<b>0.25</b>	0.10	0.10
$P_4$	<b>0.35</b>	0.25	0.20	0.20	0.15

From the results of the disease from Table 5, we see that the max value of  $P_1$  and  $P_4$  is 0.35 and therefore both of them suffer from Stress. The max value of  $P_2$  is 0.30. This concludes that  $P_2$  faces Spinal Problem. Whereas the max value of  $P_3$  is 0.25 and therefore  $P_3$  faces Vision Problem.

## CONCLUSION

Though the tabulating the final results are straight forward, i.e  $P_1$  and  $P_4$  suffer from Stress,  $P_2$  faces Spinal problem,  $P_3$  faces Vision problem.

## REFERENCES

1. Atanassov. K., On Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets Theory. Sofia Bulgaria, 2012
2. Atanassov. K., Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets, Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 20(1986), 87-96.
3. Atanassov. K., New operations defined over Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets, Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 61(1994), 137-142.
4. Biswas. R., Intuitionistic Fuzzy Relations, Bull. Sous. Ens. Flous. Appl.(BUSEFAL), 70(1997) 22-29.
5. Biswas. R., On Fuzzy Sets and Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets, NIFS, 3(1997), 3-11.
6. Bustince. H, P. Burillo, Vague Sets are Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets, Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 79(1996), 403-405.
7. Gau., W.L., Buehrer., D.J., Vague Sets, IEEE Trans. Systems Man Cybernet, 23(2), (1993), 610-614.
8. Sanchez. E, Solutions in Composite Fuzzy Relation Equation. Application to Medical diagnosis in Brouwerian Logic, in; M.M. Gupta, G.N Saridis, B. R. Gaines(Eds.), Fuzzy automata and Decision Process, Elsevier, North-Holland, 1977.

**Source of support: Proceedings of UGC Funded International Conference on Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets and Systems (ICIFSS-2018), Organized by: Vellalar College for Women (Autonomous), Erode, Tamil Nadu, India.**