

Double Fuzzy Probabilistic Interval Linguistic Term Set and A Dynamic Fuzzy Decision Making Model Based-on Markov Process with Its Application in Multiple Criteria Group Decision Making

Zongmin Liu

Abstract—The probabilistic linguistic term has been proposed to deal with probability distributions in provided linguistic evaluations. However, because it has some fundamental defects, it is often difficult for decision-makers to get reasonable information of linguistic evaluations for group decision making. In addition, weight information plays a significant role in dynamic information fusion and decision making process. However, there are few research methods to determine the dynamic attribute weight with time. In this paper, I propose the concept of double fuzzy probability interval linguistic term set (DFPILTS). Firstly, fuzzy semantic integration, DFPILTS definition, its preference relationship, some basic algorithms and aggregation operators are defined. Then, a fuzzy linguistic Markov matrix with its network is developed. Then, a weight determination method based on distance measure and information entropy to reducing the inconsistency of DFPILPR and obtain collective priority vector based on group consensus is developed. Finally, an aggregation-based approach is developed, and an optimal investment case from a financial risk is used to illustrate the application of DFPILTS and decision method in multi-criteria decision making.

Index Terms—Double fuzzy probabilistic interval linguistic term set; Preference relationship; Markov directed network; Linguistic integral; Weight determination; Group decision making.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Related Works and Gaps

IN the real social economy and engineering environment, it is increasingly a severe challenge to accurately describe DMs' assessments because of the complexity and uncertainty of decision-making problems, the constant change of decision-making environment and the fuzziness of subjective preferences in human thinking. In particular, the values of quantitative attributes can be expressed by clear numbers or fuzzy numbers, while the assessments of qualitative attributes, which are difficult to measure by numbers, can be evaluated by language to achieve more accuracy. Zadeh [1] proposed the concept of language variables in 1975. Their values are not numbers but words and sentences to express linguistic terms such as "average" and "high" for qualitative judgment. As an

extension of the hesitation fuzzy set (HFS) [2] and the linguistic term set (LTS) [1], Rodriguez et al. [3] introduced the hesitation fuzzy linguistic term set (HFLS). Zhu and Xu [4] proposed the hesitation fuzzy linguistic preference relationship (HFLPR) for alternative comparison and group decision making (GDM) in linguistic environment. In order to make each linguistic evaluation in the linguistic term set provided by DMs accurately describe the complex language terms of adverbs such as "slightly" and "very", Gou et al. [5] extended HLTS to the double hesitation linguistic term set (DHLTS) to express evaluation information in a compound linguistic form combining adverbs and adjectives. As the extensions of DHLTS, a large set of linguistic terms and preference relationships have been developed [6,7,8,9,10].

In the situation of hesitation, HFS merely consider providing evaluations with limited attributes for all language variables, such as preference degrees, probabilities of occurrence and different importance. However, in an uncertain environment, DMs may consider an alternative to have different linguistic terms with varying probabilities, such as "good" in one case and "bad" in another. To address these deficiencies, Pang et al. [11] proposed the probabilistic language term set (PLTS), which can present a set of multiple possible linguistic terms combined with corresponding probabilities.

However, there are two main paradoxes to this advanced linguistic term set. First, PLTS is essentially a set of points. When given a probability at a linguistic point, similar slightly better or worse linguistic terms are usually assigned a probability of zero. Even if the linguistic terms close to the original linguistic point are given probabilities, we can still find more subdivided linguistic terms with no probabilistic definition (or with zero probabilities). Additionally, previous studies have deliberately separated the smallest semantic terms from each other. This obviously does not accord with the actual human cognition. We think the linguistic terms are continuous and can be infinitely divided. Real cognition gives a linguistic interval, not a description of isolated points. For example, if the evaluation goes from "good" to "very good", each language terms in this range is possible.

Second, it is impossible to know the probability of every point or part of the points. Given a linguistic point probability will make the fuzzy event “clear,” which is a process of forcing the fuzzy event to be clarified. Such definitions and methods that provides too specific and clear information will eliminate ambiguity, but it will also lead to a large amount of deviations and untrue information.

In fact, the real situation is that people can only give partial semantic evaluations and give incomplete uncertainty, while most other semantic intervals are vague and do not need to be given personal certainty.

The information integration method based on PLTS set and its extensions is fundamentally flawed. For example, the score function of multiple linguistic term information is defined as the probability mean of them all. A typical example, however, is that something that is good in one context and bad in another, but cannot be "mediocre" which is a final integrated result. Or even more intuitive, in pairwise evaluations of PLTS preferred relationships, one item may be "better" or "worse" than the other, but never "the same." But the “the same” is just the calculated and used information in PLTS.

To overcome these paradoxes and defects, we develop a new double fuzzy probabilistic interval linguistic term set (DFPILTS) and its preferences relationship (DFPILPR) to reasonably reflect the ambiguity of human mind and decision-making process. They're based on semantic integrals and algorithms that we've defined.

In order to obtain the comparable values of alternatives in decision-making problems, all the attributes in the form of weight information need to be integrated. Due to the interaction of attributes in the real environment, the simplest weighting method based on attribute independence assumption is not applicable, the causal relationships between attributes and their evolution laws need to be deeply understood. The main challenge that dynamic environment brings to decision-makers is that reliable decision outcomes should be based not only on the current situation but also on historical conditions. The existing methods for determining attribute weights in dynamic conditions considers prior knowledge, experience and subjective preferences of DMs ignored in static conditions, such as TOPSIS oriented mixed weight method [12], entropy-based mixed weight method [13], PSO-based mixed weight method [14] and sparse integration method [15]. At present, there are two main methods of dynamic weight decision-making. One is to assume that the weights obey some mathematical distribution models within the considered time, such as geometric series, Poisson distribution, normal distribution, etc. [16]. These methods to determine the dynamic weights as time-oriented known functions in advance are to determine the dynamic periodic weights rather than the actual attribute weights, and the attribute weights are still static. The other is based on causal dependency reasoning, such as establishing Bayesian network to obtain the weight probabilities of attributes, and recalculate the attribute weights through updated information in each period [17]. However, this method strongly depends on the accuracy of updated information, and due to the limitations of the Bayesian theorem, the reasoning relationships between attributes are limited to the current period and cannot reflect

the intertemporal relationships. Because the relative importance relationships between attributes cannot change with time, this method is static in essence. In addition, the previous decision-making methods for multi-criteria decision making (MCDM) problems often rely on the DM's individual decision-making, which is difficult to ensure the accuracy and practicability of information. The group consensus decision-making with comprehensive consideration of DMs and experts group evaluations can effectively prevent the occurrence of deviation and make the information more stable. Therefore, the development of a double fuzzy probabilistic interval linguistic Markov Matrix (DFPILMM) and a more intuitionistic Markov directed network (DFPILMDN) with their dynamic attribute weight determination method that comprehensively covers the laws of intertemporal transformation of attribute events and to accurately represent the evaluation information provided by DMs is needed. The dynamic attribute weights obtained by the updated DFPILMDN model will realize changing over time based on the rationality of the attributes in the real sense.

B. Contributions of This Article

In summary, this paper aims to develop a double fuzzy probabilistic interval linguistic term set (DFPILTS) and its preferences relationship (DFPILPR) to reflect the uncertainty and decision making process. For this goal,

1) The concept of continuous linguistic term, fuzzy mass function, and definite integral of fuzzy linguistic terms. Some basic algorithms and aggregate operators for DFPILTS are provided.

2) A double fuzzy probabilistic interval linguistic Markov matrix (DFPILMM) and its directed network (DFPILMDN) which contains fuzzy relationships that deduces over time to obtain the dynamic weight of attributes are developed. They comprehensively cover the interactions and evolution laws between attributes. It comprehensively covers the interactions and intertemporal evolution laws between attributes.

3) A weight determination method based on distance measure and information entropy to reducing the inconsistency of DFPILPR and obtain collective priority vector based on group consensus process. And an aggregation-based multi-criteria decision making method is proposed.

This article finally provides a MCDM case study of determining the optimal venture capital problem under the financial crisis solved by the proposed DFPILTS and DFPILPR.

