

Letter to the editor

## Comment on “A fuzzy soft set theoretic approach to decision making problems”

Zhi Kong\*, Liqun Gao, Lifu Wang

*School of Information Science and Engineering, Northeastern University, Shenyang, Liaoning 110004, PR China*

Received 26 July 2007; received in revised form 25 December 2007

---

### Abstract

The algorithm for identification of an object in a previous paper of A.R. Roy et al. [A.R. Roy, P.K. Maji, A fuzzy soft set theoretic approach to decision making problems, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 203(2007) 412–418] is incorrect. Using the algorithm the right choice cannot be obtained in general. The problem is illustrated by a counter-example.

© 2008 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

*Keywords:* Fuzzy soft set; Resultant fuzzy soft set; Comparison table; Object recognition; Choice value

---

### 1. Introduction

Researchers in economics, engineering, environmental science, sociology, medical science, and many other fields deal daily with the complexities of modeling uncertain data. Classical methods are not always successful, because the uncertainties appearing in these domains may be of various types. While probability theory, fuzzy sets [1], rough sets [2], and other mathematical tools are well-known and often useful approaches for describing uncertainty, each of these theories has its inherent difficulties as pointed out in [3]. Consequently, Molodstov [3] proposed a completely new approach for modeling vagueness and uncertainty. This so-called soft set theory is free from the difficulties affecting existing methods.

A soft set is a parameterized family of subsets of the universal set. We can say that soft sets are neighborhood systems, and that they are a special case of context-dependent fuzzy sets. In soft set theory the problem of setting the membership function, among other related problems, simply does not arise. This makes the theory very convenient and easy to apply in practice. Soft set theory has potential applications in many different fields, including the smoothness of functions, game theory, operations research, Riemann integration, Perron integration, probability theory, and measurement theory. Most of these applications have already been demonstrated in Molodtsov's book [4].

At present, work on the soft set theory is progressing rapidly. Aktas et al. [5] introduced the basic version of soft group theory, which extends the notion of group to include the algebraic structures of soft sets. Maji et al. [6] describe the application of soft set theory to a decision making problem using rough sets. The same authors have also published

---

\* Corresponding author.

*E-mail address:* [kongzhi2004916@163.com](mailto:kongzhi2004916@163.com) (Z. Kong).

a detailed theoretical study on soft sets [7]. Chen et al. [8] present a new definition of soft set parameterization reduction, and compare this definition to the related concept of attributes reduction in rough set theory. Most results of fuzzy soft set may be found in [9]. And Maji et al. [6] researched the reduction of weighted soft set. Roy et al. [10] presented a method of object recognition from an imprecise multiobserver data. An example in [10] is used to validate this algorithm, which is only a special case in tabular representation of fuzzy soft set. A counter-example is found to illustrate the problem.

**2. Counter-example**

*Algorithm* [10]

1. Input the fuzzy soft sets  $(F, A)$ ,  $(G, B)$  and  $(H, C)$ .
2. Input the parameter set  $P$  as observed by the observer.
3. Compute the corresponding resultant fuzzy soft set  $(S, P)$  from the fuzzy soft sets  $(F, A)$ ,  $(G, B)$ ,  $(H, C)$  and place it in tabular form.
4. Construct the comparison table of the fuzzy soft set  $(S, P)$  and compute  $r_i$  and  $t_i$  for  $o_i, \forall i$ .
5. Compute the score of  $o_i, \forall i$ .
6. The decision is  $S_k$  if  $S_k = \max_i S_i$ .
7. If  $k$  has more than one value then any one of  $o_k$  may be chosen.

*Counter example*

Let  $U = \{o_1, o_2, o_3, o_4, o_5, o_6\}$  be the set of objects. The parameter set  $E = \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_6\}$ . The tabular representation of the resultant fuzzy soft set and corresponding choice values of objects are as in Table 1.

