

Solution of Fuzzy Multi-objective Nonlinear Programming Problem Using Fuzzy Programming Techniques Based on Hyperbolic Membership Functions

Priyadarsini Rath* and Rajani B. Dash

Department of Mathematics, Ravenshaw University, Cuttack, Odisha - 753003, India

Abstract

The main objective of this paper is three folds: (i) introduction of hyperbolic membership function in Zimmerman's fuzzy programming technique to handle multi-objective nonlinear programming problems (ii) reduction of fuzzy multi objective nonlinear programming problem to crisp one using ranking function (iii) reduction of complexity of nonlinear problem occurring in course of application of Zimmerman's technique by the process of linearization.

Keywords: Hyperbolic membership function; Fuzzy multi-objective nonlinear programming problem; Ranking function

Received: October 24, 2017; **Accepted:** November 17, 2017; **Published:** November 24, 2017

Introduction

The real world problems with multiple conflicting objectives are more conveniently modeled into multi-objective programming problems. Further, when the parameters are imprecise numerical quantities, it is very much appropriate to implement fuzzy quantities for modeling these situations. In 1970, Bellmann and Zadeh introduced the concept of fuzzy quantities in decision making. Authors like H.R. Maleki, A. Ebrahimnejad et al., P. Fortemps et al., H. Zimmerman have introduced fuzzy programming approach to solve crisp multi-objective linear programming problem. In 1981, Leberling used a nonlinear membership function in form of hyperbolic function for solving linear programming problem. In 1991, Dhingra et al. introduced exponential, quadratic and logarithmic membership functions for optimal designing problems. In 1997, R. Verma et al. used the fuzzy programming technique based on some nonlinear membership function to solve fuzzy MOLPP. R. B. Dash et al. used defuzzification through ranking function and Zimmerman's technique based on trapezoidal membership function for solving fuzzy MOLPP. P. Rath et al. used exponential and hyperbolic membership functions in Zimmerman's technique to solve fuzzy MOLPP. Recently P. Rath et al. extended the idea of their paper and solved fuzzy multi-objective nonlinear programming problem (FMONLPP) through exponential membership function [1-17]. In this paper, after defuzzification of FMONLPP, the resulting nonlinear multi-objective programming problem

is solved using Zimmerman's technique through hyperbolic membership function. Also, the nonlinear terms occurring in the Zimmerman's procedure are linearised to marginalize the intricacy. A numerical example is given for better understanding of the technique.

Fuzzy Multi-objective Nonlinear Programming Problem (FMONLPP)

We consider fuzzy multi objective nonlinear programming problem with trapezoidal fuzzy coefficients as follows

$$\text{Max } \tilde{Z}_p = \sum_j \tilde{c}_{pj} x_j^{\alpha_j} \quad p=1, 2, \dots, q$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_j \tilde{a}_{ij} x_j \leq \tilde{b}_i \quad i=1, 2, \dots, m \quad (2.1)$$

a_{ij}^1, \tilde{c}_{pj} and are in the above relation are in trapezoidal form as

$$\tilde{a}_{ij} = (a_{ij}^1, a_{ij}^2, a_{ij}^3, a_{ij}^4)_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$$

$$\tilde{c}_{ij} = (c_{ij}^1, c_{ij}^2, c_{ij}^3, c_{ij}^4)_{\alpha \in [0,1]}$$

Now the FMONLPP can be transformed to a MONLPP by applying the Rouben's ranking function R as below.

$$\text{Max } R(\tilde{Z}_p) = \sum_j R(\tilde{c}_{pj}) x_j^{\alpha_j} \quad p = 1, 2, \dots, q$$

$$s.t. \sum_j R(\tilde{a}_{ij})x_{ij} \leq R(\tilde{b}_i) \quad i=1, 2\dots m \Rightarrow \tilde{Z}_p(x^*) \geq \tilde{Z}_p(x) \quad \forall x$$

$$x_j \geq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{Max } Z'_p = \sum_j \tilde{c}_{pj} x_j^{\alpha_j} \quad p=1, 2\dots q$$

$$s.t. \sum_j a'_{ij} x_j \leq b'_i \quad i=1, 2\dots m \quad (2.2)$$

Where a'_{ij}, b'_i, c'_j are real numbers corresponding to the fuzzy numbers $\tilde{a}_{ij}, \tilde{b}_i, \tilde{c}_j$ with respect to the exponential function respectively and the Rouben's ranking function is given below.