C. Structure of This Article

The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section II provides the preliminaries of the methods used and criticized in this article. Section III presents the DFPILTS and DFPILPR. Section IV provides the weight decision model for DFPILPRs. Section V provides DFPILMM, DFPILMDN and the new dynamic fuzzy decision making method. Section VI illustrates a case study of optimal venture capital selection. Section VII illustrates a comparison between DFPILTS and PLTS. Section VIII concludes this article.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Double Hierarchy Linguistic Term Set and Probabilistic Linguistic Term Set

Some basic concepts related to the DHLTS and PLTS will be introduced briefly.

Definition 1 [18]. Let $\bar{S}_O = \{s_{t(o_k)} \mid t \in [-\tau, \tau]; k \in [-\zeta, \zeta]\}$ be a DHLTS, $h = \{s_{t(o_k)} \mid s_{t(o_k)} \in \bar{S}_O; l = 1, 2, \dots, L; t \in [-\tau, \tau]; k \in [-\zeta, \zeta]\}$ be a double hierarchy hesitant fuzzy linguistic element (DHHFLE) with L being the number of DHLTs in h_{S_O} and $\gamma (0 \leq \gamma \leq 1)$ be a real number. Then the real number γ and the subscript (t, k) of the DHLT $s_{t(o_k)}$ which expresses the equivalent information to the real number γ can be transformed to each other by the following functions g and g^{-1} :

$$g: [-\tau, \tau] \times [-\zeta, \zeta] \rightarrow [0, 1], f(t, k) = \frac{k + (\tau + t)\zeta}{2\zeta\tau} \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}: [0, 1] &\rightarrow [-\tau, \tau] \times [-\zeta, \zeta], \\ g^{-1}(\gamma) &= [2\tau\gamma - \tau] \left\langle o_{\zeta(2\tau\gamma - \tau - [2\tau\gamma - \tau])} \right\rangle \\ &= [2\tau\gamma - \tau] + 1 \left\langle o_{\zeta((2\tau\gamma - \tau - [2\tau\gamma - \tau]) - 1)} \right\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Suppose that $s_{t(o_k)}$, $s_{t^1(o_{k^1})}$ and $s_{t^2(o_{k^2})}$

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}: [0, 1] &\rightarrow [-\tau, \tau] \times [-\zeta, \zeta], g^{-1}(\gamma) = [2\tau\gamma - \tau] \left\langle o_{\zeta(2\tau\gamma - \tau - [2\tau\gamma - \tau])} \right\rangle \\ &= [2\tau\gamma - \tau] + 1 \left\langle o_{\zeta((2\tau\gamma - \tau - [2\tau\gamma - \tau]) - 1)} \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

are three DHLTs, and $\lambda (0 \leq \lambda \leq 1)$ be a real number.

Some basic operations of DHLTs are [18]:

Addition :

$$s_{t^1(o_{k^1})} \oplus s_{t^2(o_{k^2})} = s_{t^1 + t^2(o_{k^1 + k^2})} \quad \text{if } t^1 + t^2 \leq \tau, k^1 + k^2 \leq \zeta$$

Multiplication: $\lambda s_{t(o_k)} = s_{\lambda t(o_k)}$

Definition 2 [11]. Let $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_l\}$ be a linguistic term set, a PLTS can be defined as

$$L(p) = \left\{ L^k(p^k) \mid L^k \in S, p^k \geq 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, \#L(p), \sum_{k=1}^{\#L(p)} p^k \leq 1 \right\}$$

where $L^k(p^k)$ is the linguistic term L^k associated with the probability p^k , and $\#L(p)$ is the number of all different linguistic terms in $L(p)$.

Let r^k be the subscript of linguistic term L^k . Then the score of $L(p)$ is:

$$E(L(p)) = s_{\bar{\alpha}} \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{\alpha} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\#L(p)} r^{(k)} p^{(k)}}{\sum_{k=1}^{\#L(p)} p^{(k)}}$, and the deviation degree is:

$$\sigma(L(p)) = \left(\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\#L(p)} (p^{(k)} (r^{(k)} - \bar{\alpha}))^2}{\sum_{k=1}^{\#L(p)} p^{(k)}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (4)$$

III. DOUBLE FUZZY PROBABILISTIC INTERVAL LINGUISTIC TERM SET AND ITS PREFERENCE RELATIONSHIP

First, the continuity of linguistic term interval is defined.

Definition 3.

Let $f: R' \rightarrow S' (R' \subset R, S' \subset S)$, for $\forall c \in R'$, if there exists a positive real number $\delta > 0$, for $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, allows $f(c) - \varepsilon < f(x) < f(c) + \varepsilon$ sets up for $c - \delta < x < c + \delta, \forall x \in R$, then linguistic term is called continuous in S' .

I use mathematics to illustrate the two paradoxes mentioned in Section I.

Paradox 1.

Let $S = \{s_{t(o_k)} \mid t \in [-\tau, \tau]; k \in [-\zeta, \zeta]\}$ be a DHLTS. If $[s_{a(o_b)}, s_{c(o_d)}]$ is continuous, and exist $p(s_{k(o_i)}) = p_1, p(s_{k(o_{i+\xi})}) = p_1 + \varepsilon (s_{k(o_i)} \in [s_{a(o_b)}, s_{c(o_d)}]; \xi, \varepsilon > 0)$, there always exist a linguistic term $s_{k(o_{i+\xi/2})}$ that not be mentioned has the probability $p(s_{k(o_{i+\xi/2})}) = 0$.

It is unreasonable that the closer linguistic term has no possibility.

Therefore, $p(s_{k(o_i)})$ should be expanded to continuous in $[s_{a(o_b)}, s_{c(o_d)}]$.




Fig. 1. The cumulative probability paradox.

As shown in Fig. 1, $p(h)$ is defined as a function for $h \rightarrow p(h \in S, p \in [0, 1])$

Let $p(h)$ represent the probability at the linguistic term h and $\xi_i \rightarrow 0$.

Let $p(s_{t < o_i >}) = p_1$. Based on the belief that probabilities should be similar for very small changes, and let $p(s_{t < o_{k+\xi_i} >}) = p_2 = p_1 - \lambda$.

Similarly, let $p(s_{t < o_{k+\xi_i/2} >}) = p_3$ and $p_2 = p_1 - \lambda < p_3 < p_1$ can be obtained.

Let $p(s_{t \left\langle o_{k+\xi_i/2^{n-2}} \right\rangle}) = p_n$ and thus

$p_2 = p_1 - \lambda < p_3 < \dots < p_{n-1} < p_n < p_1$ can be obtained.

Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i > \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_1 + (n-1)\lambda - 1 \rightarrow \infty > 0$, which contradicts $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$.

Paradox 2.




Fig. 2. The linguistic expectation paradox.

In a linguistic-probability distribution function, the evaluation information is mixed with many unknown cases. The score function in Eq. (3) in PLTS often tends to fall into low-probability linguistic terms, or into completely ignorant linguistic terms.

For example, Fig. 2 shows all the known linguistic evaluations something given by an expert. This linguistic term-probability function is symmetrically distributed along the linguistic median. Based on Eq. (3), $E(L(p))$ will be equal to, which means the score will fall into the semantic evaluation with the lowest probability. This will create unreasonable evaluation information and make difficulty for the accurate decision making. The practical significance of this contradiction is that, based on the current limited

information, the expert thinks that alternative is likely to be good in some cases and bad in others, but the specific circumstances are unknown at present. Experts consider the probability of the item being "mediocre" to be very small or impossible, but the score, which represents this set of linguistic terms, uses the value represented the most unlikely linguistic term. This limitation is even more pronounced in preference relationships: one alternative may be much better or much worse than another, but it is never "the same". However, the result is exactly in the case of the smallest probability, no matter what its variance is, it is obviously unreasonable to represent the whole set of possible linguistic terms with this evaluation approach. In order to solve this problem, it is necessary to filter the evaluation of linguistic terms in the maximum probability case.