The comparison table of the Table 1 resultant fuzzy soft set is as in Table 2. Next we compute the row-sum, column-sum, and the score for each  $o_i$  as shown in Table 3. According the algorithm in [6], it is clear that the maximum score is 6, scored by  $o_3$ , and the decision is in favour of selecting  $o_3$ . But here the optimal choice value  $\max c_i = c_6$  in Table 1; then  $o_6$  is the optimal choice object which is contradictory to the result obtained with the algorithm for fuzzy soft set in decision making problem [10]. Thus the algorithm for fuzzy soft set in decision making problem is incorrect.

From the step 4, the algorithm is revised as below:  $c_{ij}$  and  $r_i$  should be redesigned as,

$$c_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^m (f_{ik} - f_{jk})$$

Table 1  
Resultant table

$U$	$e_1$	$e_2$	$e_3$	$e_4$	$e_5$	Choice value
$o_1$	0.1	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.3	$c_1 = 1.6$
$o_2$	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.6	$c_2 = 1.9$
$o_3$	0.1	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.1	$c_3 = 1.8$
$o_4$	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	$c_4 = 1.6$
$o_5$	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.3	$c_5 = 1.6$
$o_6$	0.9	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.8	$c_6 = 2.1$

Table 2  
Comparison table

	$o_1$	$o_2$	$o_3$	$o_4$	$o_5$	$o_6$
$o_1$	5	3	2	4	3	3
$o_2$	3	5	2	4	3	3
$o_3$	4	3	5	3	3	3
$o_4$	2	2	2	5	3	3
$o_5$	4	2	2	4	5	3
$o_6$	2	2	2	3	2	5

Table 3  
Score table

	Row-sum	Column-sum	Score
$o_1$	20	20	0
$o_2$	20	17	3
$o_3$	21	15	6
$o_4$	17	23	−6
$o_5$	20	19	1
$o_6$	16	20	−4

$$r_i = \sum_{j=1}^m c_{ij}$$

where  $f_{ik}$  is the membership value of object  $o_i$  for the  $k$ th parameter,  $m$  is the number of parameters. For Table 1, we can obtain  $r_1 = -1.0$ ,  $r_2 = 0.8$ ,  $r_3 = 0.2$ ,  $r_4 = -1.0$ ,  $r_5 = -1.0$ ,  $r_6 = 2.0$ . Step 5: the decision is  $k$  if  $r_k = \max_i r_i$ . So the decision is object  $o_6$ , which is identical to the decision according to the method in [6].

## References

- [1] L.A. Zadeh, Fuzzy Sets, Inform. Control 8 (1965) 338–353.
- [2] Z. Pawlak, Rough sets, Int. J. Inform. Comput. Sci. 11 (1982) 341–356.
- [3] D. Molodtsov, The Theory of Soft Sets, URSS Publishers, Moscow, 2004 (in Russian).
- [4] D. Molodtsov, Soft set theory—first results, Comput. Math. Appl. 37 (1999) 19–31.
- [5] H. Aktas, N. Cagman, Soft sets and soft groups, Inform. Sci. 177 (2007) 2726–2735.
- [6] P.K. Maji, A.R. Roy, R. Biswas, An application of soft sets in a decision making problem, Comput. Math. Appl. 44 (2002) 1077–1083.
- [7] P.K. Maji, R. Biswas, A.R. Roy, Soft set theory, Comput. Math. Appl. 45 (2003) 555–562.
- [8] D. Chen, E.C.C. Tsang, D.S. Yeung, X. Wang, The parameterization reduction of soft sets and its applications, Comput. Math. Appl. 49 (2005) 757–763.
- [9] P.K. Maji, R. Biswas, A.R. Roy, Fuzzy soft sets, J. Fuzzy Math. 9 (3) (2001) 589–602.
- [10] A.R. Roy, P.K. Maji, A fuzzy soft set theoretic approach to decision making problems, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 203 (2007) 412–418.