Rouben's ranking function

The ranking function suggested by F. Rouben is defined by

$$R(\tilde{a}) = \frac{1}{2}(a^L + a^v + \frac{1}{2}(\beta - \alpha))$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{a} = (a^L - \alpha, a^L, a^v, a^v + \beta)$$

Lemma 1

The optimum solutions of (2.1) and (2.2) are equivalent.

Proof

Let M_1, M_2 be set of all feasible solutions of (2.1) and (2.2) respectively.

Then $x \in M_1$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_j \tilde{a}_{ij} x_j \leq \tilde{b}_i \quad i=1, 2\dots m$$

$$\sum_j R(\tilde{a}_{ij})x_j \leq R(\tilde{b}_i)$$

(By applying the Rouben's ranking function) $i=1, 2\dots m$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_j a'_{ij} x_j \leq b'_i$$

$$\Rightarrow x \in M_{2(i)}$$

Converse can be proved similarly.

Thus, $M_1=M_2$

Let $x^* \in X$ be the complete optimal solution of (2.1).

Then $\tilde{Z}_p(x^*) \geq \tilde{Z}_p(x)$ for all $x \in X$, where X is the set of feasible solutions.

$\Rightarrow R(\tilde{Z}_p(x^*)) \geq R(\tilde{Z}_p(x))$ (By applying the Rouben's ranking function)

$$\Rightarrow R(\sum_j \tilde{c}_{pj} x_j^*) \geq R(\sum_j \tilde{c}_{pj} x_j)$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum R(c_{pj})x_j^* \geq \sum R(c_{pj})x_j \quad j=1, 2\dots q$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum c'_{pj} x_j^* \geq \sum c'_{pj} x_j \quad j=1, 2\dots q$$

Modified fuzzy programming technique

We modified the Zimmermann's technique using hyperbolic membership function in order to solve multi-objective nonlinear programming problem (2.2).

Step-1:

The multi-objective linear programming problem is solved by considering one objective at a time and ignoring all others. The process is repeated q times for q different objective functions.

Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_q be the ideal situations for the respective functions.

Step-2:

A pay-off matrix of size q by q is formed using all the ideal solutions of step-1. Then from pay-off matrix lower bounds (L_p) and upper bounds (U_p) of the objective functions are obtained.

$$\text{Thus } L_p \leq Z'_p \leq U_p \quad p=1, 2, \dots, q$$

Step-3:

Using hyperbolic membership function, an equivalent crisp model for the fuzzy model can be formulated as follows:

Min λ

$$\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^{\{((U_p+L_p)/2)-Z_p(x)\alpha_p\}} - e^{-\{((U_p+L_p)/2)-Z_p(x)\alpha_p\}}}{e^{\{((U_p+L_p)/2)-Z_p(x)\alpha_p\}} + e^{-\{((U_p+L_p)/2)-Z_p(x)\alpha_p\}}} + \frac{1}{2} \quad p=1, 2, \dots, q$$

$$\sum a'_{pj} x_j \leq b'_i \quad i=1, 2, \dots, m$$

$$\lambda \geq 0, x_j \geq 0 \quad j=1, 2, \dots, n$$

After simplification, the above problem reduces to

Min x_{mn+1}

Subject to

$$\alpha_p Z_p(x) + x_{mn+1} \geq \alpha_p (U_p + L_p) / 2 \quad p=1, 2, \dots, q$$

$$\sum a'_{pj} x_j \leq b'_i \quad i=1, 2, \dots, m$$

$$x_j \geq 0, \quad j=1, 2, \dots, n$$

$$x_{mn+1} \geq 0$$

Where $x_{mn+1} = \tan h^{-1}(2\lambda - 1)$

Step-4:

The crisp model is solved and the optimal compromise solution is obtained. The values of objective functions at the compromise solution are obtained.

Numerical example

$$\text{Max: } \tilde{Z}_1(x) = \tilde{2}x_1 + \tilde{3}x_2 - \tilde{2}x_1^2$$

$$\text{Max: } \tilde{Z}_2(x) = \tilde{3}x_1 + \tilde{4}x_2 - \tilde{5}x_1^2$$

(3.1)