As mentioned in Section I, linguistic terms are continuous and not isolated. People tend to provide probabilities for continuous fuzzy intervals. In addition, the complete probability distribution of these linguistic terms is usually not easy to be provided accurately. In order to solve the above two paradoxes, I describe the following set of language terms to fit the actual situation:

Definition 4. Let $S = \{s_{t \langle o_k \rangle} \mid t \in [-\tau, \tau]; k \in [-\zeta, \zeta]\}$ be a continuous DHLTS, a DHPLTS can be defined as:

$$I(fd) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} I^k(fd^k) = \left\langle [h_l^k, h_r^k], fd^k \right\rangle \mid s_{t \langle o_\zeta \rangle} \geq h_r^k \geq h_l^k \geq s_{-t \langle o_{-\zeta} \rangle}, \\ k = 1, 2, \dots, \#I(fd), 1 \geq fd^k \geq 0, \sum_{k=1}^{\#I(fd)} fd^k \leq 1 \end{array} \right\}$$

where $I^k(fd^k)$ is the interval linguistic term I^k associated with the fuzzy degree fd^k , and $\#I(fd)$ is the number of all different linguistic terms in $I(fd)$.

Note that if $\sum_{k=1}^{\#I(fd)} fd^k = 0$, then the evaluation interval has covered the complete information of all possible linguistic terms; if $\sum_{k=1}^{\#I(fd)} fd^k > 0$, then partial uncertainty exists because current knowledge is not enough to provide complete assessment information. $\sum_{k=1}^{\#I(fd)} fd^k = 1$ means completely uncertainty.

Definition 5. Let $I^k(fd^k)$ be a DFPILTS, then

$$p^k = 1 - fd^k \quad (5)$$

where p^k is the probability of the interval I^k covering the complete information in the DM's mind.

The definition of the peak double fuzzy probabilistic interval linguistic term set (PDFPILTS) is given:

Definition 6. Let $I(fd)$ be a DFPILTS, a PDFPILTS can be defined as:

$$I(p) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left\langle [h_l^c, h_r^c], p^c \right\rangle \mid s_{\tau(o_c)} \geq h_r^c \geq h_l^c \geq s_{-\tau(o_c)}, \\ c \in 1, 2, \dots, \#I(fd), p^c \geq \forall (1 - fd^k), k = 1, 2, \dots, \#I(fd), \\ 1 \geq fd \geq 0, \sum_{k=1}^{\#I(fd)} fd^k \leq 1 \end{array} \right\}$$

where $I(p)$ represents linguistic term set interval with minimum fuzzy degree in $I^k(fd)$.

If the interval with the minimum fd is $[h_a, h_b]$, Then the relationship between p and fd is

$$\begin{aligned} p &= 1 - \min\{fd_1, fd_2, \dots, fd_n\} \\ &= 1 - \int_{h_a}^{h_b} g(h)dh = \int_{h_a}^{h_b} f(h)dh \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In order to describe the probability accumulation, it is necessary to linguistic define integral first.

Definition 7.

If the function $f(h)$ is continuous in the interval , and there exists an original function in the mapped real number interval $[g(h_a), g(h_b)]$, then there exists

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{h_a}^{h_b} f(h)dh &= \lim_{\|\Delta h_i\| \rightarrow s_0(o_0)} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\xi_i) \Delta h_i \\ &= \lim_{\|\Delta g(h_i)\| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\xi_i) \Delta g(h_i) \\ &= F(g(h_b)) - F(g(h_a)) = F(g(h)) \Big|_{g(h_a)}^{g(h_b)} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

which is called the linguistic definite integral. And the transition relationship between linguistic term and real number term:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{h_a}^{h_b} f(h)dh &= \int_{g(h_a)}^{g(h_b)} f(h)dg(h) \\ &= \int_{x_a}^{x_b} f(g^{-1}(x))dx, h \in S, x \in R \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $f, g: S \rightarrow R$ and $g^{-1}: R \rightarrow S$.

If $f(h)$ is a continuous function in $[h_A, h_B](h_A \leq h_a \leq h_b \leq h_B)$, its definite integral satisfy the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{h_a}^{h_a} f(h)dh &= 0 \\ \int_{h_a}^{h_b} f(h)dh &= - \int_{h_b}^{h_a} f(h)dh \end{aligned}$$

In order to make the concept more intuitive and understandable, Fig. 3 is a DFPILTS image.

$g(h)$ is the fuzzy density function. Its points' value represents the no real meaning but the integral in a linguistic term interval is the fuzzy degree of the real linguistic term falling in to the interval.

The fuzzy degree fd is provided by the expert for the part with his some certainty to represent the uncertainty that

the evaluation falling in the provided interval ("partial fuzzy" intervals). The intervals (fuzzy intervals) that do not be provided with a fuzzy degree represent complete ignorance. In Fig. 3, the dashed lines represent the linguistic terms of completely unknown existence and the corresponding fuzzy density does not exist. fd is the area enclosed by the linguistic interval and the fuzzy density function, is directly provided by experts, and also is the first hierarchy of fuzzy, which represents the degree of ambiguity relative to the linguistic whole, the fuzzy density distribution in each partial fuzzy interval is the second hierarchy of fuzzy information. The interval with the minimum fuzzy degree is selected as the peak probability distribution interval provided by the expert to be extracted and integrated for the most valuable information (Fig. 4).




Fig. 3. DFPILTS.




Fig. 4. PDFPILTS.

In order to put forward a method to compare DFPILTS, in the following, the linguistic expectation of DFPILTS is firstly defined:

Definition

8.

Let

$$I(p) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left\langle [h_r^c, h_l^c], p^c \right\rangle | s_{\tau < o_{\tau}} \geq h_r^c \geq h_l^c \geq s_{-\tau < o_{-\tau}}, \\ c \in 1, 2, \dots, \#I(fd), p^c \in \forall (1 - fd^k), k = 1, 2, \dots, \#I(fd), \\ 1 \geq fd \geq 0, \sum_{k=1}^{\#I(fd)} fd^k \leq 1 \end{array} \right\}$$

be a PDFPILTS, the linguistic expectation of $I(p)$ is

$$h_{\mu}(I(p)) = \int_{h_l^c}^{h_r^c} hf(h)dh = g^{-1} \left(\int_{g(h_l^c)}^{g(h_r^c)} g(h)f(g(h))dg(h) \right) \quad (9)$$

and the score of $I(p)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} E(I(p)) &= \mu = E(hf(h)) = g \left(\int_{h_l^c}^{h_r^c} hf(h)dh \right) \\ &= \int_{g(h_l^c)}^{g(h_r^c)} g(h)f(g(h))dg(h) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $f(h)$ is the probabilistic mass distribution in the interval $[h_l^c, h_r^c]$.

Definition 9. Let $I(p)$ be a PDFPILTS and the linguistic expectation of $I(p)$ is h_{μ} , then the linguistic standard deviation of PDFPILTS is

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\sigma}(I(p)) &= \int_{h_l}^{h_r} (h - h_{\mu})^2 f(h)dh \\ &= g^{-1} \left(\int_{g(h_l)}^{g(h_r)} (g(h) - g(h_{\mu}))^2 f(g(h))dh + g(s_{0(o_0)}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the added $g(s_{0(o_0)})$ is to make the linguistic deviation satisfy linguistic standard deviation additive in the linguistic interval.

The standard deviation of DFPIILTS is

$$\sigma(I(p)) = g \left(\int_{h_l}^{h_r} (h - h_{\mu})^2 f(h)dh \right) \quad (12)$$

Therefore, in the as far as possible small and fine fuzzy linguistic interval provided by the expert, it is important to characterize the function of $f(h) \cdot [h_a, h_b]$

After define the as far as possible small and fine fuzzy interval, linguistic terms in consciousness can be assumed to have a completely random and independent distribution, that is, the linguistic terms in the interval with the minimum fuzzy degree obey the normal distribution (Fig. 5). This function describes the probability density around the most certain value in human consciousness decreases gradually.

A kind of standard deviation based on the normal distribution probability density function is given:

$$\sigma(I(p)) = 1 / 6(g(h_r^c) - g(h_l^c)) \quad (13)$$

The linguistic standard deviation is

$$h_{\sigma} = g^{-1} \left(1 / 6(g(h_r^c) - g(h_l^c)) + g(s_{0(o_0)}) \right) \quad (14)$$

The rationality of this description lies in that each expert is required to give a minimum interval of 99.73% (can be considered as 100%) in the interval of the minimum fuzzy degree (the probability of information falling outside the given interval is very small). The interval is the range of 6σ . It enhances the convenience of data acquisition. It makes up for the deficiency of PLTs: given the probability at a semantic point, there are always similar undefined linguistic terms representing slightly better and worse, and the probability is 0.

Giving the probability to the interval and the probability density without practical significance to the linguistic point will effectively improve the existing shortcomings. It means that in the area closer to the exact value in consciousness, the probability of falling into the interval under the same interval width is greater. With the expansion of the linguistic interval, the cumulative probability increases.

The operations of PDFPILTS depend on the specific probability distribution, and the interval algorithms based on normal distribution can be given:

Addition:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 \oplus I_2 &= [g^{-1}(\mu_1 + \mu_2 - 3(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}), g^{-1}(\mu_1 + \mu_2 + 3(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}})] \\ &= [1/2(g(h_l^1) + g(h_l^2) + g(h_r^1) + g(h_r^2) - 3((1/6(g(h_l^1) - g(h_l^2)))^2 + (1/6(g(h_r^1) - g(h_r^2)))^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}), \\ &1/2(g(h_l^1) + g(h_l^2) + g(h_r^1) + g(h_r^2) + 3((1/6(g(h_l^1) - g(h_l^2)))^2 + (1/6(g(h_r^1) - g(h_r^2)))^2)^{\frac{1}{2}})] \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Multiplication:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 \otimes I_2 &= \\ &= \left[\frac{\mu_1 \sigma_2^2 + \mu_2 \sigma_1^2}{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2} - 3 \left(\frac{\sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2}{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \frac{\mu_1 \sigma_2^2 + \mu_2 \sigma_1^2}{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2} + 3 \left(\frac{\sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2}{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Multiplication:

$$\lambda I_1 = [\lambda \mu_1 - 3\lambda \sigma_1, \lambda \mu_1 + 3\lambda \sigma_1]$$

Definition 10. Given two DFPIILTSs $I_1(p)$ and $I_2(p)$, Let $E(I(p))$ be and $\sigma(I(p))$ be the score and deviation of $I(p)$ respectively. Then

- (I) If $E(I_1(p)) > E(I_2(p))$, then $I_1(p) > I_2(p)$.
- (II) If $E(I_1(p)) < E(I_2(p))$, then $I_1(p) < I_2(p)$.
- (III) If $E(I_1(p)) = E(I_2(p))$, then
 - (i) If $\sigma(I_1(p)) > \sigma(I_2(p))$, then $I_1(p) < I_2(p)$.
 - (ii) If $\sigma(I_1(p)) = \sigma(I_2(p))$, then $I_1(p) = I_2(p)$.
 - (iii) If $\sigma(I_1(p)) < \sigma(I_2(p))$, then $I_1(p) > I_2(p)$.




Fig. 5. Linguistic normal distribution in the minimum fuzzy degree interval.

The double fuzzy probabilistic interval linguistic preference relationship can be defined as:

Definition 11. Let $S_o = \{s_{t\langle o_k \rangle} | t \in [-\tau, \tau]; k \in [-\zeta, \zeta]\}$ be a continuous DHLTS. An additive DHPLPR \mathfrak{R} is presented by a matrix $\mathfrak{R} = (I_{ij}(p))_{m \times m} = ([h_{ij}^l, h_{ij}^r], p_{ij})_{m \times m} \subset A \times A$, where $[h_{ij}^l, h_{ij}^r]$ is the preference value interval and

$h_{ij}^l, h_{ij}^r \in S_O(i, j=1, 2, \dots, m)$ are two DHLTs, indicating the degree interval with the least fuzzy degree $fd_{ij}^c = 1 - p_{ij}(p_{ij}, fd_{ij}^c \in [0, 1])$ of the alternative A_i over A_j . For all $i, j=1, 2, \dots, m$, satisfies the conditions $h_{ij}^l \oplus h_{ji}^r = s_{0(O_0)}$, $p_{ij} = p_{ji}$ and $[h_{ii}, h_{ii}] = s_{0(O_0)}$.

The lager p_{ij} is, the less fuzzy degree of a preference value interval is. $p_{ij} = 1$ represents that the actual result will clearly fall into the interval provided in the mind of the expert.

IV. THE CONSENSUS MEASURE AND WEIGHT DETERMINATION METHOD FOR DFPILPRS

In GDM problems, after obtaining the DFPILPRs provided by the experts, the next step is to ensure the decision result towards the collective consensus. Therefore, a suitable consensus reaching model for DFPILPRs needs to be developed. In order to achieve this goal, not only the deviation between the individuals and the group, but also the inconsistency of experts' own DFPILPR opinions need to be measured. Based on these, this section mainly proposes distance measure method and information entropy measure method for DFPILPRs. An expert weight determination method for DFPILPRs is also proposed. These information is integrated into the expert weight and finally a reasonable priority for alternatives is obtained.

A. Distance Measure Method of Collective Opinions

In the process of expert weight and consensus, it is very important to determine the degree of deviation between individual opinion and collective opinion. To properly measure this dispersion, the distance among them should be measured.

Let the provided DFPILTS of expert e^k are $\mathfrak{R}^k = (I_{ij}^k(p))_{m \times m} = ([h_{ij}^{kl}, h_{ij}^{kr}], p_{ij}^k)_{m \times m} (k=1, 2, \dots, n)$.

Firstly, the distance between DFPILTSs is defined.

Definition 12. Let $\mathfrak{R}^k = ([h_{ij}^{kl}, h_{ij}^{kr}], p_{ij}^k)_{m \times m} (k=p, q)$ be two DFPILPRs. The distance between them can be obtained by

$$d_{pq} = d(\mathfrak{R}^p, \mathfrak{R}^q) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{m(m-1)} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{i < j}^m \left(g \left(\int_{h_{ij}^{p(l)}}^{h_{ij}^{p(r)}} h_{ij}^p f(h) dh \right) \times p_{ij}^p - g \left(\int_{h_{ij}^{q(l)}}^{h_{ij}^{q(r)}} h_{ij}^q f(h) dh \right) \times p_{ij}^q \right)^2} \quad (17)$$

The distance matrix can be obtained as:

$$(d_{jk})_{n \times n} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d_{12} & \cdots & d_{1n} \\ d_{21} & 0 & \cdots & d_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ d_{n1} & d_{n2} & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

In GDM, the outer deviation weight of each expert from the group can be obtained by

$$\omega_k^{out} = \sum_{j=1}^n d_{zk} / \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n d_{jk} \quad (18)$$

The larger ω_k^{out} means the lower information entropy of the

expert e^k who should be given the larger weight.

B. Inconsistency Measure and Adjustment Method

The DFPILPR is generally not consistent. A consistent DFPILPR $\mathfrak{R} = (I_{ij}(p))_{m \times m} = ([h_{ij}^l, h_{ij}^r], p_{ij})_{m \times m}$ satisfies

$$g \left(\int_{h_{ij}^l}^{h_{ij}^r} h_{ij} f(h) dh \right) = g \left(\int_{h_{ik}^l}^{h_{ik}^r} h_{ik} f(h) dh \right) - g \left(\int_{h_{jk}^l}^{h_{jk}^r} h_{jk} f(h) dh \right) + g(s_{0(O_0)}),$$

for $\forall i, j, k$. Therefore, if $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_m)^T$ is the priority vector of the consistent DFPILPR, there exists

$$g \left(\int_{h_{ij}^l}^{h_{ij}^r} h_{ij} f(h) dh \right) = w_i - w_j + g(s_{0(O_0)}), \quad i, j=1, 2, \dots, m \quad (19)$$

Information entropy indicates the uncertainty degree and the randomness of evaluation information. Information entropy can be used to measure the inconsistencies within each DFPILPR and establish an expert weight distribution system to improve consistency.

The deviation between the preference element and the corresponding consistent preference element can be obtained by the following definition:

Definition 13. Let $I_{ij}^k(p)$ be a PDFILPR element for expert e^k , the direct preference score is $E(I_{ij}^k(p))$, and the indirect preference score is

$$E(I_{ij}^{A_{-v}}(p)) = E(I_{ij}^k(p)) - E(I_{vi}^k(p)) (v \neq i \neq j, i < j)$$

Where $-v$ represents the A_v alternative be regarded as the reference to make an indirect comparison between A_i and A_j .