$$\text{s.t. } \tilde{1}x_1 + \tilde{4}x_2 \leq \tilde{4}$$

$$\tilde{1}x_1 + \tilde{1}x_2 \leq \tilde{2}$$

$$x_1, x_2 \geq 0$$

Where

$$\tilde{2} = (1.2, 1.3, 2.3, 2.8)$$

$$\tilde{3} = (2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.8)$$

$$\tilde{2} = (1.2, 1.3, 2.3, 2.8)$$

$$\tilde{3} = (2.3, 2.5, 3.3, 3.5)$$

$$\tilde{4} = (3.2, 3.4, 4.2, 4.8)$$

$$\tilde{5} = (4.3, 4.4, 5.2, 5.7)$$

$$\tilde{1} = (0.8, 0.9, 1.1, 1.5)$$

$$\tilde{4} = (3.2, 4.0, 4.4)$$

$$\tilde{1} = (0.7, 0.9, 1.1, 1.3)$$

$$\tilde{1} = (0.6, 0.8, 1.3, 1.7)$$

$$\tilde{4} = (3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.4)$$

$$\tilde{2} = (1.8, 1.9, 2.2, 2.5)$$

Using ranking function, the problem reduces to

$$\text{max: } Z'_1(x) = R(\tilde{2})x_1 + R(\tilde{3})x_2 - R(\tilde{2})x_1^2$$

$$\text{max: } Z'_2(x) = R(\tilde{3})x_1 + R(\tilde{4})x_2 - R(\tilde{5})x_1^2$$

$$\text{s.t. } R(\tilde{1})x_1 + R(\tilde{4})x_2 \leq R(\tilde{4})$$

$$R(\tilde{1})x_1 + R(\tilde{1})x_2 \leq R(\tilde{2})$$

$$x_1, x_2 \geq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{max: } Z'_1(x) = 2.2x_1 + 2.9x_2 - 1.9x_1^2 \quad (3.3)$$

$$\text{max: } Z'_2(x) = 2.9x_1 + 3.9x_2 - 4.9x_1^2 \quad (3.3)$$

$$\text{s.t. } 1.1x_1 + 3.9x_2 \leq 3.8$$

$$1.1x_1 + 1.1x_2 \leq 2.1$$

Solving (3.2) and (3.4) by Wolf's method we get

$$x_1 = \frac{539}{1482} = 0.3637, x_2 = \frac{50387}{257798} = 0.8718$$

Solving (3.3) and (3.4) by Wolf's method, we get

$$x_1 = \frac{9}{49} = 0.1837, x_2 = \frac{1736}{1911} = 0.9226$$

The pay-off matrix of Lower Bounds (L.B.) and Upper Bounds (U.B.) of the objective functions Z'_1 and Z'_2 is given below

Function	LB	UB
Z'_1	3.0655	3.00770
Z'_2	3.8065	3.9653

The crisp model can be formulated as

$$\text{Min } x_3$$

Subject to

$$\alpha_2 Z_2(x) + x_3 \geq \alpha_2 (U_2 + L_2) / 2$$

$$\alpha_2 Z_2(x) + x_3 \geq \alpha_2 (U_2 + L_2) / 2$$

$$\sum a'_{pj} x_j \leq b'_i$$

$$j = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (3.5)$$

$$j = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

Putting the values of $Z, U, L, i=1,2$, we get

$$\text{Min } x_3$$

s.t.

$$2.2389x_1 + 3.0109x_2 - 3.7830x_1^2 + x_3 \geq 3$$

$$2.2389x_1 + 3.0109x_2 - 3.7830x_1^2 + x_3 \geq 3$$

$$1.0x_1 + 1.1x_2 \leq 2.1 \quad (3.6)$$

$$1.0x_1 + 1.1x_2 \leq 2.1$$

$$x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0$$

Due to presence of non-linear term x_1^2 in the constraint (3.6), the problem becomes too complex to solve. To avoid the situation taking advantage of

$$0.1837 \leq x_1 \leq 0.3637$$

We linearize x_1^2 as follows.

$$x_1^2 = a_{10}x_{10}^2 + a_{11}x_{11}^2 + a_{12}x_{12}^2 + a_{13}x_{13}^2$$

Where

$$x_{12} = 0.3037$$

$$x_{12} = 0.3037$$

$$x_{12} = 0.3037$$

$$x_{13} = 0.3637$$

Then the problem (3.6) reduces to

Min: x_3

s.t.

$$2.1490x_1 + 2.8330x_2 - 1.8560(a_{10}x_{10}^2 + a_{11}x_{11}^2 + a_{12}x_{12}^2 + a_{13}x_{13}^2) + x_3 \geq 3$$

$$2.2389x_1 + 3.0109x_2 - 3.7830(a_{10}x_{10}^2 + a_{11}x_{11}^2 + a_{12}x_{12}^2 + a_{13}x_{13}^2) + x_3 \geq 3$$

$$1.1x_1 + 3.9x_2 \leq 3.8 \tag{3.7}$$

$$1.0x_1 + 1.1x_2 \leq 2.1$$

$$x_1, x_2, a_{10}, a_{11}, a_{12}, a_{13} \geq 10$$

$$x_1, x_2, a_{10}, a_{11}, a_{12}, a_{13} \geq 10$$

Solving (3.7) the optimal solution of the problem is obtained as:

$$x_2^* = 0.9243$$

$$x_2^* = 0.9243$$

Now the optimal value of the objective functions of FMOLPP (4.1) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1^* &= 2x_1^* + 3x_2^* - 2x_1^{*2} \\ &= (1.9, 2.1, 2.2, 2.6)x_1^* + (2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 3.8)x_2^* - (1.2, 1.3, 2.3, 2.8)x_1^{*2} \\ &= (2.3329, 2.4577, 3.3682, 3.8856) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_2^* &= 3x_1^* + 4x_2^* - 5x_1^{*2} \\ &= (2.3, 2.5, 3.3, 3.5)x_1^* + (3.2, 3.4, 4.2, 4.8)x_2^* - (4.3, 4.4, 5.2, 5.7)x_1^{*2} \\ &= (3.2305, 3.4477, 4.3040, 4.8783) \end{aligned}$$

The membership functions corresponding to the fuzzy objective functions are as follows.

$$\mu_{Z_1}^H(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \leq 2.3329 \\ \frac{x-2.3329}{0.1248} & 2.3329 < x \leq 2.4577 \\ 1 & 2.4577 < x \leq 3.3682 \\ \frac{3.8856-x}{0.5174} & 3.3682 < x \leq 3.8856 \\ 0 & x \geq 3.8856 \end{cases}$$

$$\mu_{Z_2}^H(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \leq 3.2305 \\ \frac{x-3.2305}{0.2172} & 3.2305 < x \leq 3.4477 \\ 1 & 3.4477 < x \leq 4.3040 \\ \frac{4.8783-x}{0.5743} & 4.3040 < x \leq 4.8783 \\ 0 & x \geq 4.8783 \end{cases}$$

Conclusion

The closeness of the result of the numerical example of this paper with that of the previous paper [17] confirms that the method given in this paper is an alternative way of solving fuzzy multi-objective nonlinear programming problem.

References

- Bellman RE, Zadeh LA (1970) Decision making in fuzzy environment. *Management Science* 17: B141-B164.
- Zimmermann HJ (1976) Description and optimization of fuzzy systems. *Inter J General Systems* 214: 209-215.
- Zimmermann HJ (1978) Fuzzy programming and linear programming with several objective functions. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 1: 45-55.
- Liberling H (1981) *Fuzzy Sets and System* 6: 105-118.
- Campos L, Munoz A (1989) A subjective approach for ranking fuzzy numbers. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 29: 145-153.
- Dhingra AK, Moskowit H (1991) *European J Opex Res* 55: 348-361.
- Fortemps P, Roubens F (1996) Ranking and defuzzification methods based on area compensation. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 82: 319-330.
- Verma R, Biswal MP, Biswas A (1997) Fuzzy programming technique to solve multi-objective transportation problems with some non-linear membership functions. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 91: 37-43.
- Delgado M, Vila MA, Voxman W (1998) On a canonical representation of fuzzy numbers. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 93: 125-185.
- Maleki HR (2002) Ranking functions and their application to fuzzy linear programming. *Far East J Math Sci* 43: 183-301.
- Mishmast Nehi M, Laneghad MA (2008) Solving interval and fuzzy multi objective linear programming by necessary efficiency points. *Int Math Forum* 3: 331-341.
- Ebrahim Nijad A, Nasseri SH (2009) Using complementary slackness property to solve linear programming with fuzzy parameters fuzzy information and engineering 3: 233-296.
- Dash RB, Dash PDP (2011) Solving fuzzy multi objective linear programming problem using Fuzzy Programming Technique. *J Odisha Mathematics Society* 30: 109-120.
- Rath P, Dash RB (2016) Solution of fuzzy multi-objective linear programming problems using fuzzy programming techniques based on hyperbolic membership function. *J Computer and Mathematical Sci* 7: 653-662.
- Rath P, Dash RB (2017) Solution of fuzzy multi-objective linear programming problems using fuzzy programming technique based on exponential membership functions. *Inter J Mathematics Trends and Tech* 41: 289-292.

- 16 Dash PDP, Dash RB (2013) Solving fuzzy multi-objective nonlinear programming problem using fuzzy programming technique. Int J Engg Sci and Innov Tech 2: 137-142.
- 17 Rath P, Dash RB (2017) Solution of fuzzy multi objective non-linear programming problem using fuzzy programming technique based on exponential membership functions. Inter J Mathematics Trends and Tech 41: 289-292.