The direct preference and the indirect preference for a consistent DFPILPR satisfy the following relationship:

$$E(I_{ij}^k(p)) = E(I_{ij}^{A_{-v}}(p)) + g(s_{0(O_0)}) \quad (20)$$

The distance between the direct preference and the indirect preferences defined as:

$$d(I_{ij}^{A_{-v}}(p)) = E(I_{ij}^k(p)) - E(I_{ij}^{A_{-v}}(p)) + g(s_{0(O_0)}) \quad (21)$$

where the $g(s_{0(O_0)})$ is added to ensure the distance is nonnegative.

The deviation is defined as following to satisfy the linguistic nonnegative ($g^{-1}(D(I_{ij}^{A_{-v}}(p))) \geq h_{0(O_0)}$):

$$D(I_{ij}^{A_{-v}}(p)) = \begin{cases} d(I_{ij}^k(p), I_{ij}^{A_{-v}}(p)), \\ E(I_{ij}^{A_{-v}}(p)) \geq 0 \\ 2 \times g(s_{0(O_0)}) - d(I_{ij}^k(p), I_{ij}^{A_{-v}}(p)), \\ E(I_{ij}^{A_{-v}}(p)) < 0 \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

The inner deviation degree for expert e^k is defined as

$$u^k = \sum_{v=1}^m u_{-v}^k = \sum_{v=1}^m \sum_{i \neq v} \sum_{i < j} D(I_{ij}^{A_{-v}}(p)) - m(m-1)g(s_{0(O_0)}) \quad (23)$$

The information entropy of expert e^k is

$$le(u^k) = -\frac{1}{\log_2 m} \cdot p^k \log_2 p^k \quad (24)$$

where $p^k = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m u_{-v}^k}{\sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{v=1}^m u_{-v}^k}$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots, n$).

In GDM, the weight represented the consistence of expert e^k can be obtained by

$$\omega_k^{in} = \frac{(le(u^k))^{-1}}{\sum_{n=1}^n (le(u^k))^{-1}} \quad (25)$$

The inner deviation weight represents the degree of difference between “indirect preferences” and “direct preferences”. The smaller the information entropy is, the bigger the certainty degree will be, which means that the corresponding expert plays a significant role and it is necessary to give the expert a bigger weight. The larger ω_k^{in} means the lower information entropy of the expert e^k who should be given the larger weight.

C. Weight Determination Method for DFPILPRs

Experts may provide evaluations that deliberately deviate from accurate information for their own interests. In addition to partially eliminating this outlier by outer distance weight, the DM can directly provide the degree of trust measured by percentage. The greater the degree of trust should be given the higher the weight. This degree of trust is directly applied to weight calculation. Trust degree weight is defined as DM's evaluation information on expert, which can be interpreted as the trust for experts. It can be obtained by the DM directly and denoted by $\psi^k \in [0\%, 100\%]$ ($k = \dots n$). Then the subjective weight $\omega_k^{O_1}$ of each expert can be obtained by normalizing the evaluation information as:

$$\omega_k^{tru} = \psi^k / \sum_{k=1}^n \psi^k \quad (26)$$

The distinction of the DMs and the experts who try to reach group consensus through the trust weight and the division of the decision making into double layers are necessary: the expert groups provide two kinds of expert weights and the DMs provides one in the form of designed model. The weighting of the weights and the use of decision information are reasonably integrated in the upper layer (DMs).

To determine the weight for each expert comprehensively and accurately, the combination of the weights represented the distances between each individual and the collective consensus evaluations and the weight for improving consistence is necessary. The weight for expert e^k is

$$\omega_k = \alpha \omega_k^{out} + \beta \omega_k^{in} + \gamma \omega_k^{tru} \quad (27)$$

where $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 1$ ($\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in [0, 1]$).

Then the collective priorities and their vector w^c can be obtained by

$$\min \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n p_{ij}^k \left(\frac{1}{2} \times (w_i^c - w_j^c) \right)$$

Model 1.

$$-g \left(\int_{h_{(y)}^k}^{h_{r(y)}^k} h_{ij}^k f(h) dh \right) + g \left(s_{0(a_0)} \right)^2$$

$$s.t. \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^c = 1, \\ w_i^c > 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, m \end{cases}$$

where the adjustment coefficient $\frac{1}{2}$ is used to ensure that the range of the term in the square is restricted to $[-1, 1]$.

V. DYNAMIC DOUBLE FUZZY PROBABILISTIC INTERVAL LINGUISTIC DECISION MAKING MODEL

A. Conceptual Framework for Dynamic DFPILDMM in GDM

In a risk event, one of the most prominent features should be a dynamically evolving environment, which can be described as an intertemporal evolutionary condition. The rapid evolution and abruptness of risks result in a lack of accurate data. It is very difficult to obtain complete information at any period due to the unknown relationship of risk evolution and the vague judgment of the initial situation. In the initial phase, most of the information available is provided by empirical knowledge and historical data. In addition, the judgment given by different experts in the face of the same information is often quite different, which further aggregates the uncertainty of decision-making. What's more, the real situation for DMs is usually a multi-factor game and the primary and secondary relationships of the importance of factors must be considered. For these reasons, DMs need to effectively identify the information available and aggregate it efficiently in the face of uncertainty. At the same time, how to reach a cautious and reasonable group consensus for emergency situations is also extremely important. The Markov process can describe the causality and generation mechanism of data comprehensively in the data inference model making it becomes an ideal analytical tool to deal with more complex evolutionary relations including cyclic derivation relations, reversible derivation relations which can obtain effective information.

After fusing DFPILTS into Markov matrix to construct DFPILMM and its directed network (DFPILMDN), a comprehensive and effective method for dynamic attribute weight decision making is provided, especially for the derivation of fuzzy attribute relations in emergency situations. When dealing with attribute weights, the importance of attributes changes with the evolution of the environment. As mentioned in section I, the generalized weight information calculated by the assumed distribution function is actually inaccurate. When dealing with decision-making information, expert groups can update it according to the current situation in different periods. Most of the existing decision-making methods accept that the decision information is presented in advance and the influence of the objective information of environmental change are often ignored.

Based on the analyses above, a conceptual framework for dynamic DFPILMDN combined with group consensus model for DFPILPRs is proposed to better solve the unconventional risk decision making problems respectively. The new decision making framework features the practical dynamic information in real situations and integrates the DFPILMDN into the whole decision making process (Fig. 6).

The framework is divided into two parts, one is attribute weight determination with DFPILMDN, and the other is alternative priority decision making with DFPILPR. By inputting the information provided by the real environment into the MDN system, the historical knowledge and the updated information are well integrated in the actual evolutionary relationships. Then MDN provides real-time reasoning results according to decision information and attribute weights, which are the key factors in the later decision-making process. Finally, the optimal ordering result is obtained by using the appropriate aggregation approach.




Fig. 6. The conceptual intertemporal dynamic fuzzy decision making model.

In the following sections, I will discuss in detail the implementation of each part in determining the final rank.

B. Double Fuzzy Probabilistic Interval Linguistic Markov Directed Network

The Markov matrix method relies on the idea of encoding dynamic transfer data in time series into complex networks. I construct complex networks based on the transition probability of the Markov model.

As the intuitionistic relationship of the Markov matrix, the Markov chain can be defined as:

Definition 9 [19]. If the sequence states are $\dots X_{t-2}, X_{t-1}, X_t, X_{t+1}, \dots$,

where t is the period sequence, the conditional probability of X_{t+1} is only dependent on X_t :

$$P(X_{t+1} | \dots X_{t-2}, X_{t-1}, X_t, \dots) = P(X_{t+1} | X_t) \quad (28)$$

The Markov matrix is $M = (P_{ij})_{m \times m}$ or

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & \dots & P_{1n} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ P_{n1} & \dots & P_{nm} \end{bmatrix}.$$

That is, Markov matrix assumes that the probability of state transition at a certain time only depends on its previous state. P_{ij} represents the probability of the state X_i transferring to the state X_j in the next period. Therefore, Markov matrix can form probability transition network.

Definition 10. The DFPILMM of expert e^k is

$$M^k = (I_{ij}(p))_{m \times m} (k = 1, 2, \dots, n) \quad (29)$$

or

$$M^k = \begin{bmatrix} I_{11}(p) & \dots & I_{1n}(p) \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ I_{n1}(p) & \dots & I_{nm}(p) \end{bmatrix}$$

The double fuzzy probabilistic interval linguistic Markov directed network (DFPILMDN) can be constructed by DFPILMM.

In general, In the process of constructing Markov matrix, because the situation is based on historical information to determine the probabilistic transformation relationships, the experts' opinions are relatively unified and the fuzzy degrees are small. A method based on the least square approach is adopted to determine the collective priority vectors.

$$\min \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n p_{ij}^k (P_{ij} - g(\int_{h_{ij}^k}^{h_{ij}^k} h_{ij}^k f(h) dh))^2$$

Model 2.

$$s.t. \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij} = 1, \\ P_{ij} > 0, i, j = 1, 2, \dots, m. \end{cases}$$

Using Model 2, n experts' opinions can be integrated and the Markov matrix $M = (P_{ij})_{m \times m}$ can be obtained.

In the process of judging alternatives, the opinions of experts differ greatly, so taking collective opinions and reducing the weight of experts whose opinions deviate from the group is needed to obtain more targeted collective opinions.

Use Model 2 and set the iterations Z in the first period. The initial risk probability is updated and an iteration is added in each next period. The risk probabilities of each period is obtained as the weight ω_q^t ($t = 1, 2, \dots, T; q = 1, 2, \dots, Q$).

C. Dynamic Double Fuzzy Probabilistic Interval Linguistic Decision Making Model

With the aid of the DFPILMDN and DFPILPRs, a dynamic decision making approach in the framework of the DFPILTS

is proposed. The general procedure of the dynamic decision making approach under fuzzy environments is can be illustrated as:

Step 1. Construct the actual Markov directed network.

Each expert provides DFPILMM $M^k = (I_{ij}(p))_{m \times m}^k$ to establish the probabilistic transformation relations of adjacent periods. Use Model 2 to obtain Markov matrix.

Step 2. Calculate the weight of each risk attribute in all periods.

Use the Markov matrix and set the iterations Z in the first period. The initial risk probability is updated and an iteration is added in each next period. The risk probabilities of each period is obtained as the weight ω_q^t ($t = 1, 2, \dots, T; q = 1, 2, \dots, Q$).

Step 3. Establish the DFPILPRs model and reach the group consensus.

Generate $n \times Q$ DFPILPRs $\mathfrak{R}_q^k = I_{ij}(p)_{m \times m}^k$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots, n; q = 1, 2, \dots, Q$) for each risk attribute to be investigated. Generate trust degrees and allocation weights for the three kind of expert weights. Use Eqs. (17)-(27) to obtain the expert weights. Then, use Model 1 to obtain the collective priority vectors $w_q = (w_q^1, w_q^2, \dots, w_q^x)^T$ ($x = 1, 2, \dots, m, q = 1, 2, \dots, Q$) which are used to construct alternative priorities.

Step 4. Calculate the comparable values. Calculate the comprehensive comparable values for the alternatives by aggregating the information at different periods using

$$U_x = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{q=1}^Q \omega_q^t w_q^x \quad (x = 1, 2, \dots, m) \quad (30)$$

Step 5. Obtain the optimal alternative. Rank U_x . The optimal option is the alternative with the largest U_x .

With the aid of aggregation operators, DFPILMDN and the preference information provided by DFPILPRs can be completely aggregated without losing information. The general process of double fuzzy probabilistic interval linguistic decision making for GDM under risk events is shown in Fig. 7. The model first gives the dynamic attributes that need to be considered in the decision problem and then analyzes the internal influencing factors and their causality. The evolution law of each attribute provided by DFPILMMs and event-related update information jointly completed the construction of DFPILMDN, enabling us to obtain dynamic intertemporal attribute weight information. Then, for each risk attribute, the collective priority vector of the alternatives can be obtained through the DFPILPRs and its group consensus approach. Finally, all the risk attributes are synthesized through the weighted aggregation method to obtain comparable values for the considered alternatives. the DMs sorts the alternatives and obtain the optimal solution.




Fig. 7. General procedures of DFPILMDM.

VI. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

In this section, the risk decision making problems of financial crisis utilizing the proposed linguistic term set and decision making approach will be discussed. The transmission of the butterfly effect and the vicious circle are some of the most dangerous hazards in a financial crisis. The financial crisis greatly threatens the psychological expectations of people and the future decisions of enterprises. While the financial crisis often occurs with many signs but they are difficult to discern and predict severity in the early stage, and easily cause sudden and unexpected consequences, it is not simple to predict accurately the risk with the most probability and make full preparations and emergency actions in advance. The quality and effectiveness of the risk plans will directly affect the later risk actions, and thus influence the evolution of disasters and the subsequent losses. As a result, the evaluation and decision of the given risk plans with simulations is necessary for the risk response of financial crisis.

Assume that there are four alternatives (enterprises or programs) with similar expected rates of return and variance to

be considered for a sustained time when there is a risk of a financial crisis. The DMs set the decision attributes to be the ability to protect against interest rate risk (denoted as IRR), asset liquidity risk (denoted as ALR), financing liquidity risk (denoted as FLR), and credit risk (denoted as CR). Based on the general evolving principle and the characteristics of the financial accidents, the Markov directed network relations can be obtained. The interest rate situation in an emergency is reflexive. Interest rate is not only the comprehensive result of market economic activities but also the comprehensive expectation of major market participants. It reflects the current and future economic trend, and has a strong predictive effect on the occurrence of economic crisis, and affects the risk of asset liquidity and financing liquidity of enterprises. The scale of liquidity risk may cause the risk of capital chain fracture and operation difficulties of customer enterprises. These situations may cause customer enterprises to default and adversely affect the follow-up stable work. At the same time, interest rate risk, asset liquidity risk, financing liquidity risk, and credit risk in the crisis can be transmitted by themselves and each other to produce a vicious circle.

TABLE I
THE PREDICTED PROBABILITIES OF IRR

Periods	IRR
Period I	0.25
Period II	0.80
Period III	1.00

For the sake of simplicity, the focus of the financial crisis is only on the influence of the scale and severity of a local group of enterprises in this case. Each period represents a particularly short discrete time. The risk probabilities in the Markov matrix can indicate the scale and severity of the risk. Consequently, the DFPILMDN of the financial crisis can be constructed after integrating the DFPILMMs, as shown in Fig. 8.




Fig. 8. The DFPILMDN of the risk events in financial risk.

In the initial period, the emergency events occur with less probability, and thus, the available information for the future evolution and prediction is not that sufficient. With the appearance of new risk situations and chain reactions, the

events will turn worse. The chance of the subsequent risks triggered by the original emergent events also increases. Suppose that the accident has gone through three periods during the involving process. The three periods correspond to the initial stage, development stage and outbreak stage. In each period, the updated information of the initial risk (IRR) probabilities, which are shown in Table I, can be acquired. In addition, a method of reshaping the initial risk probabilities in the first period and restarting the Markov iterations for different periods are used to get the most accurate current risk information.

The linguistic range should be defined first:

$$S = \{s_{-4} = \text{extremely bad}, s_{-3} = \text{very bad}, s_{-2} = \text{bad}, s_{-1} = \text{slightly bad},$$

$$s_0 = \text{equal}, s_1 = \text{slightly good}, s_2 = \text{good}, s_3 = \text{very good}, s_4 = \text{extremely good} \}$$

$$O = \{o_{-4} = \text{far from}, o_{-3} = \text{scarcely}, o_{-2} = \text{only a little}, o_{-1} = \text{a little},$$

$$o_0 = \text{just right}, o_1 = \text{much}, o_2 = \text{very much}, o_3 = \text{extremely much}, o_4 = \text{entirely} \}$$

The DFPILMMs $M^k = (I_{ij}^k(p))_{4 \times 4}$ ($k = 1, 2, 3, 4$) are obtained:

$$M^1 = \begin{pmatrix} ([s_{0(o_3)}, s_{0(o_1)}], 0.8) & ([s_{-2(o_2)}, s_{-2(o_1)}], 0.9) & ([s_{1(o_2)}, s_{1(o_1)}], 0.7) & ([s_{1(o_2)}, s_{2(o_2)}], 0.8) \\ (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.8) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{3(o_2)}], 0.9) \\ (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{3(o_0)}, s_{3(o_2)}], 0.8) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.7) \\ ([s_{2(o_1)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.9) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{3(o_2)}], 0.8) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M^2 = \begin{pmatrix} ([s_{0(o_3)}, s_{0(o_1)}], 0.9) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.8) & ([s_{1(o_2)}, s_{1(o_1)}], 0.8) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.7) \\ (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.7) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{3(o_2)}], 0.8) \\ (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{3(o_0)}, s_{3(o_1)}], 0.9) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.8) \\ ([s_{3(o_1)}, s_{3(o_1)}], 0.9) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{3(o_2)}], 0.9) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M^3 = \begin{pmatrix} ([s_{0(o_3)}, s_{0(o_2)}], 0.9) & ([s_{2(o_1)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.8) & ([s_{1(o_2)}, s_{1(o_2)}], 0.8) & ([s_{-2(o_1)}, s_{-2(o_2)}], 0.7) \\ (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_1)}, s_{2(o_2)}], 0.7) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{3(o_2)}], 0.8) \\ (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{3(o_1)}, s_{3(o_0)}], 0.7) & ([s_{2(o_1)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.8) \\ ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.8) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{3(o_1)}], 0.9) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M^4 = \begin{pmatrix} ([s_{0(o_3)}, s_{0(o_1)}], 0.8) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.7) & ([s_{1(o_2)}, s_{1(o_2)}], 0.7) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{2(o_2)}], 0.8) \\ (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.8) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{3(o_2)}], 0.9) \\ (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{3(o_0)}, s_{3(o_1)}], 0.8) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{2(o_1)}], 0.8) \\ ([s_{3(o_2)}, s_{3(o_1)}], 0.9) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & (s_{-4(o_0)}, 1) & ([s_{2(o_2)}, s_{3(o_2)}], 0.9) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Based on Step. 1, the Markov matrix is obtained:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 0.2104 & 0.4854 & 0.2969 & 0.0072 \\ 0 & 0.4429 & 0 & 0.5571 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.5679 & 0.4321 \\ 0.5050 & 0 & 0 & 0.4950 \end{bmatrix}$$

Based on Step. 2 and the conditional probabilities in Tables I, the final probabilities of different statuses on the given attributes can be calculated. Then weight vectors of the four attributes at each period $\omega^t = (\omega_q^t)^T$ ($t = 1, 2, 3; q = 1, 2, 3, 4$) are as follows:

$$\omega^1 = (0.2105, 0.4854, 0.2969, 0.0072)$$

$$\omega^2 = (0.0480, 0.3171, 0.2311, 0.4038)$$

$$\omega^3 = (0.2140, 0.1637, 0.1455, 0.3768)$$

In the following procedure, the DFPIPRs information provided by experts under each risk attribute need to be handled. For this GDM problem, based on Step 3, $n \times Q$ DFPIPRs are generated. Let the PDFPIPRs $\mathfrak{R}^k = (I_{ij}^k(p))_{4 \times 4}$ ($k = 1, 2, 3, 4$) of each expert for the alternative enterprises in the first risk attribute IRR be provided respectively as follows:

$$\mathfrak{R}^1 = \begin{pmatrix} (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{-2(\phi_2)}, s_{-2(\phi_1)}], 0.4) & ([s_{1(\phi_3)}, s_{1(\phi_1)}], 0.5) & ([s_{1(\phi_3)}, s_{1(\phi_1)}], 0.7) \\ ([s_{2(\phi_1)}, s_{2(\phi_2)}], 0.4) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{2(\phi_2)}, s_{2(\phi_2)}], 0.4) & ([s_{2(\phi_1)}, s_{2(\phi_1)}], 0.8) \\ ([s_{-1(\phi_1)}, s_{-1(\phi_2)}], 0.5) & ([s_{-2(\phi_2)}, s_{-2(\phi_2)}], 0.4) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{-1(\phi_1)}, s_{-1(\phi_1)}], 0.2) \\ ([s_{-1(\phi_1)}, s_{-1(\phi_1)}], 0.7) & ([s_{-3(\phi_1)}, s_{-2(\phi_1)}], 0.8) & ([s_{1(\phi_3)}, s_{1(\phi_1)}], 0.2) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\mathfrak{R}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{-2(\phi_2)}, s_{-2(\phi_2)}], 0.5) & ([s_{0(\phi_2)}, s_{0(\phi_1)}], 0.4) & ([s_{-2(\phi_2)}, s_{-2(\phi_2)}], 0.8) \\ ([s_{2(\phi_2)}, s_{2(\phi_2)}], 0.5) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{2(\phi_2)}, s_{2(\phi_2)}], 0.9) & ([s_{2(\phi_1)}, s_{2(\phi_1)}], 0.3) \\ ([s_{0(\phi_1)}, s_{0(\phi_1)}], 0.4) & ([s_{-2(\phi_2)}, s_{-2(\phi_2)}], 0.9) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{-1(\phi_1)}, s_{-1(\phi_1)}], 0.4) \\ ([s_{2(\phi_2)}, s_{2(\phi_1)}], 0.8) & ([s_{-3(\phi_1)}, s_{-2(\phi_1)}], 0.3) & ([s_{1(\phi_2)}, s_{1(\phi_1)}], 0.4) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\mathfrak{R}^3 = \begin{pmatrix} (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{-2(\phi_2)}, s_{-2(\phi_2)}], 0.6) & ([s_{1(\phi_1)}, s_{1(\phi_1)}], 0.2) & ([s_{2(\phi_2)}, s_{2(\phi_1)}], 0.8) \\ ([s_{2(\phi_1)}, s_{2(\phi_1)}], 0.6) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{1(\phi_2)}, s_{1(\phi_1)}], 0.4) & ([s_{2(\phi_1)}, s_{2(\phi_2)}], 0.5) \\ ([s_{-1(\phi_1)}, s_{-1(\phi_1)}], 0.2) & ([s_{-1(\phi_1)}, s_{-1(\phi_2)}], 0.4) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{-2(\phi_1)}, s_{-2(\phi_2)}], 0.6) \\ ([s_{-2(\phi_1)}, s_{-2(\phi_2)}], 0.8) & ([s_{-2(\phi_2)}, s_{-2(\phi_1)}], 0.5) & ([s_{2(\phi_2)}, s_{2(\phi_1)}], 0.6) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\mathfrak{R}^4 = \begin{pmatrix} (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{-2(\phi_1)}, s_{-2(\phi_1)}], 0.7) & ([s_{1(\phi_1)}, s_{1(\phi_1)}], 0.3) & ([s_{2(\phi_1)}, s_{2(\phi_2)}], 0.9) \\ ([s_{2(\phi_2)}, s_{2(\phi_2)}], 0.7) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{2(\phi_2)}, s_{2(\phi_2)}], 0.4) & ([s_{2(\phi_2)}, s_{2(\phi_2)}], 0.6) \\ ([s_{-1(\phi_1)}, s_{-1(\phi_1)}], 0.3) & ([s_{-2(\phi_2)}, s_{-2(\phi_2)}], 0.4) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) & ([s_{-2(\phi_1)}, s_{-2(\phi_2)}], 0.6) \\ ([s_{-2(\phi_2)}, s_{-2(\phi_1)}], 0.9) & ([s_{-2(\phi_1)}, s_{-2(\phi_2)}], 0.6) & ([s_{2(\phi_2)}, s_{2(\phi_1)}], 0.6) & (s_{0(\phi_1)}, 1) \end{pmatrix}$$

The DFPIPRs evaluations on the IRR, ALR, FLR and CR represent the certain and uncertain efficiencies of the given enterprises for preventing or eliminating these risk factors.

Let $\alpha = 0.5, \beta = 0.3, \gamma = 0.2$. Based on Step. 4, the outer distance weight vector is $\omega^{out} = (0.2253, 0.3320, 0.2439, 0.1988)^T$.

The inner deviation weight vector is $\omega^{in} = (0.2898, 0.2401, 0.2212, 0.2489)^T$.

Additionally, the deciders' trust degree for the experts in IRR evaluation information is $\psi^k = (80\%, 90\%, 70\%, 80\%)^T$ ($k = 1, 2, 3, 4$). Then the trust weight vector is

$$\omega^{tru} = (0.2500, 0.2812, 0.2188, 0.2500)^T$$

The experts' weight vector is obtained as

$$\omega = (0.2496, 0.2943, 0.2321, 0.2241)^T$$

Based on Model 1, the collective alternative priority vector for each risk attribute is $w_q = (w_q^x)^T$ ($x = 1, 2, 3, 4; q = 1, 2, 3, 4$).

The vector for IRR can be obtained as $w_1 = (0.2005, 0.6629, 0.0111, 0.1255)^T$.

In the same way, assume the remaining three are obtained:

$$w_2 = (0.4500, 0.0924, 0.2126, 0.2447)^T$$

$$w_3 = (0.1138, 0.2479, 0.5870, 0.0513)^T$$

$$w_4 = (0.2815, 0.1331, 0.1185, 0.4669)^T$$

Following Step. 4 and 5, the decision making procedures can be conducted and the optimal alternative can be obtained. The comparable values for the alternatives can be obtained by Eq. (30):

$$U_1 = 0.8279$$

$$U_2 = 0.6743$$

$$U_3 = 0.6993$$

$$U_4 = 0.6981$$

The final ranking of alternatives can be obtained as $A_1 \succ A_3 \succ A_4 \succ A_2$. The optimal alternative is A_1 .

VII. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this section, I conduct a comparison between DFPIILTS and PLTS in the decision making process on IRR. In Section VI, the score of the partial fuzzy linguistic intervals can be regarded as the evaluation with the most probability in the partial ignorance part of PLTS. And the decision preference relationship matrix can be presented by the information from DFPIILTS.

I use the decision model and description approach proposed in this paper to make the decision for the collective priority vector of alternatives under IRR in PLTS.

The result is:

$$w_1' = (0.2218, 0.5224, 0.1013, 0.1545)^T$$

Compared with $w_1 = (0.2005, 0.6629, 0.0111, 0.1255)^T$, we can see that in PLTS the priority data varies even less between alternatives. For example, the difference between A_3 and A_4 is so small that it is practically indistinguishable. This is because PLTS synthesizes all the uncertain opinions at each matrix position, and some of these uncertain opinions are better than "both are the same" and some are worse than "both are the same", so that these opinions fall into the region with lower probability, or even the region of fuzzy and ignorance. DFPIILTS filters the minimum fuzzy information into PDFPIILTS, so that the decision-making information comes from the most accurate evaluation of each matrix position by each expert, so that the results are more differentiated and similar results of alternative priorities caused by PLTS are avoided.

VIII. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

It is not rational to assign probabilities to linguistic term points. The action that traditional linguistic term sets take is forcing fuzzy information to be clear and is prone to produce misinformation. To make linguistic term set fit in with the human fuzzy consciousness, the concept of continuous linguistic term and interval are first defined in this paper. Then the linguistic integral is defined. Two main paradoxes are produced. After extending the existing techniques, I come up with DFPIILTS to solve the problems and its preference relationship DFPIILPR. Some basic operations, comparison

laws and aggregation operators have been studied and proposed. To solve the dynamic attribute weight problem in GDM, the DFPILMM and DFPILMDN which can comprehensively cover the dynamic interrelationships among attributes and achieve the goal of evolving over time are proposed. The extended expert weight-based DFPILPR decision making method considering DFPILPR inconsistency and individual-group deviation are proposed. Then, taking the problem of venture capital in a financial crisis as an example, the practicability of the model is illustrated.

The model can also be applied to investment decisions, product development, and other risk decision making problems. In the application of DFPILTS, the short-term discrete-time is adopted to represent the cross periods. In the future, the dynamic attribute weight on continuously time with increasing random perturbations can be studied, and the combination with psychological effects and novel artificial intelligent algorithms is also promising research topic. In this way, I hope to further demonstrate the advantages and validity of the proposed model.

REFERENCES

- [1] Zadeh, L.A.: The concept of a linguistic variable and its application to approximate reasoning. *Inf. Sci.* 8(3), 199–249 (1975).
- [2] Torra, V.: Hesitant fuzzy sets. *Int. J. Intell. Syst.* 25(6), 529–539 (2010).
- [3] Rodriguez, R.M., Martinez, L., Herrera, F.: Hesitant fuzzy linguistic term sets for decision making. *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.* 20, 109–119 (2012).
- [4] Zhu, B., Xu, Z.S.: Consistency measures for hesitant fuzzy linguistic preference relations. *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.* 22, 35–45 (2014).
- [5] Gou XJ, Liao HC, Xu ZS, Herrera F (2017) Double hierarchy hesitant fuzzy linguistic term set and MULTIMOORA method: a case of study to evaluate the implementation status of haze controlling measures. *Inf Fusion* 38:22–34.
- [6] Gou XJ, Liao HC, Xu ZS, Min R, Herrera F (2019) Group decision making with double hierarchy hesitant fuzzy linguistic preference relations: consistency based measures, index and repairing algorithms and decision model. *Inf Sci* 489:93–112.
- [7] Gou XJ, Xu ZS, Herrera F (2018a) Consensus reaching process for large-scale group decision making with double hierarchy hesitant fuzzy linguistic preference relations. *Knowl-Based Syst* 157:20–33.
- [8] Gou XJ, Xu ZS, Liao HC, Herrera F (2020a) A consensus model to manage minority opinions and noncooperative behaviors in large-scale GDM with double hierarchy linguistic preference relations. *IEEE Trans Cybern.* <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCYB.2020.2985069>.
- [9] Gou XJ, Xu ZS, Zhou W (2020b) Managing consensus by multiple stages optimization models with linguistic preference orderings and double hierarchy linguistic preferences. *Technol Econ Dev Econ* 26(3):642–674.
- [10] Fu ZG, Liao HC (2019) Unbalanced double hierarchy linguistic term set: the TOPSIS method for multi-expert qualitative decision making involving green mine selection. *Inf Fusion* 51:271–286.
- [11] Pang, Q., Wang, H., Xu, Z.S.: Probabilistic linguistic term sets in multi-attribute group decision making. *Inf. Sci.* 369, 128–143 (2016).
- [12] T. C. Wang, and H. D. Lee, “Developing a fuzzy TOPSIS approach based on subjective weights and objective weights,” *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 8980-8985, 2009.
- [13] G. X. Li, G. Kou, and Y. Peng, “Dynamic fuzzy multiple criteria decision making for performance evaluation,” *Technol. Econ. Dev. Econ.*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 705-719, 2015.
- [14] S. H. Nabavi-Kerizi, M. Abadi, and E. Kabir, “A PSO-based weighting method for linear combination of neural networks,” *Comput. Electr. Eng.*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 886-894, 2010.
- [15] L. Zhang, and W. D. Zhou, “Sparse ensembles using weighted combination methods based on linear programming,” *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 97-106, 2011.
- [16] Z. S. Xu, and X. Q. Cai, *Intuitionistic fuzzy information aggregation: Springer Berlin Heidelberg*, 2012.
- [17] Z. Hao, Z. Xu, H. Zhao and H. Fujita, "A Dynamic Weight Determination Approach Based on the Intuitionistic Fuzzy Bayesian Network and Its Application to Emergency Decision Making," in *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 1893-1907, Aug. 2018.
- [18] Gou, X. J., Liao, H. C., Xu, Z. S., & Herrera, F. (2017). Double hierarchy hesitant fuzzy linguistic MULTIMOORA method for evaluating the implementation status of haze controlling measures. *Information Fusion*, 38, 22–34.
- [19] Gagniuc, P.A. . *Markov Chains: From Theory to Implementation and Experimentation: John Wiley & Sons*, 2017: pp.1-32.